Chapter 9
The Ethical Challenge of Global Organization

Kenneth J. Gergen

In many respects the chaotic crush toward global organizing can be viewed with alarm. In previous centuries it was only the emperor, the Pope, the king, or the Fuhrer who possessed sufficient power and resources to imagine globalization - the possibility of extending indefinitely the perimeters of influence, ownership, imprimatur, and/or self-aggrandizement. With the 20th century development of low cost technologies of communication and transportation, the potential for globalization has become available to virtually all - from youth activists in Tiananmen Square, the wine maker in rural Argentina, to the paper towel manufacturer in a small city. Because of essential needs for an expanding market and low cost labor and materials, the most aggressive thrust toward globalization has, of course, been that of the business community. And it is the multinational corporation in particular, that has been subjected to the most intense critique. Globalized business expansion has been variously excoriated for its exploitation of foreign workers (and women in particular), ruthless destruction of natural resources, disregard for the safety of its working conditions and products, marketing of inessential products, and its destruction of local cultures. For a chorus of critics, multinational corporations have been singled out as worst case examples of ethical consciousness (see for example, Muller, 1974; Tugenhat, 1973; Vernon, 1977; Levitt, 1970; Lavipour and Sauvant, 1976; Tavis, 1982).

Such criticisms have scarcely gone unanswered. Defenders point to the effects of the multinationals in increasing employment opportunities for thousands of otherwise impoverished peoples, creating an entrepreneurial infrastructure in third world nations, contributing to the democratization of otherwise autocratic nations, and even contributing to the end of apartheid in South Africa. Further, in the mushrooming of international voluntary organizations (Cooperrider and Passmore, 1991), commentators point to the potential of globalization for altruistic and life-giving ends. However, much of the argument on behalf of globalization, and particularly in the corporate sector, has remained defensive. Strong attempts are made to generate ethical guidelines, and to avoid undesirable publicity (though the development of public relations offices). But the general posture remains one of quiet reserve toward the ethical dimension of globalized expansion.

In the present chapter I wish to open discussion on what I see as the potential for global organizations to reverse the playing field. Rather than the apologetic and defensive postures of the past, I believe the time is at hand for global organizations to nurture the potential for ethical leadership. An enormous lacuna in ethical leadership now exists on the international level. I believe that global organizations, and multinational corporations in particular, are now poised for assuming this role. To pursue this argument, I shall first consider the failure of other potential contenders for

ethical inspiration. Then, I shall focus on the shift from modern to postmodern forms or organizing. As I shall argue, it is within the postmodern organizing process that we can locate the impetus for reconsidering the ethical potential of the global organization. The ethical potentials of postmodern organizing are realized most particularly in relational process. Finally, I shall demonstrate the ethical potentials of such practices by drawing from recent work in a multinational pharmaceutical corporation.

The Ethical Challenge of Globalization

It is first essential to place the problem of organizational ethics within the global context more generally. This precis will act as a prophylactic against any self-satisfying simplification of good and evil - for example, pitting malignant expansionists against innocent third world cultures. More importantly, we shall find that the globalizing process itself thrusts issues of the good into unparalleled prominence. To appreciate these points it is important, first, to consider the social origins of ethical presumptions. Virtually any form of social organization embodies an internally shared ontology (a consensus view of "the real") and ethical sensibility (quotidian commitments to what is collectively deemed worthy and desirable as opposed to improper or reprehensible). Agreements on the nature of reality and on the value of certain activities as opposed to others are essential for the very formation of organizational culture (Weick, 1995); without such agreements the organization would cease to be effective. More generally, beliefs in the good are community achievements (MacIntyre, 1984).

To the extent that organizations are fully integrated into local communities, organizational ontologies and ethics pose little problem. When community constructions of is and ought are fully reflected in the practices of its businesses, governmental offices, churches and so on, the expansion and strengthening of these institutions simply contributes to the shared sense of the good within the community. However, as organizations expand, drawing members from disparate communities or spanning several communities, so is there a tendency for the constructed character of the world within the organization to deviate from the surrounding community. The organizational understanding of the good may come into sharp conflict with local understandings (consider the frequent conflict between family and corporation in terms of the hours a young executive should work).

