



GO Global Organization  
Design Society



Readings in Global Organization Design  
Reprinted from *Festschrift for Elliott Jaques*  
with author's permission

## Musings about the Elephant in the Parlor or “Who the Devil Is Elliott Jaques?”

by Jerry B. Harvey

Article #05-11-20-F15

Rights for non-commercial distribution of this Festschrift article were gifted by Jerry B. Harvey to the Global Organization Design Society for the purpose of low-cost dissemination of this information to the world. Any price charged by the Society is limited to the cost of reproduction and distribution. Any third party receiving this material from the Society agrees as a condition of that transfer that any further use or transfer by them is covered by the same acknowledgment of source and conditions.

# Musing about the Elephant in the Parlor or "Who the Devil Is Elliott Jaques?" Jerry B. Harvey

Sometime ago, a respected colleague mentioned that he had come across a very different book in the field of management and organization entitled, *A General Theory of Bureaucracy* (Jaques, 1976) by someone named Elliott Jaques.

"Who the devil is Elliott Jaques?" said I.

After providing me with a synopsis of the author's background that he had obtained from the book's jacket,<sup>1</sup> he said, "Regardless of who he is, you ought to read it. He thinks in peculiar ways, just like you. He's just a lot smarter-on a different stratum one might say."

Vaguely aware of my colleague's sarcasm but naive as to his perceptive, precise understanding and application of the concept of Stratum, a major theoretical construct of Stratified Systems Theory (SST), I went to my university's library and checked out the only copy of *A General Theory of Bureaucracy* that the library owned. That action of itself was instructive; for in the two-plus years *A General Theory...* had resided in the stacks, my colleague and I, both of whom were employed as faculty (to my despair and surprise, I made the significant discovery from reading both the book and our university's charter that we were *employees* of the University, not *members* of the faculty, as I had mistakenly believed) of a major institution of higher learning that ostensibly possessed a first rate business school and a library of equivalent quality, were apparently the only ones who had seen fit to read it. "It's certainly not one of our most popular books dealing with management," said our friendly librarian.

Despite its absence from the *New York Times'* Best Sellers List, I read it anyway and found it to be one of the most creative, stimulating, exciting, rigorous, confronting, intellectually demanding, and morally provocative pieces of work I had ever read in the field of organizational behavior. No, that's not accurate. I found it to be *the most* creative, stimulating, exciting, rigorous, confronting, intellectually demanding, and morally provocative pieces of work I had ever read in the field of organizational behavior.

In the light of my reaction, I began to wonder how I, who pride myself as being semi-bright, relatively well read in my professional field of Organizational Behavior, and having had twenty-plus years of experience as a management consultant and an academician specializing in the study of organizations, had not heard of Jaques' work. The fearful thought that I was an anomaly crept into my mind, and I began to experience the anticipatory separation anxiety that one frequently suffers when he suddenly and inexplicably finds himself alone in a crowd.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, depending on one's particular bias, I found that I was far from being a walking definition of "sui generis." In fact, when I conducted an ongoing, informal poll of professional colleagues, clients, graduate students, managers, attendees at corporate training seminars, and others whom I believed would or should have reason to know something about Elliott Jaques and SST, I discovered that virtually none of those I interviewed had heard of him either.

Oh, there were a couple of exceptions.

One interviewee asked "Isn't he the fellow who wrote a book about how you go about changing the cultures of factories?" Another said, "I think he may be the psychiatrist who did a piece a long time ago about midlife crisis. If he's the one I'm thinking of, that was an excellent piece of work. I have always wondered what happened to him. Since I have never seen anything else written by him, I assume he has died." But on the whole, "Who the devil is Elliott Jaques?" or some derivative thereof became a stock reply that echoed in the backroads of my inquiring mind.

