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THE GOOD MANAGER

This is the ultimate test: What values govern one's life - at the end of it?

Robert Greenleaf

After you're a police officer for a while, you encounter certain temptations. They come to you as all seductions do, in increments, a teaspoon at a time, until you discover you made an irrevocable hard left turn down the road someplace and you wake up one morning in a moral wasteland with no idea who you are.

I'm not talking about going on a pad, ripping off dope from an evidence locker, or taking juice from dealers, either. Those temptations are not inherent in the job; they're in the person.

The big trade-off is in one's humanity. The discretionary power of a police officer is enormous, at least in the lower strata of society, where you spend most of your time. You start your career with the moral clarity of the youthful activist, then gradually you begin to feel betrayed by those you supposedly protect and serve. You're not welcome in their part of town; you're lied to with regularity, excoriated, your cruiser Molotoved. The most venal bail bondsman can walk with immunity through neighbourhoods where you'll be shot at by snipers.

You begin to believe there are those in our midst who are not part of the same gene pool. You think of them as subhuman, morally diseased, or, at best, as caricatures whom you treat in custody as you would humorous circus animals.

And then you step across the line.

James Lee Burke

When we lost our absolutes of right and wrong, we lost our mechanism for redemption.

We have to work our way out of the mess we are in.

Donald Wolfe
Abstract

Our intention in this brief article is to explore the idea of what it means to be a 'good' manager. We discuss some of the dilemmas faced by managers seeking to define their role performance in terms additional to those of organisational effectiveness and efficiency. To do this, we describe critical aspects of the contemporary context. We propose that the changes we are experiencing give organisations a central role in how people define their personal and social well-being. Our contention is that in this central role, organisations will be faced with situations requiring there solution of fundamental value conflicts. This means that the nature of the question as to what it means to be a 'good' manager will become both increasingly important and increasingly complex. Further, the exploration of the issue can no longer be limited to operational efficiency but must include the manager's capacity to conceptualise both his own role and that of the organisation within the broader socio-environmental context. We contribute to the dialogue by proposing that being 'good' will involve on the part of the manager an awareness of the values involved in a decision and an alignment of action with what Erich Fromm has called 'life-giving' values. This approach in no way diminishes the requirement that a manager be competent in the fullest sense of the word; it requires, however, a deeper understanding of competence and of the commitment a manager will need to act justly, fairly, and with care.
Introduction

The history of the philosophic discourse on the nature of civilisation has been marked by efforts to describe the nature of the 'good society'. Such discourse raises questions about ends or ultimate purpose, about the 'Why?' of what we do, about our deep commitments to what we hold as important. They are therefore questions about values and they remain as difficult and relevant today as they have always been.

For the most part, an understanding of the nature of the good society has been sought in a context of the existence of relatively small and independent nation sovereignties. This context has changed dramatically. Global population is now at 6 billion and set to increase to 10 or more in the next fifty years. The interrelationship and interdependence of systems whether political, legal, economic, environmental, or biological, is more critical while at the same time being more sensitive and fragile. Global systems of business and communications have challenged the nation state in terms of their power and autonomy. In this context it seems not only relevant to ask: What is the good society? but perhaps even more importantly: What is the 'good' organisation? Contemporary organisations, both large and small, operate in a context where choices require critical judgment, judgment where values play as much a part as the selected facts of a situation. We need to understand what is involved in these choices and how we have arrived at the present situation.

Background

Today's organisations operate in an environment which is the inheritance of the Enlightenment. The Enlightenment emphasised a rational and scientific approach to understanding the world. Driven by curiosity and the desire to control and master, knowledge and truth were to be determined by the rational scientific method. In general, means became more important than ends, the what more important than the why. This approach applied whether in relation to the functioning of the mind, the origins of human kind, or the understanding of chaos. The principal human value became individualism in its various forms - in religion in terms of personal truth as against acceptance of external revealed truth; in politics in terms of individual freedom and consequently democratic
forms of government; in economics in terms of competitive capitalism. Knowledge had to be pursued as an end in itself, not subject to question or limit. Facts, measurable and observable, became regarded as neutral; only the application of knowledge raised ethical questions. Such in thumbnail sketch, was the nature of the Enlightenment and its stamp on the past 200 years or so, providing the current global context for considering the nature of the good organisation and the good manager.

**Globalisation**

Major organisations today function at the global level; smaller organisations too are affected by the global nature of business and government. The global role of organisations has implications in the closely related areas of economics, society and culture, politics, and ecology. It seems now that the process of globalisation implies that the decisions of nation governments frequently mean less than those by large global businesses and international political organisations. Through mechanisms such as the large scale movement of investments and binding multilateral agreements, these organisations take the lead in settling and enforcing the rules of national and organisational behaviour.