In these terms, globalization represents an enormous intensification of ethical conflict. As organizations expand into foreign locales, so do they import alien constructions of the real and the good. From their standpoint, their actions seem reasonable, even commendable; local traditions seem parochial, backward or even reprehensible (surely in need of change). From the local standpoint, however, the ways of life favored by the globalizing organization often seem invasive, insensitive to local customs and community, and even deeply immoral (consider the reaction of Muslim fundamentalists to many Western corporations and products). There is an important sense in which much of the invective directed against the multinational

corporation is derived from just this condition - with the corporation evaluated by standards that are largely alien, or differentially construed from within as opposed to outside the organization.

As we see, however, the globalizing process represents an enormous expansion in the field of ethical conflict. The problem is not that of ruthless and colonizing organizations seeking world dominion; "ruthlessness and "colonization" are the epithets of the outsider. Rather, the problem is that of multiple and competing constructions of the good. And, without means of solving these conflicts, we face the problem of deterioration in relations, legal warfare, and even bloodshed (consider the bombing of the Trade Towers, the murder of priests in Africa, the ransoming of business executives in Colombia, and the assassination of Russian officials concerned with Mafia-like business practices).

The Problematics of Principles and Sanctions

From the present standpoint, we find that problems of ethical conduct are not essentially problems of malignant intention. We should not think in terms of the evil practices of the multi-nationals as against the purity of traditional culture (or vice versa). Rather, ethical problems result primarily from the clashing of community (or cultural) standards of action. In these terms, however, the rapid shift toward globalization invites an enormous expansion in the domain of ethical conflict. Wherever an organization coalesces and expands, so does it enter territories where its mission destabilizes and violates accepted standards of the good. As we confront a world of globalization without limit, what resources are available for adjudication, rectification or coordination? How are we to proceed?

There is first the longstanding attempt to generate binding ethical principles, to articulate a set of standards or ideals to which all parties can (or should) aspire. This is the territory of philosophers, business ethicists, and human rights specialists concerned with instilling universal goods or values. (See for example, Padsen and Safritz, 1990; Donaldson, 1993). Yet, I find little reason for optimism in this domain. At the outset, after two thousand years of moral philosophy, there is as yet no broad consensus - even in western culture - on matters of the good. As MacIntrye (1984) characterizes such deliberation, it is both "interminable and unsettleable." (p.210) When such standards move across cultures, the conflicts are even more profound. For example, western principles of women's rights generate harsh antagonism in Islamic culture. Under these conditions, who is legitimated to "call the ethic" for all? Even multi-nation attempts to hammer out a universal slate of human rights have not been impressively successful. Not only are such platforms resented by governments feeling they are being used to undermine their power, but abstract principles seldom dictate specific actions in concrete circumstances (see Gergen, 1994).

Given the problematic of generating and instilling ethical principles, most problems of disagreeable conduct are simply treated pragmatically. Thus, in the sphere of global organization, international trade commissions, international tribunals, United

Nations policies, and sanctions and policies within various nations are typically used to prevent egregious violations of situated senses of the good. While such efforts have been useful, they are also limited. By and large, such sanctioning efforts are reactive; they are activated only when problems emerge. In this sense, they are always chasing demons already on the move. There is little opening for positive visions of the future. Further, they generate a schism between "we" and "them" - between ruling and assessing organizations on the one hand, and those whom they judge. The result in the latter organizations is the emergence of a strategic sensibility: all actions are acceptable so long as they do not arouse the suspicions of the sanctioning body.

In the case of both moral principle and pragmatic sanction, perhaps the major problem is that of extrinsic origin. That is, in both cases efforts toward the good originate outside the organization itself. The organization must instill the principles or act according to rules generated elsewhere. They must acquire a special sensitivity that is not inherent in the routinized activities of the organization itself. If a broadly shared sense of the good is to be achieved, the more optimal solution would lie in the internal practices of the organization - practices valued by the participants in terms of their own sense of mission. It is precisely this set of practices that are emerge in the transition from the modern to the postmodern organization.

Shortfalls of Modern Organization

With the field of ethical conflict exponentially expanding, and attempts to instill ethical principles and legislate the good both found wanting, what other sources are available? It is here that I wish to propose that the globalizing organization itself may provide the most promising alternative. I am not speaking here of self-policing organizational policies, of the adoption of specific ethical codes of conduct for the globalizing organization. Such standards would inevitably be "local," in the sense of representing internal conceptions of the good. Rather, I am speaking of forms of organizational practice which indeed, are just those practices best suited to the viability of the globalizing organization. Such a proposal may initially seem ironic. After all, it is the globalizing process itself to which we have traced the problem of ethical conflict. However, as I shall hope to demonstrate, such conflict is largely derived from the expansion in a particular form of organization. Ultimately required is a transformation in the organizing process itself. Let us turn our attention, then, to contrasting conceptions of the organization.

