

Critical Management Studies (CMS) Division

Response to the US Executive Order on Travel and Immigration

As an academic community and as a community of human beings, we recognize our responsibilities to uphold each other's rights and dignity. As individuals and with colleagues affiliated with other Academy Divisions and the AOM Board, we are committed to challenge all forms of inequality and discrimination, to create intellectual spaces where all are able to participate in the free sharing of ideas, and to work towards policies that are both fair and ethical to enable us to enact AOM's Code of Ethics.

This document summarizes the Critical Management Studies (CMS) Division of the Academy of Management (AOM) response to:

- US President Trump's 27th January Executive Order putting in place a 90-day ban that denies entry to citizens of and those associated with seven Muslim majority countries - Iran, Iraq, Syria, Sudan, Libya, Yemen, and Somalia;
- The response of AOM through its current President to the travel ban.

The CMS Division Executive Committee carried out an email survey of Division members to seek their views on these events, to add to the debate on social media and listserv and enable more voices to be heard. Overall, we received 105 responses to our request for feedback from Division members (a little over 15% - overall Division membership is currently 687, representing 51 countries). We asked Division members three questions:

1) What are your views about the AOM President's statement of response to the travel ban?

2) Is this likely to affect your engagement with AOM and/or this year's meeting?

3) What action would you like to see from the CMS Division (e.g. should the CMS Division engage with other Divisions to put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position and discuss longer term responses and activism; should PDW, Main CMS Programs 2017 and CMS elections continue as planned, be revised, or be boycotted)? Please also share any suggestions on how any action could be coordinated.

This document summarises the response of our members. Some wish to remain anonymous. All comments received in response to the survey are included here. We do not wish to summarise CMS Division members' views, but rather let the comments speak for themselves. However we have used this data as the basis for formulating a Statement of Intended Action (below).

We encourage you to share the document widely and to comment on it via social media [@cms_aom](#) or the [Division listserv](#), and to respond to us via the Division email address cmsd.aom@gmail.com

Statement of intended action

Feedback from CMS Division membership overwhelmingly condemns the AOM President's statement as inadequate. The travel ban is perceived by many as fundamentally unethical in terms of the AOM's own [Code of Ethics](#). The travel ban, and failure to speak out against it, also runs contrary to the [domain statement of the CMS Division](#) as an academic community that challenges racial inequality and discrimination through scholarship and education. Among those affected by the ban are CMS Division members, including some who may be prevented from attending the 2017 Annual Meeting. As a member-led organization, we see it as our responsibility to act in solidarity with our members. We therefore propose to use this document as a basis from which to challenge the adequacy of the AOM response to the travel ban, and to work with other AOM Divisions to call for change in the interests of our members.

Building on the views expressed by CMS Division members in our survey, we propose to:

- Call on the AOM Board to revise their position on the Executive Order, including via [online petition](#);
- Call on the AOM Board for an immediate removal of the [AOM Policy on Taking Political Stands](#) which prevents officers and leaders (including within Divisions) from taking publicly stated political stands on any issue;
- Call on the AOM Board for an Emergency Open Meeting at the start of the 2017 AOM meeting, in place of the Welcome Reception, to discuss the Executive Order and the AOM President's response to it and to ask for an account of the process through which this response was assembled;
- Work together with Executive groups and members of other Divisions/SIGs towards action on these issues;
- We are committed to providing the PDW and Main Programs at the 2017 meeting and to run the 2017 CMS Division Elections, to honor the colleagues who have worked to write and submit their work to AOM who still wish to attend and present. We will also work to expand scope for virtual participation and argue for fee waivers for those affected by the travel ban;
- If insufficient progress is made towards change on these issues, we commit to returning to CMS Division membership to canvas further, especially on collective, up to and including the possibility of a boycott or Division disbanding.



CMS Executive 2016-2017

Emma Bell, Division Past Co-chair; Scott Taylor, Division Past Co-chair; Nimruji Jammulamadaka, Division Co-chair; Latha Poonamallee, Division Co-chair; Paul Donnelly, Division Co-chair Elect; Banu Ozkazanc-Pan, Division Co-chair Elect; Mark Learmonth, Main Program Chair; Stephen Cummings, Professional Development Workshop Co-chair; Ajnesh Prasad, Professional Development Workshop Co-chair; Nadia deGama, Representative-at-large; Sarah Gilmore, Representative-at-large; Rosalie Hilde, Treasurer; Patrizia Hoyer, Representative-at-large; Jonathan Murphy, Representative-at-large.

7th February 2017

1) What are your views about the AOM President's statement of response to the travel ban?

I was, as many colleagues, appalled by the response and wanted a clearer condemnation of the ban. That being said, I disagree with some colleagues to equate this message with the attitude or character of the people who are involved with running the Academy. I think it is a dreadful situation where we are all in and we should try to find solutions together and show that there are support inside the AOM for a more forceful message and political positioning.

Not much of a reply. 'Lame' comes to mind.

Completely inadequate. Members should have been canvassed, as you are doing. It is unclear how the President speaks for the membership. I think [one division member's] response was pretty well targeted if (understandably) inflammatory.

My view is that the AOM should have spoken out against these travel bans in a similar way as other professional organizations (ASA, APA, etc.).

I was perplexed and disappointed. I have met Anita, and her work sends important and passionate messages about possibilities for management scholarship and education to solve wicked problems in the world. Thus, the message I expected to read from her at this moment would have been of that caliber. Instead, I read a bureaucratic message with no heart and terrible timing. That is, given the nature of the situation I expected to read something closer to a general moral outrage and condemnation of the actions, and particular concern for those in the AOM who were directly affected. Rather, her message was a political statement about why the AOM cannot engage in political statements – a defense of the institution as the more important entity at this moment- and technocratic solutions for “alternatives for participation” in the meetings here (via the miracle of technology) and abroad (a colonialist gesture). The voice of the AOM conveyed a distinct message: that at this moment what should really matter for those affected and the rest of us is ability to participate in the AOM. Aside from everything else, Anita's message also forwards a statement about the reality of careerism at this point in time, the complicity of AOM in fostering it, and how these priorities leave no time or space for reflection about how we have gotten to think that the AOM is an OK place, and that this institution's values should be also our values. This was certainly in evidence when some doctoral students reminded me they sure needed the meetings to go on or otherwise they might not get a job for the following year.

I think that the statement is inadequate for various reasons that have already been articulated on various forums. I am a South African and such a neutral position would have been unthinkable in the struggle against Apartheid for example.

The AOM response is disappointing and inadequate, as many others have pointed out on the CMS email lists.

The AOM president's response is clearly not strong enough. It is a weak response and this attack on democratic values cannot be met only with a response that AOM is politically neutral. Under normal circumstances this would be an understandable position but not when such foundational democratic values are at stake. So it is not strong enough. A non-action is also an action and a doing nothing is indirectly a support of the ban.

I am deeply disappointed with the AOM President's statement. I expected such a large academic group to stand up for free movement of nationalities, and to recognise that it is not only travel which is affected. There was no evidence of an understanding that this represents discrimination based upon one's place of birth. This is unfair (and possibly illegal in the US) and unethical. The potential impact is huge, including an acceptance of racism and the mistreatment of people based upon their nationality. My worries are that if the academies don't stand up to regressive policies which take away people's rights of free movement, then who will?

I think that the AOM needs to condemn the ban. This is an opportunity for the AOM to exert pressure, and to show that AOM stands up as an international institution against injustice. I also think that this is something AOM ought to do in a regular, consistent way - as long as it calls itself international, it should be able to exert a stance under any administration, when the rights of individuals - whether nearby being deported to Mexico or being damaged by foreign policy further abroad - are violated.

Generally I am not happy with the statement of response. I personally think that a professional organization should safeguard the interests of its members against illegal and non-humane developments in society and make a public statement indicating this.

Among my colleagues (some of which originally planning to attend the conference) the opinion on the President's statement was that it was « shameful » « chicken » and that « I'll boycott now ». Several mails have circulated among us on this respect, and mostly sharing this general opinion.

It read like a lack of engagement, in times where engaged and passionate scholarship should indeed more than ever be reclaimed (Van de Ven, 2007, Courpasson 2013). Like wanting to avoid getting involved, or being remarked as dissident. Yet in such times open dissidence is key and basic courage, and our duty as scholarly community. Even more, as critical management scholars.

The statement - worded as it was - endorsed racism. Regardless of the personal views of the AOM president, as a text for the AOM membership it was weak and wholly inadequate. I was insulted to see the language of 'diversity' naively, yet strategically, employed in the way it was.

The letter from the AOM President is so very weak. It may appear to be accommodating to those impacted, but it also accommodates blanket discrimination. In light of the many academic associations that have written strong letters of condemnation and also support for their members, it is more than disappointing.

The executive order is racist and discriminatory, and anyone who doesn't call it out as such is complicit in its bigotry. If CMS does not take a strong stand against it, the division's credibility will be irreparably damaged. The AOM's position will definitely impact my decision about attending the conference.

I am disappointed, angry, and think it is completely inadequate as well as disingenuous. Politics is not the same as human rights, and to *not* take a stand is also a political action--it's tacit assent, not neutrality.

I think the response is generally weak. "Diversity" is touted, but I can't tell where this diversity is based. The actions taken are helpful (e.g., allowing for video presentation if affected), however this ought to be an option for anyone traveling a great span to the U.S. already. The president could

complain to the U.S. government that this action is distorting our mission without being political. I do not think the President and through him the Academy has taken a strong enough stand to signal that the ban goes against the principals of the Academy of Management.

I do not understand all the subtleties of US Border Law - but I do understand this is an issue AOM much have a strong voice on, assisted by the informed minds of CMS - and a voice that must be amplified.

I found the remarks to be too non-committal in condemning an outright injustice that affects a significant number of the Academy members. I see that the president's statement was worded in such a way as to not offend anyone views, however, this made the message come off as lukewarm support for our diverse members and tolerance for discrimination. During my time as a doctoral student I have met a number of Persian management scholars, and I would have liked to see the President condemn the travel ban outright in support of our diverse members.

Too light.

I believe that this was an unfortunate response to the current situation. This is not merely a political issue but one of hatred. I think the institution as a whole needs to stand up and denounce this spreading of fear. That said, I will admit that I was happy to see the offer of having people virtually still being part of the event. So regardless of how the status of the ban, we will still have our colleagues with us.

So the statement of the Academy of Management is finally out. It is a lukewarm and embarrassing avoidance of position taking, assuming that not having a position means to be politically neutral. To paraphrase Trump: Total bunch of losers. Sad. No great words.

Weak, cowardly, and hypocritical recital of AOM values while not pursuing them. A lot of other professional orgs have gone a lot further, and framed as pursuing academic and scientific integrity, free international flow of ideas, etc.

I think it is an embarrassing statement and I feel ashamed for it.

Bottom line, AOM is not a political institution, don't make it one.

The letter from the AOM President was disappointing, weak and showed lack of courage. It accommodates the policy of exclusion.

This is absolutely crazy.

Their statement was horrible and a cop-out - deciding they have no role to play in the current human rights crisis. Which I think they argue is because some of the members may support these violations.

The response is understandable but it is too guarded. If such a catastrophic decision which is entirely racist in content, style and character, is taken out in the public domain then it is incumbent upon our established institutions to either accept it and, therefore, be de facto agents of collusion, or to take a position of principle in keeping with the values of the institution and the American constitution, and above all universal human values. History has too many lessons in quiet and reasoned culpability.

I note that this message is about concerns re US travel restrictions. I also note that I have found no such expressions of concern about the restrictions of democratic rights, of freedom of scholarship, and of travel in totalitarian societies such as China. I also note my concern that the AOM is actually planning to extend its linkages with China; a society where individual thought and action are constantly monitored by a totalitarian government. Understandably, President Trump's actions have caused division. But he was elected on a policy of restricting immigration into the US - a policy that has clearly led to a undermining of US labor standards and social dislocation - so this is all part of the democratic process. I note that Trump's policies are reflective of a wider concern as to where unrestricted free movement has led us. In my country, Australia, 20% of the workforce are temporary immigrants, a figure that is an underestimate as it would not include large numbers of illegals. Meanwhile 1/3 of the male citizens of working age - and 48% of females - of working age do not even work 1 hour a week. Finally I note that according to the US IPSOS poll, 50% of US voters support and the ban and roughly 40% oppose it. So, as noted earlier, this is part of the democratic process; something most of us respect.

