

Another new year and another editorial needs to be done. The year 2023 has been a year of chaos and upheaval, following the same pattern as the preceding years of this decade. Since 2020, we have witnessed several wars, economic hardship, the COVID-19 crisis and an upswell of hate around the globe. Indeed, we could expect 2024 to potentially be even more chaotic and disastrous for humanity, as several major powers have elections to be held, there are rumors of even more wars, and another lockdown is a possibility. In addition, the difference between the global haves and have-nots remains. From a business standpoint, we are still witnessing scandals that have racked management since 2000. There is also a troubling trend of increased authoritarianism from the government and violence in the streets. It seems that 2019 was from a different century rather than just four short years ago. I am not sure my students would understand the optimism that I had as a college student in the last part of the previous century (1995–1999). To them, it would be as remote as the Victorian Era was to me.

As I am writing this editorial, the former US Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, passed away. Kissinger lived an interesting and dynamic life – a refugee from Nazi Germany, he later served in the US Army in Second World War. After the war, he went to Harvard on the G.I. Bill and became a renowned expert on foreign policy. He then served as Secretary of State under the administrations of Nixon and Ford – culminating in a controversial Peace Prize in 1973. We forget that Kissinger was a first-rate scholar and an incisive thinker of history. His first book, *A World Renewed*, on the Congress of Vienna, is a historical analysis of the balance of power that emerged after the Napoleonic Wars. This treaty would ensure peace in Europe for 100 years, a remarkable accomplishment. Contemporary political scientists challenged Kissinger's work, arguing that the advent of the Nuclear Age made research of historical diplomacy antiquarian. However, Kissinger was correct – the past opens vistas to explain the present.

The historical study of management, however we define history or management, is essential in providing both managers, students and scholars with an understanding of how modern business is influenced, for good or ill, by past events. I think more than ever, management scholars need to consider (like Kissinger did for foreign policy) how past events shape practices, even though business was very different 20 years ago, much less 200 years ago. One of the major issues with the dominant mode of logical positivism is that it downplays (or ignores) the role of context in shaping theory and findings. Yet, we are consistently surprised to find that contingency, whether national, group or otherwise, plays in limiting business practices. As such, we need a thorough education on the role these contingencies play in shaping managerial practice and discourse.

History can provide this lesson. Currently, there are debates about artificial intelligence and how it will impact modern work. How many jobs will be destroyed in the process? The perils of artificial intelligence lie in its potential to surpass human control, leading to unintended consequences, ethical dilemmas and the erosion of privacy as it becomes increasingly integrated into various facets of society. That last sentence was written by ChatGPT – does this mean that there is no room left for scholarship? There are also concerns about social media spreading inaccurate information. There is fear that the advent of modern technology will allow for governments and corporations to have the ability to spy on the populace. Finally, as we continue to map the human genome, what we could find may astonish us. Mostly, all these developments challenge the privacy and uniqueness of the



individual. However, reading and studying history may provide a template in how to perceive these challenges. More than ever we need good history.

We have witnessed epochs of great change before. For example, the joint emergence of the industrial economy, the market revolution and the stability of property allowed the world to break from the Malthusian trap that had been the prime experience for the overwhelming majority of the population. For example, Abraham Lincoln was born in 1809 in a log cabin to a subsistence farming family. When he was six, the Battle of Waterloo occurred. A battle where Napoleon and Wellington received information as did Caesar and Alexander, by horse. When Lincoln was assassinated, the advent of the railroad, steam engines, telegraphs and other inventions brought the beginnings of the modern world. This was a tremendous upheaval and provides us with lessons needed for us to thrive.

It is in this light that we present the following six papers. Each of these papers is unique, but build upon the themes that permeate this journal. Namely, the ongoing historical relevance of management thought and practice. Indeed, some of these papers trace the development of scholarly literature, others example policy and some papers develop themes regarding corporate actions. The time span of these papers is also quite diverse, as we have a paper talking about developments in 17th-century Italy to papers that examine recent programs in India that are designed to promote women's entrepreneurship. However, each of these papers shares one commonality, namely, each is an excellent piece of scholarship. I am very proud of this set of papers.

Our first paper, by Dana, Chhabra and Agarwal, is a systematic literature on the women's entrepreneurship in India. This is a very important topic as it covers two trends: one, the emergence of the Indian economy and, second, the role of women's entrepreneurship. Despite the various attempts at promoting women's entrepreneurship, it nevertheless lags behind male entrepreneurship. This a problem on both equity and economic fronts. In fact, one of the principal findings in the paper is that despite the importance of this topic, it remains underresearched. This finding does have one silver-lining, this research may allow politicians to improve their outreach. Young scholars (especially doctoral students) should note this as they start their careers. In addition, the historical examination of literature provides further evidence for the ongoing importance of history in research as the past reveals where we were and where we may go.