Against such a backdrop, national and regional governments seek to deal with the issues of the equitable distribution of resources, employment, the environment, and the general functioning of their economies. Again, what has in a sense always been the case (though more at an internal national level), is made more extreme and immediate by the development of communications and transport technology, and flexible manufacturing and production systems, or what Anthony Giddens collectively calls the transformation of time and space. This transformation complicates further the web of global business, government, technological, and scientific relationships. Maintaining privacy and the control of information are almost impossible. Smaller business enterprises seek to function in this volatile environment, their survival often being determined by forces far beyond their control. Into this scenario must be placed the desire of many nation states to protect their independence. Smaller groupings based on specific political, ideological, ethnic, environmental, or other cause, also resist the movement to the 'global village',
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sometimes resorting to fundamentalist and dogmatic positions, or to violence to achieve their goals. On the positive side are efforts to develop international organisations to control and monitor international activity and to preserve equity and justice in global affairs. This is an area for national Governments to more actively support and develop.

International organisations have too, the potential to undermine important dimensions of social life. The political system, whether democratic or otherwise, can become quickly unstable when parties and governments cannot deliver on their promises nor meet the material expectations of their people - expectations often shaped by the system itself. Economic power remains largely outside of their control. This can lead to both social unrest and more restrictive and authoritarian political systems as attempts to maintain some control. It is claimed too, that the globalisation of production and marketing weakens local cultures, creating a 'sameness' and even shallowness of cultural experience. The fundamental value system of individual consumerism underlying the rational economic model likewise displaces other value systems important to individual and community well-being.

All this means that large and powerful global organisations create a level of economic and cultural reality above that of specific nations and societies. It is within such a complex situation that the role of organisations and the functions of management need to be explored. Executives and managers find themselves in situations where all these issues converge on the day-to-day decision processes.

**Achievements and costs**

The achievements of the rationalist approach flowing from the industrial revolution, the information revolution, through to the revolutions inherent in biogenetics and nanotechnology, have been spectacular. It seems that they will continue to be so. Importantly, they today underpin the process of globalisation.

Yet the achievements have not been without costs, especially in the impact of a Darwinian-type competitive capitalism on social and political systems and the environment. At the broadest level, as the dominant economic and social ethos,
competitive capitalism generates dramatic systemic change; it creates what Anthony Giddens calls manufactured uncertainty. Of this phenomenon he writes:

*The intrusion of manufactured uncertainty into our lives doesn’t mean that our existence, on an individual or collective level, is more risky that it used to be. Rather, the sources, and the scope, of risk have altered. Manufactured risk is a result of human intervention into the conditions of social life and into nature. The uncertainties (and opportunities) it creates are largely new. They cannot be dealt with by age-old remedies; but neither do they respond to the Enlightenment prescription of more knowledge, more control. Put more accurately, the sorts of reactions they might evoke today are often as much about damage control and repair as about an endless process of increasing mastery.*

Such manufactured uncertainty poses in a new and immediate way, the continuing complex and interrelated value dilemmas related to how we make sense of our individual, organisational, and collective lives.

**Value dilemmas**

We note the following as some of the major value dilemmas facing organisations.

**Exploitation vs reconciliation**

This dilemma has been pointed out by Parker Palmer (1983). Palmer makes the point that our knowledge is often assumed to be the neutral accumulation of facts and theories about ourselves and the world. This approach to both the way we know and to what we know, relies on our capacity for rational, logical, reasoning. This way of knowing has led to technologically sophisticated advances, yet at the cost of treating the world "as an object to be dissected and manipulated, a way of knowing which gives us power over the world" (p. 2). Paradoxically our seeking control seems to lead to less control, whether it be terms of building harmonious and peaceful communities or nations, providing equitable outcomes of economic management, maintaining species diversity, or limiting the possibilities of nuclear and biogenetic warfare. This apparent paradox is not because of reliance on the rational function per se, but according to Palmer, because we have lost
the sense of the originating passion driving the rational scientific approach. We have come to believe that 'facts' in themselves are neutral and able to be manipulated to meet market or propaganda needs. He writes:

    We have long ignored the question of origins because we imagine that knowledge begins as neutral stuff - 'the facts'. Facts are facts, we say, and we can neither alter them nor stop gathering them. The problem we believe is not how our knowledge arises, but how we use and apply those neutral facts. We think that knowledge itself is passionless and purposeless. So our strategy for guiding its course is to surround the facts with ethics, moral mandates meant to control the passions and purposes of those who use the facts - the engineers, the industrialists, the politicians. It is a strategy now employed in our schools where the occasional course in values is offered as a supplement to the standard factual fare.

