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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to present a biographical sketch of David D. Monieson whose academic career in marketing included time spent at the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania, the University of Toronto, and over 30 years at Queen’s University. It is focussed on Monieson’s contributions to the history and philosophy of marketing thought, especially with respect to what Monieson called “usable knowledge” in marketing.

Design/methodology/approach – This paper uses a traditional historical narrative based on extensive personal interviews with Monieson and with some of his students and colleagues as well as archival research including personal correspondence, course notes, research notes, and other unpublished documents.

Findings – Monieson made important contributions to the thinking about history and philosophy of marketing thought. Some of his ideas, such as the intellectualization and re-enchantment of marketing, have found a following among marketing academics; others, such as complexity, have not.

Originality/value – There is no published biographical study of Monieson and no detailed analysis of his contributions to marketing thought. This biographical sketch provides insights into several significant marketing ideas and tells the life story of an important marketing scholar.
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Introduction

Intellectual biography contributes to our understanding of the history of ideas by examining the origins of an individual’s work, how he or she came to focus on certain ideas, and the ideological foundations of that person’s thinking. It helps us to understand achievement by examining subjects’ motives, the personality they brought to their work,
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and the people and conditions that influenced them along the way. Another role of biography is simply to tell life stories. In telling those stories, we may also learn more about ourselves. This is an intellectual biography of David D. (Danny) Monieson. He was our teacher, mentor, colleague, and friend.

Monieson retired from teaching in 1991 after more than 35 years in the marketing academy. Following graduate studies at the Ohio State University (OSU), he began his academic career at the University of Toronto in 1955 followed by three years as a member of the faculty at the Wharton School of Business, then settled down in 1961 at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario, Canada where he remained for the balance of his career. Monieson twice won the Queen’s Commerce Society’s Teaching Excellence Award and in 2009 was among the first individuals inducted into the Queen’s School of Business Faculty Hall of Fame. He was first and foremost an outstanding teacher. As a consultant, he worked with government and quasi-governmental organizations, with multinational companies in pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, toiletries, confectionaries, and with advertising agencies. Monieson wrote and published selectively, but his scholarship is nonetheless important. Most of his writing appeared in the *Journal of Macromarketing (JMM)*. He wrote the lead article, “What constitutes usable knowledge in macromarketing,” for *JMM* when it began publication in 1981 and won *JMM*'s 1989 Charles C. Slater Memorial Award for most outstanding article published in 1988 – “Intellectualization in macromarketing: a world disenchanted.” His work has also been published in the *Journal of Marketing, Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, and, in true earlier twentieth century tradition, some of his most interesting and important work was published in conference proceedings. He held the Nabisco Brands Chair in Marketing at Queen’s for over 15 years. These achievements are part of what the biographer Milton Lomask (1986) calls “residue” and what makes David D. Monieson a deserving subject for biographical study.

This biographical sketch is largely based on in-depth personal interviews conducted by the lead author with Monieson in September of 1998. For additional information regarding Monieson’s consulting work, we relied on archival records and a personal interview with his long-time friend and client, Goodes (2007). Monieson supervised only three doctoral graduates during his career. Two were collaborators with Monieson on some of his published research and are co-authors of this biographical sketch. All the authors were students of Monieson’s, either in his MBA courses at Wharton or at Queen’s, or in his doctoral seminar at Queen’s. Thus, personal reflections of the authors and course notes also provided source material. Additionally, some archival documents were studied including Monieson’s course notes from Wharton and Queen’s, unpublished research notes, and personal correspondence.

**Preparations for a career in marketing**

Danny Monieson (Plate 1) was born on August 17, 1927 in Montreal, Canada. His grandparents had emigrated from England in the late nineteenth century and founded the London Paper Box Company in Montreal. Monieson grew up during the Great Depression, but did not suffer. His father worked for the family business as sales manager and provided a comfortable life for the Monieson family. In high school, Monieson sang in the choir, played hockey, and led a full life. There would eventually be some pressure to join the family business, but his mother did not want him to take this path. She wanted him to “do something with his life.”
After high school, Monieson enrolled at the University of Vermont (UVM) where he earned his Bachelor of Science degree in Technology and Economics with a minor in statistics. A career in teaching had never occurred to him, but aptitude tests taken while he was an undergraduate student suggested that he was suited for business, social work, or teaching. One of Monieson’s favorite instructors at UVM was a professor of economics and statistics who had earlier taught at Miami University of Ohio and he recommended that Monieson go there for graduate studies. However, after graduation from UVM in the Spring of 1949, there was subtle pressure from his uncle, who managed the London Paper Box Company, to join the family business. Monieson’s uncle insisted that he learn the business from the ground up and so he began working in the factory punching cardboard for a salary of $25 per week. When it became clear to Monieson that he would have to wait a long time for an office job, he decided to take his UVM professor’s advice and enrolled in the MBA program at Miami University of Ohio in the Fall of 1949.

