

The following is a highlighted summary of the book, Maslow on Management, published by John Wiley & Sons Inc.. The statements below are key points of the book as determined by James Altfeld and have been made available at no charge to the user.

Maslow On Management

By

Abraham H. Maslow
Foreword by Warren Bennis

Additional Notes on Self-Actualization, Work, Duty, Mission

The test for any person is—that you want to find out whether he’s an apple tree or not—Does He Bear Apples? Does He Bear Fruit? That’s the way you tell the difference between fruitfulness and sterility, between talkers and doers, between the people who change the world and the people who are helpless in it.

This business of self-actualization via a commitment to an important job and to worthwhile work could also be said, then, to be the path to human happiness.

The only happy people I know are the ones who are working well at something they consider important.

(A good question: Why do people not create or work? What has to be explained are the inhibitions, the blocks, etc. What stops these motivations which are there in everyone?)

If you take into yourself something important from the world, then you yourself become important thereby. You have made yourself important thereby, as important as that which you have introjected and assimilated to yourself.

Become a part of something important.

This identification with important cause, or important jobs, this identifying with them and taking them into the self thereby enlarging the self and making it important, this is a way of overcoming also actual existential human shortcoming, e.g., shortcomings in I.Q., talent, in skill, etc.

Any scientist must be treated with a certain respect, no matter how minor a contributor he may be—because he is a member of a huge enterprise and he demands respect by participation in this enterprise. He represents it, so to speak. He is an ambassador.

The same is true for a single soldier who is a member of a huge victorious army by contrast with a single soldier who is a member of a defeated army. So all the scientists and intellectuals and philosophers, etc., even though they are limited figures taken singly, taken collectively they are very important. They represent a victorious army, they are revolutionizing society; they are preparing the new world; they are constructing Euphychia.

Why Do People Not Create or Innovate?

Perhaps we should begin to seek out the creativity and innovation killers in our organizations instead of trying to fix the people within? One step in the right direction might be to ask. “Why do people not create or innovate in the current environment? The question reminds us of a story told about Peter Drucker, the legendary author and tireless teacher. He was speaking to a group of senior level executives and he asked them to raise their hands if there was a lot of “dead wood” in their companies. Many in the audience raised their hands. He then responded, “Were the people dead wood when you interviewed them and decided to hire them or did they become dead wood?”

...one may be able to uncover procedures, policies, and mindsets that inhibit creativity and innovation.

The Great Debates: Douglas McGregor and Abraham Maslow

Douglas McGregor wrote *The Human Side of Enterprise* in 1960. He quickly became known as the father of Theory X and Theory Y—theories of managerial leadership that portrayed managers as authoritarian (Theory X) or as collaborative and trustful of people (Theory Y).

1. Do you believe that people are trustworthy?
2. Do you believe that people seek responsibility and accountability?
3. Do you believe that people seek meaning in their work?
4. Do you believe that people naturally want to learn?
5. Do you believe that people don't resist change but they resist being changed?
6. Do you believe that people prefer work to being idle?

Real achievement means inevitably a worthy and virtuous task. To do some idiotic job very well is certainly not real achievement. I like my phrasing, “What is not worth doing is not worth doing well.”

Enlightened Economics and Management

1. Assume everyone is to be trusted.

It assumes that the people selected for the particular plant are a fairly evolved type of person, relatively mature, relatively healthy, relatively decent.

2. Assume everyone is to be informed as completely as possible of as many facts and truths as possible.

3. Assume in all your people the impulse to achieve; assume that they are for good workmanship, are against wasting time and inefficiency and want to do a good job, etc.
4. Assume that there is no dominance-subordination hierarchy in the jungle sense or authoritarian sense.

There must be an ability to identify with a fairly wide circle of human beings, ideally with the whole human species. The ultimate authoritarian can identify with nobody or perhaps at best with his own blood family. **Authoritarians must be excluded or they must be converted.**

5. Assume that everyone will have the same ultimate managerial objectives and will identify with them no matter where they are in the organization or in the hierarchy.

What is best for the solution of the problem or the effectuation of the goal rather than what is best for my ego, or my own person?"

6. Enlightened economics must assume good will among all the members of the organization rather than rivalry or jealousy.

Here use the example of sibling rivalry as a kind of evil or a psychopathology arising out of perfectly good but immature impulses, i.e., the child who wants the love of his mother but is not mature enough to recognize that she can give love to more than one.

Observe that the two- or three-year-old child would be dangerous to his own newborn sibling but not to any other infant. That is, he is not against infants in general but only the one who will steal his mother's love.

So the growing out of sibling rivalry in any team or organization must also demand this fairly high level of personal maturity.

6a. Synergy is also assumed.

It is possible to set up organizations so that when I am pursuing my own self-interest, I automatically benefit everyone else, whether I mean to or not. Under the same arrangement, when I try to be altruistic and philanthropic, I cannot help benefiting myself or advancing my own self-interest.

For a Blackfoot Indian to discover a gold mine would make everyone in the tribe happy because everyone would share the benefit from it. Whereas in the modern society, finding a gold mine is the surest way of alienating many people, even those who are close to us.

If I wished to destroy someone I can think of no better way of doing it than to give him a million dollars suddenly.

...prerequisite synergic institutions set up in such a way that what benefits one benefits all.

Synergy Is Anything But Simple

Maslow defined synergy as a culture in which what is beneficial for the individual is beneficial for everyone.

Maslow's organizational theories as he saw too many business cultures in which one's success could only occur at the expense of others.

Blackfoot culture stood in stark contrast to that of a modern organization

- **An emphasis on generosity as the highest virtue of the tribe**
- **The needs of the tribe as a whole were effortlessly combined with the needs of the individual tribe member.**
- **The tribe tended not to have general leaders with general power but rather they had different leaders for different functions. Thus the one best suited to lead the Sun Dance was not expected to lead the representation of the tribe to the government. Each leader was chosen for a particular job based on the needs of that job.**

7. Assume that the individuals involved are health enough.

8. Assume that the organization is health enough.

There must be criteria for a healthy organization.

10. We must assume that the people in organizations are not fixated at the safety-need level.

That is they must be relatively anxiety-free, they must not be fear-ridden, they must have enough courage to overcome their fears, they must be able to go ahead in the face of uncertainty, etc.

On the whole, where fear reigns, enlightened management is not possible.

11. Assume an active trend to self-actualization—freedom to effecuate one's own ideas.

12. Assume that everyone can enjoy good teamwork, friendship, good group spirit, good group homonomy, good belongingness, and group love.

...esprit de corps. Talk about identification with the group, the kind of pride that a high school boy can have in his own school's basketball team or the increased self-esteem that a college student will have from the heightened prestige of his college.

