

Operational Sciences

Strong unification efforts are taking place within the fields of management sciences. In a not well publicized move, the Presidents of the Institute of Management Sciences (TIMS), Operations Research Society of America (ORSA), and American Institute for Decision Sciences (AIDS), at a meeting in Washington, D.C. in October 1978, have agreed to use one term to describe management science, operations research and decision science: **Operational Sciences**.

This term is so far intended for purposes of communicating with the National Science Foundation. The usefulness and impacts of the new terminology remain to be seen.

The risks of such unification efforts are obvious, although the potential payoffs are large enough to accept them. One danger is that a *unitary view*, rather than a *unity of diverse views*, will become a dominant characteristic of operational sciences.

The above hazard of unification could become very real. For example, in the statement of objectives for Decision Analysis (*Management Science*, January

1980), it is stipulated that, "suitable papers will be based on an axiomatic foundation (such as that of Von Neumann and Morgenstern or Savage)."

On another front, some journals have agreed to emphasize their similar interests by exchanging submission lists. *Management Science*, the *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, *Operations Research*, *Omega*, *Naval Research Logistics Quarterly*, and the *Journal of Operations Management*, have instituted this system of information interchange. An unintended result could be further decrease in the variety of published works, loss of competition, and ultimately a drop in the number of submissions. Some journals, like the *European Journal of Operational Research* and *Computers and Operations Research*, are not yet part of the exchange.

Considerable overlaps in terms of editorial board membership, pool of referees and an emerging unified submission pool, represent a significant publishing experiment carried out by these kindred journals. The outcomes will be interesting to watch.

Management in the XXI Century

The American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) and the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD) have undertaken an ambitious project aimed at making management/business education relevant to the rapidly changing needs and challenges of modern society. These efforts are reminiscent of the famous Ford-Carnegie Foundations reports, shaking up business education curricula a quarter-century ago.

In a fast-paced succession, the two sponsoring organizations arranged three international confer-

ences: Windsor Castle in February 1979, Arden House in November 1979, and Paris in June 1980. Their themes were, respectively, "The Changing Expectations of Society in the Next Thirty Years", "Management in the XXI Century", and "Managers for the XXI Century: Their Education and Development". Published reports from all three colloquia are available.

The participants listened to invited presentations of Daniel Bell, Jacques Chaban-Delmas, William R. Dill, Jacques Lesourne, Ignacy Sachs and Jan Tin-

bergen, among others. It is interesting to note that HSM Circle members (Lesourne and Sachs) provided most interesting ideas and leadership. Jacques Lesourne also directed the INTERFUTURES project sponsored by OECD, assessing problems the advanced industrial societies and developing countries are going to face up to the year 2000 and beyond. The INTERFUTURES Final Report is now available (see below). Among other HSM Circle participants were Warren Bennis, Charles B. Handy, Enda Hession and Bruno Leblanc, to name a few.

The space does not allow to describe and analyze all the proceedings. More questions were raised than answers agreed upon. Will this project result in perceptible changes in management/business education? Too early to tell. But the managers who will run business and other institutions in a radically transformed society are entering their professional education *today*. Are they free to choose a curriculum inducing the gestalt/holistic view of business, encouraging risk-taking, original thinking, moral responsibility and future oriented long-term 'feel' for business environment? Or are they constrained to acquire only

narrow technique oriented skills, shattered disciplinary 'bits and pieces', or case histories of past, never-to-be-repeated situations? It might be too late for them. James B. Farley, chairman of Booz Allen & Hamilton, is suggesting that companies will perhaps have to "skip a couple of generations" when reaching for their top executives in the future. Is it not too late even for a project as ambitious as the AACSB/EFMD efforts?

Human Systems Management is going to continue to facilitate the debates and encourage meaningful action with respect to the crucial issues of management education. There is no other way.

For our readers' information: INTERFUTURES, Final Report, September 1979, 462 pages, \$ 20, can be ordered from OECD Publications and Information Center, Suite 1207, 1750 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006, U.S.A.

Further information on the AACSB/EFMD project is available from: Mr. Roger Talpaert, Secretary General, E.I.A.S.M., Place Stéphanie 20, B-1050 Brussels, Bte. 15-16, Belgium.