Monieson should have completed the MBA in one year but the research for his thesis on the coal industry dragged on through the Summer and Autumn of 1950 so, during the Fall semester of 1950, he taught a course in introduction to business while still
completing his MBA. Of that initial teaching experience, Monieson recalled that he quickly learned to be prepared but also spontaneous; he learned that he had to be himself in the classroom. His MBA thesis supervisor, Professor Bice, had invited Professor Harold Maynard from OSU to speak to his MBA class and introduced Monieson to Maynard who convinced Monieson to enrol in the doctoral program at OSU.

At OSU from 1952 to 1954, Monieson’s teachers included Harold Maynard, William Davidson, Ralph Currier Davis, and Theodore N. Beckman who supervised Monieson’s doctoral dissertation. His classmates included Robert Buzzell (later a Professor at the Harvard Business School) and William Lazer (who became a Professor at Michigan State University and later President of the American Marketing Association), both of whom also completed dissertations under Beckman’s supervision.

Maynard taught the doctoral seminar in the history of marketing thought. For the most part, the reading materials for that course were taken from Robert Bartels’ (1962) dissertation work on “Marketing literature development and appraisal” which was supervised by Maynard and Beckman, completed in 1941, and eventually published as The Development of Marketing Thought. Maynard had a strong interest in the history of the marketing discipline and Monieson recalled that the walls in Maynard’s office were covered with pictures of pioneer marketing scholars. Interestingly, the historical component in Monieson’s own dissertation was quite different from Bartels’ work as it traced portrayals of the role of marketing middlemen as producers of value from ancient Greek scholars through various schools of economics including the Mercantilists, Physiocrats, Classicists, Austrian School, Neoclassicists, and twentieth century dissenters – none of which had been discussed in Bartels’ work. Monieson never published any of this historical research[2] and the ideas did not become part of the marketing history literature until the 1980s when Donald Dixon and (his student) Eric Shaw began to write about them. It did, however, kindle Monieson’s interest in understanding the roots of the marketing discipline and how those roots evolved over time. That interest in the history of marketing thought became an important part of his later contributions to the marketing literature (Jones and Monieson, 1987, 1988, 1990a, b, 1992; Monieson, 1992).

Monieson acknowledged that his most influential teacher was Theodore N. Beckman. One of the first courses he took in the OSU doctoral program during the Fall of 1952 was Beckman’s. Soon thereafter, he became Beckman’s Graduate Assistant for the undergraduate course in Credits and Collections. Later, Beckman supervised Monieson’s (1957) dissertation on “Value added as a measure of economic contribution by marketing institutions.” At OSU, and especially as Beckman’s student, Monieson gained “an incredible education in marketing” (Monieson, 1998) and developed strong beliefs about the integration of theory with practice that laid the foundation for his subsequent consulting work.

Beckman’s most important contributions to marketing thought were undoubtedly on the topic of marketing productivity (Jones, 2007). He was deeply concerned with the popular misconception that marketing was an unproductive, unnecessary part of the economic system. During the 1950s, Beckman developed the concept of “value added by marketing” and focused his attention on developing measures of that value. He wanted two doctoral students to work on the topic. With Monieson’s undergraduate training in economics and statistics, he was a likely candidate[3]. Monieson had been
interested in the start-up of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as a topic, but “Beckman ignored that” and told Monieson that he should work on value added. While Beckman provided the conceptual foundation for Monieson, it was up to the student to figure out precisely what he was going to do with it. Monieson’s dissertation further developed the concept of value added by marketing and devised methods of measuring the value added by marketing institutions. These measures were tested using data from the 1948 US Census. Except for the historical content, Monieson’s dissertation was a rigorous empirical study heavily laden with economic statistics. It was an exercise in what he later termed “intellectualization.”

Monieson’s (1988, 1989) notion of “intellectualization” refers to a process of continuous rationalization of society’s activities, including marketing, to create an ordered and predictable world. It is a linear kind of thinking with teleologic and reductionist overtones where every phenomenon can be rationalized and calculated, where values and value judgments have no place, resulting in what Monieson called disenchantment. Intellectualization seemed necessary for academic respectability, but it stood in the way of understanding the beauty, magic, and poetics of marketing. Monieson soon felt that disenchantment and struggled for most of his career to find a balance between scientific knowledge and what he termed “usable knowledge.”

[... ] in a world disenchanted

Through connections between Harold Maynard and Queen’s University economist William MacIntosh, Monieson was offered a one year sabbatical replacement position at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario. During the 1954/1955 academic year at Queen’s, Monieson was still completing his doctoral dissertation, but presented some of his findings (Monieson, 1955) at the December 1954 American Marketing Association conference in Detroit. In the audience for that session was Wharton Professor Reavis Cox who was sufficiently impressed to tell Monieson to get in touch with him when the dissertation was finished.

When his dissertation was completed in 1956, Monieson sent a copy to Reavis Cox who invited Monieson to come to Wharton. Monieson joined the faculty of the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania as an Associate Professor in the Autumn of 1958. His experience at OSU may have provided the launch pad for Monieson’s academic career, but Wharton fueled his intellectual curiosity. The academic atmosphere and culture at Wharton was very different from OSU. The latter was traditional in its emphasis on economics and the department was heavily influenced by Beckman’s thinking. Wharton was more eclectic and more multidisciplinary, its faculty including Reavis Cox and Wroe Alderson who were interested in Monieson’s work measuring value added and shared Monieson’s interest in history. The faculty also included Ralph Breyer whose ideas about wholeness and order in marketing and the organic nature of social groups was ultimately an important theme in Monieson’s later work.