He continues.....

    I have come to see that knowledge contains its own morality, that it begins not in neutrality but in a place of passion within the human soul. Depending on the nature of that passion, our knowledge assumes a certain trajectory and target - and it will not easily be deflected by ethics once it takes off from its source.

Thus the use of our intellectual capacity when driven by curiosity and control, leads to an emphasis on a competitive accumulation of apparently neutral facts. Unfortunately, when 'information' is substituted for 'facts,' the words seem to have an all too familiar a ring to them. But as Palmer reminds us, "If curiosity and control are the primary motives for our knowing, we will generate a knowledge that eventually carries us not toward life but death." (op.cit. p.8)

Palmer proposes that compassion needs to be the originating passion for our knowledge. This passion will shape both the why and the what of our action. Thus as an alternative to knowing driven by the need to control, Palmer proposes a knowledge whose core value is the need to preserve and to build community - a way of knowing whose underlying current pulls us towards relating. Here we quote at length from Palmer:
But another kind of knowledge is available to us, one that begins in a different passion and is drawn toward other ends. This knowledge can contain as much sound fact and theory as the knowledge we now possess, but because it springs from truer passion it works toward truer ends. This is a knowledge that originates not in curiosity or control but in compassion, or love - a source celebrated not in our intellectual tradition but in our spiritual heritage. The goal of a knowledge arising from love is the reunification and reconstruction of broken selves and worlds. A knowledge based on compassion aims not at exploiting and manipulating creation but at reconciling the world to itself. Here, the act of knowing is an act of love, the act of entering and embracing the reality of the other, of allowing the other to enter and embrace our own. In such knowing we know and are known as members of one community, and our knowing becomes a way of reweaving that community's bonds (op. cit. p. 8).

Fromm (1949) points out that such a way of knowing promotes life and is the basis of ethics:

The choice between life and death is indeed the basic alternative of ethics. It is the alternative between productiveness and destructiveness, between potency and impotence, between virtue and vice. For humanistic ethics all evil strivings are directed against life and all good serves the preservation and unfolding of life. (p. 214)

In case this should be construed as a negation of a rational approach, we need to assert that the way of knowing arising from compassion is no less rich than that arising from the desire to accumulate knowledge as a source of power and control. It calls upon the capacities of both the right brain and left brain, though more attuned to the quiet resonances of the left brain than knowing as a way of control has been. The difference between the two ways is in the passion driving each. And as we have tried to indicate in the above brief description, that difference in values can be seen as the basis of both our ethics and our spirituality.

Person as person vs person as object
As we have come to regard the world as an object, so we have come to see ourselves as objects. Erich Fromm (1957) clearly points out this tendency:

> Modern man has transformed himself into a commodity; he experiences his life energy as an investment with which he should make the highest profit, considering his position and the situation on the personality market. He is alienated from himself, his fellow men and from nature. His main aim is the profitable exchange of his skills, knowledge, and of himself, his 'personality package' with others who are equally intent on a fair and profitable exchange. Life has no real goal except the one to move, no principle except the one to exchange, no satisfaction except the one to consume. (p. 76)

By transforming ourselves and others into commodities we again lay open the possibility of relationships lacking in moral direction. In more traditional terms we become role incumbents; our morality is dictated by the realities of the role. Values are a part of every role, though most often they are implicit. Such values reflect those idiosyncratic to the organisation, but also those emanating from dominant cultural paradigms such as that discussed above concerning the nature of knowledge and true knowing. In a conflict situation say between personal values and organisational values, there is enormous pressure to following organisational requirements using the justification of role, even when in other circumstances such behaviour would not be acceptable. Katz and Kahn (1986) capture this dilemma:

> Perhaps the most telling property of the secondary relationship is its alleged affect-free quality. The common assumption of organisational theory is that role relationships in organisations (and, we might add, between organisation and its various stakeholders) imply no fear or delight in interdependence, no pleasure in giving rewards, no hatred in receiving punishment. In our institutional society this aspect of relationships is carried to extremes. The executioner is not required nor expected to feel for the criminal either hatred or sympathy. His job is to pull the switch. Even the making of war partakes of the bureaucratic transformation. It was not required of the pilot over Hiroshima that he hate the Japanese nor even the then government of Japan. It was his job to drop the bomb, a role. Indeed,
when the pilot of that historic aircraft later found himself severely ridden with guilt, he was considered to be neurotically incapacitated. (pp. 322-323)