I think the AOM's president's statement of response is unacceptable. I believe by taking no sides, they take the side of the Trump and his policies. Such a ban should be condemned at all costs as it already opened a discriminative and racist path for such movements. Hence, I read the statement by disappointment and, unfortunately, such a stance confirmed the AOM's parochial nature which many scholars have been discussing for years.

Her response is wishy washy. She comes across as afraid of taking a stand and ruffling feathers because of the diversity in the academy.

I will start by saying that I came to academia because of a deep commitment to 'higher purposes' than just making a career, which I should have continued to pursue if I had to take a pragmatic perspective. The latter seems to me the framework that AOM is currently using. Disappointed? Yes. Surprised? No. I will tell you why I feel personally ashamed at the moment. This presidential (non) statement stands in clear contradiction with the 'objective of internationalizing the Academy'. The latter is the objective of the Carolyn Dexter award that my co-authors and I received at the AOM meeting... I have had the plaque with the Academy of Management brand proudly standing on a shelf above my desk. From yesterday, it is sitting in a closet. As much as the Carolyn Dexter Award has been the highest (visibility) point of my ... journey so far, since yesterday I started to reconsider boosting my CV through it. Particularly when considering that the paper I presented at last year's Academy focuses on how people in position of power - such as academics - have a duty to reflect on how their actions (as well as non actions) shape the society we live in. Using the Academy brand currently makes me feel a hypocrite. In my opinion, the president of the Academy does not understand the intellectual implication of her (self declared) apolitical position. If she doesn't understand how her statement has political implications anyway, in my opinion she shouldn't be representing the intellectual creme of management academia; if she does and prefers a pragmatic position, then she's as culpable as people that directly endorse the executive order. There are no such things as apolitical positions and there are many paper published (by journals of the Academy by the way) that can make the point much clearer than what I did in the last few sentences. If the president hasn't read them, maybe she should.

I completely agree with the AOM president and think your efforts to undermine the AOM position are deplorable.

The AOM President's statement was woefully inadequate. I understand that there might be constraints on what she can say, given the rules and norms of AOM, but the statement she issued was really pathetic. If it is not possible for the AOM to take a stand on this issue under current rules, then surely the President should be working with the Executive to change those rules. If she isn't appalled by the travel ban that's a problem, and if she is appalled but feels constrained in terms of her ability to comment or act, perhaps she ought to consider resigning. I know that's easy for me to say, but I think those are the options for her. Personally, I'm pretty confident that she is appalled by the ban, so I hope that she is working to try to change things.

Inadequate, inappropriate, as expected.

Woeful and wholly inadequate. I made this comment on social media.... I'd add that the reference to 'diversity' as an explanation was just appalling...

As a senior member of AOM, I have heard so much about "Impactful scholarship" in the sessions of the past annual meetings. What I see in this message is nothing but ignorant passive scholarship. I am, among others, an associate professor at ... a Dutch business school that had a very high number of attendants in AOM. As members of AOM, an honorable academic institution, I want to ask AOM to show us a bit of what "impactful scholarship" means. I think the requests for a united clear message from AOM does not involve taking side of any particular political party. It is our ignorance if we see it just political. What is happening is NOT about "ban of entries from 7 countries", "changes in environmental policies of one country", "changes in budget allocation about abortion". Current orders are start of a trend that may have huge social and environmental impact for the whole world in the future. Management scholarship can do more than such a passive act. If current policies of AOM makes this institute incapable of even sharing any concern about future social and environmental issues, with all due respect, we may need some reforms in the policies. I am sure AOM top scholars, and among them the CMS division top, can make such a reform possible. As a response to these orders, I will act and visit Iran this year, where I have two PhD students who are both in the last stage of their programme. I hope other scholars also will become activated, we are not anxious to stand up (as some of these guys seem to think).

I sent the following email to the President a couple of days ago. This is also on social media where it has been shared widely:

I was looking forward to the Academy of Management's official response to President Trump's Executive Order, given my earlier email to you calling for a condemnation of the order as so many academic associations in the United States have done. Today I read your response with dismay, disappointment and a rising sense of anger and betrayal. To put it mildly this was a cowardly and shameful response to what is a blatantly discriminatory and racist policy measure. What I find particularly galling is your statement 'Yet because of our very diversity, the AOM has long had a binding policy that restricts any officer from taking a stand on any political issue in the name of the AOM'. So diversity is not a 'political' issue? And since when did blatant discrimination against specific groups of people become a 'diversity' issue? If this is your understanding of diversity I suggest you start doing some basic reading on the topic. I will be happy to provide you a reading list of papers and books many of which have been published by your members. I am truly puzzled by your refusal to engage with the obvious racist and discriminatory nature of the Executive Order. What precisely are you afraid of? After all associations representing sociologists, anthropologists, economists, geographers, historians and even astronomers have released statements condemning the Executive Order. Even CEOs of major US corporations have criticized the

order. Do you really expect us to ‘stand together in Atlanta in solidarity with our diverse membership’ when some of our members may not be permitted to enter the US because of a blatantly discriminatory order? I am sorry but I cannot show solidarity when a co-author or colleague belonging to a particular religion or nationality is forced to present his or her work via Skype thanks to the magnanimity of the Academy of Management, while my passport allows me to travel to Atlanta. To sum I have two suggestions to add to the options you have outlined in your response. First, you rename the Academy of Management more appropriately as the United States Academy of Management. That way it is quite clear where your priorities lie despite your pretensions to diversity. And second rephrase the sentence on diversity and political issue to read: ‘AOM has long had a binding policy that restricts any officer from taking a stand on any moral or ethical issue in the name of the AOM’. That at least would be an honest statement. At least the Critical Management Studies division had the honesty and courage to take a moral and ethical (not ‘political’ of course) stance to the Executive Order. I endorse their statement as do several of my colleagues in the Academy of Management. I have been a member of AOM since 1995 and have attended almost every conference since then. It is with sadness and a deep sense of betrayal that I inform you that I will not be attending this year’s meeting at Atlanta. And that I will be encouraging my colleagues in the United States and elsewhere to boycott AOM at Atlanta as well.

I thought her response was below what was needed. Please see https://www.facebook.com/permalink.php?story_fbid=1764877427163760&id=100009245605843¬if_t=like¬if_id=1485934533015270

I think it was a very bad statement, not condemning the ban and just proposing “practical solutions”.

I’m not pleased with the AOM response. The AOM wants to be non-partisan but it cannot be apolitical without tacit acceptance of the status quo. I don’t believe the academy can be a bystander in an abuse of this sort.

The Rhetoric "We do not take a political stance" is itself, a VERY political stance. It says, in fact, "We enforce and support whatever happens."

I think it is too careful. If human rights like equal treatment and freedom of speech are seriously affected, AOM should take a position. Remaining neutral in this case means that inequality and human rights violations are tolerated.

Afraid.

It’s a shame to the country and unacceptable.

The AOM President’s response is incomprehensible. Can she articulate a legitimate reason that a management professor from any country should be denied entry to the U.S. to attend our annual meeting? If not, why can’t she just say that she opposes the ban?

The travel ban will not affect me personally. However, the concern is that the ban amounts to religious discrimination and reflects a departure from basic human values--assisting refugees. The USA already has extreme vetting procedures. However, my biggest disappointment is the statement from the President of the AOM which made no statement about contradiction between the ban and espoused AOM principles. To suggest that those banned can participate virtually further marginalizes international members of the Academy--which has become an increasingly significant percentage of membership. But I am not surprised as the AOM likes to view itself as apolitical and

neutral. I would prefer if AOM would make a statement about how the travel ban will restrict its members from fully pursuing engagements with their scholarly community. We should take a stance as a community of scholars.

I am disappointed by the statement of the President. Although their stance did not surprise me, but still I find it quite puzzling. How could they make their political stance so obvious!!! Indeed their statement reflects their alignment with the ruling white elite class.

I was disappointed by the AOM Leadership response as my view is this is not a political issue in the sense of which group to follow or endorse as the AOM rules seem to address, at least that was the tenor of the argument presented. This is a moral issue that does need the AOM to take a stance on, regardless of political party affiliation...

The official communication of the AOM seems to me to reflect in the first place self-interest and cowardness. As a critically oriented scholar of diversity, I am appalled to see diversity heavily abused to condone racist policy. Together with many colleagues, I am disgusted about the political stance the AOM is de facto taking by not condemning this executive order.

I was deeply disappointed by the way that the statement evaded taking a stand by claiming that the issue is "political". Other scholarly societies have clearly identified the threats too many freedoms and to scholarship; that the AOM chooses not to speak volumes about its inability to identify as a true scholarly body. Principled leadership involves taking a stand, even though it may upset some constituencies. This was not principled leadership.

The AOM President's statement completely misses the point of the reaction to the travel ban and reads like a cowardly condonation of the highly disturbing and unacceptable thinking behind the ban. Having people present virtually or by proxy is absolutely not the point.

Having a diversity of members and viewpoints should mean fighting to keep the principles that diversity alive rather than staying silent. AOM can't remain neutral - and if it doesn't speak up and add to the voices condemning the ban now, it's a part of the problem rather than part of the solution, and doesn't deserve its international reputation at all.

I feel that the AOM made a bad call in haste, but the grandstanding by CMS-affiliated faculty has unfortunately played a counterproductive role. Name-calling has been extreme. Also, we must remember that the AOM chief is a woman. Gender politics has to have praxis. Having said that, their position has been mystifying. I wish we could ask for an accounting. I can only conclude that they did not understand how transparently discriminatory the Executive Action was. I wonder if they would have made the same call had they known that Facebook, Harvard, the American Sociology Associations, AAU and others had opposed the EA. The AACSB made the strategic (and self-serving) call to wait before responding, and now looks a lot better than AOM, which has been cast as the right-wing goat. I bet AOM is regretting their call now. Can we briefly make a friendly suggestion to AOM asking them to incorporate some changes in their position? I ask more out of hope, I fear that positions have hardened in both directions. Reach out friendly and firm to AOM, please. The position taken by the United States is discriminatory, hate-provoking, and I believe will ultimately prove to be a stupid move which causes the problems it seeks to avoid.

My instant response was I simply do not want to travel to the United States when colleagues and friends of mine will be denied entry into the country. This is not something that affects just other

people. In my ... role I know we have 6 staff in my School who this ban currently affects. The co-author of the papers I have submitted to the conference is a Muslim friend and colleague. I am offended that I will be able to attend somewhere they will be excluded from because of birthplace. It is simply not good enough for someone to say that we will ensure that people who are banned from the conference by Trump's edict will still have access to the materials.

The statement was too tepid. With 51 % of the AOM membership consisting of non-Americans, the statement needed to be much more strong, rather than 'politically correct.'

Despite the AOM's policy not to make political statements, I think this is an issue that the AOM needs to take a stance on. Sitting back and saying it is not policy is simply condoning Trump's Executive Direction. [One Division member's listserv] views (reproduced below) are useful for suggesting how to move forward. I think the Academy must rethink their response. *Friends - Personally I am appalled by Trump and his actions, and I share the sense of urgency in finding ways to resist. But I would suggest that we (here on the CMS list) keep in mind that the AOM has a long-standing policy against taking 'advocacy' positions. So if we want the AOM to move on this, as best I can see, we either (a) develop some wording for a resolution to propose to the Board that does not violate that policy (perhaps by arguing that the travel ban conflicts with our commitment to our own AOM values) or (b) recommend that in the face of extreme conditions such as this we engage a discussion about the underlying policy. My 2 cents...*

I think the statement was not sufficiently critical. Independently of to which party one belongs, the ban can be firmly criticized for what it does to the academic community.

Banal, dismissive, and tone deaf. In its avoidance of taking a stance, it has. It is political regardless of the smoke screen of policy it is using as a shield. As a job seeker, with an interdisciplinary background who researches in CSR, CMS, immigrant labor, and ethics, it has made me seriously question whether I should even pursue work in the Management discipline of academia — recognizing that this may mean I do not work in academia at all as a result. At least not in the US. AOM's radical departure from every other major social science statement on this issue reveals its deep, perhaps irreparable, commitments to neoliberalism that prevents engagement with questions of human rights, human dignity, and social justice that supersede a politic.