Between 1944 and 1959, Alderson worked primarily as a marketing consultant (Wooliscroft, 2006). He joined the faculty at Wharton full time in Autumn of 1959, a year after Monieson arrived, so they overlapped for only two years. Even so, it was an important two years for Monieson’s intellectual development. Before arriving at Wharton, Monieson had “absorbed” Alderson’s (1957) book, *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action* and found its sociological approach very appealing. He even used it to
teach the MBA course in marketing management when he joined Queen’s University full time in 1961 and later credited Alderson’s book, along with Wilson’s (1975), *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, as the most influential in his thinking. At Wharton, he also became interested in epistemology as he began to question how one learned about marketing.

The students in Monieson’s 1958, Fall semester MBA class included Louis Stern, Henry Assail, G. David Hughes, William Rudelius, and Stanley Shapiro – all of whom went on to distinguished academic careers. Monieson was instrumental in Shapiro’s dissertation and the two later became close friends and colleagues. Monieson continued to consult, notably with the Ontario Hog Marketing Board. He hired Shapiro as his assistant and the Hog Board, viewed as an Aldersonian Organized Behavior System, became the subject of Shapiro’s dissertation. Wharton was intellectually stimulating for Monieson, but his ideas about epistemology in marketing, about the biological and evolutionary dimensions of Alderson’s work, and about the fusion of other disciplines with marketing, which began to take form during this time, were not fully developed until many years later.

Settling down at Queen’s

For family reasons, in 1961 the Moniesons moved to Kingston, Ontario and he joined the Queen’s School of Business as a faculty member. This would be home for the rest of his career, although other opportunities were considered from time to time. His graduate studies at OSU gave him a solid education in marketing, an appreciation for the history of the discipline, and a sense of the importance of consulting in “feeding” his teaching. The latter would also influence some of his later thinking about epistemology in marketing. His three years at Wharton had been intellectually stimulating and planted the seeds of some of Monieson’s later contributions to the marketing literature on usable knowledge and complexity theory. In the years leading to his appointment at Queen’s, instrumental connections had been made with scholars such as Theodore Beckman, Wroe Alderson, and Stanley Shapiro, all of whom influenced Monieson’s later work. But for now, as he settled into his university career, he focused on his teaching. Teaching was job one then and throughout his career.

At Wharton, Monieson had taught the MBA marketing management course using a combination of seminar discussions of assigned readings and some case discussions. As described in Trebuss’s article elsewhere in this issue of the journal, Monieson’s sense of drama, forceful personality, and spontaneity in the classroom later made him a legend in the School of Business and among other students at Queen’s.[4]. During the early 1960s, Monieson began to truly appreciate the importance of consulting to his teaching. He had little business experience, so consulting provided a vital link to marketing practice. It provided him with examples to use in class and added depth to his teaching. Ironically, during the 1960s Monieson’s consulting experiences fed a growing disenchantment with his teaching as he became increasingly aware of the disparity between what was written in marketing textbooks and what was practiced in business. He had begun to see a tension between science and tacit, ordinary, personal knowledge.

He took a sabbatical in 1968/1969, travelled extensively and began reading about the philosophy of science. He sought out and read critiques of marketing such as Galbraith’s (1967) and Baran’s (1973) works in economics. At the end of the sabbatical...
year, he resolved to change his approach to teaching and to write about the disparity between what was typically taught and what was actually practiced by business people.

**In search of usable knowledge**

Monieson’s search for usable knowledge began in earnest during the 1970s, a decade he later described as a time of personal discovery. His consulting work had convinced him that marketing practitioners did not practice what most marketing teachers taught, that practitioner knowledge was very different from the knowledge that marketing scholars developed and published. Each thinks and knows differently; each uses a different epistemology. But for marketing knowledge to be meaningful, it must be usable for practitioners.

By 1971, Monieson shifted his teaching entirely to the case method. His MBA course in marketing strategy that year is actually very similar to the course he taught at Wharton ten years earlier except that there was even heavier use of cases. A textbook was recommended, but not required and, as he did at Wharton, he provided students with copious notes for background reading. However, all of the in-class time was now spent analyzing and discussing marketing cases (Monieson, 1971). By 1982, his MBA course was exclusively case-based; no textbook was even recommended and no notes were provided. There were learning points summarized at the end of every class, what Monieson called his “aphorisms” or “rules of thumb.” Even in his MBA course, he raised the question of how we know what we know and discussed the role of tacit knowledge. While acknowledging popular models of marketing behavior such as the product life cycle and various grid models of decision making, Monieson criticized them as rigid and deterministic, arguing that the very reason they were popular was because they brought “order to chaos,” a phrase he borrowed from dissipative theory.