In fact, the question occurred with such monotonous frequency that I associated it with a story I had heard about an eccentric CEO of a massive organization who housed a huge, powerful, stately elephant in the parlor of his metropolitan penthouse. When guests visited him for business appointments, cocktails, or dinner, the elephant in its grandiose, domineering presence would meander to and fro about the room, brushing against the guests, the furniture, the walls, and the chandeliers; but for reasons known only to the CEO's Manager-Once-Removed (Jaques, 1989, p. 48), few guests acknowledged its presence. In fact, when the host showed his visitors to the door and said, "Incidentally, what do you think about the elephant in my parlor?" most would reply "What elephant?"

Forgoing for the moment any temptation I might have, as a function of my Baptist-biased knowledge of Stratified Systems Theory, to explore the potential theological significance integral to the roles of the CEO or his MoR, I am impressed by the similarity of the guests' response to the elephant and the reaction, by and large, that individuals who have an avowed interest in the theory and practice of management and organizational behavior have had to our honoree's work. That is, when confronted with the reality of a piece of seminal thinking, stately in its design, powerful in its capacity to deal with the world of which it is a part, massive in its implications for organizations of all kinds, and even more impressive when viewed in comparison with other works of *pissant* proportions that attempt to address the same basic issues, why do so many in the field of organizational behavior respond with, "What's Stratified Systems Theory?" "Who the devil is Elliott Jaques?" or some other equivalent of "What elephant?"

Consequently, in this essay I would like to muse a bit about Elliott Jaques, the metaphorical elephant who resides in organizational parlors throughout the world, and his work on SST. More specifically, I would like to focus my musing on why I think a work of such extraordinary creativity and importance has, in my opinion, been relatively ignored and has had comparatively little impact when viewed within the context of what I believe to be both its deserved and its ultimate potential.

As I go about my reverie, I can only express the wish that I do not lapse into a solipsistic soliloquy that has little relationship or relevance to your experiences with Jaques' work. Also, I hope that you will keep in mind, as I talk about Elliott Jaques personally and his work on SST, that I am speaking about them interchangeably. I say this because I am aware of, and agree with, one of the basic tenets of SST, namely that an isomorphic relationship exists between any given individual and the level of work he/she is potentially capable of producing and, more importantly, given a particular mix of knowledge, skills, wisdom, temperament and experience (Jaques, 1989), the level of work he/she *does* produce.

Given that preamble, here are some of the explanations I have heard proposed for why the world of management and organization (at least the world of which I am a part) has, for the most part, ignored the elephant in its parlor. To provide order to what otherwise could be chaos, I'm

going to start with several rationales for such ignore-ance (sic) that I have rejected, and tell you why I have seen fit to do so. Then I'm going to suggest an explanation, which, I believe, will, over time, turn out to be valid. Finally, I'd like to discuss what I believe is the major contribution of SST to the world of organization, both formal and informal, and perhaps to the organization of the world at large.

## Rejected Explanations

Let's start with some proposed explanations I have rejected, and the reasons underlying my rejections.