I was amazed at how weak the AOM statement was. By not stating a position on the travel ban the AOM Exec have basically endorsed what Trump has done. To then defend this on the grounds of Academy's 'diverse' membership is bizarre and serves to normalize this appalling discrimination. The AOM now stands in stark contrast to pretty well every other academic association which has come out strongly against Trump's travel ban (geographers, sociologists, physicists etc).

Appalling and unacceptable. I have pasted in just below the text of the email I sent back to the President:

I am writing to express my great dissatisfaction with the response below. The travel ban constitutes an unambiguous act of religious and racial persecution and discrimination. It offends against basic human rights and is therefore well beyond being a matter of mere political difference. There is significant public comment by legal experts and there are a number of rulings already made to suggest it is also unlawful to a lesser or greater degree. It will adversely affect colleagues from the banned countries from participating fully in their academic community. I believe the Academy's Code of Ethics compels us to make a statement that is clearly critical of the ban on the grounds listed

above. I am aware that many universities in many countries have already issued such statements, as have a number of other academic professional associations. Given this, it is especially concerning to me that the AOM has not joined in this effort but has, instead, chosen to remain silent by failing to recognise that this is fundamentally a human rights issue and that the policy to which you refer below is therefore not the appropriate basis on which to formulate a response. In addition to making a statement, I believe the AOM should also be actively exploring alternative meeting venues outside the US for its annual meeting, given the ban. There is an opportunity here to show that the AOM is not really just the American Academy of Management but, rather, a genuinely international organisation that seeks to serve the interests of all its members, regardless of their country of origin. I urge you and the Executive to reconsider your position and to act with the courage that comes from recognising the ban as an immoral act that warrants a response founded in our code of ethics.

Here is the letter I sent to the AOM president after her statement was released:

I am writing regarding today's President's message on the Academy of Management's response to the new US government's travel ban. I am pleased that the AOM officers have instituted new practices that will allow scholars from the affected countries to participate in the AOM meeting if they cannot attend in person. However, I am extremely disappointed to see AOM refuse to take a stand on the travel ban, on the grounds that the ban is a "political issue". I'm sure you and the other AOM officers are aware that the ban is the subject of several lawsuits alleging it to be unconstitutional, on the grounds that it effectively bans members of a single religion from entering the US. I'm sure you are also aware that a key advisor to the new US President has stated explicitly that the purpose of the ban was to exclude members of that religion, and the restriction on the basis of country of origin was simply a way to accomplish that. It's extremely disappointing that AOM apparently considers discrimination on the basis of religion to be a "political issue". In refusing to oppose such discrimination, the other statements in the President's message about valuing diversity, inclusion, and solidarity are meaningless. The refusal also flies in the face of what we teach in business schools about ensuring fair treatment, equality and ethical behaviour in workplaces. Today I am embarrassed to be an AOM member. I urge the AOM leadership to reconsider its refusal to speak out against these discriminatory actions.

I have read the statement from the AOM President and found it very disheartening. As scholars I would have expected (hoped) for a far more thoughtful, considered response.

My view is AOM is meant to be an international and broad reaching organisation with a focus on high quality, ethical and effective management and leadership. As such, siding with Trump is not in line with those values.

To put it mildly, it was a weak and cowardly response - an indifferent shrug of the shoulders to what amounts to a constitutional crisis in the US and a human rights emergency worldwide. In particular, this assertion stuck in my craw: "because of our very diversity, the AOM has long had a binding policy that restricts any officer from taking a stand on any political issue in the name of the AOM". Given the assault on basic liberal-democratic values under the Trump regime, *not* taking a stand against the Executive Order on Immigration is already a political act. Authoritarianism thrives on such mealy-mouthed manoeuvres. Compare the AOM President's statement, for example, to the strongly worded statement from the American Sociological

Association: <http://www.asanet.org/news-events/asa-news/statement-american-sociological-association-concerning-new-administrations-recent-and-future->.

The present crisis requires a change in the AOM principle on policy advocacy. AOM's fundamental commitment to diversity cannot withstand the unconstitutional actions of the Trump Administration.

I don't even know where to start. I am disgusted. What I want to do is to write to AOM demanding they cross me out of their members database. But this is clearly not enough.

It tries to balance a line in a situation where there is nothing to balance anymore. I do value the commitment to diversity, the willingness to ensure participation (also in virtual form) and all that, but to refrain from making a political statement by pointing to AOM policy is inconsequential. To quote Anita: »We are committed to inclusion, supportive communities, and social and academic freedom as fundamental and undeniable tenets of scholarly association. Our values emphasize the full diversity of member backgrounds and experiences. « In the age of Trump, committing to social and academic freedom as well as diversity IS DEEPLY political. It is not just the Muslim ban that flies smack in the face of AOM's values as Anita stated them, but the overall position of the new administration when it comes to science, truth, and scholarly (in fact any public) discourse. Calling this out more explicit would have been the right thing to do, regardless of one's personal political affiliation. What we have seen in the past days and weeks is an utter disregard by the incoming administration for the very foundations of informed, enlightened discourse. If we as academics do not raise our voice in these circumstances, especially as academics in the managerial sciences (that determine so much of our everyday life), how can we ever speak in front of our students again?

Well, framing travel bans and violations of human rights as "travel restrictions" is an unethical act itself. The issue is political, but it is also ethical at the very same time. So claiming that AOM does not take a political stance is false because act of politics was just done in that very statement.

I am extremely disappointed and disturbed by the AOM President's statement of response. For reasons already eloquently stated on the CMS listserv over the past few days, I feel that AOM is hiding behind statements of diversity and politics, and by doing so are condoning Trump's actions and the oppression, fascism, and racism that he is undertaking. The association is also going against its own stated mission and values.

If the rule on political comment is incontrovertible, I understand the position. However, I'd expect that the executive could empower the president to break this rule. Most organizations have some means of exception handling. Even if that isn't possible, the president could have made a personal note speaking for himself rather than AOM. It's obvious that these restrictions on the movement of academics are discriminatory on the basis of religion and the relative political influence of their home country. That should be an anathema to the academy.

I regard the AOM president's message as outrageous. The travel ban violates not only political reason and human rights but also is in outright opposition to all the values the global community of researchers stands for. I therefore would like to see AOM explicitly protesting against this measure.

Two words: weak sauce. My thoughts largely echo those expressed on the AOM facebook site in connection to the announcement of that statement... Pretending not take sides is taking sides in this case. AOM basically expresses its toleration for racism. Shameful and appalling.

The response seemed a bit meek, to me. Even if there is a stated policy for the AOM to be apolitical (if such a thing exists), I think it would be justified to speak out more clearly on this if only because it has direct impact on the AOM's mission.

My view is that the response is weak, insipid, and a wasted opportunity to take a meaningful position on an issue that has stimulated protest across the world. As the discussions on the CMS list have illustrated, several similar professional societies have taken clear and more deliberate stances on this issue.

I was deeply shocked to receive the AOM statement which advocated, in essence, quietism. This does not seem to me an adequate stance, given the importance of the present juncture which calls us all to 'think what we are doing' (paraphrasing Arendt). Interestingly, many businesses don't seem prepared to stand aside, and are mobilising actively to resist the President's executive order. I would very much like to see the CMS division engaging with these businesses - assisting them and also bringing them forward to the AOM in a keynote event which showcases the joint concern of academics and practitioners.

I am both dismayed and disappointed by the failure to join other learned societies in, at the very least, pointing to the adverse impact on members and, in turn, on the free movement of people and ideas that should be at the heart of our values. I have written to the president to say so.

Disappointing and lacking leadership.

This racist policy is outrageous and deeply worrying and should be denounced in the strongest terms.

I think our Division should very firmly oppose AOM leadership's stance. Trump's decision is the epitome of racist thinking. To say that such restrictions are just a political issue is to inadvertently legitimate racism.

I appreciate the message and believe it was a thoughtful response with short-term solutions to address the challenges posed for the event in Atlanta. I also respect that AOM's policy that restricts any officer from taking a stand on any political issue in the name of the AOM; however, it seems there may be a time to reconsider that stance, especially when being silent may be supporting injustice or minimally, not opposing it. "If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor. If an elephant has its foot on the tail of a mouse and you say that you are neutral, the mouse will not appreciate your neutrality." Desmond Tutu

I was quite disappointed with the statement. I can understand the caution in taking a position in the name of a large association. However, how could an association that comprises academics – which, since Middle Ages, is a group that traditionally travels between universities in order to advance research – be so "delicate" on a public statement regarding one of the most absurd acts of this century (so far)?

Apparently pusillanimous and weak kneed, but ultimately contributes to the status quo. It is not a neutral position. No action = support the status quo.

I found the presidential statement a bunch of nonsense. It was quite clear that they won't take a stand on this matter, which makes one wonder what they would ever take a stand on. Yes, we are a

diverse group of scholars. But that should not be an excuse for doing nothing (because membership will never agree). This is what I would describe as a "myth of a perfect solution" when teaching first year students critical thinking. Because no perfect solution exists, people can be tempted to do nothing or criticize a course of action by virtue of its flaws rather than its benefits.

I believe that the statement is wholly inadequate. At the very least, I would have expected outright condemnation of Trump's position. While I recognise the spirit of the attempt to engage with those affected by the travel ban, even the provision of a "virtual" presence only serves to emphasise the difference between those academics who Trump considers to be legitimate and those who he is treating as not legitimate. It may sound clichéd to state that I am reminded here of Pastor Martin Niemöller's poem, but in all such instances an injury to one academic should be considered as an injury to all

I do not mind the reaction of the AOM president. I do not need or prefer other actions. I admire the action made by 'our' corporation IKEA
http://www.ikea.com/us/en/about_ikea/newsitem/013017_IKEA_US_Immigration_Information It is much similar to Merkel's reaction, when it was clear that Trump won, where she stressed the values of humanity. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VnAORtmzYBM> Trump is doing a lot of media show. I think IKEA and Merkel is commenting with dignity without engaging in media shows. But of course, they appear to also have a solution to another problem....<http://www.the-postillon.com/2017/01/border-wall-ikea.html> This joke shows that it is impossible to react without jokes. Now USA got your Berlusconi. But to defend Berlusconi, he had more humanistic values than Trump has. So, I am satisfied with the AOM reaction since I read it as the IKEA and the Merkel reaction, stressing the values of freedom and humanity very clearly.

A start, but inadequate. She has at least acknowledged that the issue exists. She appears to be trying to keep the AOM's response within its policy guidelines (no advocacy positions) and offering at least some response (waiving attendance requirement, etc). But she is not acknowledging the emergent concerns of members, which arguably transcend the policy guidelines because they have ethical, and not just transactional, implications. In other words, the emergent concerns invoke values, not just transactions. We are members of a large, diverse, pluralistic, multinational membership association that has shown itself not to be very agile compared to similar associations (e.g., ASA) in responding to such value-based emergent concerns. Also, I note the irony of this year's AOM president being in Canada (don't know if Anita McGahan is Canadian), and the program chair (Carol Kulik) being an American working in Australia.

I certainly agree with the views of CMS people who wrote to the list-serve. So much more could have been said in the statement and a condemnation of the Executive Order would at least relieve some of the tensions. With the current statement, AOM board is not in line with what is written in the Code of Ethics, and it's ironical to see that the board breached the Code of Ethics in the name of being "politically correct". Having said that I do not think blaming the person who signed the statement, Anita McGahan, responsible for the thoughts delivered with the statement. This statement does not represent actions of any 'individual', rather it is an institutional issue.

I replied to the president immediately after receiving this message, saying that these are not normal times, so why fall back on normal policies. Academic freedom, diversity and inclusion and inequality are at stake here. Refraining from a political stance is a political stance, and one I disagree with

strongly. A much stronger statement is needed, and there plenty of examples out there. We need one from the organization and management community in there, and we need it fast.

In my view, the statement was a political statement. Although, allegedly designed not do be political. As most of the CMS members, I considered that the statement should have been more strong in condemning Trump's executive order. Such order clearly goes against the Human Rights principles; it was based on prejudice and does not help to deal with the terrorism problem. Under this context, it goes against the AOM core values and has implications to the business and management academia and to AOM members. Under this context, AOM President's choice of not condemning such executive order, not been vocal against it, helps to settle what such order represents on the *status quo*. It leaves the message that is fine to develop practices that hurt Human Rights principles, which are racist and will have severe consequences on others' lives. It is impossible to be neutral and apolitical under this context. Not clearly express the concerns and consequences of such act is to act in favor of it. History has many examples that teach us such lesson. Finally, such statement does nor stands for AOM values and more important, does not act in favour of those non-USA members. Therefore, it makes AOM less diverse, less representative, and maybe, that was its objective, to consolidate an exclusive United States of America Academy of Management (not used American on purpose).