Another important finding in the paper is the discovery of several clusters of research. The authors found that "contextual embeddedness in women entrepreneurship," "reasons for starting a business," "microfinance interventions and empowerment of women entrepreneurs" and "marginalization dynamics for women entrepreneurs in India's informal sector" are the most common topics. Based on the discovery of these topics, the authors develop improved programs that address women's entrepreneurship, such as loan usage, government outreach/responsibility, relevant technologies and various types of support, such as marketing and social.

Our second article is McCormick and Bean's work on the greatest American business leaders and entrepreneurs based on a survey of various business scholars. This is the third article of their survey that they issue every 10 years (the previous additions were published in 2001 and 2011). We are proud to have this article in the journal, as the first article in this series was published in the august *Business History Review*. These lists are always thought provoking and commonly serve as fodder for debate, as I am sure this article will inspire debate. Although I find exercises like this tend to be a bit unhistorical (and perhaps given survey limitations unscientific), nevertheless this raises important questions as to who is truly important. In fact, I probably have more comments and thoughts on McCormick and Bean's work than other articles we have published. There is a lot of fun and intellectual

---

profit to be had analyzing this list. I think a common theme from each of these leaders is that they have increased wealth and betterment for the USA.

One, it is remarkable that Henry Ford remains perched on the list again. This is remarkable because of the controversial nature of Ford's career, as he helped to produce rampant consumerism and (later) was an odious anti-Semite. I would also suggest that the analysts keep on getting this wrong. John D. Rockefeller was the most important business leader in the history of the country and, perhaps, the world. His development of the oil industry allowed for the birth of the "hydrocarbon man" (Yergin's phrase) that has dominated commerce since the 1870s. In addition, why Walt Disney? Is it because of his company (that has preserved until recently) or his actual influence? In fact, I think most Hollywood executives of the 1950s and 1960s would have believed that Louis B. Mayer was the better business leader. In addition, why the exclusion of John Jacob Astor, David Sarnoff, William Paley and Henry Kaiser? That is to say nothing about the exclusion of Mark Zuckerberg. I believe best lists suggest more about the judges than it does the figure. Whatever the case, this article will spur on debate and interest. I enjoyed reading this immensely.

Based on McCormick and Bean's article, I would like to propose a question. Namely, why did we list the greatest managers/entrepreneurs and not explore the bad ones? I think a list of bad entrepreneurs/managers would be quite interesting. Namely, I believe that a list of bad managers/entrepreneurs would list corporate frauds (Ken Lay), rent-seekers and those who have explored destructive entrepreneurship, such as slave traders and conquerors. Indeed, I believe that Julius Caesar was a form of Roman entrepreneur in that he increased the wealth of Rome but, in the process, took it from somewhere else. Mostly, a list of the bad business leaders/entrepreneurs would demonstrate that these individuals do not adhere to the principles of Adam Smith. They gain their wealth at the expense of someone else, rather than creating actual value for society.

Niccolò Machiavelli is one of the most famous names in history as he is an important influencer in political science, philosophy, leadership and management. Indeed, Machiavelli is so well-noted that his name is shared by a dark triad personality trait (Machiavellianism, a tendency to be manipulative). An argument could be made that there is nothing fresh about Machiavelli. However, Mertens, Villegas, Ware, Vengrouskie and Lloyd provide an excellent paper that provides a fresh (and new) application in that there is a strong hint of Machiavellianism within the topic of business process reengineering (BPR). The authors of the paper demonstrate that the constructs of Machiavellian thought remain embedded within management research. They expand upon this idea that Machiavellian work continues to influence management practice despite the development of more employee-centered approaches.

This article is a prime case of why scholars (and managers) should carefully examine the history of a concept. I am willing to wager that the creators of BPR probably did not understand that they were absorbing the ideas of Machiavelli as they constructed their system. Likewise, scholars are often unaware of the intellectual basis of much of their work. As Arthur Bedeian wrote, professional maturity is a gift – but we too often treat it like it is a pair of socks at Christmas. In particular, this article raises a very intriguing idea, namely, why do bad business practices continue to exist. This is a question we need to examine more thoroughly in the future.