### Jaques Doesn't Communicate His Ideas Very Well.

Individuals who have read one or more of Jaques' articles and books or who have heard him speak in person about his work, frequently contend that many of their reservations regarding SST stem from the fact that he is neither a poetic writer nor a charismatic speaker. Such criticism is frequently registered in concrete terms such as, "If he wants his work to be understood, he ought to write a book like *The One Minute Manager*,"<sup>2</sup> (Blanchard, 1982) or, "He doesn't speak with the evangelical zeal, the melodious rhythm, and the drumbeat cadence of a Tom Peters preaching about organizational excellence." Because I, too, am aware that Jaques' writing style doesn't have quite the literary quality of a Shakespearian sonnet, and that his talks about SST don't exactly conjure memories of Winston Churchill speaking to the English Empire about blood, sweat, and tears, I, at times, have nearly been seduced into believing that his deserved influence has suffered, if not from his own communication deficiencies, from a shortage of competent translators. Ultimately, though, I have concluded that such criticism of his work is irrelevant. It's irrelevant because if one listens carefully to both supporters and detractors of SST who offer that argument, they frequently follow it up with a statement such as, "I had to read the damn book five times before I thought I understood it; but each time I re-read it, I understood it better," or "After Jaques concluded his talk to our group, a half-dozen of us sat in my office and discussed what he said for three hours." Since the very people who claim he lacks communication skills frequently re-read and debate what he supposedly hasn't communicated, I have decided that he must communicate something fairly well. Realizing that, I also have gained renewed appreciation of the validity of a point Jaques made during a recent rambling discourse to participants in a faculty seminar on leadership at The George Washington University (Jaques, 1990A). Specifically, he said that the influence of leaders stems from the fact that "they have competence to burn, and one way or another, they communicate that competence to others. (Jaques, op. cit.)." I can only wonder what might happen if he did become Shakespearian or Churchillian in his communication skills. Some fairly well known people in leadership roles have been crucified for less. One can only guess what might happen to an elephant.

### SST Can Be Understood Only by Persons in the Upper Strata of Cognitive Power.

Another plausible explanation I have heard for SST's relative anonymity is that only those with Cognitive Power in Strata V - VIII can truly understand it. Therefore, given the low proportion of persons who occupy those strata, it will take a sizable amount of time to accumulate a critical mass of individuals who both comprehend the work and have the Cognitive Power to put it into practice. On the surface, it is a persuasive argument; and if one happens to suffer from a touch of vanity, it is particularly attractive to those whose Cognitive Power is to be found in Strata V-VIII.

Persuasive as the argument may be, from my experience I have concluded that neither our understanding of SST nor our acceptance or rejection of its essence is related to Cognitive Power, so long as one's Cognitive Power is located in what Jaques terms, "the adult range" (Jaques, 1989).

For example, I know a Stratum VI colleague who has rejected SST with a vengeance, employing "...arguments supported by accumulated conceptual information in which the concepts are actually related to each other. (Jaques, 1990B, p. 3)." Thus, my colleague contends that SST is fascistic in its underlying value system, violates Kantian moral imperatives, and is based on flawed scientific methodology. Consequently, he has concluded that SST's resulting gestalt is both scientifically and morally unacceptable as a theoretical model for conceptualizing organizational behavior. Although I don't agree with either his premises or his conclusions, I do realize that the thought process by which he reached them is an expression of what those of us at the lower levels of the "Universal Depth Structure" (Jaques, 1976) would consider to be stratospheric Cognitive Power.

Alternatively, I have heard Stratum I individuals, who live in the "The 1st Order World of Concrete Language and Ideas" (Jaques, 1990B, op. cit) embrace SST with uncomplicated assertive statements such as, "You frizzy haired professors can talk about this guy Jaques and use all the bells and whistles you want to while you do it. But, to me, he is saying that I can't get along with AI, my boss, because even though the SOB isn't any smarter than I am, he still keeps trying to tell me how to do my job. Believe me, Jaques is absolutely right. "

In short, once acquainted with SST, whether by reading or through conversation with someone knowledgeable about the subject, everyone understands the theory, even though the specific nature of each individual's understanding undoubtedly varies as a function of the Cognitive Power he or she brings to the task. Looking at that conclusion retrospectively, I don't know why I or anyone else, for that matter, should be surprised by it. Jaques for one, has discovered that anyone both can and will discuss a potentially complex issue such as, euthanasia, or any other subject which interests him, within the framework provided by his own Cognitive Power (Jaques, 1990B). In fact, one *can* judge the individual's Cognitive Power from how he/she talks about such topics. Or, to provide a slightly different example, all of us understand the Bible, assuming we read it; but how we interpret its content and whether we accept or reject what we understand from reading it is an entirely different matter. That's apparently true for our comprehension of elephants, also. The fact that we can discuss elephants in our own unique ways that reflect our respective levels of Cognitive Power, doesn't provide a clue as to which of us will like or dislike having one pad around our parlors. One person's elephant droppings are another's organic fertilizer.