The statement of the AOM president is weak and illustrates a lack of courage in such a turbulent time. More than 20000 members, and 10000 attendees year by year at the AOM meeting give the AOM a strong mandate to speak out in the name of our community. Representing such a large community, we can not afford not to express our concerns and doubts about the recent political developments in the USA. There is an understanding that we can't have a spontaneous or personal reaction on political issues but in our democratic association we need to take a stance when the environment is changing in a dramatic way like it is doing at the moment. In that sense, we can not act as an apolitical body. To the contrary, we need to take a strong position to disrupt the negative dynamics that are currently gaining pace. The AOM-leaders need to address the US-government and explicitly request to halt/reverse all discriminatory measures performed/planned. As professional research scholars, we owe this to the global society that offers us the possibility to pursue a career in this privileged domain. Furthermore, it's deplorable that the AOM-president is doing everything to have a 'normal' meeting in a 'non-normal' time by granting the possibility to virtually attend the meeting. Also, there is no possibility to act in solidarity by boycotting the meeting as a non-affected scholar if a submission is accepted. This kind of policies is called normalization and is absolutely shameful for a reputable organization like the AOM.

The AOM President's statement is understandable and informative but puts the responsibility of action back on the membership to navigate a way to interpret, examine, and deal with the impact of the EO on the membership. It is reasonable and understandable that the AOM may not respond to the actual EO issued by Trump, but the AOM can take decisive action to inform the administration of the impact of this EO. That is not a political response. It would be a response of fact. If the White House administration bans a group of people of coming into the country, a response of what the impact is to the organization is not political. It would be a statement of fact. No one is asking the President of AOM to engage with Trump and offer her opinion of Trump's actions. That, as she has explained, would be inappropriate.

2) Is this likely to affect your engagement with AOM and/or this year's meeting?

I believe in changing things from within therefore I don't think that leaving the AOM will improve the situation, just create more division among us.

No.

I had already decided not to travel to the US for 12 months when Trump was elected...

No. In impression is that the problematic statement is a result of the strict no-political-statement policy of the AOM (rather than of latent pro-Trump attitudes within the AOM Board). Importantly, this no-political-statement policy could be removed. Indeed, on Facebook, AOM President Anita McGahan writes that: "As I've written elsewhere, the Board is currently deliberating a change to the no-political-statement policy."

In my view, we are at a point in history when important decisions must be made. At the most fundamental, it is important to examine how our own disciplines have contributed to getting to this situation –how do the ethics and values of organization studies pervade precisely the problems we are observing –including things like the fact that the AOM could claim to be apolitical, and to think that it can get away with it. Of course, the AOM doesn't think; rather, the political core of the AOM has faces and names that dictate policy in the name of the institution while hiding behind it. So, if anything, I believe that engagement in this year's meeting should bring with it the spirit of protest and resistance from the street to the institution, and be ready to interrogate the institution's claims and to demand a very different AOM if we are to continue to be members (a drop in membership is always of concern for them...). At the end, there are always possibilities that might emerge if we stop granting more power to the AOM than it really has, but all this would require collective action.

It will not stop me travelling. It will increase my engagement to lobby for support to encourage AOM to take a position of resistance to this new executive order. I will be looking to raise this issue at every opportunity. I will be working with colleagues around the world to submit proposals which will talk about this issue. I will also work to organise meetings and discussion groups on this issue for the next AOM meeting, unless any of the divisions organise sessions. In that case, I will attend these and will encourage my colleagues to attend.

This is something that I have given much thought. Probably it depends very much on the actions that AOM collectively will undertake. If nothing happens it is likely that it will affect my participation in the AOM. I feel that there is something fundamentally wrong with going to the US in this situation, and my participation in AOM is conditioned on that AOM can in no way be seen as a support of the Trump Administration. And I feel if AOM does not take a strong position against Trump's ban it is a way of supporting him. The ban is just the beginning. This will probably become worse.

I still would like to travel to the AOM despite the travel ban not directly impacting on South African born travellers. Nonetheless we go through a rigorous vetting process at the US embassy before a visa is granted. I have a previous USA visa and the staff have always been kind and courteous despite the enormous logistical and monetary undertaking involved in obtaining a USA visa. I don't think many people realise the effort we undergo to obtain visas to travel to western countries in general. If travel becomes even more difficult, then there is no incentive to engage in the AOM further. But as I said the ban does not impact on South African as yet. My anxiety is more around been profiled

upon arrival in the USA since I am of South Asian origin, but a South African citizen with a Christian name but I think my brownness supersedes these other identities.

I sincerely hope that it doesn't. I have submitted a paper to [another] division this year (rather than CMS) and intend on travelling to Atlanta to present it. I have never met my co-author on the paper, so I feel it's important I be there.

I think the Atlanta programme should continue as normal and not be boycotted but perhaps we can mobilise support for a more committed response from the AOM itself. I will only consider a boycott of future events based on what is achieved/not achieved this year in terms of reissuing a statement by the AOM.

If the AOM does not immediately change its stance and unequivocally condemn the ban - yes, this might affect my engagement, but I am very conflicted on this point: I would like to be guided by those immediately affected by this ban, and for these individuals to inform me what they would like me to do as a CMS member in response to the AOM statement. I would like them to instruct us, who are not affected, on how they think and feel, rather than us with privilege deciding what to do on their behalf, however well-intentioned these attempts may be. It strikes me as colonial and silencing to speak on behalf of those who are directly affected - and this, if it occurs, should to me be happening least of all in a CMS division. Further to following a debate on Twitter about the academic boycott, I am concerned, for example, about academics and students currently in the United States, who are unable to leave the United States for a conference in other countries because of the ban, for fear that they would not be allowed back into the U.S. This includes people who may fear leaving who are currently not on the listed countries, but with this volatility may well be (other Muslim-majority countries.) In this case - if no one from CMS comes to the US, would this actually be harming their need for solidarity, for building international collaborations and discussion and strategizing about how to resist? Even if the AOM does not change their stance (and I desperately hope that they will, and soon), would our colleagues in the US still like us to attend for these reasons, and possibly joining up together to protest at the leadership doors? Do CMS academics outside of the US, affected by the travel ban, want us to boycott, no matter what the AOM position? Or do they prefer us to use our privilege to attend and try to mobilise our voices to object to the AOM, and to the US, and to learn about subversive strategies on the ground that could be used in resistance across borders? I do not know the answer to any of these questions - I keep searching for these views in online sources, and I will be grateful to learn and be guided in my action by those who are affected.

Yes. I have decided not to travel to AOM2017 nor pay the AOM membership fee for this year. I also considered of withdrawing one co-authored paper in review for AOM2017, but cannot do that because it was co-authored with a doctoral student who still wants to attend the meeting if the paper was accepted.

Yes. AOM 2016 was the best conference of 2016 for me. The CMS division has clearly made significant developments since my last visit. When Trump became president I thought about boycotting, but the message statement on the travel ban has meant that I will not support AOM in any capacity.

Absolutely. I am considering withdrawing my paper (which I sent to OMT). Though I would fulfil my duties as a reviewer to CMS and OMT.

No. I wasn't going to Atlanta anyway. My main engagement is reviewing, which I will continue to do.

No, it is not likely to affect my engagement. Scholars are not the best leaders, but our mission and our scholarship does not change because of a travel ban. I would gladly participate in a meaningful demonstration in Atlanta if possible. I would gladly support moving the conference (and taking the hit on cost) to Canada or a nice resort in Mexico if possible.

The ban does not affect me. I can still travel to the USA (so far!) It does lower my pride in my association with the Academy.

This quite possibly will affect my engagement with AOM this year, I have considered not attending.

Yes, forever.

Tough one. I would like to say I would boycott it, but then we do not get to exchange our ideas and in a way does that not mean the fear wins. Wouldn't it be nice if we could have it arranged to be located someplace outside of the US - perhaps Canada? London? That would mean we do not lose our ability to exchange ideas, and send a message that we do not need this brand of hate.

Won't attend this year, have emailed concerns to leadership.

I do not plan to participate in the AOM meeting

No.

I am considering boycotting the Atlanta meeting as a result, though undecided.

I will not attend the AOM and I did not yet pay for 2017 and now decided not to extend my membership. I will reconsider my decision by the end of the year, but it does not feel like home.

No.

As a non-US citizen I always understand that the US government has absolute discretion on who they will let in and who they will not. It is the same in my country, Australia, where - at this very moment - thousands are held in offshore detention camps. Can I expect a similar denunciation of Australian immigration policies? Are you going to send a similar message to CMS members about my government's policies? If not, why not?

The ban does not directly have impact on me, however I am not going to attend to AOM conference this year in any case. However, in principle, regardless of my country of origin, I would not feel comfortable to attend AOM this year while many invaluable colleagues would not be able to visit to the US for conferences.

Absolutely. I am going to a conference (pending no issues at the border) this month. I'm going because it was booked and paid for in 2016. Beyond this conference, I will not be travelling to the US.

Yes it will. Out of solidarity and as a son of a refugee family I decided not to attend AOM this year because I find current US politics outrageous.

... assuming that the apolitical position of such a high-ranked leader is not a one-woman decision, but it came after an internal discussion within the AOM executives, I don't really want to be associated with an organisation that took such position. That's why I am not going to renew my membership, I will seriously take into consideration whether I will ever come to the AOM meeting again and if I knew last week about the position of the Academy on the matter, I would have probably reconsidered giving some free time to review papers for the next meeting.

I haven't yet decided what to do. Honestly, I am sceptical about the ability of divisions, let alone individuals, to have any influence on the AOM as an institution. It's so large, conservative and set in its direction that I think the chances of change are limited. Perhaps the correct course of action for members who are angry about the lack of action on the ban is to boycott the conferences and to resign. Of course this is very unlikely to have any effect on the AOM as a whole, but at least it would be a clear statement of principle. The only thing that would prevent me would be if I felt that there was hope of change from within.

Yes - I will not be there.

Yes, I have a paper under review but I now have no intention of attending. I have missed only a couple previously in the last 15+ years.

You bet. I am boycotting and am using my not inconsiderable charm to influence others not to attend.

No.

I did not send a manuscript, but I do not feel comfortable to collaborate with the AOM while this is not revised. So, I decided not to review any papers to the AOM. I am also considering not participating in AOM in the future, specially while Trump is the President of the US.

My intention is to attend EGOS instead of AOM.

I will go to AOM anyway. I support critical performativity, and so I'll continue to engage in that action.

No, since I was not planning to come this year.

I have to say, that I didn't plan to come this year. But it may change my plans for next year, even if I am not (yet) affected by the ban.

No I plan to be at the meeting regardless.

No, if my paper gets accepted I'll go and if it doesn't I won't.

Certainly it is going to affect my engagement with AOM. In fact I did not put anything: either a paper or a PDW proposal this year because I had been so disappointed by this incident- that is by the result of the US election. I am not going to renew my membership if they do not change their stance.

It is not likely to stop me attending the AOM assuming I get funding support for this conference.

I had not planned to attend the AOM this year. However, I've regularly attended in the past. I truly believe that if the US President and his government continue their current foreign policy, in the coming months a growing share of the international scholarly community will avoid travelling to the US out of principle, fear and/or solidarity with colleagues who are not allowed to. I will myself not travel to the US for any reason as long as the current government implements racist policies which are clearly in conflict with human rights and fundamental democratic values.

Hard to say. I wasn't going to Atlanta anyway this year, and I'm approaching retirement. So any comment here would feel to me like a rather hollow gesture.

I'm not going to Atlanta, I have enough worries about indiscriminate anti-Muslim, anti-Mexican, anti-anyone-who-isn't-white xenophobic violence in New England, and I don't feel comfortable spending even a short while in a part of the US that I know is far more openly racist. To have the AOM president not stand up for its members genuine fears for safety or giving clear support is a failure on its part - what reassurance is there that those who do try to attend will feel welcome, or secure?

The travel ban does not apply to me – but I will react as though it does. I will not be attending AOM or other travel to the United States.