There is now a voluminous literature on the changing nature of the organization in the 20th century, with much of this commentary focused on the major transformations of the past few decades. There are numerous ways of indexing these changes, with terms such as post-industrialization, the information age, chaos management, and postmodernism among the more prominent. To sustain coherence with a number of previous offerings (Gergen, 1991; Gergen and Whitney, 1995) I shall use the term modern to refer to an ideal form of organization, approximated in varying degree by most major corporations (along with military, educational and

governmental establishments) in western culture for over a century. We may then refer to the emerging processes of organization as postmodern. In what follows, then, I shall briefly characterize major features of the modern organization, along with its vulnerabilities - both practical and ethical - within the context of globalization. This will prepare the way for a discussion of the ethical potentials of postmodern organizing.

There is a burgeoning literature on the modern organization.[*] Of specific relevance to our present concerns, we may characterize the modern organization as one committed, at the outset, to a hierarchical view of relationship. In more primitive form, the single, rational agent takes command (responsibility, control) over a group of subordinates. In expanded form, a policy making committee, informed by subordinates responsible for collecting relevant information, dictates organizational action. Directives flow from top to bottom, information (or feedback) flows in the opposite direction. In this sense, the organization is monological; a single, coherent rationale (strategic plan) dominates all sectors of the organization. The model is also committed to an individualistic basis of action, wherein single individuals serve as leaders or followers, are assigned responsibilities, subjected to evaluation, and rise upward in the hierarchy (or are thrust out) accordingly. The organization itself is also framed in the individualist metaphor, with firm boundaries recognized between what is inside vs. outside the organization, and organizations themselves are typically viewed as locked in a competitive struggle for position in a hierarchy from which they may be discarded.

In the present context, it is also important to point out that the modern organization represents a major incitement to ethical conflict. Although modern organizations inevitably generate a shared sense of the good, an internal justification for their policies, they do so in relative independence of their social surrounds and with their own prosperity or well-being foremost in view. Thus, as the modern organization becomes globalized, it essentially attempts to replicate itself (through its subsidiaries) throughout the world. The monologic rationality and ethical sensibility ideally prevails throughout. In effect, the organization becomes an alien intruder that functions primarily to fortify (and justify) its own hegemonic ends.

It is not simply that the modern organization is flawed with respect to the ethical necessities of a pluralistic world. Rather, in my view, as the modern organization globalizes, its capacity for effective functioning is also diminished. In significant degree, such losses result from the availability of the very technologies which have made globalization possible. I am speaking here primarily of this century's advances in communication and transportation technology. Through such innovations as the telephone, video recording, the microchip, high speed computers, and satellite transmission on the one hand, and massive highway systems, rail systems, and jet transportation on the other, it is possible to move information, opinions, persons, and products across the globe with ever increasing speed and efficacy. However, the global expansion of the modern organization is also accompanied by range of new challenges and adjustments, each of which undermines its viability. Among the more

prominent alterations:

- *Dispersion of intelligibilities*. As the organization expands, a strong tendency toward specialization occurs. The company is divided into functional areas; Individuals are hired and evaluated as specialists in different domains (e.g. research, production, marketing). Differing specialities are housed in separate buildings, and sometimes in different geographical locations. With further expansion, the organization is reproduced in miniature in other parts of the world. Within each segment, shared conceptions and values develop differentially. Most important, what is obvious, rational, and valuable in one part of the organization is seldom duplicated in others. In effect, a multiplication of realities is generated, reducing the intelligibility and the rhetorical efficacy of the singular "voice from the top."

- *Disruption in chains of authority*. Because there are few decisions within a functional domain that do not impact on others, and because most major initiatives require the coordinated input from diverse functional specialties, increased reliance must be placed on time-specific teams from across specialty areas. The result is first a blurring of the modern organizational structure in terms of the orderly distribution of responsibilities. The clear assignment of responsibilities to individuals or distinctive functional units is subverted. Further, the command structure is undermined, as unit chiefs lose the power to control and evaluate the work of members operating in multiple team contexts.