### **The Implications of SST are Unclear.**

Initially, I entertained the possibility that the spread of SST might be limited because its practical implications were unclear. To the contrary, I have discovered that, if anything, the spread of SST has been restricted because its practical implications *are* clear.

For example, I know an industrial relations (IR) manager who opted to allow 4,800 hourly employees to go on strike rather than employ SST as a conceptual guide for solving a labor-management dispute. He did so even though he believed that the dispute clearly related to the organization's failure to provide Felt Fair Pay and to the anti-requisite reporting relationships that existed between the organization's first line managers and its hourly employees. Paradoxically, the IR manager refused to use the theory, not because he feared it would not work, but because he feared it would. According to him, SST's success would open up a

Pandora's Box of issues relating to the organization's basic structure, its compensation scheme, the managerial and quasi-managerial roles played by specific organizational members, and most of all, would call into question a lot of activities that went on in his own area of organizational accountability. In his words, "I'd rather call in a traditional OD Consultant to do a 'good ol' inter-group conflict resolution design (Walton, 1987), even though I know that type of intervention won't solve the problems we have. At least others would think we were trying to do something, and I wouldn't run the risk of being the focus of a lot of downstream flap I couldn't control if this SST stuff caught on."

Although I might question his ethics for choosing a non-solution he knew wouldn't work instead of a solution that he believed might, I think he was essentially correct in assessing the potential "ripple" effect the theory might have had on him and the remainder of the organization. To him, the theory's implications were crystal clear and that clarity, in turn, led him to reject its use.

In similar fashion, I have been approached by more than one director of an executive development program for which I have been scheduled to do a presentation about SST's potential for draining the environmental swamps that produce organizational phrog farms (Harvey, 1977), with a question such as, "I don't mind your talking about phrog farming, but must you speak about SST? Couldn't you do a session on something else?"

When I have asked the reason for their queries, their replies generally have been versions of, "The implications of SST to the participants are too disturbing. They will get to thinking that a lot of what goes on in their own organizations doesn't make much sense. And, more important to me, it means that a lot of the other material in the program dealing with leadership style, organization structure, compensation, conflict resolution, career development, motivation, strategic planning, and management development won't make much sense, either. It also causes a problem for future presenters who speak on those topics, not to mention the headaches it creates for me when the participants start complaining about the contradictions between SST and most of the other material they get."

When I ask, "Would you prefer that I present some material that doesn't make sense so that it would fit both the nonsensical organizational environments of the participants as well as the nonsensical environment of the program?" they have always said, "No, but I thought I would ask. I just don't like the implications of Jaques' work, even though his ideas are extremely interesting and undoubtedly represent a real advance in the field. "

Nor is their attitude significantly different from that voiced by a doctoral student from the School of Education who took a course that I don't teach (Harvey, 1979) in which *A General Theory of Bureaucracy* (Jaques, 1976) is used as a textbook, and in which the elephant himself bangs against the classroom walls from time to time as a guest lecturer. Several years after she took the course, the student visited my office to discuss some of her experiences.

"Do you still use Elliott Jaques' book, and does he still serve as a guest speaker from time to time?" she asked.

"The answer is 'yes' to both questions," I replied. "Why do you ask?"

"I hated the book, and I was very upset by what he had to say."

"Would you mind telling me why?"

"Well, if he's correct, and I suspect that he is, then much of the material I've received in my

doctoral program about how school systems should be organized, and the way in which people learn is probably irrelevant I feel like a large part of my time as a doctoral student has been wasted."

"Well, if you believe that, why don't you just forget about Jaques' work and 'dance with the one that brung you?'"<sup>3</sup>

"I can't," she said. "Doing that would be like trying to sit in the corner for thirty seconds and not think about a brown bear."