The conference should not be taking place in a country that does not allow access to all travellers from across the world. If this was any other country in the world we would be looking at an academic boycott. I think the organisers should look to move the conference somewhere that is friendly such as Canada, New Zealand or somewhere else in Europe. If AOM loses money on such a move, as a member that is absolutely fine with me. I have not yet made my final decision about whether to attend the conference but I am almost certain I simply won't travel to the United States whilst such an offensive ban is in place.

No, although it has left me disappointed.

I was not planning to attend AOM this year. I will review the papers I have been sent to me. I do hope that the CMS division takes up this issue at AOM this year and to make it clear some members have been discriminated against on the basis of their birth country and/or religion.

This year I was not planning to participate at the meeting but I would have considered withdrawing if I had. As to my engagement with AOM, I am not sure, but if it is to be an international academic community it cannot be based in a country that applies such bans to entire countries based on religion.

Very likely.

I am reconsidering my continued membership of AOM and whether I will attend the meeting in Atlanta. Attendance would appear to endorse acceptance of the Trump regime's discrimination.

I hadn't submitted a paper for this year's meeting so wasn't going to go anyway, so I can't claim any brownie points for now refusing to attend. However I do feel that if the AOM will not change its stance then I would advocate that the CMS division formally debates whether it wishes to remain an affiliate. I would want to hear the reasons for and against before I could decide myself, but I think the option should be debated if the AOM remains spineless in its response.

I was not planning to attend the meeting anyway. I was considering withdrawing my reviews for the meeting submissions I have been assigned, but I also realize that would cause problems for the divisions. I will complete the reviews, but I will be seriously considering whether to participate in next year's AOM meeting and whether to renew my membership.

As a result of the statement and the current actions being taken in the US, I am unlikely to attend the AOM conference this year. As a British Pakistani Muslim living and working in Denmark, it has never been easy for me to enter the US upon arrival. I tend to be made to sit in a room full of other brown faces awaiting interrogation and not sure I wish to experience this (or a far worse scenario) this year. Even being born in the UK and having a British passport has never stopped the US authorities asking me inappropriate questions, not sure I wish to experience what is in store under the Trump regime. And I'm not one of those from the 7 listed countries!

I will not go to the USA under the current administration.

Yes, it does. I am considering not attending this year in protest.

Yes, I am reevaluating my involvement in AOM in this moment of danger.

I have no intent to come back to AOM ever again, sorry to say that.

I was on and off for the past weeks and months. Initially I wanted to go to Atlanta no matter what and show solidarity with my colleagues in the US. After the first days of the Trump administration, I am severely in doubt if that is the right thing to do. Given how Anita's statement is tip-toeing around politics does not encourage me. I have to be honest, I still feel lost if I should go and I wonder if a management association that cannot speak clearly in favour of diversity and open discourse AND THUS rightfully condemn measures taken against these very basic rules of a democratic society is right for me.

I have mixed feelings. I would say yes, if it was only about me. To offer my support to the collective whose rights are violated. To show that we do not support an organization who really does not live up to its acclaimed ethical standards. But then the proximity comes in. For example, a personal problem of mine is that I have submitted a symposium proposal consisting of 10 participants and their papers. My decision affects them if the symposium is accepted and they feel they want to participate. And some of them are a part of CMS but not all. Some of them are also more junior faculty. So the thing is that CMS people do not only 'act' in CMS community. Anyway, at this point, I have decided that I will at least take care of my review assignments. The authors are not AOM board members and deserve comments for their work.

This will definitely affect my engagement with AOM. I will not renew my membership in May, nor will I attend the conference in Atlanta (to which I have submitted a paper). I also will not be involved with the organization moving past Atlanta if it does not change its stance on this issue, and issues like it. An academic organization, of all institutions, needs to be front and centre calling out human rights issues, and I will not be a member of an organization that chooses to stay silent so as not to offend those people who perpetuate the abuses.

If the ban continues past 90 days and the executive does not make a stronger statement it will. I think a response similar to the NBA moving/cancelling the All-Star game over the North Carolina bathroom law makes more sense. The academy should be intolerant of intolerance.

I'm currently contemplating on that. I would otherwise have certainly attended since I have always gained a lot from attending these annual meetings. Currently I'm still wondering whether it would be better to make a statement on site, or by boycotting the event entirely. I haven't yet paid my membership for this year.

For this year I will not be going to the AOM... and I may rethink my membership if such a weak position continues to be the 'view' of the Academy.

I was not going anyway, so I cannot pretend to a high moral stance - but have said that I would not attend in order to show my support of excluded colleagues.

Yes it is. Despite having submitted papers to the meeting, I have decided not to attend this year because of trump immigration policy and the AOM president's response (this is only the third time I have missed AOM in over 20 years).

I'm not coming to the US under such circumstances.

No. I am unable to attend this year's meeting and it does not affect my current engagement.

It won't affect, as I tend to keep up with AOM not on a physical basis (and do not expect to attend the Annual Meeting as well)

Yes, I just rejoined after several years' layoff, and am annoyed that I did so now. I live in Australia and was going to visit colleagues in LosAng and FL to collaborate. I won't now especially as having travelled to Iran I am denied an easy-visa and must travel 1000km from my home city to be interrogated rudely... I definitely won't be going to AOM and pulled out of another US conference to which I was invited. Actually I'm sorta glad I'll never set foot on US soil again as the airport staff are the rudest and most aggressive in the world. At Teheran airport I was ushered through with smiles in 5 minutes and there was no police officer wearing a sidearm. Pity as I have a dear dear friend in LA.

I have a paper submitted to the Academy (GDO division), which I will myself not go to present if it is accepted. My co-author may decide to, but I don't want to be in the USA any more than I have to. I think President Trump needs to see there is a downside to his version of "America first." Commerce of all kinds will be affected by his ridiculous policies, and until people and organizations pay the price and express their discontent, he will go on thinking that by keeping the "outsiders" out is best for America. I had hoped he would be forced to work with more reasonable and enlightened people in the GOP, but he seems to not want advice from anyone (other than possibly his family).

Yes, it will affect my engagement with the AOM meeting this year

Probably will not affect my engagement with AOM. I am retired from academia and have peripheral engagement anyway. If the AOM president's response is not strengthened, then it will definitely affect my decision re attendance at this year's meeting. I will boycott. However, my response to this question may be overtaken by events between now and the meeting (e.g., the 90-day ban may be rescinded or expanded or extended; other executive actions may occur; etc).

The short answer is it may and I don't know. I am a doctoral student, who is a citizen of a Muslim country, studying in a US university. My current visa situation does not allow me to leave and re-enter US without renewing my visa from my country of citizenship. Thus, if I end up having to leave

US, I will not be able to re-enter US and attend AOM. In addition, because of my current visa situation, I do not have the option to go to Europe as I am not eligible to get a visa to enter European countries (or Canada) before renewing the US visa.

Honestly, I had already decided not to go to Atlanta this year, but with all there is going on, I am very happy that I am not going to the US Academy this year as it is making clear that it is a US academy. I am currently contemplating renewing my membership. On the other hand, it may be a better idea to stay in and fight it from the inside, as proposed by some of the board members of CMS. I am involved in the board of [another division] and will stay on and try to do this work from there as well.

Yes. I am considering my engagement with AOM and its publications (consuming, targeting and reading them).

I think that these policies are absolutely scandalous and will have a substantial impact on my engagement with all US-based associations, including the AOM. I will definitely reduce or even avoid my engagement with the AOM be it through membership, participation, and submitting articles (annual meeting and journals) unless a clear position against discrimination and bigotry is explicitly taken. To be clear, I value the diverse and rich environment that the AOM offered to all scholars over the past years, however, the institutional framework (the USA) needs to guarantee a political environment that allows all scholars to participate - an issue that can't be guaranteed at the moment.

How do we stand in solidarity if the impact means that members from affected countries are scared to attend the Atlanta Conference in 2017? How does AOM plan on solving this issue? Moving the conference to a non-US country might help affirm the solidarity and resolve the impact of the ban on the membership. Until the AOM president can determine what she and the Board plans to do to resolve the issue — the call to write scholarly papers and do research does not address the immediate impact. What is the social and economic impact of the EO on AOM? How much money are we having to spend to help our colleagues in these countries? How much of the AOM staff are now devoted to this impact? How does absorbing all these costs support the mission of the AOM?

3) What action would you like to see from the CMS Division (e.g. should the CMS Division engage with other Divisions to put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position and discuss longer term responses and activism; should PDW, Main CMS Programs 2017 and CMS elections continue as planned, be revised, or be boycotted)? Please also share any suggestions on how any action could be coordinated.

I think the CMS division should pressure for a more open debate about the appropriate response to the ban. I also think that this year's program should represent the current terrible state of politics by exposing the terrible implications of such actions, but also opening up spaces for debate not only inside CMS, but also with other divisions. I'll be happy to help in any way I can.

Please take a clear stance beyond referring to already existing values.

I think this is really difficult and I do not envy your position. That is not particularly helpful but it is hopefully supportive. My view is that: A. Officers of the CMS Division are best placed to mobilise other Division officers to challenge the adequacy of the President's response and the manner in which it was assembled. It also provides an opportunity to challenge, or at least seek a justification of, the refusal to condemn the Executive order (which now turns out to be illegal - at least until Trump fires and replaces the entire judiciary!). I think CMS elections, etc. should continue. However, if there is no significant change in the President's line and/or not change in the Academy's craven position, then I think the membership of the CMS Division should be balloted to determine whether the Division should continue within the AOM. That is because it is difficult for me to reconcile CMS with membership of an AOM that is unable/unwilling to challenge such a discriminatory (and illegal) order. In common with other AOM members, I would like to see the legally binding document that prevents the President from speaking out when so many other professional associations seem to be uninhibited.

I really appreciate the pressure that CMS is creating. In my view, the pressure should focus on overcoming the no-political-statement policy. Once this is done, the AOM could release a similar statement as the ASA or APA. I see no need for a boycott. Instead, a moderate position will help CMS coordinate with other divisions (I have heard of like-minded concerns from within OMT and SAP).

Revise to organize the program differently. Perhaps creating "political action" as theme (instead of "interface" – which is a mindless but also almost ironic theme under the current circumstances) – to boycott - meaning to not attend - doesn't work too well at this moment. We need to be present and ready to act.

As with my response in (2), I'm conflicted about a boycott for the above reasons. I also worry - wouldn't some mainstream management academics love nothing more than for the CMS Division to disappear? If we have the encouragement and lead from those directly affected by the ban that they are OK for us to participate, then the CMS space could be used as a site of resistance. We could revise some of our activities - for instance, in some time blocks, reaching out to movements in Atlanta, such as Black Lives Matter, and minority communities to learn how we can be of help and critical support, there and going forward. Also for (3), I worry about PhD students who submitted perhaps their first paper, and Early Career Scholars eager for feedback on a new paper, or on their first submission to the CMS Division, and so on. Is there a way, even if we are called on to boycott by those affected, that we could still review the submissions and provide feedback in a non-AOM space, for providing encouragement and support of the papers' further development? Perhaps this is

especially important for academics directly threatened by the travel ban - by refusing to review and provide support for their work, they would be excluded in more than one way, which is depressing to think about. Overall, I hope that collectively the decisions will be acts of solidarity that support our fellow CMS academics and students in their best interests. In addition to these points, I think that, in time, this could possibly be used to broaden the discussion to reflect on our privilege as academics and conference attendance overall, and perhaps exercising care not to Other one country - as horrific as the policy is - as the bearer of all global injustice. Should we, for instance, also boycott CMS this summer, to protest the British Government using EU citizens as 'bargaining chips' and leaving them in anxiety about their future here? And to focus on a less privileged group - should we boycott CMS in the UK because of the UK's inhumane refugee policies and border control, which shuts many people out, and leads to horrendous treatment for those who are here? Was there a call to an academic boycott of US conferences in previous United States administrations with records of deportations and droning of innocent civilians? Should we consider boycotting conferences altogether? - given that the fees are not affordable to many academics globally, and thus conferences exclude them - disproportionately from the Global South.

Yes, the CMS Division could try to engage with other Divisions to put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position and discuss longer term responses and activism. In the meanwhile, I think we should boycott elections and conference activities. Social media is one possibility to put pressure of AOM management and to coordinate activities.