During the early 1970s, Monieson became a student again, reading voraciously across a wide range of disciplines including the philosophy of science, epistemology, sociology, biology, history, physics, chemistry, and economics. Over the next 20 years, there were two common threads through his reading and thinking – epistemology and complexity theory. Monieson came to believe that any general theory of marketing must be based on complexity theory and any understanding of complexity theory must embrace a broader approach to epistemology than the one that had dominated the marketing discipline since the late nineteenth century. The subjects most represented in Monieson’s library[5] were philosophy (particularly epistemology), sociology and its related field of sociobiology. Of course, his library includes the two books that most influenced his thinking – Alderson’s (1957), *Marketing Behavior and Executive Action* which laid the foundation for a multidisciplinary general theory of marketing and Wilson’s (1975), *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* which started the sociobiology debate and popularized the term. The latest additions to the library focused on complexity theory.

Sojourns to the Management Development Institute at IMEDE in Lausanne, Switzerland in 1974/1975 and to the Harvard Business School in 1978/1979 led to his first serious writing and publication in years. He had become interested in distributive justice and while at IMEDE wrote and published two short articles about the right to consume (Monieson, 1975a, b). Drawing from critical economists such as John Kenneth Galbraith and Paul Baran, Monieson called for a more effective working of the market economy.
Marketers stimulate demand, he wrote, not only from affluent consumers, but also from the poor – who are unable to satisfy their wants in our market economy. Marketers manipulate the expectations of all of us, affluent as well as poor. By virtue of their actions, Monieson (1975b, p. 40) continued, marketers have forced the poor into the market and they too have “the right to consume at levels that closely approximate [their] acquired consumption patterns.” It was sobering advice coming from a marketing professor in a business school in the mid-1970s. This early writing by Monieson on distributive justice brought into focus for him the inescapable need for values and value judgments in marketing. Distributive justice became Monieson’s favorite example of why science could never lead to a complete or satisfactory knowledge of marketing. There was an ethical, moral core to his teaching. He argued that if marketing had “prowess and control” then it also had responsibility. In re-reading the notes taken in Monieson’s 1991 doctoral seminar, we were struck by his foreshadowing of criticisms of the marketing discipline that “ordained” certain values (like materialism). Monieson was an early critic who noted that while there has been considerable study of how society affects marketing, there had been far less work on how marketing has affected society.

Monieson also understood the importance of paradox and brought the need to incorporate and understand opposites into his teaching. Drawing on a wide range of literature such as Pirsig’s (1974), *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance*, and Shelley’s (1818), *Frankenstein*, he illustrated the nature of ambivalence and how interpretations of concepts evolve over time as the need to understand the ambivalence between opposites arose (love and hate, man and monster, nature and technology).

As a visiting scholar at Harvard in 1978/1979, Monieson made good use of the resources of the Baker Library to investigate the origins of the marketing discipline which he traced to the German Historical School of Economics, although those ideas were not published until much later (Jones and Monieson, 1990a). Monieson’s (1988, 1989) purpose in this historical study was to demonstrate that, in its beginning, the marketing discipline had developed a need for academic respectability and adopted a scientific ideal as the means of achieving academic legitimacy. The technical rationality and empirical investigations to inductively develop law-like generalizations that characterized the study of marketing by German-trained American economists beginning in the late nineteenth century laid the foundation for the logical positivism that dominated marketing scholarship throughout the twentieth century. He later described this process as one of intellectualization.

Shortly after returning to Queen’s from Harvard, Monieson was invited to write a paper about Alderson’s contributions to marketing theory for the 1980 American Marketing Association Winter Educators’ Conference. Monieson was fascinated with the sociology of knowledge and loved to trace intellectual “family trees” and the lines of influence among scholars. In “Biological and evolutionary dimensions of Aldersonian thought: what he borrowed then and what he might have borrowed now,” Monieson and Shapiro (1980) focused on Alderson’s functionalism and demonstrated convincingly how Alderson built upon the work of the sociologist, Talcott Parsons. Alderson died in 1965 just before his seminal work on marketing theory was published. Parsons’ subsequent writings integrated evolutionary biology with his ideas about social systems and, Monieson speculated, would surely have influenced Alderson’s thinking. Those remarks were nonetheless just a segue for Monieson to speculate about the potential influence of Wilson’s sociobiology on Alderson. Had Alderson lived...
another 15 years, surely ideas such as ecological competition, population biology, adaptive demography, behavior scaling, and social drift, would have formed part of Alderson’s theory of marketing. Monieson also believed that any theory of marketing must move beyond the old social sciences and systems theory to incorporate the ideas of Lindblom and Cohen (1979) about usable knowledge and practical judgment, as well as ideas about the new biology or sociobiology being proposed by Wilson. Wilson’s (1975), *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis* was a revelation to Monieson.

In an unpublished, undated manuscript (probably written circa 1980), Monieson clearly and concisely summarized Wilson’s (1975, 1978), *Sociobiology* and subsequent Pulitzer Prize winning *On Human Nature*. He focused on Wilson’s criticisms of other social sciences (sociology, psychology, cultural anthropology, and economics) for wholly inappropriate approaches to theory building. As the “new biology” was replacing outdated notions of “old” biological ideas, the implications for marketing were clear to Monieson (circa 1980, pp. 16-18):

Some very simplistic, often erroneous, and sometimes dangerous notions are lifted from biology and taken up with similar effect on marketing studies in particular and business studies in general […] A major problem arises when we borrow and try to apply evolutionary theory to marketing and business modeling; we have to develop a proper understanding of the borrowed theory, we have to appreciate which variant of theory we are using, and we have to be logically faithful to that which we borrow.