Evidently, elephants sometimes develop thick coats of fur and replace their tusks with fangs.

### **The Theoretical Relationships Proposed by SST Would Not Hold Up in the World of Practice.**

A final explanation I have heard for the relatively limited spread of SST is that its theoretical constructs would not be validated if individuals attempted to apply them in their respective organizations. Although I have heard variations of that argument a number of times, I have never heard it offered by people who actually have experimented with SST in their organizations. In the light of such data, and assuming that your experience has been similar, I see no reason to pursue that point of view further. More specifically, until someone tells me, or you, or Jaques, or some other verifiable source, that he has had an experience with an actual (rather than an "as if") Accountability Structure in which Time Span of Discretion (TSD) is not reliably related to Felt-Fair-Pay, Cognitive Power does not follow multiple predictable developmental courses, and breathing human beings with Stratum IV Working Capacities have requisite reporting relationships as subordinates with superiors whose Working Capacities are Stratum III, I see no need to worry about the elephant's health.

Having rejected four seemingly plausible explanations for why so many who should be familiar with SST (as opposed to agree with it-that's a different issue altogether) are not, to what then do I attribute SST's limited dissemination and the collateral question, "Who the devil is Elliott Jaques?"

### **SST Stimulates Fears Inherently Associated with New Expressions from the World of Universals.**

In my opinion, SST is not merely a technological prescription for analyzing and constructing Requisite Associations and Accountability Structures. Nor is it simply a methodological guide for enhancing organizational design or improving our understanding and practice of organizational leadership and management. Rather, in Jaques' terms, it is an expression of "The 4th Order<sup>4</sup> of Universals: This is the world, inhabited by true genius, of universal ideas and languages, required for handling whole societies, social movements, ideologies and philosophies" (Jaques, 1990B).

Consequently, SST, like all new statements generated from within the World of 4<sup>th</sup> Order Universals, requires that virtually all of us interested in the field of organizational behavior either change or abandon a wide variety of our established beliefs about the nature of human organization. In addition, it also requires that we either change or abandon our relationships with friends and colleagues who have supported us in holding those beliefs. In short, SST demands that we change not the systems of thought but also the isomorphic networks of associates who have provided us with the emotional security required to maintain those thoughts. Such changes, in turn, will cause many of us to suffer from anaclitic depression<sup>5</sup> (Spitz, 1946), a form

of primitive depression that strikes otherwise normal individuals when the emotional support that is provided by other people or familiar belief systems (Spitz, op. cit.; Lynch, 1977; Harvey, 1988) is withdrawn. If it runs its full course, anaclitic depression results in "marasmus" -a type of debilitating atrophy that can be both physical and emotional in nature; and because of that, most of us both fear and will do whatever is required to avoid it.

Thus, similar to the way in which many alchemists<sup>6</sup> probably attempted to avoid anaclitic depression<sup>7</sup> when the emerging theory of chemistry threatened to destroy alchemy's intellectual and collegial foundations, many of us associated with the field of organizational behavior or probably have attempted to avoid the experience of anaclitic depression by ignoring SST and continuing to live within the false security provided by a theoretical and collegial environment with which we are also comfortably familiar.<sup>8</sup>

Paradoxically, the fact that most of us probably have lived the greater part of our lives in anti-requisite Accountability Structures, or Associations that in their anti-requisiteness have produced rather than ameliorated anaclitic depression, doesn't help us withstand the impact of such fears. In fact, if I am correct in my analysis, by providing us with multiple experiences of institutionally-induced anaclitic depression, the lives we have led in a wide variety of Anti-Requisite organizations have exacerbated our fear of it. Since the development of any ideas from the 4th Order of Universals requires the kind of debate and controversy that may fracture established intellectual and collegial alliances, I believe that such experiences have acted to stifle the discussion, dissemination, and development of SST itself, even though the theory offers a potential organizational blueprint for gaining existential relief from the anaclitic depression of which we are so afraid.