**Individual vs collective or community values**

Individual values have been pursued at the expense of collective values. The inequitable distribution of benefits has seen the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few individuals and organisations, leading to concerns about collective social justice and the instability created by the widening gap between the 'haves' and the 'havenots,' whether within individual societies or between nations. Measures of organisational performance such as lower costs and shifts in share value, tend to encourage the self-interest of the individual whether a Board member, a manager or an individual or institutional investor, often further weakening the relationship between organisations and the communities in which they operate. There is sometimes a sense that communities, whether small country towns or those in developing countries offering large pools of cheap labour, are there basically to serve the organisation rather than the organisation to serve the community. Under such pressure utilitarian values take precedence over social and cultural values.

**Material values vs ecological values**

The impact on the environment of the rapid industrial and population changes over the past 200 years has raised serious concerns about the consequences of the loss of natural environments, food chains, biodiversity, and the general capacity of the environment to sustain human life without major crises and upheaval. Many organisation decisions now need to involve a consideration of their environmental impact, whether it be a large multinational seeking to open a mine, or a small developer confronted with the preservation of a community's cultural heritage.

**Received values vs emergent values**

The Enlightenment saw too, the challenging of traditional sources of knowledge and ways of behaving embedded in the social establishment, religion, and tradition, leaving what some have described as a moral vacuum. This has had a great freeing effect, but on
the other hand has led to the loss of collective foundation myths and stories guiding
individuals and communities in their choices of action. The impact of globalisation
seems to have further weakened the role of communities and societies in guiding the
value choices of individuals without, so far, the emergence of a global ethic acceptable to
all and sustained by its own stories and ritualisations.
**Figure 1: THE GOOD ORGANISATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value dilemma</th>
<th>The good organisation builds a culture where:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation vs reconciliation</td>
<td>· the consideration of ends is as important as the consideration of means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· ‘facts’ are accepted as selective value positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· all ways of knowing are valued - the rational, logical, intuitive, imaginative, creative, and knowing arising from felt deep concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· reconciliation of difference is valued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person as person vs Person as object</td>
<td>· every effort is made to hold in mind the person as person. Anything diminishing of person hood whether in advertising, marketing, or use of employees is sought to be avoided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· value dimensions of roles are openly explored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· ways are sought to empower direct stakeholders such as employees in the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual vs collective or community values</td>
<td>· the implications of actions are considered in terms of the organisation conceived as a community in its own right and on the communities within which the organisation operates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· support is given to those persons, organisations, or activities, fostering the well-being of the community and persons and setting life-enhancing models for others to follow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material values vs ecological values</td>
<td>· values related to a sustainable environment are taken seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· its own activities are evaluated against supporting the sustainability of the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received values vs emergent values</td>
<td>· it is recognised that values need to be thought about from diverse perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· it is understood that values may be espoused or held tacitly and these may not be in harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· space is given for value issues to be clarified despite the process often being unsettling and where avoidance through such ways as moving precipitously into action is minimised, where action becomes valued above reflective thought</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the contrary, the availability of information and the has laid bare the clay feet of many who were supposed to lead in terms of the values they represent. Larrie Elliot from the Guardian encapsulates the situation when he writes (The Age, 13/7/99, p. 15):

There is a vacuum at the heart of globalisation. The project lacks a moral dimension, a sense that there is something wrong about a system that apportions risk to those able to bear it least and that tolerates grotesque disparities in wealth and wellbeing

The 'good' organisation and the 'good' manager

In our view, the questions such moral dilemmas pose cannot be answered definitively, but must be addressed continually - and addressed in practice (action), not just as matter of intellectual curiosity. Resorting to tradition, authority, or dogma will not assist in dealing with the complex issues faced by organisations and their managers.

In Figure 1 we have used the value dilemmas to consider the nature of some of the practices a 'good' organisation might seek to pursue. Although shown in tabular form, the Figure is to be read in terms of the interrelatedness of the issues. For example, in seeking to ask Why? of a particular activity or proposal, the value choices in the dilemma 'Personas person vs person as object' must also be considered. The chart is perhaps best conceived as a spiral. It must also be made clear that we are here focussing on one dimension - one often given little attention. We assume that an organisation must have the requisite strategic, operational, and material and human resources to carry out its activities against bench-mark performance standards. We also note however, that in trying to build a culture as described in Figure 1, there would be implications for the nature and balance of such resources. In Figure 2 we have extended this analysis to look at the 'competencies' required of the good manager who seeks to make a 'life giving' contribution to the value dilemmas facing organisations.