Interestingly, while he believed that there were important potential conceptual applications of sociobiology to marketing, in this unpublished paper Monieson focused on the epistemological implications of Wilson’s work.

In 1980, Monieson was invited to write a paper about usable knowledge for the upcoming Macromarketing Conference. The following year, when the *JMM* was founded, Monieson’s (1981c) revised paper about “What constitutes usable knowledge in macromarketing?” was the lead article in the new journal. It was the first full, published statement of his beliefs about usable knowledge.

**What constitutes usable knowledge in marketing?**

The essence of Monieson’s (1981c) ideas about epistemology was captured in three important articles. In “What constitutes usable knowledge in macromarketing?” He described the dichotomy between practitioner knowledge and marketing science, traced the origins of marketing science to the very beginnings of the discipline, and argued for what he called usable knowledge which he described as a combination of practitioner knowledge and marketing science. Several years later, he refined his case for usable knowledge, largely through a detailed critique of marketing science in “Intellectualization in macromarketing: a world disenchanted” (Monieson 1988, 1989). Motivated by his concerns for distributive justice, Monieson was clearly identified with the macromarketing school of thought (Tamilia, 1992). However, while it is important to note that while the titles of these articles and some of the examples discussed in them focused on macromarketing, Monieson’s ideas about usable knowledge were targeted at the marketing discipline in general.

Monieson agreed with Polanyi (1958) who wrote that practitioner knowledge includes a tacit dimension that permits them to know more than they can tell, a knowledge based on experience. To Monieson, there is an art or craft to knowing in that way that is phenomenological. Monieson also saw a parallel between tacit
knowledge and Lindblom and Cohen’s (1979) concept of ordinary knowledge, a personal type of knowing based on the common sense that is used in practical problem solving. Monieson was sometimes misunderstood to be dismissing marketing science altogether. However, Monieson (1981c, p. 17) was careful to note that:

(...) if we want to know and to understand the marketing practitioner then it appears that we will have to employ a mode of thinking that transcends but somehow does not exclude scientism (emphasis added).

Anyone who thinks otherwise need only read what Monieson (1983a) wrote about the cognitive sciences and marketing in “Artificial intelligence and the human mind: a review essay – Godel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid”. In fact, Monieson’s (1988) concept of usable knowledge combined ordinary, reflective, practitioner knowledge with scientific knowledge. He later refined this definition of usable knowledge to include three basic elements: information, interpretation, and criticism. Marketing science generates information whereas marketing practice leads to interpretation. Criticism allows us to introduce values and value judgments to our knowledge of marketing. Using distributive justice as his example, Monieson argued that marketing problem solving (practitioner knowledge) must include values and value judgments. And so, criticism must be part of usable knowledge.

Immediately following the publication of “What constitutes usable knowledge in macromarketing?” Monieson (1981b) was challenged by a colleague at Queen’s[8] whose attack prompted a passionate defense that adds some clarity and depth to the arguments published:

This paper is not a cri de coeur; I am not at all unhappy, unduly pessimistic, or gloomy [...] There was no baleful cry straining to be emitted from my throat. I am quite at home with [quantitative] research methodology, and use that which is usable in business consultation. It would not have been possible to have spent so many years with so many large, sophisticated business firms if I were doing otherwise. My own observations and experiences in consulting anticipated the research results of the [AMA's] Massy-Greyser report: much of what marketing academics do is, to be most charitable, useless to businessmen. My reference is the Commission's evidence – not mine. The Commission maintains enough faith to exact a belief that more than the given 25-year scope of their study is required to prove out to the businessman what we academics have been and are presently producing. I say that they [the Massy-Greyser Commission] should stick with their results and not profess to an article of faith that goes contrary to their derived results. Further, I say that so long as the academic pursues the path that he is on, his work will be usable to the practitioner only by chance. This is because we have made the field a narrowly focused discipline. We may use the businessman and his firm as the object for our investigation, but we do so really for our own selfish purposes. Given our present course, we may someday exalt our discipline to a level higher than it presently is; but the results of our work will continue to be useless to the practitioner – probably even more so. Given the politics and the sociology of knowledge of our field, I do not see much change in our present direction. I, for one, think as Alfred Marshall, that we are the “handmaidens to businessmen.” If many more of my colleagues feel as I do, then perhaps the direction could be changed. But this will require a new way of thinking in and about our field. I suspect that it would have to be a “science plus” mental construct. I went out of my way to reference very successful and famous scientists on this matter, and I could have referenced even more, to demonstrate that there are others who think like me, and feel as I do. I do not want to destroy our science; I want to improve it, and bring into it in a systematic manner, the poetics, the “art” of the field.
Monieson had a vision of marketing academics working together with marketing practitioners to combine practitioner knowledge with scientifically derived knowledge. He hoped that this “science plus” model might produce knowledge that was usable to practitioners and if the knowledge marketing academics produce is not usable to marketing practitioners, then what is the point of it?