Strange isn't it? Elephants apparently activate whatever self-defeating proclivities we human beings inherently possess.

*Once more, SST offers a fecund hint. Perhaps people with 4th Order (Quintave D) Cognitive Capacities are in touch with and receive support from their contact with the reality of the universal ideas themselves, ideas which have no reality and provide no security to those of us Orders (Quintaves) 1, 2, and 3 (Jaques, 1989 and 19908), but have comforting reality for those of us very few who live 4th Order (Quintave) existences.*

*Assuming that is true, Einstein's 4th Order rejection of traditional religious beliefs emanating from Orders 1, 2, and 3 but his avowed "...Intoxication with the God of the cosmos (Mallove, 1985) makes sense in the same way that a 1st Order person finds the spiritual security repaired for him to take risky actions from the worship of a concrete (no pun intended), 1st Order religious artifact.*

*Thus, all of us (regardless of the Order or Quintave to which life has consigned us) paradoxically receive both the stability required to live and the courage required to change from a totem of some sort, a totem I believe most of us refer to and experience as God.*

*Finally, if Jaques and my interpretation of his work are correct, orders of complexity beyond Order IV must exist, and sooner or later someone in the process of human evolution will express realities inherent to them.*



## **SST's Major Potential Contribution: A Means for Elucidating and Clarifying Ethical, Moral, and Spiritual (EMS) Issues of Organization**

Assuming that SST does emanate from the world of 4th Order Universals, I doubt that its major contribution will stem from the technological guidelines it provides for creating requisite Accountability Structures, Associations and other forms of organization. Rather, I believe it will come from SST's capacity for providing a more sophisticated, rigorous order of concepts and language for illuminating the kind of ethical, moral, and spiritual (EMS) relationships that we human beings require both to survive and flourish in a wide variety of organizations. Furthermore, it will do so because new 4<sup>th</sup> Order statements, which by their nature require that we restructure intellectual and interpersonal alliances, *always* demand isomorphic changes in EMS relationships within and among all persons whose Cognitive Power is found in lower Orders.

For example, within the framework of the potentials and limits set by my own Working-Capacity, SST has led me to understand that the empirical relationship which exists between felt fair pay and TSD becomes not only the basis of a technique for efficiently ascertaining monetary compensation schedules but also an invitation for me and others to consider more consciously, and rigorously, how we express fairness and unfairness, decency and indecency, support and rejection, respect and disrespect, love and hate, kindness and cruelty, competence and incompetence, greed and altruism toward one another through the medium of compensation.

Or, by making me aware of the potential isomorphic relationship that exists between a given individual's cognitive power and the complexity of work he is capable of carrying out, SST practically demands that I explore the EMS issues which are generated when we create organizations in which such relationships are facilitated or inhibited.

Or, knowing the predictable course of a given individual's cognitive development over time, I am provided with a new way of thinking about the EMS issues related to the education of our young, our middle aged, and our elderly. What EMS issues are involved, for instance, when we place one another into educational environments that demand Cognitive Power greater than, equal to, or less than we possess?

Or, employing SST as a conceptual guide, and assuming that we succeed in producing a truly Requisite organization, I must ask whether it is morally, ethically, or spiritually legitimate for me and others to hoard such knowledge and to employ the resulting requisiteness to gain a competitive advantage over Anti-Requisite Organizations for the purpose of diminishing or destroying them?

Or, playing with the implications of SSTs constructs in depth, I am led to the conclusion that an organization's psychological structure can be moral or immoral of itself. Thus, I realize that consciously constructing an Anti-Requisite organization that impairs one's psychological health is ultimately no different from willfully using asbestos in the construction of a brick-and-mortar building when we know that using such material will ultimately destroy the physical health of those who will work within it.