Core Values

We propose that in working within the value dilemmas we have noted, four interrelated core values or strengths are required of the good manager - integrity, service,
compassion, and hope. In naming these, we are anxious that they not be seen as absolutes. They represent for us more motivational states or goals guiding behaviour, the expression and actualisation of which is always in process, continually worked out in the web of day-to-day decisions and relationships. Nor do we wish to imply that these are the only values important in the present circumstances. They do however, seem to us to touch the core of managerial and leadership behaviour in the present context.
**Figure 2: THE GOOD MANAGER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Dilemma</th>
<th>The good manager:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exploitation vs reconciliation</td>
<td>· works from a ground of compassion not control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· considers ends as important as the means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· values the varieties of knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· discerns as well as makes decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· seeks reconciliation not fragmentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person as person vs person as object</td>
<td>· holds in mind the person as person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· has a clear sense of self apart from roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· empowers others without seeking to control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· considers impact of actions on welfare of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· promotes equity including gender equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· see him/herself as servant not traditional leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual vs collective or community values</td>
<td>· builds relationships, seeking to contribute to the common good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· appreciates and encourages diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· understands own culture and cultural roots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· pursues own spiritual growth in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· allows order to emerge rather than impose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material values vs ecological values</td>
<td>· seeks understanding of the relationship between organisation's activities and the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· has a deep sense of relationship with the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· avoids corruption and corrupt organisation practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· is committed to contributing towards a sustainable environment for future generations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received values vs emergent values</td>
<td>· has capacity to work with ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· seeks personal balance between own espoused and tacit values - tries to 'walk the talk'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· has capacity to 'stay with' an issue even when it seems difficult or threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· works for just and fair actions and outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Integrity

In using the concept of integrity we are not referring to some moral or ethically virtuous state limited to a few people, nor to a 'passive' form of integrity which allows one to walk the thin line between a positive and active position and silent avoidance of the issue. Rather, with Srivastva and Barrett we refer to that constant process whereby a person (or an organisation) is committed to seeking actively his or her sense of personal value and meaning in the context of relationships with others and with life-sustaining systems.

In our frame it is misleading to speak of a person who "has" integrity, as if it were a possession. **Integrity is an interactive event, an evolving, transformative process that occurs in exceptional moments, moments when individuals step out of the ordinary day-to-day life of self-oriented existence for survival in an effort to attend to the other's development.** We create moments of integrity whenever we are able to appreciate what we allow ourselves to see in the other and in such a way that the relationship is is furthered and sustained. The "wholeness" that the word integrity refers to is the wholeness of the relationship, the wholeness of the interaction. (p. 291)

Exclusion limits the frame of meaning making and so limits the notion of wholeness that is the fundamental meaning of integrity. We exclude when the other becomes a label or an object, defined by particular aspects rather than by their wholeness. We opened this paper with an extract from Burning Angel by James Lee Burke. Here we find a police officer coming to the realisation that he is working to a limited notion of persons. They have in fact, "a teaspoon at a time," ceased to be people to him. They have become objects to be dealt with. And with this realisation comes the loss of integrity. To
understand that our ways of knowing can be driven by both the desire to control and by compassion and to seek to integrate these different passions is a further form of integrity. Last to seek to bring our actions in line with our deepest life-giving values is another perspective on the concept of integrity. In the complex dilemmas we have described it will be extraordinarily difficult for organisations and management to achieve such a "wholeness." Nevertheless, this is the strength or commitment needed of the good organisation and the good manager in their leadership capacities.

Service

Robert Greenleaf has elaborated the concept of the leader as servant. For him, as for us, to serve is a core value for the good manager. It is the basis of a growthful, life-giving relationship. He writes:

_The difference (between leader first and servant first) manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test, and difficult to administer, is: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society; will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (pp.13-14)_

This understanding of service and servant-hood is far removed from the notion of customer service. There is depth and challenge in servant leadership.

We claim then that the good organisation and the good manager will act from the basis of their servanthood to the various stakeholders they serve. Not that this will make many decisions easier. On the contrary it introduces another layer of complexity. Yet the criteria are clear - will those being served become "healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to be servants."