13. Assume hostility to be primarily reactive rather than character-based, i.e., that it will be for good, objective, present, here-now reasons and that it is therefore valuable rather than evil, and that it is therefore not to be stifled and discouraged.

...the better the manager, the more freedom people will feel to express irritation, disagreement, etc.

14. Assume that people can take it, that they are tough, stronger than most people give them credit for.
15. Enlightened management assumes that people are improvable.

All it says is that people can be better than they are by a little bit at least.

16. Assume that everyone prefers to feel important, needed, useful, successful, proud, respected, rather than unimportant, interchangeable, anonymous, wasted, unused, expendable, disrespected.
17. That everyone prefers or perhaps even needs to love his boss (rather than hate him), and that everyone prefers to respect his boss (rather than to disrespect him).
18. Assume that everyone dislikes fearing anyone (more than he likes fearing anyone), but that he prefers fearing the boss to despising the boss.

We may not like the strong men, but we can't help respecting them, and in a pinch preferring them, trusting them. The tough and hard but capable leader may be hated, but he is must preferred to the soft and tender weaker leader who may be more lovable but who may also bring about one's death.

19. Enlightened management assumes everyone prefers to be a prime mover rather than a passive helper, a tool, a cork tossed about on the waves.

Interview with Mort Meyerson

Perhaps Meyerson is most famous, not for his corporate accomplishments, but for being courageous enough to admit and smart enough to know, that the ways of the past will not longer work in today's world.

Meyerson wrote entitled "Everything I Thought I Knew About Leadership Was Wrong."

Maslow stated that, "I must help these corporate types to understand that it is well to treat working people as if they were high type Theory Y human beings not only because of the Golden Rule and not only because of the Bible or religious precepts or anything like that, but also because this is the path to success of any kind whatsoever, including financial success."

Accounting has become the way we measure business to find out whether we are indeed making a profit or doing well. Most of these metrics are easy and quantifiable. From this

body of knowledge, we have developed management by objectives. Business is built upon assumptions of analytical and metric-oriented work.

I think that most males are more comfortable in the world of metrics and measurements than they are in a psychological or feeling world.

“What business are we in?” As I see it, we are in the business of forming teams of people to do things for companies that create value for them. Without our people, we have no business. We don’t make anything tangible.

“I know that, but you are dealing in this soft stuff. People don’t even want the creativity, the freedom, and the things that you are trying to give them. They aren’t trying to find meaning in their work. People just want to come to work, do their job, and have a clear understanding of what’s expected from them. They want to be paid fairly that is all that they want.”

I said, “You couldn’t have stated more clearly everything that I don’t believe about people and work. It’s just plain wrong. Those reasons are not the only reason people come to work. People also come to work because it is community, because it is family, because work is an important part of their identity, and because they are trying to do something for their families. The money meets their needs, but it is not an exchange of service for money. It is much more powerful than that. If you only deal on the level of a fair exchange of work for money, you are missing the whole essence of what is happening in the work place.”

Although the payback to the company is not easily measured, we can measure the productivity of employees.

The assumption is one of giving credence to the underlying idea that one has to measure it to create any value. I’m just not convinced we have to measure it. We have to start by trusting that it will work and that later, it will show up.

It will show up in customer attitudes, employee attitudes, employee productivity. It will show up eventually, but I am not sure we can measure the connection.

Business people like to say it’s Wall Street because they say they need the ability to think long-term. I heard that same argument 10 years ago from the Japanese. They were telling me they had a better system because they could think longer term. Japan did not have the quarter-to-quarter Wall Street pressure which they believed contributed to their superiority. It appeared that they were superior 10 years ago. Now, it appears that they did not know what the hell they were doing and the bubble burst! They artificially inflated real estate, colluded with banks, did criminal things, and misled the public shareholder. I do not accept, at first blush, the Wall Street argument.

I don’t think the business can be transformed unless the leader and leadership is transforming. This type of change cannot come from the bottom up. It is a leadership issue. It must resonate with the leader.

You will not be successful with the power of one to convince. The power of one will not work inside the company organization. The only time the power of one works is with the aggregation of customers. Employees are not customers.

20. Assume a tendency to improve things, to straighten the crooked picture on the wall, to clean up the dirty mess, to put things right, make things better, to do things better.
21. Assume that growth occurs through delight and through boredom.
22. Assume preference for being a whole person and not a part, not a thing or an implement, or tool, or "hand."
23. Assume the preference for working rather than being idle.

Point out that to force people not to work is a cruel a punishment as could be devised.

24. all human beings prefer meaningful work to meaningless work

If work is meaningless, then life comes close to being meaningless

...anhedonia (loss of zest and pleasure in life.

25. Assume the preference for personhood, uniqueness as a person, identity (in contrast to being anonymous or interchangeable).
26. We must make the assumption that the person is courageous enough for enlightened processes.

He can endure anxiety.

27. We must make the specific assumptions of non-psychopathy.

He must be able to identify with other human beings and to know what they feel like.

28. We must assume the wisdom and the efficacy of self-choice.
29. We must assume that everyone likes to be justly and fairly appreciated, preferably in public.
30. We must assume the defense and growth dialectic for all these positive trends that we have already listed above. Every time we talk about a good trend in human nature, we must assume that there is also a counter trend.
31. Assume that everyone but especially the more developed persons prefer responsibility to dependency and passivity most of the time.

Too much responsibility can crush the person just as too little responsibility can make him flabby.

32. The general assumption that people will get more pleasure out of loving than they will out of hating (although the pleasures of hating are real and should not be overlooked).

It can be said in another way that for fairly well-developed people, the pleasures of loving, of friendship, of teamwork, of being a part of a well-functioning organization, that these pleasures are real and strong and furthermore are greater than the pleasures of disruption, destruction, antagonism, etc.

33. Assume that fairly well-developed people would rather create than destroy.
34. Assume that fairly well-developed people would rather be interested than be bored.
35. We must ultimately assume at the highest theoretical levels of enlightened management theory, a preference or a tendency to identify with more and more of the world, moving toward the ultimate of mysticism, a fusion with the world, or peak experience, cosmic consciousness, etc.
36. Finally, we shall have to work out the assumption of the metamotives and the metaphologies, of the yearning for the “B-values,” i.e., truth, beauty, justice, perfection, and so on.

The Balance of the Forces Toward Growth and Regression.

...what do we mean by “good conditions” and “bad conditions,” what forces, what changes in our society could change the dynamic balance toward regression instead of toward growth? What would simple economic scarcity do, for instance?

Memorandum on the Goals and Directives of Enlightened Management and of Organizational Theory

Its perfectly true that we can forget about the far goals in our discussions and think only about the immediate goals of an enterprise—that is, to make a profit, to be a healthy organism, to have some insurance for the future, etc., But this is not enough. The managers of any enterprise want it to continue, and they don't mean for two or three years, they mean for fifty years or a hundred years. And not only do they want it to continue for a hundred years (which makes necessary, then, the profoundest discussion of human motives and human far goals), but they would also like their organism, the group or the enterprise, or the organization to grow in a healthy way.

...the whole eupsychain growth...

It seems very clear to me that in an enterprise, if everybody concerned is absolutely clear about the goals and directives and far purposes of the organization, practically all other questions then become simple technical questions of fitting means to the ends.

It's Profitable and the Right Thing to Do...

Columbia University has been tracking the relationship between human resource practices and economic indicators since 1986. Collaborative partners in this research have included the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, Carnegie Mellon University, and The World Bank. Two of the studies in this collaboration have produced evidence that is quite compelling. The first study, led by David Lewin, covered 495 organizations and reached the following conclusions:

- Companies that share profits and gains with employees have significantly better financial performance than those who don't.
- Companies that share information broadly and that have broad programs of employee involvement (the researchers define involvement as areas of intellectual participation) perform significantly better than companies that are run autocratically.
- Flexible work design (flexible hours, rotation, and job enlargement), is significantly related to financial success.
- Training and development have a positive effect on business financial performance.
- Two-thirds of the bottom line impact was due to the combined effect of group economic participation, intellectual participation, flexible job design, and training and development.

As if Lewin anticipated the skepticism of the finding, he and his team went a step further, using statistical techniques to identify causal relationships between human resource practices and bottom-line performance.

The 1990 Brookings Institution conference on pay and productivity also demonstrated Maslow's words in its investigation of the relationship between pay and bottom line performance. When all of the results were in, Conference chairman Alan S. Blinder concluded from the data that "changing the way workers are treated may boost productivity more than changing the way they are paid.

The purpose of a business firm is not simply to make a profit, but is to be found in its very existence as a community of persons who in various ways are endeavoring to satisfy their basic needs and who form a particular group at the service of the whole of society. Profit is a regulator of the life of a business, but it is not the only one; other human and moral factors must also be considered, which in the long term are at least equally important for the life of a business...Pope J. Paul II in "The Hundredth year: An Essay".

The fact is that a certain proportion of the population cannot take responsibility well and are frightened by freedom, which tends to throw them into anxiety, etc.

The fact is that an unstructured situation, a free situation, a situation in which people are thrown back on their own resources will sometimes show their lack of resources.

They may be by in the ordinary authoritarian, conventional structure situation, but in the free and open and self-responsible situation, they discover that they are, e.g., not really interested in working, or that they mistrust their intelligence, or that they may become overwhelmed by depression which they have been strongly repressing, etc.

...where you try to move over from a strictly authoritarian managerial style to a more participative style, the first consequence of lifting the rigid restrictions of authority may well be some chaos, some release of hostility, some destructiveness, and the like. Authoritarians may be converted and re-trained, but this is apt to take some time, and they are apt to go through a transitional period of taking advantage of what they consider to be the weakness of the managers.

Once people have a sense of security, once they are no longer hungry, all they want to do, no matter what job or level, is to learn and grow.

Who could argue with the notion that people should be able to grow and to learn and to self-actualize in their work?

...making it a reality is a whole different ballgame.

It is important to remember that corporations are a large collection of human beings connecting with each other. It is all very personal. We are people talking to people—human beings sitting next to one another trying to accomplish a goal. When the alignment we speak of works, the human part of the organization is very well connected. This also changes the role of the leader. The leader has to believe in these concepts. It has to be dripping from his or her pores or people will know (and they always do) that it is nothing more than talk.

And the charisma of the leader is not what it's about.

...its leading by example, meaning what you say, standing for something, and being willing to take action when what the company stands for is violated.

If alignment really exists throughout the organization, when the company runs into hardship, you don't have to look to that one visionary leader for the strategy or the answers. In the world we live in today, it is almost ludicrous for us to believe that the answers or the direction or the vision will come from the leader.

...in a crisis situation there would be two areas we would focus on first. They are the security levels of Maslow's pyramid. For example, if you have a company in turmoil, I think the leadership would need to take steps to make sure the company could survive. These steps involve cost cutting. They involve cost cutting. They involve getting employees to focus on short-term projects that will help the financial picture, such as writing new software, forging alliances and partnership, things of that nature. However, you have to realize that those actions threaten the basic security of employees. So important to realize that those exact steps, on an organizational level, create uncertainty, fear, and a threat to the security of

people. Yet, you need those people to be performing at a higher level in the hierarchy of needs or you stand no chance of surviving in the long term.

I think you can successfully take this step in times of crisis as long as people within the organization know the vision. The vision is so important, that if people understand the big picture, they will bleed with you. They will sacrifice, work harder, and even create in times of great uncertainty. However, if you lose the alignment and the vision of the company, people begin to question why they are continuing to work in an organization with such insecurity.

That vision allowed people to know the direction of the company, where their departments were going, how their work made a contribution to the end goal.

When Steve Jobs came back, even Wall Street responded with a 2 percent increase in their stock price. Why? The company was still bleeding but he embodied the original vision. That is how powerful these concepts can be.

The exploiter comes to take for granted the exploiter almost as a kind of character. The wolf expects that the lamb will continue to behave like a lamb. If suddenly the lamb turns around and bites the wolf, then I can understand that the wolf would get not only surprised but also get very indignant. Lambs aren't supposed to behave that way. Lambs must lie quietly and get eaten up. Just so I have seen human wolves get very angry when their victims finally turn around and strike back.

We don't know how many people or what proportion of the working population would actually prefer to participate in management decisions, and how many would prefer not to have anything to do with them. What proportion of the population take a job as simply any old kind of a job which they must do in order to earn a living, while their interests are very definitely centered outside of the job.

What proportion of the population is reduced to the concrete and so finds planning for the future totally incomprehensible and boring?

Maslow's Theory Z

Theory Z presupposed that people, once having reached a level of economic security, would strive for a life steeped in values, a work life where the person would be able to create and produce.

The March 1998 cover story in FORTUNE magazine is but one example of Maslow's Theory Z in action. Entitled *Yo, Corporate America—I'm the New Organization Man*, the article depicted the wants and needs of the new "gold collar worker." Expecting to be well paid, this generation also believes they are entitled to a job "that fun, a job that's cool, a job that lets them discover who they really are." *Work is not about paying the rent anymore—it's about self-fulfillment.*

“Work is not work. It’s a hobby you happen to get paid for.”

Interview with George McCown

3000 Sand Hill road in Menlo Park, California, is synonymous with power, prestige, and the art of the deal. Home to the venture capitalists, this address houses the people who fuel a large portion of America’s economy through funding, acquisitions, and buyouts of companies. Always in search of the next profitable business. San Hill road has become a legend in the archives of corporate American history. In the midst of this financial mecca sits George McCown, who with his partner, David De Leeuw, founded McCown and De Leeuw & Co in 1984. the firm is a private venture banking firm that invests in high quality ventures in partnership with management. Yet, as we discovered, their goal is simply to build great companies where people can self-actualize.

When there is a wrong owner, it’s like having the wrong boss. It has a massive impact on the organization. The “wrong owner syndrome” can be found in private and publicly held companies.

Things we couldn’t make work at all because of past policies and procedures magically became terrific companies in the hands of an entrepreneurial environment with adequate financing where the single focus of the enterprise was the business as opposed to being spread across a number of businesses or egos.

Our business is about setting up the right owner, becoming the right owner, usually in partnership with management. In fact always in partnership with management.

...we attempt to provide a completely focused and congruent set of objectives so that everybody is lined up, everybody is on the same side of the table.

Let’s talk about vision, It’s each individual’s mental picture of what that organization could be like in its highest and best self-actualized mode.

...the thing that you think about that give you job.

It’s that thing which touches our highest and best part. It the part that is inspirational and aspirational.

We wanted to define what making a difference was through the idea of the stakeholders’ circle. That is we wanted to build companies that took into account and tried to balance over time, as appropriate, all the interests of these folks.

An organization that is self-actualized because the people in it are self-actualized is when it’s really fun. That’s when you get the fantastic results. When people get up in the morning and want to go to work.

The ego system has a lot of characteristics and one of them is tremendous competition between people. How can you build a team when the fundamental precept is to compete with

each other? But that's really what we tend to do in organizations. It's why teams don't work very well. They become internally competitive and we don't understand why they're that way, we just think that's the way it is. What we are missing is that we don't know that there's another way of being.

Business is where the rubber meet the road—where people spend most of their lives going to work. We and the non-for-profits have a much greater role to play in shaping the good society than any institution I can think of.

Enlightened Management as a Form of Patriotism

...in a brotherhood situation of this sort, every person is transformed into a partner rather than an employee.

...democracy needs absolutely for its very existence people who can think for themselves, make their own judgments, and finally, who can vote for themselves—authoritarian enterprises do just the opposite of this; democracies do exactly just this.

...enlightened management was a way of limited human beings trying the best way they could to produce the good life on earth or to make a heavenly society on earth.

Spirituality in the Workplace

The dialogue and debates inside of companies help us to answer important questions about who we are collectively and individually. What we stand for. How we will do business. How we will treat one another.

...the more we immerse ourselves in the human side of the enterprise, the more spiritual we become.

Any one of them, for instance, if he saw a fire breaking out would without taking votes about it or anything of the sort immediately go to the put out the fire; he would immediately respond to the objective requirements of the situation, to the demand character of the facts, without thinking of mutual exclusiveness of interests, and whether his contract said that he should do this, etc.

Every person is transformed into a partner rather than into an employee. He tends to think like a partner and to act like a partner. He tend to take upon his own shoulders all the responsibilities of the whole enterprise. He tends voluntarily and automatically to assume responsibility for any of the various functions of an enterprise which an emergency might call for. Partnership is the same as synergy, which is the same as recognizing that the interests of the other and one's own interests merge and pool and unite instead of remaining separate or opposed or mutually exclusive.

You can trust people according to Theory Y in a wealthy society in which there is plenty of money, plenty of goods, plenty of food, but obviously you cannot trust people with a key to the pantry when most people are starving, or when there is not enough food to go

around. What I then do under such circumstances/ Well, I'm very clear about it in my own mind. If there were one hundred people and there was food for ten, and ninety of these hundred had to die, then I would make might goddamned sure that I would not be one of those ninety, and I'm quite sure that my morals and ethics and so on would change very radically to fit the jungle situation rather than the previous situation of wealth in which these principles once had worked well.

Management policy or any other kind of policy is best which best fits the objective requirements of the objective situation.

The best kind of thinking, the best kind of problem solution, clearly depends on a good viewing of the problem situation itself, of being able to see it objectively, without expectations, without presuppositions, without a priori thinking of any kind but simply in the purest sense of the word, objectively, the way a god presumably would be able to see it without being determined by prejudices or fears or hopes or wishes or personal advantage or anything of the sort. This is the best way to see any situation. This is the best way certainly to see any problem which is calling for a solution. The problem to be solved is the problem out there in front of our noses.

“fitting to the objective requirements of the objective situation.”

Further Notes on the relationship between Psychological health and the characteristics of Superior managers (Notes from Likert)

Most of the experiments that Likert reports compare good American managers with poor American managers, with the terms good and poor being defined pragmatically in terms of productivity, worker satisfaction, low turnover, low sickness, low absence, low labor trouble, etc.

1. The best managers under the American research conditions seem to be psychologically healthier people than the poorer managers in the same researches.
2. The best managers increase health of the workers whom they manager. They do this in two ways: one is via the gratification of basic needs for safety, for belongingness, for affectionate relationships and friendly relationships with their informal groups, prestige needs, needs for self-respect, etc.: the other is via the gratification of the meta-motivations or the meta-needs for truth and beauty and goodness and justice and perfection and law, etc. That is, once granted a sufficiently high level of worker health to begin with, enlightened management increases worker health in these two ways of gratification of the basic needs and of the meta-needs (89).
4. As we move toward enlightened management policies, enlightened managers, enlightened workers, and an enlightened organization, so also do we move toward synergy.
7. ...a better individual person tends to make a better group out of the group in which he is. But also the better a group is, the more it tends to improve the person within the group. The

same is true for the group in the larger society. The influence each other. Goethe: "If everybody in the world cleaned his front yard, then the whole world would be clean." Or another way of saying it is that every person is a psychotherapeutic influence or a psychopathogenic influence on everybody he has any contact with at all.

8. ...who are healthier are more apt to hold to theory Y in their spontaneous and instinctive management policies. And those who are sicker are more apt to express Theory X in their management policies. Contrariwise, those persons who are found to function by Theory Y will be found upon examination to be psychologically healthier than those persons who function by Theory X.

10. Here, also we have a network of interrelations. The better the organization the better the society, the better the productivity; the better the managers, the more psychologically healthy the individual men; the better the leaders, the better the managers; the better the individual men, and so on, the better the enterprise.

Memorandum on Enlightened Management

It was found, for instance, in Jim Clark's studies or in many of the studies quoted in the Likert book that one department was doing better economically than another department, that is, it had a higher production rate or it had less turnover or it had better morale or something of this sort, and the experiment was made in order to find out what factors were responsible for this economic superiority. What was found in practically all of these cases was that a particular kind of foreman or supervisor-manager was responsible for the economic superiority of the working group. And the qualities of the superior managers have been worked out, i.e., they are more democratic, more compassionate, more friendly, more helpful, more loyal, etc. That is, the whole thing has been done pragmatically, rather than on a priori, moral, or ethical or political grounds.

A certain kind of democratic manager makes more profit for the firm as well as making everybody happier and healthier.

...what is true of the behavior and attitudes of these pragmatically superior supervisors should be copied or forced upon the pragmatically inferior supervisors, even if this is not their spontaneous self-choice.

By-Products of Enlightened Management

...the supervisor who takes all sorts of courses and reads all sorts of books and is trained in various ways to who agrees with the data and who honestly tries to behave like a superior supervisor, may not be able to get the same results if he does not deeply feel democratic, parental, affectionate, etc.

This brings up the profound existential question of the difference between being something, and trying to be something.

There is no way for an authoritarian supervisor to become a democratic supervisor except by passing through the transitional stage of consciously, artificially, voluntarily

trying to be a democratic supervisor. This man who is trying to be a democratic supervisor is obviously quite different from the person who is spontaneously a democratic supervisor.

Notes on Synergy

The more influence and power you give to someone else in the team situation, the more you have for yourself.

Self-actualizing people get pleasure from the pleasures of other people. That is, they get selfish pleasures from the pleasures of other people.

...what is good for my child is good for me, what is good for me is good for the child, what give the child pleasure gives me pleasure, what gives me pleasure gives the child pleasure, and all the line of difference fall and we can say now that these two persons are identified and in certain functional theoretical ways have become a single unit.

The synergic doctrine of Unlimited Amount of good versus the Antisynergic doctrine of Unlimited Amount of good

...there is a fixed quantify of influence in a company or plant. Consequently if subordinates are permitted to exercise more influence as to what goes on in the organization, the superiors have correspondingly less. The pie, so to speak, is thought to be just so big, and if some people are given more, others must have less.

This better management system, while giving the men more influence, also gives the high-producing managers more influence. The high –producing managers have actually increased the size of the influence pie by means of the leadership processes which they use.

The more influence and power you give to someone else in the team situation, the more you have yourself.

Make every man a general instead of hanging just one single general. Under the circumstances in which a general is in charge of a whole group of generals to whom he has given high power, he will find to his amazement that he has far more power and influence than he had before passing out power. The more he gives, the more he retains.

All one can steal is a product, a by-product of creativeness or of good management policy. One cannot steal the creativeness or the good management policy.

...anybody who tries to learn the secret of making good voltmeters would eventually become a non-copier and would discover that the best way to make them would be to become a creative person, functioning with human beings in a particular way.

...what I discovered was that whenever they were stolen, it was by a person of such bad tastes that he overlooked the good ideas and stole the poor one.

Interview with Andrew Kay

If work is meaningless then life comes close to being meaningless. —Abraham Maslow

The very process of talking about ideas helps the creativeness, and thereby makes it more likely that there will be hundreds of ideas where there were only dozens before. Copying or stealing is a little like stealing the egg, instead of the hen that lays the eggs. In a word, money must be used; the mind must be used; creativeness must be used and one must spend it and be prodigal with it rather than to hoard it and be stingy with it and think that it can be used up or spent or decreased in quantity.

One thing about synergy is that you enjoy making other people happy or, to say it in the true synergic fashion, that you can selfishly enjoy other people's happiness.

...with such an attitude there would be somewhat greater tendency toward an economic system of unlimited production at lower prices rather than the anti-synergic principle of limited production with high profit for each unit.

...what benefits one person benefits me, or benefits anybody else for that matter.

I believe that synergy is an actual perception of a higher truth, of a higher reality, which actually exists and that the development over into synergy is like the development from becoming blind to becoming seeing.

What is good for any scientist is good for me as scientist. What is good for my wife is certainly good for me. What is good for me is good for my children. What is good for the teacher can be demonstrated to be good for the students, most of to time, etc.

The more holistic a structure is operationally, that is, the more mutual interdependence that is, the better the communications, etc., the more the team has to rely on each other—for instance as in a basketball team—the more synergic everything will be.

...once that's true, then there is no contrast between the good of the team and the good of the person, and he can't tell the difference. It doesn't matter too much who makes the score.

The more teamwork there is, the more they rely on each other, the more they trust each other, and so on; the more synergy there is.

If all this network of relationships is true, then anything that makes better managers also makes better human beings in general and improves the whole society.

Whatever improves the society at any point tends to improve the rest of the society.

Training Kinder-Leaders

If our executive training programs look fifty years ahead then we should think about the kindergartens being of the right sort in order to create the future bosses and generals and managers and leaders that we will need in the next century—Abraham Maslow, 1961

We were delighted to learn that a group of volunteers from Oracle Corporation, a local company, was participating in the local Junior Achievement project. The volunteers were going to visit the classroom of our kindergarten. Through a series of classroom activities, exercises, and discussion, the business executives hoped to impart good citizenship and leadership skills to this group of 5 year-olds learners. We decided to learn more about Junior Achievement as it seems to fit Maslow's vision for the future. We learned:

- Junior Achievement is the world's largest and fastest growing nonprofit economic education organization. The programs are taught by classroom volunteers from the business community in both the United States and nearly 100 countries worldwide. The purpose is to educate young people to value free enterprise, understand business and economics, and be workforce ready. The predominately volunteer effort reaches more than 2.6 million U.s. students each year.
- Junior Achievement's elementary School Program, for levels kindergarten through sixth grade, demonstrates how economics impacts people's lives as individuals, workers, and consumers. As they progress in school, students will grasp important economic concepts that enhance their understanding of the world and positively affect their future. The program's focus is as follows:

--Ourselves: Economic roles of the individual.

--Our Families: role of families in the local economy.

--Our Community: Responsibilities of and opportunities available to citizens in their economic community

--Our City: Economic development, local business, and career opportunities

--Our Region: State and regional economies, business, and economic resources.

--Our Nation: business operation and economic issues in the United States.

--Our world: world resources, economic systems, monetary exchange, and global trade.

Volunteers share their life experiences through stimulating, age-appropriate activities. These programs promote important life concepts that foster individual success.

Today's elementary school children are part of a rapidly changing and challenging world. Through interactive, hands-on activities, students can better understand the relationship between what they learn in school and success later in life. Students learn to value and respect:

- the relationship of basic economic concepts to the life experiences of the students
- The role of the individual as a consumer and producer in the market economy
- Practical applications of classroom theory to real life
- The ability to effectively work with others and as a member of a team
- The importance of staying in school

As we observed the business volunteers working with this group of kindergartners, we understood the importance of training our youth to take their place as leaders in society.

Maslow's words echoed in our heads as we watched the 5-year-olds: "Whom among them will change the world?" We truly understood Maslow's words that day.

Poor social or environmental conditions are those which set us against each other by making our personal interests antagonistic to the group, to those of others.

The dichotomy between selfishness and altruism is resolved and transcended and formed into a new higher unity: This is to be done by institutional arrangements so that when I pursue my selfish gratifications I automatically help others, and when I try to be altruistic I automatically help others, and when I try to be altruistic I automatically reward and gratify myself.

Poor social or environmental conditions are those which set us against each other by making our personal interests antagonistic to those of others, or mutually exclusive, or are those in which the personal gratifications, are in short supply so that not all can satisfy their needs except at the expense of others.

Under good conditions the successful person is loved rather than hated or feared or resented.

"Under what conditions does enlightened selfishness work for the good of the whole society?"

"Under what conditions is it true that what is good for General Motors is good for the United States?" Or, "What is good for me is necessarily good for you?"

Good management and good workers and good enterprises and good products and good communities and good states are all conditions of one another and of good, mutual relations. If an improvement in the community does not have an ultimate effect of the goodness of the product, then something is wrong someplace.

Good management and good workers and good enterprises and good products and good communities and good states are all conditions of one another and of good mutual relations. If an improvement in the community does not have an ultimate effect on the goodness of the product, then something is wrong someplace. The system is not integrated enough, the communications are bad, or groups are set against each other instead of being synergic or something of that sort.

Dr. Maslow's theory that people long for a shared sense of purpose, to be a part of something larger than themselves and their search for meaning is often found in work.

The person who seeks power for power, is the one who is just exactly likely to be the one who shouldn't have it. Such people are apt to use power very badly; to overcome, overpower, use it for their own selfish gratifications.

The Blackfoot Indians tended not to have general leaders with general power, for instance, like our President of the United States, but rather to have different leaders for different functions. For instance, the leader in a war party was the one whom everybody thought to be

the best person to lead a war party, and the one most respected or the leader in raising stock was the man best suited for that.

In truth we do have different capacities and powers and certainly in any group of hundreds of people, we should not expect that the person who is best suited to arrange the Sun Dance must be exactly the same person who is best suited to be the political representative to the Canadian government, let us say.

This can be called functional leadership.

It corresponds to the objective requirements of the objective situation, of reality in general, both natural and psychological reality.

Another aspect of this B-leadership in the Blackfoot was that the leader has absolutely no power whatsoever that wasn't deliberately and voluntarily given to him ad hoc by the particular people in the particular situation. Didn't really influence anyone or order anyone about. There was a kind of a mutual give and take between the group and the chosen leader because generally the chosen leader considered himself quite objectively to be the best one for the job and the group considered him to be the best one for the job. It was assumed that they all had the same purposes and that the leader then was a kind of quarterback who called the signals and coordinated the group toward common ends rather than one who gave orders, who used power, who tried to influence them or control them in any way.

And by the way, the Blackfoot Indians didn't bother with leaders when there was no necessity for any leader, and in some situations there were simply amorphous, unorganized groups, quite unstructured, and this worked well too.

The person who seeks for power is the one who is just exactly likely to be the one who shouldn't have it, because he neurotically and compulsively needs power. Such people are apt to use power very badly.

They use it for their own selfish gratifications.

The task, the job, the objective requirements of the situation tend to be forgotten or lost in the shuffle when such a person is the leader. He is essentially looking out for himself, for a kind of self-cure of neurosis, for a self-gratification.

That is, the one who is best suited actually to solve the problem or to pursue the task successfully, i.e., the one who is most perceptive about the objective requirements of the situation, and who is therefore most selfless in the situation-just that person, because by definition he is psychologically healthier, gets absolutely no kick out of being able to order people around or to boss them. It simply doesn't give him kicks or gratification. The safest person to give power to is the one who doesn't enjoy power. He is the least likely to use it for selfish, neurotic, or sadistic purposes, or for showing-off purposes.

If a person struggles for leadership and for boss-hood, then this is one dangerous point against him that should make us question his suitability.

B-Power is the power to do what needs doing, to do the job that ought to be done, to solve the objective problem, to get the job done that needs to be done or to say it in a more flossy way, B-power is the power to foster and protect and enhance all the B-values, of truth and goodness, beauty, justice, perfection, order, etc., etc.

The B-leader in the work situation, if we follow the above objective type of analysis, can be defined as the one who can get the job done best or who at least can help to organize things in such a fashion that the job gets done best.

The B-leader doesn't want to twist anybody around anybody's finger, and while I'm at it, I might as well talk about the B-follower.

As one who has introjected the goals or directives or objectives in the problematical situation and who is so identified with them that he wants them done in the best possible way.

B-follower is presumably exactly as eager to have the B-leader become the leader as the B-leader is himself.

B-leader would have to have the ability to give orders without feeling guilty about it, feeling that he was taking advantage or getting into a tizzy about it in a way. Furthermore, if his job is to give out life sentences or death sentences, then he must be able to do this too without falling apart.

I think what I'm trying to say here is that there are many situations in which the boss ought to be very strong and authoritative boss, although in large-scale industrial situations my guess is that participative management and therefore participative managers are more often needed objectively than the strong boss who can bark out an order and have it executed immediately without any question.

Most leaders have to be able to withstand hostility, that is, to be unpopular, without falling apart. The kind of person who must be loved by all probably will not make a good leader in most situations.

He must not be ruled by fear. He must be courageous enough for the situation.

“Every man a general.”

Every man in the ideal or perfect society or situation would be able to become a functional leader wherever he was the most suitable one for the job.

Every man, then, ought to have broad enough shoulders so that he can enjoy taking on responsibilities, rather than feeling burdened and overloaded by responsibilities.

The process of becoming a leader is analogous to that of a musical conductor. At the start, you spend many years acquiring the knowledge and skill required to play an instrument. Perhaps you learn several instruments. You begin by playing a solo where you are the lone element. Before too long, you play with another person in a duet. The duet is still rather easy because you are close to the other player, can look into his or her eyes to keep the beat and create the harmony.

As your grasp of the music and your experience grows, you find yourself leading a quartet, then a chamber orchestra. You learn how important each and every player is. If the first violin is off key, or the French horn is off beat, the entire musical piece is affected. Instead of the audience focusing on the beauty of the music, they focus on the one weak player or the one fault in the whole. At this point, you might be able to fill in for one of the musicians, in a pinch.

Eventually you are in the position of conducting a full symphony orchestra. As you look out, you know all of the musicians want to be there. They want to perform. After all, nobody practices bass for years and doesn't want to play. You also know that as the conductor, they are looking to you to bring them together. To bring the passion and feeling of the music together. To make each musician a part of the whole. You realize that not only can't you dash about playing each instrument yourself, don't even know how to play many of them! So, you begin. You begin by pulling together everything you know, everything you've learned, everything you are, and you lead.

As the music ends, the musicians take a large breath and say "WOW! I am so glad I was a part of that magnificent piece." As you turn to the audience you see through their applause that they are also thinking "WOW, I'm so glad I was a part of this audience."

The good boss or the good leader in most situations must have a psychological prerequisite the ability to take pleasure in the growth and self-actualization of other people.

He must be strong in the above senses, he must enjoy responsibility, that is, of supporting a wife and children; he must be able to mete out discipline as necessary, to be stern as well as loving, he ought to be able to be a captain or a general; he ought to be able to get great gratification out of watching his children grow up well and out of watching his wife develop her personality well and grow on toward greater maturity and self-actualization.

...good manager must also be able to be a good B-follower, that is, he must be able to take the reins and be the boss in that situation where he has to and to do this well, but he must also not need to be the boss in every conceivable situation, i.e., he must be able to play second violin when there is a better first violinist and must be able to enjoy this situation exactly as much as when he himself plays first violin or is the soloist.

The Superior Person—The "Aggridant"

No society can function unless the inferiors have the ability to admire the superiors, or at least not to hate them nor attack them.

The leader in many situations ought not to be as expressive and open about himself as other people are permitted and encouraged to be. Again here I think of the example of the captain of the ship which is in danger, or the surgeon or the general in the army who may entertain all sorts of dark suspicions and fears and so on but who had better keep their mouths shut rather than open up freely about their anxieties.

...he must take upon his own shoulders the responsibility for the worry and the anxiety and the tension that may be necessary.

B-leader enjoys and fosters the B-values, having his own way means the ability, the power to set things right in the world that needs setting right, and of getting great personal pleasure from this. If I'm to be the B-boss, then I must get a special kick out of doing a good job or seeing a good job done.

...it would be obviously be very desirable, especially since each of these 300 people was a general, to vote, I am sure, for setting up conditions under which they could enjoy their work, that is to say, in which they could enjoy living, enjoy their lives.

That which is good for personal development is also good for turning out good automobiles, in the long run at least. And that which is good for turning out good automobiles in the long run, and for having a good functioning factory which is to last for along time, then it turns out that this is good for personal development of the workers.

..."who is best qualified to deal with this problem."

There are some situation which demand the highly directive leader as in a captain of a ship or the commander of any army group or of a submarine; there are other situations which demand realistically the team sharer. This is to say, we have to accept both of these variables as realities and then try to fit the right manager to the right situation.

...the psychological makeup of the highly directive leader: is more irked than other people are by lack of neatness, lack of order, lack of aesthetic rounding out, lack of completeness, etc. This is the kind of person who simply has to straighten the crooked picture on the wall. It just bothers him more than it bothers other people.

...it may be the main reward for having power.

...just so that he can retain in his own hand the power to get rid of irritating incompletions, lack of neatness, lack of closure, and the like.

...we can assume that people are born different with respect to the qualities of need to be in control, of need to defer, need to be passive or to be active, proneness to anger or to flight, etc.

The Very Superior Boss

The objective requirements of the particular situation or problem should be the main determinant of leadership policy and followership policy.

Another variable in this situation, then, would be time and the time span. Obviously, where quick decisions are needed, the superior must make these decisions quickly and directly, authoritatively, and without much discussion. Orders must be given, without explanation if necessary. On the other hand, if the situation has a long time span, as in building up a business which is to last for fifty or a hundred years, and especially if it is to be stable enough to last past the death of the superior, then greater patience is required and greater participative management, more explanations, more giving out of facts, more discussion of the facts, and common agreement upon the conclusions. This is the only way to train good managers and good leaders in the long run.

...why it was that obviously borderline people like Hitler or Stalin or Senator McCarthy or some of the Birchers or people of this sort can gather so many followers. Because they were so decisive, so sure of themselves, so unwavering. So definite about what they wanted and didn't want, so clear about right and wrong, etc. In a nature in which most people do not have an identity, or real self, in which they are all confused about right and wrong, about good and evil, in which they are basically uncertain about what they want and what they don't want, then they are apt to admire and succumb to and look for leadership to any person who seems to know definitely what he wants. Since the democratic leader, the non-authoritarian person in general, is apt to be marked by tolerance and by admission of ignorance, by willingness to admit that he doesn't know everything, sometimes for less educated people the decisive paranoid authoritarian then can look very attractive and relieve the follower of all anxiety.

Healthy people have no need for power over other people; they don't enjoy it, they don't want it, and they will use it only when there is some factual need in the situation for it.

...shift the whole center of organization of the theory from the person of the leader to the objective requirements of the particular situation or problem. The latter should be the main determiner of leadership policy and followership policy.

Interview with Michael Murphy

...exploring the self and examining how people can develop their capabilities.

The person who is criticized honestly may be hurt for the moment, but ultimately he is helped and cannot help but become grateful. Anyway, it's a great sign of respect to me, for

instance, if someone feels I'm strong enough, capable enough, and objective enough so that he can tell me where I've pulled a boner.

...the whole framework permitted non-evaluation, non-judging, non-punishment. The framework stressed acceptance rather than rejection. One form of inability to love is censoriousness, moralism, disapproving of a person and trying to make him over, to remodel him, and remold him.

People, one may say, become good lovers only when they can accept others as they are, and can then enjoy and like them rather than being bothered and irritated and disapproving.

...it makes life much tougher for the boss if he has to executive his friends. Things are likely to get all mixed up, certainly all sorts of guilt feelings can be aroused, and this is a good, fertile source of stomach ulcers. It would be better for a certain amount of detachment and social distance to be maintained here, as between officers and me in the armed forces.

Openness in the boss and in participative management can mean and should mean his openness to any suggestion, to any fact, to any feedback or information that pours in on him, no matter whether it is pleasant or unpleasant. He should be open in this sense, and there's no question about it. He must know what's going on.

But openness in the sense of expressiveness, of dropping of all inhibitions and speaking, I would say is definitely not desirable in the judge, the policeman, the boss, the captain of the ship, and the general of the armies. It is one of the responsibilities of the leader in such a situation to keep his fears to himself often. I know that if I were on an oceangoing ship and the captain were to report all his fears and anxieties and uncertainties and doubts, I wouldn't take that ship again. I would prefer him to take full responsibility for everything, and I would prefer to think of him as capable and competent.

The good farmer simply throws out seeds, sets up good growing conditions, and then gets out of the way of the growing seeds most of the time, helping them only where they really need help. He doesn't pull up the sprouting seed to see if it's doing all right; he doesn't twist it, or train it or shove it around or put it back in the soil, or whatever. He just leaves it alone, giving it the minimum necessary help.

...the good leader is again like the farmer, not so much in training or molding or forcing or shaping people, but in offering them good growing conditions and in either supplying them with seeds or bringing out their own inner seeds and then permitting them to grow without too much interference.

Notes on Creativeness

Michael Ray and his colleagues say that when creativity is stifled, individual performance is compromised, and the organization cannot function a full capacity. By leveraging the creative potential that already dwells within each individual, the organization can bring about dramatic improvement.

There was a study conducted at Harvard University several years ago which set out to measure IQ, spatial, visual, social, and emotional intelligence of infants and young children. The researchers found that up to age 4, the young children were up to the genius level. After age 4, through the development process, their scores were lower. What I take from this research is that after age 4, mainly from parents and society, we get messages which cover up our own natural tendencies to creativity. We get messages that we shouldn't approach, a problem in this way, we shouldn't do this and we shouldn't do that. Even the best of parents send these messages. By the time we are 35 or 40 our creativity is completely covered over.

Creativity is not just idea generation, problem solving, or the next innovative product. The process of creativity contains joy, wisdom, faith, intuition, compassion. It's having so much faith in the creativity you are born with that you know you can have it at your disposal all the time.

...executives to go for one week with no expectation, no mechanisms of control, no walking into a situation with a plan or vision of the future. We also suggest they become comfortable with saying "I don't know."

Absence of judgment makes you more receptive to innovation ideas. You look for information in places you wouldn't normally think about.

When people are creative, they are sensitive to all types of possibilities. When they are not operating from a creative base, people block out the possibilities and operate from a control base or control mechanism. That control base prevents us from reclaiming our creativity.

Addition to the Notes on the Creative Person

The creative person is able to be flexible; he can change course as the situation changes (which it always does); he can give up his plans, he can continuously and flexibly adapt to the law of the changing situation and to the changing authority of the facts, to the demand character of the shifting problem.

He is able to face a changing future; that is, he does not need a fixed and unchanging future. He seems not to be threatened by unexpectedness (as the obsessional and rigid person is). For the creative person who is able to improvise, plans are definitely no more than heuristic scaffolding and can be cast aside easily without regret and without anxiety. He tends not to feel irritated when plans change or schedules change or the future changes. On the contrary, my impression is that he is sometimes apt to show increased interest, alertness, and engagement with the problem.

...giving up the past and the future, or of pushing them aside from the present situation. That is, the person viewing a present problem does not see it merely as a matter of shuffling over every problem he has ever had in the past to see which past solutions fit this present problem. **He is totally immersed in the here and now, thereby implying considerable courage and trust in himself, the calm expectation of being able to improvise when the time comes**

for him to solve new problems. This means a particular kind of healthy self-respect, self-trust. It also implies freedom from anxiety and from fear. This, in turn, means a certain appraisal of the world, of reality, of environment, which permits him to trust it, not to see it as overwhelmingly dangerous and powerful. He feels that he is able to manage it. He is not afraid of it. It does not look monstrous or frightening. Self-respect means that the person thinks of him self as a prime mover, as the responsible one, as autonomous, the determiner of this own fate.

Notes of the Entrepreneur

...the entrepreneurial plan or vision, the recognition of a need which is being unfulfilled and which could be fulfilled to the profit of the entrepreneur and to everyone else's benefit as well, had also better come under the general head of invention.

Kosnik realizes that those who will be the great managers and leaders will embody not only the technical tasks but an understanding of the importance of the human side of the enterprise. He knows that greatness is much more than technique or skill. Thus, the elements of integrity, core values, unrelenting optimism, and contribution to society play as large a role in Kosnick's repertoire as the quantitative topics. He manages to blend both worlds with the finesse of a symphony conductor.

The Good Enlightened Salesman and Customer

...the relationships between the healthy enterprise and its customer are very different when these customers are supposed to be kept for a century or two.

I told the suppliers that I did not want to spend time inspecting carefully whatever they brought to my plant; I wanted to be able to trust them. I told them that I would give them an order but not inspect the material supplied. Then, if I were swindled, I would make up for the swindle, certainly, and get my money back, but, also, I would never have anything to do with them thereafter, and they would lose the possibility of a profitable relationship.

...a "good eupsychian customer" is one who doesn't like being fooled, one who appreciates it if his interests are kept in mind by the enterprise and its representative.

...the salesman then must be a man of integrity, a man who can be trusted, a man whose world will be believed, a man whose word is his bond, a man of honor, a gentleman...

He is the eyes and ears of the company, and furthermore, he is the representative or the ambassador of the company. He is the company at a distance.

PeopleSoft approaches each customer with the belief that employees will work with customers for 10, 15, 20 years or more.

Memorandum on Salesmen and Salesmanship

"Do you want this company to grow even after you're dead?" Any man, for instance, who wanted to pass on his privately owned business to his son or to his grandson would certainly

function differently from the way he would act if he didn't give a damn about what happened to the whole businesses when he died or retired.

...if one recognizes the fact that one's enterprise is really related to the community, to the state, to the nation, and to the world, that this is more so under good conditions, then there would be really easily understood consequences of such an attitude. Such an enterprise would behave differently from an enterprise which regarded itself as totally independent and autonomous and beholden to nobody else and really not connected with anybody else, or even against everybody else, an enterprise, for instance, involved in swindling some customer who simply passes by on the side in a tourist trap or which caters to a transient who will never come again.

The Necessity for Enlightened Management Policies

The more grown people are, the worse authoritarian management will work, the less well people will function in the authoritarian situation, and the more they will hate it.

What this means is that people who have experienced freedom can never really be content again with slavery, even though they made no protest about the slavery before they had the experience of freedom. This is true with all higher pleasures; those people who have known the feeling of dignity and self-respect for the first time can never again be content with slavishness, even though they made no protest about it before being treated with dignity.

Treating people well spoils them for being treated badly.



The above summary has been provided to you compliments of Altfeld, Inc.