Not very sure about what would be the best course of action at the level of AOM. I don't think any petition or letter to the white house might change anything. However it is important to do so for ourselves as a community, not to stay silent. If this community does not act, does not engage, it's a lie to everything that CMS stands for. Beyond the recent attack on the 7 Muslim countries, other issues are equally scandalous - not least of which the wall of infamy along the border. Are we back to cold war Berlin?

I must say that the President's address was just the last straw. I was anyway thinking of suspending my travel arrangements until I could see how things evolve since the Trump election. Indeed, I am Mexican, a nationality not particularly welcome for a few decades now and even less under the new administration. As a Mexican woman I do not particularly appreciate the macho-wasp discourse of discrimination against my people or my sex. As a scholar, I am revolted to see how stupidity can reach such massive proportions. I am very much reminded of a certain year - 1933, where similar discriminatory discourses by a certain elected politician went unpunished and unchallenged until a world war and several million dead occurred a few years later. I am not sure yet, but depending on how things evolve, I am considering boycotting not only the conference but also any trip or the purchase of any product from the USA.

Personally, I would like to see a public apology from the AOM. I also think that CMS needs to make its own statement to condemn Trump's ban, and other issues that threaten humanity. If this cannot be accommodated within AOM, I'm not sure how CMS can do its work. My vote would be to boycott the conference.

I cannot speak for others, but if the CMS took collective action, I am happy to put my name to it and join.

CMS should talk to the other divisions and figure out a collective response if there is enough common ground.

I would like CMS to work with other divisions to put pressure on the AOM leadership to revise their position. I would like CMS to work with other divisions to change the underlying policy that allowed (?) the leadership to believe that such a statement was an acceptable response. I would like the Academy to acknowledge its complicity in promoting an American business culture that puts unlimited profit at any cost above every other value and made possible President Trump's characterization of the US taking refugees from Australia as "a bad deal" for the US. (Why not dream big?) I almost always take the "change from within" approach, so do not support a boycott.

The action being taken by the Trump administration is nominally short term – 180 days or something like that. What I think we ought to do is organize – form a group to look out for our members' interests on this topic; plan a special forum in Atlanta addressing the topic and what we can/should do; prepare for more that is to come so we can be more nimble in response the next time. There will be a next time. We should encourage scholarly interest into the effects of culture on organizations and vice versa. Strong qualitative (and quantitative!!) papers regarding HR, inclusion, diversity, leadership, political opportunism, etc. would really be a boost to AOM overall. For example, so many firms (in the U.S.) are going along with Trump (though many are not) simply because they don't want to be on his bad side. Auto, pharma and other CEOs are playing along too easily. Only silicon valley/tech is standing up to him now (as well as Starbucks and a few other notable firms). We could have a paper development session on this very topic.

Some sort of co-ordinated response to the leadership of the Academy. It would be great to change the location of the meetings to a more welcoming country.

I would like to see us engage with other divisions to pressure AOM leadership to revise their position. From what I understand the OB listserv blowing up with disgruntled remarks about the AOM president's message too, so it appears that we are not alone as a division. Is there any chance we could send an email survey to all AOM members petitioning AOM leadership to revise their position? Or at least pass the survey to each division leader? I think a boycott would be the next step after a petition.

Boycotted, cancel all.

I think it is very important that we find ways to act collectively against exclusionary tactics such as this ban on entry to the USA and I would hope that we would not confine response to dealing with this particular ban but also consider the other factors that undermine the capacity of some to participate: 1. Selecting venues that do not have excessive visa requirements and processing times that make it difficult for people to travel; 2. Selecting venues and ensuring that there are services available for parents of children; 3. Recognizing how the costs of travel vary around the world and how venue selection affects participation. While I do not attend AOM often I was happy to see a message from the AOM so promptly on the issue; however, as indicated above, this should be the beginning of a conversation not the end. FYI, perhaps liaising with other scholarly associations to locate conferences outside of the US would be an avenue to explore. ASA may be a possible partner, among others.

Moving the entire entity may be too much - maybe we just move our division?

I'd continue sessions for those who can/choose to come, organize remote participation, but strongly push other divisions to join in putting pressure on AOM leadership to take stronger stance on this and other things in future.

I would be happy to sign a joint statement in the spirit of what I have seen already on CMS mailing list.

Bottom line, AOM is not a political institution, don't make it one.

I will support a division-wide action.

The risk of an individual exit is marginalization of CMS within the AOM. But then: who wants to be part of a club that refuses to denounce discrimination? Perhaps use numbers of people who give up membership (if the number is impressive...) and also protest from within (for those who decide to stay) by finding out how many AOM members are from these countries?

I am with whatever you guys decide to do. Just do something to engage the current do nothing leadership of the AOM on this racist issue.

I would love to see a statement from CMS, or a petition, in partnership with other areas, if possible, that pressures AOM to make a formal statement.

If the CMS Division is intent on behaving like a mob of student Trotskyists, I will withdraw my membership of the Division. This is a decision of the US democratic process. If people do not like it, they can vote at the next election. In the meantime, President Trump is reflecting the will of the US democratic political process. Not in solidarity.

This is a pretty difficult question. Given the stance taken by the AOM leadership, I do not have any trust in them. Hence, I suggest two options: A) Revise the program and prepare a set of panels, workshops and discussions with all the members of the CMS instead of a usual program. The AOM conference can be converted into a subversive social and academic event to protest travel ban. I am sure there would be many international scholars who would join you and support their colleagues who would not attend to the sessions. B) Boycott everything and let every other institutional organ know about that. This may be a radical option and it is not easy to suggest given all the efforts to have a space in the AOM domain, however this would be a meaningful reaction given the disappointment the statement created. While suggesting these options, I am also aware that the CMS executive team will be in charge and in action. Hence, I also respect the limits of the exec team whether these options are inapplicable.

Yes. Given the fundamental worldviews of our CMS division this is exactly the time a strong position needs to be taken. Isn't this what we stand for or against? Yes to putting pressure on the president. Yes to taking a stance as a division despite what the AOM establishment chooses to do. We need not be reactionary, but strategic, disruptive and thoughtful in our approach – yes to boycott. A letter to the AOM president indicating that the CMS division fundamentally disagrees with her stance, stating the reasons why. And making it clear that if she does not change her position, that the CMS division will be boycotting the annual meeting. A planned approach to activism and action beyond the boycott. You may opt to follow the women's march framework – clear mandate as to why we are boycotting, and a newsletter to the CMS members prompting meaningful action every 10 days. 10 actions in 100 days type of idea (action speaks louder than words). From writing and calling

representatives, to writing blogs, articles, papers, to media interviews, use of social media, to grassroots activism in our own communities. I've seen many academics already boycotting events and conferences and using their social media pages to release statements, critical analysis pieces. If we coordinate, we can use CMS facebook, twitter and linkedin pages to share pieces written by CMS colleagues across our respective networks. I think we can draw on the tenants of fourth wave feminism to use social media for grassroots activism in coordinated way. Why not host sessions on Facebook live in a coordinated way –making them interesting, thought provoking and accessible by the masses? Why not release podcasts? Let's get creative working at the intersection of activism, technology and CMS. Why not also move beyond the boundaries of CMS to collaborate with other scholars such as Hamid Dabashi, head of Iranian Studies at Columbia University, others in the field of Middle Eastern Studies, Political Science etc. – collaborating across interdisciplinary lines with other academics who have a broad platform and actively using their voice on social media.

I would say a withdrawal from this year Academy before any fee for the conference is paid, so to make it a bit more salient for the organisers as I am sure they already expect a strong statement from the CMS group. I think a statement only will be overlooked, while 'real' action is what I think is needed. Also, I would use the savings for the organisation of a parallel meeting in any of the countries that have been banned by the executive order. I am going to put my own money - and I remind you I am a student on a scholarship - to be present at those locations if you take such a bold decision. I do acknowledge that the Academy has a policy re. political statements and respect for the variety of views within it... this is a time when intellectuals need to show they have 'cojones'...and clearly the Academy does not seem to have any! As I said above, I have doubts about the ability of divisions to change anything at the level of the institution. To be honest, this is particularly the case for CMS which is seen as a marginal part of the Academy. Having said that, I think that the CMS division needs to register our view and to put pressure on the leadership of AOM to change. This is unlikely to be achieved by boycotting or withdrawing, which is likely to be seen as petulant, if it is noticed at all. I would not be surprised if other divisions were similarly disappointed in the President's response and I think there could be value in coalition building. In fact it will only be if a number of divisions band together that the leadership is likely to take notice. I guess the way to proceed would be for you to write to other divisions and see what might be possible. There are symbolic acts which we might engage in at the meeting in August, eg. a forum on the travel ban, but this would be unlikely to achieve much other than making us feel good. Coalition building seems the way to go. I'm sorry that I haven't been able to make any particularly brilliant suggestions, but this is such a difficult issue to deal with and I think whichever way we proceed, individually or as a division, the prospects of any meaningful change are very limited. But one must maintain Gramscian optimism of the spirit and pessimism of the intellect I suppose.

Make AOM less 'American'; hold global meetings so Americans might learn a little about their exceptionalism and the rest of the world.

I think CMS should provide a voice for its own constituents. But it is more likely to exercise influence if it acts with others. I am also a member of OMT and would hope there are many scholars in that division who would feel similarly. I further think individuals should take their own views on participation or otherwise. But if we take the president at their word, the current policy of AOM is the obstacle to taking a clearer institutional position and this should be subjected to orchestrated pressure for change.



The email that [two Division members] sent to the AOM leadership should be submitted as a formal response. And yes pressurize the AOM leadership and urge them to rethink their cowardly and shameful response. Disrupt the board of governors meeting. Organize protest marches at the meetings. If CMS cannot or will not issue a statement condemning the Executive Order (and also AOM's response) then CMS should be disbanded forthwith as a division in the Academy,

The CMS Division should engage with other Divisions to put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position and discuss longer term responses and activism. At least AOM should condemn the executive order as violating scholarly values and academic freedom.

I think the CMS Division could considering resigning unless the AOM change their positioning on this situation. Even ACCSB has made a stronger statement. I see as very difficult to keep a CMS Division in the AOM under the current situation.

I believe that CMS should speak out forcefully in opposition to the ban and in support of its members. By the time AOM meeting occurs the ban would have been lifted and I'm not sure how lack of attendance is interpreted in that context. The decision to skip AOM this year is out of concern that 'extreme vetting' will send the same message that the ban has sent; 'you're not welcome here.' I wish I had more substantive and constructive ways to address this issue, but I do not.

We should change the 'rule' that we politically support whoever is in power by never speaking against these disgusting violations of human rights. Removing our own voice at this critical juncture is a BAD idea. We need to speak to the values of those we want to change. They care about feeling as if they are doing the "right thing" while also getting the pay/power that comes from shilling for the colonial power. If Trump came for the US business professors, would we continue to remain "neutral" on political issues? Clearly not! This just proves AOM's actions are self-interested. This should prove to many non-crit members of AOM that it is just another arm of the West's domination of the other through the authority and legitimacy of intellectual discourse (i.e. Orientalism)

Please engage with other divisions to put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position and discuss long term activism. I do not have ideas about how to coordinate this.

I don't know. I am a bit lost to be honest...

Yes, coordination with other division to put pressure on AOM leadership sounds good. I do think that AOM should adopt an official position and make it known, rather than simply accommodating a decision which is inadmissible.

We shouldn't boycott AOM, that hurts junior faculty and we should never do anything that hurts junior faculty because we are supposed to stand up for the oppressed and junior faculty are more oppressed than senior faculty. It hurts junior faculty because it denies them opportunities for scholarly achievements that they need to accomplish in order to someday be senior faculty.

I think CMS Division should engage with other Divisions to put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position and does advocacy through activism for longer term responses. Having said that I think Main CMS Programs 2017 and CMS elections should be boycotted.

CMS should explore the moral dimension of this order and how the AOM should engage with such ethical problems. How CMS undertakes this I shall leave to the leadership and other voices as I have not given this sufficient thought yet.

Would try to build alliances with other divisions that might be sensitive to these issues (SIM, GDO, ONE, PN...) - to put pressure on AOM to reconsider its official position; - to organize co-ordinated action at this year's conference to make the CMS protest within the AOM visible to a broader audience of attendees from all divisions; - to make the exclusion visible: for instance, through exposing visual art at the conference representing those who were not able to attend because of the executive order and those who stayed at home in solidarity with them, and even those who stand with them... I would not advise a formal boycott in this early phase, as it will erase critical voices from the AOM 2017 and will reduce our visibility at a moment when we need to become more loud... Individuals will boycott AOM, but the division should stand there and confront the AOM leadership and other divisions about what is happening. If I can help in some way (although I won't be in the US), please let me know.