Our next paper by Fezzey and Swab is a bibliometric review of individual competitiveness, which is an individual difference variable that compels people to excel, whether it is against others, previous performance or an absolute. In essence, as they point out in the first paragraph, competitiveness has a very long intellectual history, as it was one

of the major drivers of human behavior as suggested by Darwin. There are favorable outcomes for competitiveness, such as achieving rewards, status or survival. Indeed, much of management and economics literature highlights the absolute importance of competitiveness. Indeed, the desire to outperform another individual, team or organization is so salient that we transform this desire into a need. Given the tremendous influence of competitiveness, we should not be surprised that this personality difference variable also leads to many negative outcomes, including unethical behaviors and burnout.

The authors of this paper make several contributions. First, their use of historical analysis allows them to understand the key influences, contributors and theoretical underpinnings. In doing so, this allows them to track the relationships of the subdomains. Second, they provide evidence that scholars from different disciplines research the same concept independently of each other, to the detriment of the concept. Finally, the authors make suggestions to create greater dialogue. Their hope (and mine) is that this will allow us to better understand when and where competitiveness works and when it does not.

Our fifth article is by Giorgino on the notion of the hybridization process, which is in regards to a nonprofit organization pursuing some commercialization. Organizations are increasingly pursuing hybridization for several reasons that usually stem from institutional inducements. One particular issue is that even state entities, such as universities, are going into areas that are for-profit – such as scientific research, business consulting or (in the American case) basically running quasi-professional sports teams. This paper presents the case that Immobili theater and academies possessed hybridization in the 17th century due to a lack of government support and operational constraints. A finding of the paper is that there is alignment of nonprofit missions with contemporary market logic, multilevel structures, integrating volunteers and paid workers and other resources such as mandatory revenues. Basically, this was a 17th-century equivalent of a modern university trying to find additional revenue to allow itself freedom.

This paper raises something that I believe scholars should pursue. Do for-profit companies seek to hybridize (such as pursuing corporate social responsibility [CSR]) as a means of preventing stakeholders from sanctioning the focal corporation? Certainly, there is a wide range of arguments for pursuing CSR – but an argument that has been making the rounds is that companies attempt to leverage their CSR programs as a means of avoiding sanction from the state or other actions brought on by influential stakeholders. Certainty, this could explain why some mainstream corporations have become so political. Above all, it would appear that institutional pressures could make companies pursue not-for-profit as well. Giorgino's paper is excellent in that it provides clear answers to questions – but also inspires future research insights.

Our final paper is on the Tata group written by Kaul and Ghosh. The paper is about a Tata, a private conglomerate, and their policy of handling disabilities from postindependence until the liberalization of the Indian economy in the 1990s. A couple of notes, Tata is a conglomerate with assets around \$300bn, and it has a reputation for cronyism, exploitation and even mass killings. Kaul and Ghosh provide a much more nuanced thesis in that the Tata group offered disability programs during this period. In fact, the argument presented here is that Tata pursued a very active prosocial disability policy (such as medical interventions and rehabilitations) during a period of state-dominated development. In many ways, this policy anticipated the current landscape of countries seeking diversity. This paper provides a distinct approach regarding philanthropic and charitable engagement during a period of strong government intervention in the economy. Tata's policy can be seen as a model of a program of strategic assistance to both Indian companies and those in other countries.

---

This is a paper that really spoke to me as I have an interest in CSR and social entrepreneurship. First, it is a companion piece to the Immobili paper, in that we have a for-profit company providing welfare to a group of workers who often remain unnoticed. This approach anticipates modern strategic human resource systems that seek to locate underrepresented populations in the market, such as those with a disability. As such, there is a direct business benefit from this policy. Second, I believe that there is also an indirect benefit in that it helps to align Tata with the Indian Government's policy, aiding in better government relationships. Third, this was not just a charitable approach, but a pioneering strategic effort on the part of the corporation.

I would like to end on a happy note. Once again, our CiteScore has reached a new high, continuing a trend over the past few years. Our acceptance rate is higher; we have a large pipeline of papers, and downloads are holding steady. We receive papers from a worldwide set of authors with different research interests and philosophies. These are all signs that the journal is in excellent shape. Our journal is a broad-church, big-tent journal, as our definitions of what constitutes both history and management are very broad. We welcome literature reviews, traditional history, critical management and postmodern work. In addition, we consider operations, entrepreneurship, marketing, accounting, finance and economics to fall within the definition of management research. We will have several special issues coming up on a wide variety of topics and interests. I would like to thank our editorial board (especially the associate editors), reviewers, authors and readers for these accomplishments.

**Jeff Muldoon**

*School of Business, Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas, USA*