According to Greenleaf, one of the key capacities (competencies) of the servant leader is the capacity to listen. Too often today various individuals and communities feel that they are not heard by our organisations and their leaders. There is an isolation emerging.
When attempts by an organisation and its managers to listen are made it is often construed, and often rightly so, as a self-serving listening. Listening is a reconciling activity and can only occur when there is a deep commitment to mutual respect. But good listening often takes time and, indeed, courage for it may take us into unknown territory and appear at first threatening. The capacity to listen involves the capacity to hold open the space sufficiently to allow for reconciliation.

The good manager, then, is, in our view, moved by the passion to serve. He or she has the capacity to listen to the other and to their own inner spirit.

**Care**

Following Erikson\(^\text{10}\), David Kolb\(^\text{11}\) sees care as one of the major appropriate developmental strengths of the age-mature person. It is expressed “through caring relationships, through careful work, and through moral leadership.” It is the last which Kolb sees as the greatest challenge. He writes:

*The challenges of moral leadership are the most difficult in advanced professional life. For many, caring relationships and careful work have been continuously growing since early career. The requirements of moral leadership are often sharply discontinuous, offering difficult new challenges - to be a public person, to represent others, to serve as a model for others, to be a leader and creator of culture, to chose right from wrong in the most difficult of circumstances. All these activities require the management of values, while earlier career activities primarily focussed on the management of knowledge. ............... The tasks of moral leadership are to make judgments about value priorities, to promote them in one’s activities, and to preserve these values through the creation of a culture that sustains them.*

Previously, age had corresponded with a managers status in their career. While in many cases this is still so, the growth of high-technology organisations and professions often sees quite young managers in senior executive positions. This is true too of those many organisations coming into being overnight and exhibiting extraordinary growth sometimes disappearing with as much speed. Can we expect such managers and
organisations whose developmental balance has more to do with their own achievement and personal power, to exhibit the sort of generational care described by Kolb? Unfortunately, too, with the drive for efficiency and effectiveness as measured by short-term measures of profitability, many 'older' managers find difficulty in keeping their job. Yet these are the managers to whom we should, in theory at least, be looking to for moral leadership. Even when in such a position, the culture of the organisation is such that little time is left after immediate pressures, to be able to develop the caring we have been describing.

Despite these problems we hold that caring remains a critical strength for both the good organisation and the good manager. Out of this strength will come a sense of responsibility towards employees and customers, to communities and cultures, to life-giving products and processes, and to the sustaining of the environment.

Hope

Hope for Erik Erikson\(^\text{12}\) emerges from the first developmental antithesis of basic trust vs basic mistrust. He writes: "... hope bestows on the anticipated future a sense of leeway inviting expectant leaps, either in preparatory imagination or in small initiating actions. And such daring must count on basic trust in the sense of trustfulness that must be, literally and figuratively, nourished by maternal care and - when endangered by all too disparate discomfort - must be restored by competent consolation, the German Trost."

Greenleaf points to the difficulty of the road for the leader who seeks to be servant first and foremost:

\textit{In the absence of solid evidence of such initiatives, servant leaders may stand alone, largely without the support of their culture, as a saving remnant of those who care for both persons and institutions, and who are determined to make their caring count - wherever they are involved. This brings them, as individuals, constantly to examine the assumptions they live by. Thus, their leadership by example sustains trust. (p. 330)}
The strength of hope is what makes such a stance possible for it is grounded in basic trust. There will be times, and probably more than expected, when inner doubts and the pressures for self-preservation come like black clouds. There will be times of frustration, especially when no one seems to share a similar vision of a good and just social order or of a nurturing organisational culture, or when efforts are misconstrued, or when the acceptance and recognition one might have expected do not come. Such times are frequent and frustrating. They are times when hope is most needed, a trust in an evolving process of good. Hope then is a vital strength in the good manager.

**Creating space**

We have indicated principles guiding the good organisation and the good manager. While there is a level of general applicability, the manager must deal with each particular case; the reasoning cannot be axiomatic\(^{13}\). This is the hard work of values-based management and we believe that many managers, from Senior Executives and Board members to small local proprietors are involved already in this work. But the nature of the task implies another required of the good manager, hopefully supported by the organisation's culture. *It is to create and hold space.*

In an environment where 'time is money' this can be an especially difficult task. It seems much more useful to discuss the response time for answering customer complaints against industry benchmarks, than to explore the affective dimensions of role and the conflicting values many experience. Yet the good manager will need to create space for both himself and others to contribute to the conversation which is work. In creating such a space the manager will recognise and hold the boundaries of the space. This is an important psychological process enabling trust to be affirmed and to grow. Containing the space is an important task, for it enables an environment of trust to emerge.