I suspect that knowledge of SST will likewise arouse in you and others EMS issues, the specific form of which will undoubtedly reflect your respective Working-Capacities. Furthermore, I know that, because of their inherently controversial nature, (issues of right and wrong, good and evil are inevitably controversial) the exploration of such issues will generate in each of us a fear of anaclitic depression; a fear that, in turn, may make us reticent to explore them. Jaques, himself, apparently has fallen victim to some such fear. For example, although Jaques has discussed

some of the political and social implications of SST, in works such as *A General Theory of Bureaucracy* (1976), *Free Enterprise and Fair Employment* and *Requisite Organization* (1989), he has not discussed their EMS implications in depth. Nevertheless, he does provide hints that he is aware of the EMS significance of his work, in statements such as:

*The trouble is that our current ambiguous theories and coercive procedures for settling wages and salary differentials are so disturbing in their effect that they bring out the worst in all of us, including the eruption of our most primitive unconscious paranoid reactions. But even this strong disaffection is mitigated by our positive impulses-unless we are driven to rage and despair and [the] breaking point when inequity is pushed too far; similarly destructive hate may be mitigated by positive influences in the primitive layers of the mind, and paranoid responses held at bay. (Jaques, 1982, p.74)*

I believe that the aggressive exploration of what he refers to as "the primitive layer of the mind" and "the positive influences that mitigate destructive hate" will inevitably lead us into the realm of the EMS. In addition, until those of us interested in SST engage forthrightly in such exploration, I believe that SST's most important contribution to the world of organization will be diminished significantly.

However, if Jaques and others of us stimulated by his ideas overcome our fears of anaclitic depression and develop the intellectual, the collegial, and perhaps the transcendent 4<sup>th</sup> (or higher) Order attachments required to explore the EMS implications of SST, I think that when we produce the Festschrift for Jaques' 100th birthday, the MoR of the CEO who houses our metaphorical elephant will be pleased. In addition, most of the CEO's guests will say as they depart from their host's requisitely designed, multilevel penthouse apartment, "That's a mighty fine elephant you have in the parlor." Finally, I, my colleagues, and others in the field of management and organization development will not be asking "Who the devil is Elliott Jaques?" Rather, virtually everyone involved in all kinds of organizations will be asking in language rife with theoretical and symbolic precision "How in God's name could you not know of Elliott Jaques?"

## References

Blanchard, Kenneth and Johnson, Spencer. *The One Minute Manager*. William Morrow and Co., Inc., New York, NY. 1982.

Harvey, Jerry B. *The Abilene Paradox and Other Meditations on Management*. Lexington Books. Lexington, Mass., 1988.

Harvey, Jerry B. "Organizations as Phrog Farms." *Organizational Dynamics*. Spring, 1977, pp. 15-23.

Harvey, Jerry B. "Learning to Not Teach." *Exchange: The Organizational Behavior Teaching Journal*. Spring, 1977. pp. 19-21.

Jaques, Elliott. "Basic Propositions About Leadership." Talk Delivered at a Seminar on "The Psychology of Political Leadership," at The George Washington University. Washington, DC. January 12, 1990.

Jaques, Elliott. *Requisite Organization*. Cason Hall & Co. Arlington, VA, 1989.

Jaques, Elliott. "Basic Propositions About Leadership." Unpublished Manuscript. 1990, p.3.

Jaques, Elliott. "How to Observe the Current Working Potential of Individuals." Unpublished Manuscript. 1990(B).

Jaques, Elliott. *A General Theory of Bureaucracy*. Halstead Press. New York, NY, 1976.

Lynch, James. *The Broken Heart: The Medical Consequences of Loneliness*. Basic Books. New York, NY, 1977.

Spitz, R. "Hospitalism: A Follow-Up Report." *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*. V 01. 2. Yale University. 1946.

Walton, Richard E. *Managing Conflict: Interpersonal Dialogue and Third-Party Roles* (2nd ed.). Addison-Wesley Publishing Co. Reading, MA, 1987.