Monieson (1988, p. 4) had refined his concept of usable knowledge to include values writing that, “human values have to be incorporated so that the science of macromarketing is conducted by humans in the service of humans.” His “Intellectualization in macromarketing: a world disenchanted” was first presented at the 1988 AMA Winter Educators’ Conference where it was described by the editor as “one of the more exciting presentations” of the conference (Shapiro, 1988, p. 523). Dholakia (1988, p. 11) hailed the paper as “one which will achieve landmark status” and hoped that it would “shake up and loosen […] the moribund knowledge structures of micromarketing.” Monieson’s paper was subsequently published in the JMM where it provoked a response from Hunt (1989) which led to a rejoinder by Monieson (1989) and a later commentary by Levin (1991).

The exchange between Hunt (1989) and Monieson was but one of the many chapters in a debate. It was a debate that began in the early 1980s about the philosophical foundations of the marketing discipline and has continued into the twenty-first century. It was a debate in which Hunt (2001) must have sometimes felt he was the only marketing scholar arguing in favor of empiricism. While Hunt found much in Monieson’s intellectualization thesis to disagree with, he also credited Monieson for advancing the philosophical debate. To begin with, Hunt claimed that Monieson’s argument was ahistorical and that there was no “hard evidence” for Monieson’s “attack” on the motivation of marketing science claimed by the latter to be a quest for academic respectability. Some of that “hard evidence” was published the following year by Jones and Monieson (1990a) in a rigorous examination of the late nineteenth century philosophical origins of marketing science. Hunt also pointed to the irony and logical flaw in Monieson’s universal rejection of law-like generalizations in marketing. Monieson wrote in a dramatic style that sometimes may have overstated his beliefs. However, we also believe that Monieson always left room for some level of generalization in his “science plus” model that included “information.” In that connection, we are quite certain that Monieson would have accepted Hunt’s (1989, p. 6) version of law-like generalizations he described as “tendency” relations. Did Monieson “abuse” the term positivism by oversimplifying its research design as Hunt suggested? Perhaps, but that seems to be a common misunderstanding (Hunt, 2001) and it may partially explain their ontological disagreement.

However, the issue argued most strongly by Hunt was Monieson’s claim of reification by marketing science. In his original article Monieson (1988, p. 5) used the term “reification” only a few times and offered only the following passing definition: to give a human face to reality. Hunt’s (1989) rebuttal argued that reification meant “to treat as real,” to treat unobservable concepts such as love as having a real existence, and argued that positivism does not reify unobservable concepts, rather that the philosophy of realism does. In his rejoinder (1989), Monieson disagreed with Hunt’s definition of reification arguing that it meant not “to treat as real” but rather to mimic or present a distorted image of the real. Pursuing Hunt’s example of love, Monieson agreed with Hunt that love is real but that it is part of our subjective world with all of its complexities, mysteries, wonders, fears, and hopes; it has ontological meaning that cannot be reduced and calculated in the objective world that marketing science
presents to us. This aspect of the Monieson-Hunt debate was later pursued by Zinkhan and Hirschheim (1992) who agreed with Monieson’s interpretation of reification and its methodological implications, a point they suggest was missed by Hunt. That is:

\[
\ldots \text{researchers reify those abstractions so they can research them by using orthodox (traditional) (Monieson would add “scientific”) methods (e.g. hypothetic-deductive method). In so doing, they cause the inquiry to become contrived, artificial, and illusory (Zinkhan and Hirschheim, 1992, p. 82).}
\]

In a bizzare postscript to the Monieson-Hunt debate by Levin (1991), the latter read into Monieson’s use of terms like “dialectical” and “critique” a neo-Marxist concern with commoditization that led Hunt (1992, p. 92) to conclude that Monieson “was arguing from a Marxist view [... and I [Hunt] from a philosophy of science perspective”. As a macromarketer, Monieson certainly believed that our marketing system could and should work more fairly, but he was no Marxist. As Tadajewski discusses elsewhere in this issue of the journal, Monieson was a pluralist thinker who happened to cite some neo-Marxist ideas from time to time. Tadajewski (2010) concludes that Monieson was a “humanist in the Frommian vein.”

Monieson would surely have agreed with Levin’s (1991) conclusion that from a philosophy of science perspective reification means “to postulate as an entity fallaciously,” that it is “thus a mistake by definition just as miscalculation is” (quoted in Hunt, 1992, p. 91). Hunt (1989, 1992) concluded that “if reification is marketing’s problem, positivism is not the cause.” There may in fact have been much common ontological ground for Hunt and Monieson, but a difference in what was the appropriate research design for studying reality. More positively (no pun intended), Hunt also credited Monieson with:

- advancing the debate by pointing out that the normative requirements of managerial relevance inhibit the usefulness of positive science;
- arguing for the development of authentic knowledge about marketing; and
- emphasizing the importance of ethics, social responsibility, and distributive justice.

Years later, Hunt (2001) made an observation about the philosophy debates in marketing that seems relevant to his exchange with Monieson. Hunt wrote that as a doctoral student he had noticed that classmates often seemed to talk past one another and that discussions, especially about philosophical issues, were often unproductive because substantive disagreements were confused with semantic misunderstandings. In retrospect, that seems true of his debate with Monieson, indeed with others since. He also argued that while critical discussion was essential to the development of knowledge, civility in critical discussion was a virtue. In the philosophy debate between Monieson and Hunt, both sides were guilty of lapses in civility using language such as “unintelligible,” “tone of umbrage,” “unreasoned,” and “prisoners” (Hunt, 1989); and “diatribe,” “crisis literature gang,” “chortles,” “outrageous,” “nonsense,” and “concoctions hurled at me” (Monieson, 1989).

Whatever the misunderstandings, “Intellectualization in macromarketing: a world disenchanted” was a provocative contribution to the debate about the philosophy of marketing science and won for Monieson the Charles C. Slater Memorial Award for best article published in 1988 in the JMM. Interestingly, enough, Hunt won that same
award in 1989 for his response to Monieson. Monieson (1990a, b) never again wrote about the philosophy of marketing science although he co-authored work about its history.

History of contemporary marketing and development of marketing thought
This was the original title used by Monieson (1983b) proposal for a doctoral seminar in Marketing at Queen’s. Monieson first taught the course in the Fall semester of 1983 and it was the last course he taught before retiring in 1991. That seminar tied together much of Monieson’s thinking about the history of the epistemology of the field and the academic and practical consequences thereof. The full course syllabus with reading list and assignment sequence is available on the CHARM web site: www.charmassociation.org. However, from the topic outline (course topics in italics below) alone one can readily see Monieson’s overall thesis.

Marketing was a handmaiden to technology (Chandler, 1977; Boorstin, 1974). That is, “the technology of an era dictates the framing of problems and the problem solving techniques.” Contemporary marketing technique followed important technological developments of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. At the same time, contemporary marketing technique preceded the origins of any science of marketing. The intellectualization of marketing practice thus began in the late nineteenth century (Monieson, 1988; Jones and Monieson, 1990a) and continues today. One of the consequences of that intellectualization was a definition of marketing that promised the creation and delivery of a standard of living. It was a promise and responsibility unfulfilled and that performance has not gone uncriticized, although the reaction is found in a literature not read by many marketing students (Baran, 1973; Galbraith, 1967). Emerging ideas from sociobiology about human nature (Wilson, 1975) and from the study of the mind (Hofstadter, 1979; Monieson, 1983a) required a complete rethinking of our notions about the human factor in marketing, about markets and marketing. Monieson believed such ideas also required new thinking about teaching. He noted that the teaching of marketing lagged practice. Much of what appeared in marketing textbooks and classroom approaches was based on “Newtonian physics which is linear and involves the breaking down of phenomenon into parts so that it is teachable. Quantum physics, on the other hand, requires a process of synthesis which is largely unteachable,” although it is knowable. Recent studies of the human mind acknowledge that there are approaches to knowing that go beyond analytical thought, including personal knowledge (Polanyi, 1958), tacit knowledge, and reflective knowledge (Schon, 1983) – all of which are essential parts of usable knowledge (Lindblom and Cohen, 1979; Monieson, 1981c). All of this leads to, and indeed is part of, complexity theory (an approach toward a unity of the sciences that examines how relationships among elements of a system create collective behavior and impact the system’s interactions with its environment). Marketing can no longer be understood in terms of the quantum (physics) world, but must be understood from the post-quantum world of the complexity sciences. Marketing in a quantum world must give way to a theory of marketing based on complexity theory (Gleick, 1987; Monieson, 1981a; Warsh, 1984).

Well into retirement, Monieson continued to read about complexity and to think about its application to marketing. To this day, only a handful of marketing scholars have attempted to apply complexity theory to marketing (Hibbert and Wilkinson, 1994; Wollin and Perry, 2004). For years, Monieson planned to write a book about marketing
and complexity but, unfortunately, never did so. During our 1998 interview with Monieson, he admitted that it was unfinished business.

**Epilogue – philosopher and pragmatist**

Monieson was once described as a philosopher and pragmatist (*Inquiry Magazine*, 1976). Despite a family background in business, he had little personal experience in business when he began his academic career. Consulting provided an essential link between practice and teaching. Theodore Beckman and, later, Wroe Alderson were role models in that regard. Monieson’s pragmatism grew out of his consulting work and was carried into the classroom. It also influenced significantly his writing about the philosophy of marketing thought. As a marketing philosopher, he was primarily interested in epistemology and, to a lesser extent, in history. He spent his life and career in the pursuit of what he called usable knowledge. His published work on that topic is undoubtedly his most important.

If not for a chance meeting with Harold Maynard in 1950, Monieson might have never attended the OSU’s doctoral program or developed an interest in the history of the marketing discipline. Ironically, Monieson pursued that interest, not for its own sake, but in order to document the process of intellectualization in marketing. Ultimately, it may be his work on the history of marketing thought that has had the greatest influence on others. A small but continuous stream of Monieson’s students and colleagues have pursued historical research[9] (Beckman, 2005; Bourassa and Cunningham, 2005; Bussiere, 1999; Cunningham and Jones, 1995; Cunningham *et al.*, 1993; Cunningham and Wetsch, 1999; Harris, 2005; Jones and Richardson, 2007; Neilson, 2001, 2003). Monieson’s own published work on the history of marketing thought grew out of dissertation work he supervised (Jones and Monieson, 1987, 1988, 1990a, b, 1992; Monieson, 1992).

Wroe Alderson’s work had a tremendous influence on Monieson’s thinking. Like Alderson (Halbert, 2006), Monieson was a voracious reader and had a tremendous breadth of knowledge. Perhaps, in part as a result of that, both Alderson and Monieson were difficult to read and, as one of the reviewers of this paper suggested, that may contribute to why they are underappreciated. Both held strong beliefs against reductionism and followed a multidisciplinary approach to the study of marketing. In sociobiology and complexity theory, Monieson believed he had found the basis to further develop Alderson’s sociological approach to marketing theory. Except for some tentative ideas about sociobiology (Monieson and Shapiro, 1980; Monieson, circa 1980), his thoughts in that connection were never written down. Monieson admitted that he found writing “torturous.” He never felt any great compulsion to write and would have published less if not pushed to do so by his friend and colleague, Stanley Shapiro. He wrote in pencil, with an eraser, started with an expression, and his first draft was usually his final one.

In spite of the fact that he published less than many of his colleagues, he left a huge legacy at Queen’s. His devotion to the school was manifest in later years when he worked tirelessly to raise funds for a new building. Fitting for a scholar of usable knowledge, a research center at Queen’s bears his name and its purpose is to better understand knowledge-based enterprises. The centre’s mission was chosen because Monieson wanted a centre that would benefit all faculty and students, no matter what
their functional discipline. He believed the need to understand how knowledge was created and applied was universal to all business disciplines.

Monieson was a rebel and innovator. Working outside the mainstream of marketing science, indeed swimming against it for much of his career, his ideas have not received the understanding or appreciation we believe they deserve. However, as Fisk (1988) noted some 20 years ago in his commentary on Monieson’s intellectualization thesis, there are interpretive studies of subjective phenomena and studies that explicitly incorporate researchers’ values being published in the mainstream marketing journals. Perhaps, as Fisk suggested, the revolution in marketing thought and thinking called for by Monieson is well under way.

Notes
1. While he was not officially the dissertation supervisor, Monieson played a key role in shaping the dissertation of one of the authors (Shapiro, 1961), who was supervised by Reavis Cox at Wharton.
2. That history chapter of Monieson’s dissertation is, however, included elsewhere in this issue of the journal.
3. The other student that worked on value added was Robert Buzzell.
4. Several of his Queen’s students during the 1960s went on to distinguished careers including Mel Goodes with Warner-Lambert, Tom Kinnear at the University of Michigan and Paul Myles who for years directed Canada’s largest marketing/public opinion research firm, Goldfarb and Associates.
5. The Monieson Library includes some 600 books and is displayed at The Monieson Centre at Queen’s University. A full bibliography including commentary is posted on the CHARM web site: www.charmassociation.org
6. For a more detailed discussion of Monieson’s critical ideas about marketing, see Tadajewski in this issue of the journal.
7. The authorship was credited to Monieson and Stanley Shapiro, however Shapiro maintains that the ideas and writing were largely Monieson’s.
8. The challenge was communicated verbally to Monieson and, therefore, the only written record we have of the exchange is an undated letter from Monieson responding to his Queen’s colleague, Kristian Palda.
9. Since 1997, the best student paper presented at the biennial CHARM conference is awarded the David D. Monieson Best Student Paper prize.

References
Bartels, R. (1962), The Development of Marketing Thought, Irwin, Homewood, IL.


Monieson, D.D. (1957), “Value added as a measure of economic contribution by marketing institutions”, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.


Further reading


Beckman, T.N. (1954), “Request for permission to perform outside service, November 15, some employment and other facts about T.N. Beckman”, unpublished manuscript, T.N. Beckman papers, Ohio State University Archives, Columbus, OH.


Howard, J. (1957), Marketing Management: Analysis and Decision, Richard D. Irwin, Homewood, IL.

Hunt, S. (1976), Marketing Theory: Conceptual Foundations of Research in Marketing, Grid, Columbus, OH.


About the authors
D.G. Brian Jones is a Professor of Marketing at Quinnipiac University and an Editor of the *Journal of Historical Research in Marketing (JHRM)*. D.G. Brian Jones is the corresponding author and can be contacted at: Bjones1@quinnipiac.edu

Peggy Cunningham is a Professor and R.A. Jodrey Chair as well as Director of the School of Business Administration at Dalhousie University. She is also an Associate Editor of *JHRM*.

Paula McLean is a Visiting Professor at Quinnipiac University.

Stanley Shapiro is an Emeritus Professor at Simon Fraser University and an Associate Editor of *JHRM*.

To purchase reprints of this article please e-mail: reprints@emeraldinsight.com
Or visit our web site for further details: www.emeraldinsight.com/reprints