We define this 'containing space' as the space allowing for that conversation between the self and others through which we define ourselves and, eventually, find the courage to be. This discovery of self is essential if one is to have the capacity to provide such space for others to grow and develop (Rogers, 1961)\(^{14}\).
As persons, we need time to listen, to reflect, to 'take in.' This is partly the meaning of space. Such space allows for deep and transforming listening to take place within the person, the organization, the community, and the nation. We propose that the provision of such space is essential in any approach requiring change and transformation. Without the opportunity to experience this space, both human and organisational development in terms of task achievement and compassionate understanding can become only a superficial act of conformity bound by the power of externalised authority.

If there is no space for genuine conversation, if the boundaries are too confining or vague and indeterminate, or if the space is 'polluted' with unfinished work on the part of those in the conversation, then conformity or rebellion may follow rather than genuine growth. Such polluted space crowds the person, the group, and even the nation, with authoritarian or 'expert' voices, self-justifying demands, black-and-white scenarios, and marketing babble. The exploration of values or the capacity to even hear the value issues, are squeezed out of the conversation.

Further, the notion of a containing space implies a certain level of trust - trust that the space will remain open for conversation despite the ways one might misuse or abuse that privilege, resist the discipline the space offers through its boundaries. We see the present time as one where it is more and more difficult to trust, and hence, to feel safe enough to enter transforming conversation or dialogue. Resnik\textsuperscript{15} notes:

\textit{........ real dialogue is an encounter between lonely people - or, rather, between people able to be alone, people who are neither invasive not overwhelming nor seductive, people who can give solitude to each other. I use "solitude" here to mean a living loneliness - being alone with oneself.}

\textit{To find a place to be oneself is an adventurous experience that everyone desires, yet we live in a culture where we are always running away from ourselves - but running away only increases the fear of finding oneself, and the fear, in turn, increases the tendency to run away, to escape into the outer world. Sometimes ............... this appears as the compulsion to jump into the mind or the mental space of a guru or some other leader. (pp. xix-xx)
In one sense, the qualities of the 'containing space' as we have conceived it, are similar to the characteristics of a helping, learning-promoting, relationship as described by Rogers. In another sense a 'containing space' is both how and where we care for our souls. "Soul is not a thing," writes Thomas Moore, "but a quality or dimension of experiencing ourselves." Through increased knowing of our self and the 'other', through respect, through taking responsibility, and through caring (Fromm, 1957), we are able to give a depth to our experience even though that depth will mean going through the experience of facing our own aloneness. The notion of a containing space reminds us of the space we all need at one time or another to undertake the soul's work.

**Conclusion**

Organisations will determine increasingly the quality of life we have as a global community. This is so whether they be large multinational organisations, virtual organisations, small businesses, or local and global agencies. Much, therefore, is placed upon the managers of those organisations to ensure that life-giving values take precedence over those values that dehumanise and destroy. We are still to determine what life-giving values are in our evolutionary journey. Perhaps we shan't really know that until we reach the end of the journey and look back. But in our push towards subjectivism, relativism, and materialism, it would seem foolish to ignore those values held high in most cultural and religious traditions. While our Enlightenment heritage has accomplished much, we need also to remember that such accomplishments have in many cases been made possible by men and women and the organisations giving them agency, who have held a deep and abiding sense of justice, fairness, and caring. To imagine any system - political, economic, or social - surviving without the contribution of those willing to serve, is impossible. On this issue the rhetoric and the reality are often at odds.

The efforts of individuals and groups will remain important, if only acting as the sparrow in the mine of development and change. But the rate and extent of development is now so fast and so dramatic that in its rush it leaves a vacuum, especially a moral vacuum. Organisations must now consciously look to filling that vacuum. The old excuses - It's only business; We are legally right; Competition demands it; This is what our customers want; Buyer beware; It's the bottom line that counts; Our share price will fall; etc - can
no longer be seen as viable in the present context. Organisations increasingly must be 'good' organisations, despite the often justifiable anxiety such a phrase might conjure.

But organisations are not machines. They are essentially people's decisions in action. Through the decisions and actions of managers, organisations take action in the world and increasingly shape the world. Hence we need to focus on the 'good' manager.