## Endnotes

---

<sup>1</sup>In case you don't realize it, a synopsis of a synopsis is exceedingly brief.

<sup>2</sup>The choice of *The One Minute Manager* as an example of poetic writing doesn't say much for such critics standards of poetry or, paradoxically, maybe it says a lot. Specifically, anyone who finds stimulation and comfort from reading about how to carry out a task that requires Time-Span of Discretion (TSD) of only one minute, would make, according to SST, a better poet for a few people than a manager of any.

<sup>3</sup>A Texas expression that foreigners (anyone born outside of Texas) might not understand. Roughly translated, it means, "Stick with the concepts and theories with which you were previously familiar."

<sup>4</sup>In an earlier work (Jaques, 1989, p. 137) Jaques refers to Orders as 'Quintaves'. Thus, the 4th Order would be 'Quintave D.'

<sup>5</sup>I am aware that secular theologians from within the Psychoanalytic and Psychological orders define 'anaclitic' as "...the choice of an object of libidinal attachment on the basis of a resemblance to early childhood protective and parental figures ..." (*The Random House Dictionary of the English Language: Second Edition, Unabridged*, Random House, New York, 1988). I am also aware that they generally use the term 'anaclitic depression' only in conjunction with the impact of separation experiences on infants and small children in reference to their parents or primary attachment figures and do not extend its meaning to include the responses of adults and their reactions to experiences of separation. Finally, I am aware that they don't own the term.

<sup>6</sup>A profession which Jaques is fond of describing (Jaques, *Requisite Organization*, 1989, p. 9) as being as similar in its relationship to chemistry as the current profession of Management and Organizational Development is similar to groundbreaking management and organization theory, of which I believe SST is an example.

<sup>7</sup>As far as I am concerned, "Resistance to Change" is really a reflection of our resistance to being punished by experiences which create anaclitic depression. See Harvey, Jerry. "It's Not My Dog: Eight Myths OD Practitioners Believe in and Die By." *OD Practitioner*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 1-5, for a discussion of that point of view.

<sup>8</sup>One is then forced to ask, "From where does the impetus for any fundamental change come? Why would anyone embark on the development of a heretofore unexpressed 4th Order idea, if our inherent fear of isolation and alienation is so great?"



## OUR PURPOSE

The Global Organization Design Society is a not-for-profit corporation registered in Ontario, Canada to promote the following objective:

The establishment and operation of a world-wide society of academics, business users and consultants interested in science-based management to improve organizational effectiveness for the purposes of:

Promoting among existing users increased awareness, understanding and skilled knowledge in applying concepts of Levels of Work Complexity, Levels of Human Capability, Accountability, and other concepts included in Requisite Organization and/or Stratified Systems Theory.

Promoting among potential users of the methods, appreciation of the variety of uses and benefits of science-based management, and access to resources.

### OUR BOARD

Piet Calitz, South Africa  
Julian Fairfield, Australia  
Jack Fallow, United Kingdom  
Jerry Gray, Canada, GO Treasurer  
Judy Hobrough, United Kingdom  
Ken Shepard, Canada, GO President  
Harald Solaas, Argentina  
George Weber, Canada  
Jos Wintermans, Canada

### EDITORIAL BOARD

Jerry Gray, Ph.D.  
James G. Hunt Ph.D.  
Larry G. Tapp, LLD  
Ken Craddock, M. A., Web Editor and  
Peer Review Coordinator

### CONTACT US

Global Organization Design Society  
32 Victor Avenue  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4K 1A8  
Phone: +1 (416) 463-0423  
Fax: +1 (416) 463-7827  
E-mail: [Info@GlobalRO.org](mailto:Info@GlobalRO.org)  
URL: [www.GlobalRO.org](http://www.GlobalRO.org)



**GO** Global Organization  
Design Society

Sponsorship for the period 2005-2007 is provided in part by the generous support of the following organizations:

