

Chapter 20 Ancient Ethics of Leadership Participation

What are ethical participation modes leaders can facilitate?

ETHICS DIALOG OF THEATRICALS OF LEADERSHIP

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) in *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785/1993) distinguishes between the ethics of “practical reasoning” and the ethics of “categorical imperative.” Practical reasoning ethics is about “means” to some end. Categorical imperative is an “end” such as “humanity” is an end unto itself. When a leader treats workers or customers as “means” to gain “profit” “power” “prestige” that is “practical reasoning.”

Categorical Imperative – be ethical even if it does not lead to your own happiness. Treat humanity as an “end” unto itself, not a means to avoid punishment or as means to attain profit, happiness, etc. “I should never act except in such a way that my maxim should become a universal law” (Kant, 1785/1993: #402, p. 14).

Maxim – “A maxim is the subjective principle of volition” (Kant, 1785/1993: #401, footnote 13, p. 13). An example of a “maxim” is the leader’s “will.” The leader’s dialog can will their intent become a universal law, or that it be just practical reason.

An example of Categorical Imperative is the white lie.

[This means that when you tell a lie, you merely take exception to the general rule that says everyone should always tell the truth and behave that what you are saying is true. When you lie, you do not thereby will that everyone else lie and not believe that what you are saying is true, because in such a case your lie would never work to get you what you want] (Kant, 1785/1993: #444, footnote 16, p. 15).

Are the 10 Commandments Categorical Imperatives or just Practical Reasoning? Are they imperatives or just guidelines? (Following is Wikipedia) is from Exodus:

Do not have any other gods before Me. Do not represent [such] gods by any carved statue or picture of anything in the heaven above, on the earth below, or in the water below the land. Do not bow down to [such gods] or worship them. I am God your Lord, a God who demands exclusive worship. Where My enemies are concerned, I keep in mind the sin of the fathers for [their] descendants, to the third and fourth [generation]. But for those who love Me and keep My commandments, I show love for thousands [of generations]. Do not take the name of God your Lord in vain. God will not allow the one who takes His name in vain to go unpunished. Remember the Sabbath to keep it holy. You can work during the six weekdays and do all your tasks. But the seventh day is a Sabbath to God your Lord. Do not do anything that constitutes work. [This includes] you, your son, your daughter, your slave, your maid, your animal, and the foreigner in your gates. It was during the six weekdays that God made the heaven, the earth, the sea, and all that is in them,

*but he rested on the seventh day. God therefore blessed the Sabbath day and made it holy. Honor your father and mother. You will then live long on the land that God your Lord is giving you. Do not commit **murder**. Do not commit **adultery**. Do not steal. Do not testify as a false witness against your neighbor. Do not be envious of your neighbor's house. Do not be envious of your neighbor's wife, his slave, his maid, his ox, his donkey, or anything else that is your neighbor's." (Exodus 20)*

There are two sets of 10 Commandments, 1st is Exodus 20, 2nd is Exodus 34.

Which Ten Commandments? Source

<http://www.positiveatheism.org/crt/whichcom.htm>

First Tables of Stone (Exodus 20)("which Moses didst break")	Second Tables of Stone (Exodus 34)("the words that were on the first")
1. I am the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. You shall have no other gods before me.	1. Thou shalt worship no other god (For the Lord is a jealous god).
2. You shall not make for yourself a graven image. You shall not bow down to them or serve them.	2. Thou shalt make thee no molten gods.
3. You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain.	3. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep in the month when the ear is on the corn.
4. Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy.	4. All the first-born are mine.
5. Honor your father and your mother.	5. Six days shalt thou work, but on the seventh thou shalt rest.
6. You shall not kill.	6. Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks, even of the first fruits of the wheat harvest, and the feast of ingathering at the year's end.
7. You shall not commit adultery.	7. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread.

8. You shall not steal.	8. The fat of my feast shall not remain all night until the morning.
9. You shall not bear false witness against your neighbor.	9. The first of the first fruits of thy ground thou shalt bring unto the house of the Lord thy God.
10. You shall not covet.	10. Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk.

OK, pick one, translate them into whatever is your faith, or if you are without faith, then what is your list of 10 ethical categoricals? From here, we just like at the “supposed right to lie,” the corporation’s right to lie.

Kant (1785/1993, #427, p. 65) takes the position that even a white lie, “does harm to humanity in general, inasmuch as it vitiates the very source of right.” Kant gives the example of a murderer who asks you if their intended victim is in your house; even then according to categorical imperative, a white lie is not allowed.

It is indeed possible that after you have honestly answered Yes to the murderer’s question, as to whether the intended victim is in the house, the latter went out unobserved and thus eluded the murderer, so that the deed would not have come about. However, if you told a lie and said that the intended victim was not in the house, and he was actually (though unbeknownst to you) gone out, with the result that by so doing he has been met by the murderer and thus the deed has been perpetrated, then in this case you may be justly accused as having caused his death. For if you had told the truth as best you knew it, then the murderer might perhaps have been caught by neighbors who came running while he was searching the house for his intended victim, and thus the deed might have been prevented. Therefore, whoever tells a lie, regardless of how good his intentions may be, must answer for the consequences resulting there from even before a civil tribunal and must pay the penalty for them, regardless of how unforeseen those consequences may be (Kant (1785/1993, #427, p. 65).

Derrida’s Rebuttal to Kant’s Categorical Imperative Against the White Lie - Derrida (2000) raises the issue, about what happens when two (or more) categorical imperatives come into conflict. What happens when “thou shalt not lie” under any circumstances comes into conflict with the categorical imperative “of Hospitality?” There is an ethics of Hospitality, a maxim (will) that you do not give over guest in your house to a murderer. Is there a “supposed right to lie out of humanity” (Derrida, 2002: 67). Kant argues that one should never lie, under any circumstances. Derrida makes the maxim of unconditional hospitality by host or hostess to their guests something that is a categorical imperative (a maxim he seeks to make a universal law), the “laws of hospitality”

(Derrida, 2000: 77, 81): “to give the new arrival all of one’s home and oneself, to give him or her one’s own, our own, without asking a name, or compensation, or the fulfillment of even the smallest condition.”

“Should one hand over one’s guests to criminals, rapists, murderers? Or lie to them so as to save the people one is putting up and for whom one feels responsible?” (Derrida, 2000: 151). Derrida’s reply is to cite the story of Lot, who did offer hospitality to strangers who it turns out were being hunted by murderer’s

Lot came out to them at the door, and having closed the door behind him said, “I beg you, my brothers, do no wicked thing. Listen, I have two daughters who are virgins. I am ready to send them out to you, to treat as it pleases you. But as for the men, do nothing to them, for they have come under the shadow of my roof” (story of Lot from Genesis 19: 1-9; as told by Derrida, 2000: 153; see similar story, Judges 19: 23-30).

To what extent does one universal, categorical imperative, such as ALWAYS TELL THE TRUTH, have precedence over another imperative, UNCONDITIONAL HOSPITALITY, over yet another, NEVER ABUSE WOMEN? In the stories from the bible, men give women to the rapists or murderers, rather than give up a stranger (given hospitality) or rather than tell a white lie.

Now the question arises: does a leader have an ethical categorical imperative NOT TO LIE, to tell the truth, even in advertising? Other questions: does a leader’s dialog, speak the truth, and does the leader have an unconditional obligation to extend hospitality to all workers, especially to women workers in a sweatshop in Asia, making garments or sneakers for some 1st world corporation?

Kant speaks of the Kingdom of Ends, the ideal utopia in which all people behave with categorical imperatives (speaking truth, extending hospitality, etc.). “We think that Kant’s **utopia**, the ‘kingdom of ends’, could hardly include ‘downsizing’ and involuntary ‘career re-adjustments’” and I will add lies in advertising and sweatshops for young women (Campbell, Parker & ten Bos, 2005: 46). Why? Because in Kingdom of Ends, ends matter, not utilitarian, practical compromises, not practical reasoning (where means to ends are paramount).

Global (free market) sweatshop trade is opposite to Kant’s project for perpetual peace, which is all about the means (sweatshop) justify the ends (lower prices at Wal-Mart; higher dividends to shareholders; humungous salaries for executives). People thinking of their own ends (i.e. greed), bring great harm to humanity.

You would have to conclude that business leaders, for the most part, operate using Practical Reason ethics; its Ok to tell white lies (even whoppers) if the extends the bottom line. Kant envisioned autonomous individuals, seeking to make their maxims universal, to operate with humanity as an end unto itself. It has been suggested that

business ethicists invoke an instrumental interpretation to fit the business ethics of practical reasoning (Campbell, Parker & ten Bos, 2005: 52).

Dialog between leaders and followers, between leaders and customers, between leaders and society – is considered (un) ethical discourse. The ethical (or not) discourse of a top executive permeates the dialog of the entire organization; “he or she set the tone, influencing the behavior of the next tier of executives, and down the line to rank-and-file employees, although there may be an occasional exception or whistleblower” (Hartley, 1993: 310). This is the case in Bhopal (Union Carbide), unsafe consumer goods (GM Corvair; Ford’s Pinto), corporate mis-advertising (Nike), in predatory global practices (Wal-Mart), and in the energy fraud (Enron). When the dialog values bottom line (greed) over the hospitality to its workers, or the truthfulness of its executives, it’s evident that (instrumental) practical reason, has precedence over Kantian categorical imperatives.

Does Nike have a First Amendment right to publicly claim that it is a leader in fighting sweatshops -- or is that false advertising? An example of white lie justified by Practical Reason: In leaderly dialog, you find occasions when the leader recommends a “white lie” as a expedient “means” to achieve rewards (profit, bonus, etc.) or avoid punishment (going to prison, losing market share, etc.). Nike Corporation, for example, argued that it can tell white lies in advertising (claiming that Nike does not contract with sweatshops, pays living wages, gives workers in Third World factories the right to organize, has safe working conditions, etc.) – that such white lies in its advertising is consonant with “Free Speech.”

Bill of Rights: 1st Amendment “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.”

14th Amendment gives rights to former slaves; it was opened as a loophole in 1886 court decision that granted “personhood” to corporations, which is why Nike can legally claim protection under the 1st Amendment.¹

Nike’s Little White Lies - In the mid-90s, Nike officials launched a public relations counter-offensive against charges that workers in its Asian factories were subjected to dangerous chemical exposure, physical abuse, and substandard wages. Nike sports marketing director Steve Miller, for example, wrote to university presidents and athletic directors in June 1996 to reassure them Nike was still a brand their teams could wear proudly. The company's subcontractors, he claimed, were obliged to follow "government regulations regarding minimum wage and overtime as well as occupational health and safety, environmental regulations, workers'

¹ Source for Personhood of corporations and the Nike case <http://www.corpwatch.org/article.php?id=7110>

insurance, and equal opportunity provisions" (Josh Richman, *Mother Jones*)²

Nike in 2003 agreed to pay \$ 1.5 million to settle the lawsuit claiming the corporate dialog in its advertising, about global labor practices, was a pack of white lies (& some real whoppers). The suit was brought by Marc Kasky in 1998, a labor activist in San Francisco. The California Supreme Court, in a 4-to-3 decision in 2002, ruled that Nike's statements were commercial speech subject to the advertising law because Nike was "engaged in commerce" and its statements were "likely to influence consumers in their commercial decisions."³ Lest you be fooled, the \$1.5 million went to the "Fair Labor Association" an enterprise founded and funded by Nike, Reebok, etc. to monitor global labor practices of these same corporations contract factories adherence to corporate codes of conduct; in short, it is if Nike lost the law suit, then settled by giving the money to its own enterprise.

Adam Smith (1776) on Sweatshop Wages: "A man must always live by his work, and his wages must at least be sufficient to maintain him. They must even upon most occasions be somewhat more; otherwise it would be impossible for him to bring up a family, and the race of such workmen could not last beyond the first generation" ([Smith, 1776, CHAPTER VIII Of the Wages of Labor](#)).

In dialog, there is a herd mentality; the herd follows the lowest ethical conduct of the leader. The energy traders followed the off-the-balance sheet behavior, and other practices of Enron. Reasons given by competitors who followed Enron, are same as those of the S&L scandal:

1. Since everyone else is doing it, it must be the thing to do
2. If we don't do likewise, we will be at a competitive disadvantage and our viability may even be threatened (Hartley, 1993: 312).

This is the dialogic herd mentality, ways of discourse that invariable lead to practical reasoning to justify what is unjustifiable in the ethics of Kant's categorical imperative.

You will read in this chapter about Enron's attempts to tell white lies, about their attempts to cover up when those white lies were found out. There has prolonged denial and cover-up by many corporations, about the white lies, about worker safety, about environmental impact, about sweatshop labor practices. Nike and Wal-Mart blame their sub-contractors, or the oversights of their monitors. They try to escape responsibility, answerability and blame for sweaty practices.

It's all about Public Image The white lies are a way to preserve public image to salvage a besmirched reputation, to engage in dialog of the white lie. A besmirched public image

² Josh Richman, *Mother Jones*, "Greenwashing on Trial" 2001
<http://www.motherjones.com/news/feature/2001/02/greenwash.html>

³ Source material http://reclaimdemocracy.org/nike/nyt_nikesettles.html

can negatively affect sales, profits, and those executive bonuses. Monsanto, Nike, Wal-Mart, and McDonald's have "war rooms," teams of public relations specialists dispatched like SWAT teams to counter any negative dialog on college campuses, in academic meetings, and anywhere in the public square where the whistles are about to blow. A corporate reputation has currency; protecting the public image at all cost, by whatever practical means, is the work of the war room. The history of these firms is one public relations disaster after another. The dialog between corporate leaders, their staff, the public, and the critics is all about disputing public image.

(Sept 30 2002) I heard Gretchen Morgenson, the Pulitzer prize-winning journalist from the New York Times speak on the NMSU campus. Provost Flores introduced her by raising some important questions:

1. Are CEOs of American corporations ethically challenged?
2. How do we raise the issue of ethics in our classes?
3. Can we rethink what we do in the business world?

Morgenson asked these questions:

1. Is greed a bigger problem than it has been historically?
2. Are executives more ethically challenged than before?
3. Are we witnessing a corporate crime wave?

- Lerach noted that the U.S. is "awash in the largest wave of financial fraud since the 1920s."

CEOs have become the chief cheerleaders, and in terms of dialog, the chief spinmeisters. They use their dialog to push up sales revenues when that is the measure of their performance, or shift liabilities into the asset column when that is the measure of their performance review. The charge is that executives lead according to what is best for their executive incentive plans. For WorldCom, it was billing; for Enron it was number of trades.

She qualified her remarks by saying she is a capitalist and not against big business. She is in favor of the free market and is not a socialist. But she is also concerned about the long term trend, the transfer of shareholder wealth to a few executives.

People in high places have abused the system. A few greedmeisters are destroying capitalism. She then offered the first line of this well known quote by Rohatyn:

Only capitalists can destroy capitalism. Populist capitalism of a type is very beneficial to the vast majority in our system, but an ethical tradition is needed to make it all work. When you have senior people walking away with hundreds of millions, leaving everyone else in the dirt, that is hugely depressing and very dangerous.

—Felix G. Rohatyn (Ambassador to France)

in December 2000; Chairman of the Board of Aton Pharma, Inc., a company recently formed to develop and test a promising cancer therapy).

Gretchen Morgenson gave a list of corporate CEOs who were out to destroy capitalism:

1. TYCO, she says gets the “Grasping Executive Award” - Dennis Kozlowski used company funds to buy homes and expensive artwork; he himself an \$18 million apartment and \$13 million worth of paintings.
2. Qwest - CEO Joseph Nacchio – Qest was the Greediest of the greediest executives and companies in Fortune’s September 2, 2002 issue. Nacchio walks away with \$200 million from his stock, after adding \$1 billion in phony revenue. Executives sold \$2.26 billion Phil Anshutz, Director of Qwest Communications, made \$1.57 billion. Former CEO Joe Nacchiw, got paid \$230 million The stock was at \$65 and is now at \$3. “Nacchio was paid a \$1.5 million bonus, as well as a cash payout of \$24 million, on top of his \$1.2 million salary and miscellaneous stock options, for a year when Qwest teetered on the brink of bankruptcy” (Garcia Aug 25 2002 Alb Journal).
3. GLOBAL CROSSING - Chief Executive Officers John Legere and Gary Winnick (founder of GC)– Winnick, worth \$3.2 billion today, did accounting trickery similar to Enron. Winnick made \$508 million in his stock sales. In October, Global Crossing pardoned two-thirds of a \$15 million loan it made to newly appointed CEO John Legere when he worked for the company's Asian subsidiary. Former CEO Gary Winnick sold \$735 million in Global Crossing stock. Salomon Smith Barney analyst Jack Grubman, boosted his Global Crossing stock and served as an adviser to them. He mad tens of millions on a merger he designed. Like Qwest, it sold network capacity to other companies, then bought the same amount back. Enron did with energy swaps. Stock boosting strategies bought this CEO, Gary Winnick, a \$94 million house, but his shareholders took a \$47 billion loss.
4. WORLD Com – CEO Bernard Ebbers – used accounting trickery and Andersen auditors and Wall Street’s Jack Grubman, to boost stock prices. WorldCom counted \$3.8 billion in ordinary operating costs as a capital expense in 2001 and 2002, so they could claim profits when they actually lost money. They shifted another \$1 billion in operating costs to capital accounts during 1999 and 2000. Their whistle blower is Cynthia Cooper. The shareholder losses were \$191 billion. CEO Ebbers made \$408 million from loans he took against WorldCom stock.
5. ENRON – CEO Kenneth Lay; former CEO Jeffrey Skilling – Used accounting trickery and metatheatre to keep the media, Wall Street analysts, regulators, employees and investors thinking Enron was more than it was. The result was a shareholder loss of \$68 billion, while Enron insiders sold \$1.1 billion in stock. And froze employee stock selling, while executives sold theirs. Fortune Magazine

named Enron America's most innovative company six times; they were not skeptical or critical; they were cheerleaders. Enron hid its debt in 3500 off-the-books partnerships. Former division head, Lou Pai married a stripper and cashed in \$270 million. Ken Lay married his secretary Linda, and cashed in \$102 million. Rebecca Mark, former division head, cashed out \$80 million. Jeff Skilling cashed out \$68 million. Andrew Fastow made over \$30 million on the off-the-balance sheet partnerships, plus his stock sales.

6. Adelphia, a cable TV company, had claimed up to 500,000 fictitious subscribers while keeping two sets of accounting books, one of which inflated the amount it was spending on upgrading its cable systems. No wonder the company is being investigated by the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) and is the subject of criminal investigations by two federal grand juries. Adelphia's auditors, Deloitte & Touche, also have a lot of Enron-style questions to answer.

Executives are over-paid: "Business Week reported that in 2000, CEOs in 365 top companies were paid 531 times more than their average hourly worker. In 1980, they were paid 42 times more" (Garcia, 2002). The Robber Barons are back, says Morgenson. The "robber barons" of the late 19th century brought American capitalism into disrepute, but were then tamed by a series of anti-monopoly laws which restored law and order to the market place. Under the order issued by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission in June, companies and their officers are liable to penalties by federal agencies.

Gretchen's point was that CEOs are amassing wealth while shareholders are left holding worthless stock. She explains this as the love of the stock option that is now the root of all evil. Executives use DIALOG to get stock price to soar, then exercise their stock options to cash out. This is causing a crisis in investor confidence and employee confidence in executives.

The problem with the Stock Option is that it is tied to performance of the company. This sounds like a great idea, but becomes a powerful incentive to cook the books. Executives use dialog to "shade the truth," to overstate earnings, to inflate cash flow, and pad earnings with contract swaps, and to form off-shore partnerships and stock options so as to avoid paying U.S. taxes.

THE INSTITUTIONS INVOLVED

These are mega scandals that are embedded in the bedrock of American institutions: financial, education, political and industry. It is more endemic than in previous megaspectacles. Wake up business is not a democracy; executives are bagging away stock options and leaving investors and employees in the dirt.

Wall Street has come under inquiry - Investment banks Merrill Lynch and CSFB have each been fined \$100 million for bad practice; analysts were pumping up stocks to suit the requirements of the firm's investment bankers, while privately describing their

recommendations to investors as "crap" (or worse). Citigroup's star telecom analyst, Jack Grubman, got so close to Global Crossing, a telecom stock he was touting, that he masterminded two of its acquisitions and became personal finance adviser to its boss. Grubman was chief cheerleader for WorldCom. Wall Street did not question the new off-the-balance sheet partnerships. They did not question the stock option accounting methods. The International Accounting Board is trying to get better stock option reporting standards; to report it as an expense instead of an obscure footnote. Standard and Poors is doing this now in its ratings (the first to do so). The Journal of Finance is recommending that executives be forced to hold their stocks for several years, to give them incentives for the long term, instead of cashing out and running.

The Press - Journalist played a role in issuing dialog about executive and corporate performance, without using critical thinking. They are says Gretchen the un-indicted co-conspirators. They were not acting as skeptics; they were part of the club. Reporters were put on special advisory boards and paid fat fees. Reporters were gulled into believing in the New Economy. Financial journalists reported only what was told to them by the corporate PR staff.

Boards of Directors – The boards are not governing. They are irresponsible to the mx. They are not meeting their fiduciary responsibility to investors. They are not being skeptical about the CEO dialog they hear. They are lulled to sleep. Are they incompetent or just lazy? Gretchen recommends peppering executives with tougher questions. Not to just buy into the rhetoric that an Andrew Fastow hands out and suspend the corporate code of ethics so he can run off-the-balance-sheet partnerships and be the Chief Financial Officer at Enron (conflict of interest).

401 K – Pension plans shifted from sold investments to the risk of 401 (K). The problem is the new pension plans are tied to corporate stock prices. Fine as long as the price is up.

IS THIS ANY WORSE THAN HISTORICALLY?

Great Crash of 1929 resulted in a new financial framework in the 1930s, including Wall Street's very own "cop on the corner", the SEC.

They said things like "greed is good" (Ivan Boesky) and "Only the little people pay taxes" (Leona Helmsley);

Webster's dictionary defines greed this way: "excessive or rapacious desire, especially for wealth or possessions." After 9-11, greedy corporations and executives developed lots of new option grants, because their stock prices were temporarily lower.

The good news is after this wave of corporate leader crime, there is no more wide-eyed acceptance of executive statements. In the leadership class we learn critical thinking, we learn to be skeptical about dialog.

In the last two decades, we have put CEOs, such as Jack Welch and Chainsaw Daggut on a pedestal. Now we see on TV the weekly perp walk. It began with a couple of WorldCom executives taking the perp walk after no Enron executives did.

CBS poll conducted last month, 67 percent of those surveyed said most executives are not honest. Only 27 percent disagreed.

Gretchen put it this way, “CEOs are held in lower esteem than used car salesmen.”

SEC rule, new legislation, the Sarbanes-Oxley Act, gave this requirement greater force.

Over the coming months, the top executives of all 14,000-plus publicly traded companies in the United States will be required to certify the accuracy of their quarterly and annual reports filed with the SEC.

Under Sarbanes-Oxley, the penalties are more specific than the SEC's still-undetermined penalties. The law provides that CEOs who falsify their companies' financial reports can face a \$5 million fine and up to 20 years in prison.

Bottom line, populist capitalism, its spectacle needs an ethical tradition. We need an ethics course in the Business College.

Do you want a system of capitalism where shareholder wealth is diluted so that only a few executive shareholders amass the lion's share?

Gretchen Morgenson did not mention that there are still some ethical executives:

Business Week (Sept 23, 2002) lists

“In fact, they have led their companies an average of 18 years and worked in them for an average of 26 years. James D. Sinegal, of Costco Wholesale Corp., co-founded his company 19 years ago, while James C. Morgan has been in charge at Applied Materials Inc. for 25 years” (BW Sept 23). Here are some counter examples to the Enron, WorldCom, GlobalCrossing, Tyco, etc. leaders”

- [James Sinegal, Costco](#)
- [Reuben Mark, Colgate-Palmolive](#)
- [James Morgan, Applied Materials](#)
- [James Keyes, Johnson Controls](#)

- [Harold Messmer, Robert Half International](#)
- [Joseph Neubauer, Aramark](#)

RESOURCES: For more on ENRON METASCRIP T - see Boje, D. M. (2002b) Enron Metatheat re: A Critical Dramaturgy Analysis of Enron’s Quasi-Objects. Paper presented at the Networks, Quasi-Objects, and Identity: Reintegrating Humans, Technology, and Nature session of Denver Academy of Management Meetings. Tuesday August 13, 2002. http://business.nmsu.edu/~dboje/papers/enron_theatre_LJM.htm

 [Mintzberg web site and references](#)

 Mintzberg, H. 1975. The manager’s job: Folklore and fact. Harvard Business Review 53: 49-61.

 Mintzberg, H. 1973. The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row.

ADVANCED SECTION – FOR GRAD STUDENTS ONLY

Barry and Elmes (1997) look at monophonic and polyphonic aspects of leadership strategy. See Boje ([2000c](#)) for more on the multiple voices of leadership.

1. Polyphonic Dialogism – several people each with vastly different logics or worldviews (ideologies), may or may not be present in the same time/space of a dialog. In the four voices model, the more interesting polyphonic form of participation is way beyond the face-to-face meeting of people in a conference room, or on a conference call. Rather, in the 3rd and 4th voice, there is dialogic participation with ethical (transcendental, even spiritual) and aesthetic (voiceless) voices.
2. Stylistic Dialogism – The aesthetic (4th) voice, can be a dialogicality among different styles: everyday speech used by advertisers (called skaz) such as “Just Do It” (Nike) or “I’m Lovin It” (McDonald’s) or “Digital DNA” (Motorola) can be juxtaposed with official speeches of the CEO to shareholders, with science-imitative speech like the income and loss statements, and with photos of minorities to make an annual report appear to be participative, as well as other stylistics. Stylistic dialogism is defined as the orchestration of widely different styles of speech. This orchestration may be the lie of 1st voice autocracy pretending to be participative when it is not. It can be 2nd voice double narrative, where some skaz ripped off from the Other is appropriated to by a corporation to make it seem like there is participation (e.g. “Just do it” was ripped off from the inner city speech act “Just F _CK it!)). In 3rd and 4th voice the multi-stylistics move toward dialogic participation.
3. Chronotopic Dialogism – A chronotope is how one narrates or stories temporality and spatiality (or time/space). Do people story the future as the land of progress, or revere the past in sacred tomes, or put their faith in being in the moment in the

- here-and-now. Bakhtin was inspired by Albert Einstein's theory of relativity, where space becomes the fourth dimension of space. Chronotopic dialogism occurs when there are multiple conceptions of time and space, and these begin to interact, to participate in one another. Imagine the Navajo who meets the Astronaut; their conceptions of time and space will be vastly different.
4. Architectonic Dialogism – Your family story is nested in your societal story. My grandmother Wilda's brother Gerard married Stella LaClair, a native American woman, and had a child named Georgia (or Georgie, as some called her). It was still the age of genocide. Wilda's second husband (Percy Brown, or Brownie as we called him) was abandoned by his mother to be raised on the Yakima Indian Reservation. On my dad's side, my grandfather's brother Edward Boje married a native American woman from the Pualup tribe in Washington state. The Boje family wrote Edward's name out of the family bible, it was forbidden to ever speak Edward Boje's name, or his wife's name, or the names of their children, forevermore. I only learned of this silence, this shunning, this 4th voice of the voiceless when I was over 50 years old. Architectonics dialogism is a dialogic interanimation of cognitive, ethic, and aesthetic discourses. In my story of Wilda, Stella, Gerard, Georgie, and Brownie – the voices of my ancestors are nested in the societal discourse (voice of society), and resonate with my internalized (2nd voice of the Others, the dead ancestors), and 3rd voice of ethical conscience, and 4th voice (the aesthetics of how my family, & my country tells their narratives of Natives who were to be voiceless in the genocide, in the appropriation of land by the settlers). What is brave about Wilda, Edward, Brownie, Gerard, Stella, Georgie is they participated with the people different than themselves, and defied the edict of shunning, and appropriation. In architectonic dialogism, the ethical voice resonates with the cognitive reasoning of a society bent upon destruction, and the aesthetics of poetic storytelling where I let the voices silenced speak to me in utter defiance of societal hegemony.