I would very much like to see CMS work to get the AOM to take a strong, principled stand. Ideally this would involve coordinating with other divisions, although as a former division chair (not this one) I can well appreciate how much work that would involve. I share others' skepticism about the efficacy of boycotts; I've seen many over the years, and they rarely have any impact. Trump (or should I say Bannon?) would be oblivious to it; his supporters won't be convinced to change their minds if a bunch of crazy professors decide not to meet in the US.

Not sure about other CMS programs, but CMS should definitely pressure AOM to reverse their position and issue a clear condemnation of the ban, as well as take some form of longer-term support for everyone. I don't know what this should look like, but staying silent is the last thing anyone needs to do. (I keep thinking of Martin Niemöller's "First they came...")

Academic people hold a privileged position in society. With this comes a responsibility to teach ethical leadership, and also to demonstrate what this would look like in a civil society. If CMS does not promote a complete boycott of AOM, who would? Please consider the "domain statement" of AOM CMS: The Critical Management Studies Division is a forum within the Academy of Management for the expression of views critical of unethical management practices and the exploitative social order. Structural features of contemporary society, such as the profit imperative, patriarchy, racial inequality, and ecological irresponsibility, often encourage managers to see organizations as instruments of domination and exploitation. Driven by a shared desire to change this situation, we aim in our research, teaching, and practice to develop critical interpretations of management and society and to generate radical alternatives. I have included my name with this comment – but sincerely hope the Trump administration doesn't notice the Canadian address and immediately move to build a tall wall at the 49th parallel north and send us the invoice.

Yes the CMS should engage with other divisions like the GDO, to ensure a stronger statement. One should even reconsider the AOM conference venue in the future: why USA if so many scholars can't even attend, why not Canada, with its publically acclaimed inclusive outlook?

I would like to see a statement from the CMS division expressing solidarity with our excluded colleagues. I would like the leaders of the division to press AOM leadership on the issue (and I wonder how many more things like this will arise??) and other issues in the future that require a

response. I am not in favour of a boycott. I think there is more to be gained by working within the Academy to push for change.

I absolutely think that the division should engage with other Divisions to put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position and discuss longer term responses and activism. No concrete ideas at the moment, sorry. Boycotting could be one way, but it needs to be done by more than one division to have some effect, I think.

Engage with other divisions to pressure. Engage with other divisions and consider seceding from AOM this year and hold your meeting outside the US. Not everyone is in the same position of power, and for many, this is the only route to employability - so yes, it is critical continue its fight for viability from within by electing leaders, etc. However, considering as many subversive approaches to these procedures is encouraged.

For foreign academics to attend the AOM annual meeting while other nationals (and dual-nationals?) are prevented from entry to the US strikes me as hypocritical. I realise significant work has gone into organising the meeting but these are extraordinary times and perhaps a boycott is what is needed.

I definitely think we should be reaching out to other Divisions to try to foster support to keep challenging the President's statement. Also, the more I hear about universities and other academic associations coming out with clear statements opposing the ban the more ashamed and frustrated I feel with the AOM position. I think if someone could collate these so that the AOM is made fully aware of how others are responding then it may help persuade them to reconsider their stance. I think the electoral processes should continue unaffected unless there is information suggesting that the ban has had an effect on people's ability to receive candidate information and engage in the voting process. In saying this I'm assuming that most people don't attend the Annual Meeting in any given year and hence vote on the basis of the candidate information, rather than relying on personal contact with candidates at the Annual meeting to inform their decision. As mentioned above I think a debate should be held as to our continued affiliation with the AOM. This could be at the annual meeting, supported by online access for those of us that are not in attendance. I would like the CMS executive to explore whether its stream in the Annual Meeting could be located in a different country for 2017, pending a longer term decision re AOM affiliation, recognising that practical and budgetary considerations must legitimately form part of such a discussion. While I won't be attending this year for reasons other than this I would like to see time on the schedule for discuss about how the CMS community responds more broadly to the Trump/Brexit era - this should be about more than the travel ban and should instead examine how we best respond more generally to right-wing populist governments in increasingly illiberal democracies. I would like the CMS Division to issue its own public statement condemning the ban, irrespective of whether the full AOM does so or not. I would like this to go beyond the ban and condemn the general disregard for facts, honesty, evidence and due legal process that the new administration is demonstrating and also point out how both the ban and the Mexico wall are actions founded in bigotry. I know the ban is dreadful but so is the wall, so is Trump's endorsement of torture, so are the outright lies etc, and all of these offend against morality and reason. If there is resource available, it would be great if someone could compile a list of key organisations, facebook groups, journalists and twitter accounts that are engaged in active critique of Trump (and Brexit) and share this with CMS members, so that we can more readily lend our support to these efforts. No doubt we each have these connections but if we pooled and shared what we each know then this would enable all of us to be better connected. Gary

Younge and Sabrina Saddiqqi from The Guardian, for example, have written some excellent pieces about Trump and their work is worth following via Twitter. Another matter, if there is resource available, would be talking to the Editors of The Conversation and seeing what kind of material they would be interested in from critical management scholars and letting us know that. There's been some excellent stuff and I'm guessing it's not just simply the result of individual initiative but will instead be being co-ordinated or solicited by the Editors.

I am not opposed to the alternative arrangements proposed for those who cannot attend (although in past years authors of accepted papers from non-banned countries have not been able to get visas to attend, so the AOM leadership may have opened a can of worms in extending the virtual option to some participants but not others). I am concerned about affecting the work of conference organizers/reviewers who likely had no input into the AOM executive's decision, so I would not support any boycott or withdrawal related to this year's meeting. But I would like to see CMS work with other divisions in lobbying the executive to take a stand against the travel ban. I would also support CMS issuing a statement on its own opposing the ban, and considering boycotts or other action for future meetings if the executive's decision is not reversed.

I only recently joined the CMS group so not really sure about all the activities, thus not in a position to suggest what action CMS should take. I would suggest that a collective action across the groups needs to be taken to have impact and raise awareness. I have not heard anything from the operations group which I am part of...I wonder if other groups are concerned with this issue.

Yes the view of informed dissent should be heard. Don't know how and where though. The logical place to start would be any research/case studies or similar that show that such policies might fail on a practical and ethical level? Maybe ask for more focus and visibility on ethical leadership?

I would like to see the CMS Division put pressure on the AOM leadership to revise their position. I would also like to see a boycott of this year's CMS Division program, if the Executive Order is not overturned. It is unconscionable that many scholars from the world over will not be able to attend an academic conference due to the racist and Islamophobic policies of the host country. These are extraordinary times and we cannot afford to act as if they are not.

First, let us see if other Divisions are sympathetic. The AOM should have the discretion to protest these steps by the Trump administration which may be fatal to our conception of diversity.

I back the idea of CMS putting pressure on AOM leadership. Not sure if boycott would work. CMS is a small division and I think it's better to troll AOM during the conference and organise beforehand rather than not come. They won't learn anything otherwise...

CMS should point out the inconsistencies of the President's statement very clearly and seek allies within other Divisions. If it is just the Critters, you know... We need allies to make our concerns heard more widely, yet if this is proving difficult we should not hesitate to act alone. I know that a lot of members feel uneasy to speak about politics, but when there is something so basic at stake, it is not politics; it's basic democratic and enlightened values. Have you ever asked yourself 'what would I have done?' Well, now is the time to answer that. What could be done: making the rise of authoritarianism the core question of all our CMS sessions; to have sit-ins, talk-ins or other discursive formats with academics and citizens of Atlanta about it; or to ultimately pull out of AOM2017 completely. The last point might be challenging, it could lead to a severe breakup but these are not normal times and I would stand with CMS on that decision. We have 700 members and

probably 300 to 400 show up every year. Anyone's university willing to make room for a conference in August on the fly? I would be happy to get my uni involved in something like that.

I would seek engagement with other divisions to put pressure. We are one of the smallest division so mere withdrawal and boycott is probably framed as "unfortunate" or "problematic" but that's it. And then some of them are happy that 'mosquitos buzzing in the ears of real management' are not at site. We might become even more marginal. I know that some people won't attend no matter what AOM does. But I still think it is important platform to seek influence through. Do we (want to once again) end up organizing CMS conferences to like-minded people? Or could our separation make the community stronger? I do not know. Although I would love to see the whole AOM being relocated out from the US with a skype possibility for those who wish to stay there ('wish to stay' does not equal with those who fear they cannot return if leaving US, of course).

I would love to see the CMS division engage with other divisions to pressure the AOM leadership – I have seen email streams from both GDO and Entrepreneurship raising similar concerns. I haven't seen anything from Management History, but we (as they're my other division) should also be front and centre... I believe that the conference in Atlanta should be boycotted. I don't know where I stand in terms of academics boycotting the US, because there are very good arguments both for and against, but at this point I believe we should be boycotting AOM because the association has clearly shown a set of values which differ drastically from our own. I don't know enough about how AOM works to suggest ways to coordinate action, but I am available to support the division in any way that I can. I have already emailed Dr. McGahan expressing my anger with her response.

The CMS division should boycott the conference if any members of AOM are constrained from participating fully in the conference.

My view is that boycotting AOM, is boycotting an enlighten community. I felt sad to hear that people want to boycott conferences in the US. President Trump does not care much for the liberal intellectual community, so this boycott would in my view not affect his policies.

On the other hand it might weaken the very same liberal intellectual community that needs to be reinforced and that can act as beacon to the rest of the country. We shouldn't let short sighted policies affect our freedom of opinion, and our independence of thought. Boycotting is giving up, continuing is a statement of what we value. Therefore we should continue and make clear in what spirit we are treating this AOM as business as usual. We should make sure that people can present papers through Skype, and videoconferencing so no one feels cut out. We should broadcast our conference to the world, and show how globalisation of ideas cannot be stopped.

I have mixed feelings about boycotting the programme. It may also be an opportunity to demonstrate solidarity and discussing activism as it is not to be expected that the travel restrictions are the last word.

I would like to see pressure towards AOM leadership from CMS and the other divisions. ONE and SIM at least probably would have good reasons to side with you on this, and many of the individuals in other divisions are likely also dismayed by the weak stance AOM leadership has taken. As for the program, it's difficult to predict how many will skip the conference. Likely the rate is higher than average in CMS. Talking about these issues within CMS is mostly preaching to the choir, I would guess, so if there are to be items in the program to be connected to this issue, probably some could be therapeutic in nature, others about mobilizing action both in terms of research and practice

against 1) the kind of stuff the Trump administration espouses (racism, misogyny, lies...) and 2) concerning collective inaction as action in times such as this. Anyhow, these are more stream of thought than anything – just wanted to get this out of the way so I won't forget to reply.

I think that it is a good idea to find ways to put pressure on the AOM leadership, especially across Academy Divisions if this can be done. (Meaning that CMS is less isolated). It does send a message if such a Global and powerful society of management scholars is publicly seen to be against the ban, especially if backed up by a focus in the international press.

If events of this kind are not welcome at the AOM, then I think you should considering a principled boycott of the conference. Perhaps you could arrange a parallel conference in a part of the US which has never hosted an AOM, and which is particularly interesting because of industrial decline due to the impact of globalisation. Something highly interdisciplinary would be instructive and creative - involving not only the management disciplines, but also scientists and the wider humanities, in a debate with local people and organisations. The conference could ask questions related to power, fear, hopelessness, loss of meaning, belonging and repair. I do hope the CMS Division can do something which will bring life and humanity to the AOM's disappointing position on political and public engagement.

I still think that CMS events ought to go ahead so that we do not penalise US colleagues who will be just as horrified as those of us outside the US. I am sure that common cause could be made with some from divisions like OMT in order to debate the very real issues that are raised both by the ban and by the response to it.

CMS division should certainly engage with other divisions to put pressure on the AOM leadership to revise their position. I personally would be in favour of the main CMS program for 2017 being boycotted (although I recognise the practical and political difficulties involved).

Official statement against this policy and the broader orientations of this administration; contribute to protest and encourage resistance to Trump/Bannon's fascist coup. It is our civic duty as citizens of US and foreign countries to not stay silent.