In this brief paper we have used some of the dilemmas to be faced by organisations and managers to try to access some of the values integral to a 'good society.' The challenge is clearly there:

...... This approach is to recognise that we need to create a new morality, a new vision of society. We have the capacity to create the 'good society' in a fashion that was unimaginable 2,500 years ago, when this debate was first recorded. Such a new vision of society would have to rest on a secular morality, but one which would need its rituals and symbols for support, just as much as religious morality did in the past. A secular morality would turn around affirming what is integral to being a human being, and uphold the dignity of all human beings.17

No one could deny the interrelated complexity these issues pose for decision makers nor the size of the task in building a new vision of a secular, life-oriented, civil society. Our position is that in this complex and challenging task, managers and especially those who have major leadership roles, can play an important part. Leaders are needed who are inwardly committed to values of integrity, service, and compassion, who approach their task in hope, and who can make and hold space for the growth of themselves and others. This inner commitment must be matched by wisdom of action.

Is the task impossible? It can be argued that organisations whether private, government or not-for-profit, must necessarily cast people in roles - the customer, the citizen with his/her different needs in society, and those served. Are we asking too much of business organisations and especially large multi nationals whose first concern must be it seems, their own survival and expansion? In our view we are expecting too much if we lay all responsibility for the good society with them. Governments need to reclaim their task of building the good society. When caught in the self-justifying absolutes of market forces
and competitive capitalism, their task is greatly hampered. The 'justified' protection of commercial right as against citizen welfare can easily lead to lack of transparency and lack of real accountability. Governments then have as our opening quote reminds us, 'hard work' to do. So too has the citizen. Immediate and tangible 'benefits' such as unlimited choice of tiles and fittings for the bathroom renovation, can readily lose their sense of value as person and citizen. They too have the 'hard work' of redeeming society to ensure real quality of life. We do not believe any path, including that of capitalist globalisation, is inevitable. It is only so if we deify such concepts as 'market forces.'

Even so, leaders and managers in our organisations have heavy burdens to carry. We have no fantasy about the number who are willing to take up such burdens. Yet we believe with Charles Handy, that many managers are hungry in spirit for something more in their work, that they have a sense of having a job but no sense of vocation. Perhaps then, we need to come back to such terms as vocation to rightly describe the contributions 'good' managers could make to our future.
END NOTES


   Greenleaf’s understanding of the leader as servant is used in this paper. He is particularly concerned with those who have leadership responsibilities and those who are 'natural' leaders. However, we have used his central idea to apply to organisations, especially large multinational corporations and to the leadership responsibility each manager has, though obviously the scope for the exercise of leadership varies considerably. A valuable paper, *Leadership in Times of Uncertainty*, explores the relationship between traditional and contemporary epistemologies and the type of leadership the non-linear open systems epistemologies require. Greenleaf's ideas are central to this newer approach. For a copy of the paper contact the author, Peter Sheldrake, at the RMIT University’s School of Management.


   Burke is a crime fiction writer.


4. Erich Fromm's works, especially *Man for Himself* (1949), *The Sane Society*, (1956), *The Art of Loving* (1957), and *To Have or To Be* (1976) provide the backdrop of thinking about the contemporary context. Much of what Fromm described in his early work seems to apply even more so today.

5. 'Globalisation' has become one of the theme descriptors of the present circumstances of the world economy. Much is written on it, including features and articles in newspapers and journals. References that have been useful background to the present discussion include William Greider's article *Planet of pirates: the manic logic of global capitalism* in the UTNE Reader, May-June 1997, pp. 70-73 & 101-102 and his book (1997) *One World, Ready or Not*, Simon and Schuster. See also Kenichi Ohmae


7. Parker Palmer is a Quaker educator and scholar. Quotes in this paper come from his 1983 book, To Know As We Are Known, Harper and Row.

8. Katz D. and Kahn, R.L. (1966). The Social Psychology of Organisations, Wiley. The authors particularly develop the concept of role in understanding organisational behaviour. It is the role one occupies that allows for the process 'splitting' described in the quote from their book, whereby one can undertake things which in another role would be incomprehensible. Where the 'split' is too great compared to innate value systems, or does not have wider cultural sanction, stress and dysfunctional behaviour as seen by other role incumbents can occur. Role theory seems to be an underutilised means of organisational analysis.


13. See Albert Jansen and Stephen Toulmin The Abuse of Casuistry, Ch1.


17. From *Matching Personal and Corporate Values: the challenges of cultural diversity*, an Invited Paper by Professor Peter Sheldrake presented at the Corporate and Human Values Seminar, Malaysian Airlines Academy, Kelana Jaya, Malaysia, on 2 August, 1999. Starting with the recent case of sponsored advertising in Australia, this Paper goes on the explore the nature of our current economic and social situation, arguing for the need for a Third Way - that of a society with a strong sense of civil secular morality. This Paper can be regarded as forming the background to this Occasional Paper.
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