I would like to see CMS division engage with other divisions and put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position and discuss longer term responses and activism.

Perhaps some sort of "counter" or "alternative" public statement. This could be also a good opportunity for our division to take a firm position (perhaps where AOM leadership cannot). Something that reminds everyone else that the "C" in our division name stands for Critical.

1) Do not have any AOMs in the US until these policies are reversed. 2) I am currently in Iran gathering research collaborators and exchanges. A large portion of the Iranian (Persian) people [esp academics and business people] are amazingly liberal minded and well informed (I have CNN and BBC going in my hotel room as I write); they have very strong western values favouring democracy, freedom, tolerance, gender equality etc. (and have the same contempt for the grey beards as any decent American would have for Trump). There is strong support for forming a symposium of Iranian business research interests at a western conference where they can showcase their work and interests, and also develop collaborative relationships. We were targeting BAM and EGOS with AOM being out of the question. However, if an AOM conference were out of the USA then I see real possibilities.

This is a difficult question to answer. Some kind of objection has to be registered, or else the AOM leadership won't understand the magnitude of the problem. I wouldn't want the CMS division (or any division) to do something that jeopardizes their status with the AOM, which might be a possibility if they boycott the 2017 conference. I think drawing attention to other conferences in more tolerant and welcoming places (e.g. Administrative Sciences Association of Canada conference in Montreal May 29 – June 1, papers being accepted until February 17) would be helpful. I definitely think the AOM needs to understand that a lot of people really don't want to be in the USA right now, and that their membership will take a hit because of that. Having smaller conferences outside the USA or an annual conference in Canada once every five years might not be enough for an organization claiming to be "international" when the political climate (and threat of violence) is as it is.

I believe that the initial campaign should be for the whole conference to be moved this year to another country in the American continent - e.g., Canada, or Mexico - that will not exercise such restrictions. If the suggestion is that cannot be achieved because of the size of the conference, then I believe that the conference should be moved piecemeal to different venues outside of the USA with video links being arranged between those venues for all-conference activities, colleagues participating in more than one track, etc. I believe that such a campaign should be organized in conjunction with other divisions and tracks, but if others fail to engage with such an action, I believe that CMS should seek an alternative venue outside of the USA, or cancel the track this year. My view is that the initial campaign identified above should be carried forward into future years until Trump rescinds the restrictions on travel.

I think it is important for the Academy to make a decision that allows FULL participation at the conference. If some of the membership cannot attend due to an Executive Order than it is not inclusive. My classmates are directly affected as are professors on my campus. I join the voices of those who believe it should be moved to a location that is welcoming to all until the executive order is lifted. How the academy approaches this does affect how I approach my membership.

I see that the academy has relaxed the policy that attendance is a requirement for names to appear in the program for any international attendees who face specific travel restrictions. I think this relaxation should be extended. Many attendees may prefer not to risk being turned back at the border or face more than the usual unnecessary questioning due to their name, nationality, religion or ethnicity etc. Many others may prefer not to visit the US at this time in solidarity with or to protest the racist exclusion of others. If the Academy wants to be seen as truly international then the names of all international authors should be included in the program without attendance, including those who submitted in good faith but who now prefer not to visit the USA for the moment due to the exclusion of others. I hope this is helpful. I feel it is less divisive than the CMS division either calling for a boycott by international attendees, or appearing to do nothing.

I already tabled my proposal - meet in Canada instead.

Are there affected people we could ask to 'volunteer' and support in an attempt to enter....profile.... support legal costs and so on?

Not sure. Depends on what happens between now and then. We need to hold some tactics in reserve in case "things get worse")? Suggest coordinated action with other like-minded divisions of AOM.

I have been following the conversation happening in the list-serve and I do not agree with boycotting. I think this would do harm more than good for CMS division in the AOM and for the people who would like to raise voice about the Executive Order. I am currently a PhD candidate, located in a program that is tailored towards positivist and mainstream research, and my research falls squarely in the domains of CMS. For me, CMS division in the AOM is the only reference point to legitimize my existence in the School of Management, and to tell people in my department, both faculty and other doctoral students, that my research matters. For me, this space is important to reproduce and survive and foster research that allow us to make sense of the conditions. I feel that, people who have shared their strong opinions about boycotting, are mostly from UK or Europe, and do not share the anxiety of losing their "home". Besides, even though nobody mentioned it in the email correspondences, for me the heart aching part of this Executive Order is the ban on 'refugees', not really the ban on people, including me, who are already located in the ivory tower "traveling" to US (although I'm aware the towers are not so ivory in the places I come from). Overall, I think, instead of losing this space, we need to be present more than ever, and do events that disrupt the AOM instead of not attending. Why don't we request/pressure AOM board to have a large special event, perhaps before/after the welcome reception, to open conversation about this Executive Order? From my knowledge, GDO, ONE, SIM and OB divisions have reconsidered the statement among their execs, and condemn it. Thus, instead of not attending, organizing a special event and coordinating it with other divisions who share this view would be a start to "voice" concerns of CMS.

Yes the CMS division should work with other divisions so put pressure on AOM leadership to revise their position. Yes the CMS programme should continue as planned. Whilst I respect the views of established academics in the UK who have called for a boycott and/or cancellation, they can easily access other high quality conferences. As someone from 'Downunder', it's not so easy/affordable. More importantly, I'm not sure a boycott and/or cancellation will make much of a difference to the AOM leadership, and it risks weakening the CMS division.

The idea of the AOM having regional conferences as a way of dealing with travel bans is a form of othering and apartheid.

The CMS should engage with other division. Only in this way our protests will be strong enough. The CMS programs cannot in any way proceed if nothing has happened. There must be some kind of action. That would be very problematic.

I believe in power through collective action, so CMS should work with other divisions to put pressure on AOM. I'm not convinced of the value of a boycott (but I'm willing to listen to arguments). I think that CMS and its members should create opportunities to focus on this issue. Call for papers and presentations on the issue. Provide spaces for the voices of those who have been impacted by the order. Encourage colleagues to publish (not just peer review journals) on this issue and get as many different voices, stories, points of view out into the public arena. We must be vociferous not quiet and accepting!

Not sure whether boycotting might enable us to be active in changing such environment. But I am up to support it. Additionally, we clear need to be vocal about it. A suggestion might be organising a session and/or a call for papers, to discuss political engagement within academia. How we academics can be activists and what we can contribute in helping the world to be more equal and diverse.

A coordinated action between the CMS division is necessary to leverage pressure on the AOM-leadership. This coordination should not be pursued at any costs if the other divisions don't share the same goals. Regarding suggestions, they need to be broken into two parts, the short-term (2017) and the long-term (beyond 2017). In the short-term we need to establish a platform for dialog between all scholars on how to tackle the travel-ban and other upcoming restrictions and obstacles on groups within our global-community. This should lead to an agreed agenda on "what to do" if certain scenarios occur. In that sense, a fundamental question needs to be addressed whether a nation needs to provide a minimum standard of social- & political-freedom to be eligible to host a big event like the AOM-meeting. In the long-term we need an explicit commitment from the AOM-leadership and the US-government that discriminatory policies that divide the research community based on religious, ethnic/cultural background, or sexual orientation are no longer on any present or future agenda. Until then, a temporal relocation of the annual meeting outside the USA needs to be considered. Furthermore, we need to set a catalogue of actions that can be followed on group- as well as on individual-level. Some ideas that come to mind are to cease membership, boycott the annual meeting, and/or a protest note in all published articles and/or email-correspondence of scholars.

Boycotting would only affect our colleagues and members. My suggestion is that we move the CMS programs for 2017 to another "friendly country." A financial impact would probably affect all CMS participants/members for moving these programs to friendly countries. Collaborating with other divisions would help. Or moving the HQ of AOM to another friendly country might be more appropriate.

It may be easier for the CMS division to make a clear statement, as other divisions may be more split across the political spectrum. But teaming up with others, also with less usual suspects, may have more impact. Teaming up with the chairs and broader leadership of other divisions (also the large ones) is a good idea. I would say that the 2017 program needs to reflect what is going on politically and how that affects international academic collaboration, this needs to be part of the all AOM and the specific CMS program. Good luck, I hope our dissent will be heard and if not, we'll have to be louder.

We gratefully acknowledge comments received from¹:

Albert James; Albrecht Becker; Alexander Maas; Ali Mir; Alison Pullen; Alistair Mutch; André Reichel; Bernard McKenna; Bill Harley; Bill Lee; Bobby Banerjee; Bradley Bowen; Carin Sundstedt; Cedric Dawkins; Chef Quang; Christopher M. Hartt; Christopher Wright; Cyrille Sardais; Cyrus Parks; David Jacobs; David L Levy; David Wicks; Doreen MacAulay; Eda Ulus; Elizabeth Siler; Emilio Marti; Fiona McQuarrie; George Munchus III; Georgianna Melendez; Guido Palazzo; Hari Tsoukas; Helen Etchanchu; Hugh Gunz; Hugh Willmott; Inge Bleijenbergh; Jared R. Chapman; Jawwad Raja; Jay Mitra; Joel Rudin; John Hassard; John Selsky; Jose Manuel Alcaraz; Jukka Rintamäki; Kelly Thomson; Kenneth Mølbjerg Jørgensen; Larry Corrigan; Lars Huemer; Laura E. Laitinen-Warren; Lucia Crevani; Mar Peretz; Marcos Barros; Marcus Vinicius Peinado Gomes; Maria Anderson; Marjo Siltaoja; Marta Calas; Mathieu Bouchard; Mattia Anesa; Mick Rowlinson; Nick Butler; Ozan Alakavuklar; Päivi Eriksson; Patricia Genoe McLaren; Patrizia Zanon; Payal Kumar; Pedro Ivo Dias; Rafael Alcadipani; Ralph Hamann; Raza Mir; Rick Delbridge; Robert Perey; Rohny Saylor; Russ Vince; Ruth Yeoman; Samer Abdelnour; Seray Ergene; Shaun Ruggunan; Shelby Solomon; Sierk Ybema; Stella Nkomo; Stewart Clegg; Susan Mayson; Suze Wilson; Sven-Olof Yrjö Collin; Todd Bridgman; Trish Ruebottom; Ulf Henning Richter; Walid Shibib; Wendy Cukier; Wendy Fox Kirk; Yvonne Benschop; Zahira Jaser.

General comments on CMS travel ban survey

Many thanks for taking the time and trouble to canvas us in this way.

Thank you for the efforts you made so far.

Thank you very much for reaching out to the CMS members! I think that this is an excellent way to create support for changes within AOM.

Thank you all for doing this

First off, thank you very much for your thoughtful move and giving everyone this space to raise their concerns.

Thank you so much for your time and care in addressing this issue, by reaching out to us as members for our views. I really appreciate this consideration, and it is helpful to have a collective discussion.

I am so heartened by this note, thank you.

Thank you for taking this on.

Thanks for raising this with members.

Thank you again for taking the time to listen and speak for us. Truly appreciated.

Thanks for this email and asking each member their views.

Thanks for taking the time to engage with your members, I really appreciated.

¹ Some elected to remain anonymous



Thanks for your email. I appreciate the effort to communicate with members of the division. Clearly the decision about what the division might do about this issue is complex and far from straightforward.

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to the CMS response/debate.

Thanks for including the members' opinions in formulating the division's position.

Thank you for soliciting this information — the CMS leadership is in a challenging position and I appreciate the time and attention to this issue.

Firstly, thanks for the efforts that the CMS Exec are going to in trying to formulate a response - it's really great!... Thanks again for fostering this kind of inclusive process. I know it must be taking up a lot of the Exec members time but this is invaluable work and very much appreciated!

Thanks for the opportunity to respond to the events in the US over the last week. It is certainly important for academics - not least ones who describe themselves as critical - to take a stance on this, and I am very pleased you are soliciting opinions.

I am very glad that CMS Division is raising its voice.

Thank you for taking the initiative.

Thanks for contacting me (and all of us CMS'ers) on this matter. As far as I know, CMS is still the only division to have taken a stance (the only justifiable stance) on this, so let me express my appreciation for that.

I am very pleased to be asked to comment upon the AOM's response to the Trump travel ban.

Thank you for the invitation to comment on this issue.

Thank you for taking on the task of working with the AOM leadership to revise their current position on the US travel restrictions.