- *Erosion of rationality*. With the availability of high speed information transmission, information can be rapidly accessed or collected from a variety of sources and speedily transmitted across broad networks. Thus, decision-makers are confronted with ever increasing amounts of information relevant to various decisions. Because the organization is increasingly segmented, this also means that there is increasing differentiation in the sources of information available. There are more "kinds" of information to process. And, because information continuously accumulates, new factors are continuously identified, and new developments continue to take place, the half-life of available information is reduced. Yesterday's statistics are all too often a summary of yesterday. Although statistics are the benchmarks most frequently used in strategic planning, few guidelines exist for evaluating when information is useful and when it has outlived its relevance. In effect, not only is reliance on a single center of rational planning reduced, but the very concept of rationally based policy is thrown into question.

- *Reduction in centralized knowledge*. The same technological advances stimulating global expansion of the organization, also mean that centralized authority is progressively cut away from the context of decision making. Subsidiary decision makers are more intimately acquainted with the contests in which they operate; their knowledge based is richer and more fully nuanced. Further, windows of opportunity are suddenly and unpredictably opened (for example, by a local election, an invention, a shift in interest rates, a merger), and shut. As a result, decisions from a distance - from the spatio-temporal remove of headquarters - prove relatively slow

and insensitive. Increased dependency must be placed, then, on local representatives to respond within the context of application.

Communication technologies have simultaneously permitted a broad expansion of interested audiences - groups involved in the control, purchase, or use of a product or service - not only in terms of sheer numbers, but in variety as well. Such audiences will also vary in characteristics and requirements from one culture to another. Further, as the media, the government, and various interest groups become players in decisions affecting the organization, the organization must be able to communicate with differing content and emphases to multiple audiences. The potential of a centralized authority to communicate effectively across all target audiences is minimal, and most particularly when this group operates at a geographical remove from the target. Again, the result is increased reliance on local, contextually embedded decision makers.

- *Undermining of autonomy*. Because the media are increasingly the major sources of public information, their power to shape an organization's future is substantially augmented. In effect, media professionals - news analysts, commentators, science columnists, news writers - operate as gate keepers of national reality. Because their views are typically presumed to be unmotivated - and thus objective - they often seem more authentic than those issuing from the organizations themselves. In this way, organizations lose a certain capacity for autonomous, self-direction. Their voice loses authority in the public sphere. Increasingly the views of outside opinion leaders must be taken into account prior to decisions, in effect, giving such leaders a voice within the organization. The boundary between "inside" and "outside" the organization is blurred.

This erosion in autonomy is further by the fact that available technologies increase the capacity for various concerned audiences to identify themselves and their goals, and to organize action. This is not only true in the case of political parties and governmental offices, but also for various groups which recognize the economic potentials in organizing (e.g. consumer and labor groups), and for various grass roots interest groups (e.g. environmentalists, feminists, associations of retired people) who now take a keen political interest in global organizations. Not simply passive observers, such groups are actively engaged in information searches relevant to globalizing practices. In effect, the global organization is placed under unprecedented scrutiny, the effects of which may spill into the media at any time. Again, there is a diminution in the capacity of the organization for self-direction.

As we find, the technologies of globalization place the modern organizational structure in jeopardy - with the capacity of central authority to maintain intelligibility, command authority, make rationality claims, accumulate knowledge for local decision making, and make autonomous decisions all diminishing. As David Freedman (1992) summarizes the case, "The traditional scientific approach to management promised to provide managers with the capacity to analyze, predict, and control the behavior of the complex organizations they led. But the world most

managers currently inhabit often appears to be unpredictable, uncertain, and even uncontrollable."(p.26) More generally, Bella and Jenkins (1993) observe, "Highly complex organizational systems are beyond the capacity of any individual or group to grasp, much less control."

Relational Process and the Ethics of Postmodern Organizing

As I am proposing, the 20th century process of globalization is accompanied by a decline in the capacity of the modern organization to sustain itself. Yet, as we have seen, ethical conflicts are born of just this capacity of the modern organization for self-exportation and global duplication. In effect, ethical conflict is derived from a form of organization that ceases to be functional. In this sense, organizations seeking to bolster top-down authority, to control local operations, and to be increasingly self-determined, are not only operating against their self interests, but do so at a cost of ethical anguish. Given this condition, we now confront the challenge of envisioning practices of organizing that are at once beneficial for the organization and ethically productive. Can we, then, elucidate processes of postmodern organizing that simultaneously benefit the organization and favor a globalized condition of ethical wellbeing?

It is here that we enter the sphere of postmodern organizational theory. As will be outlined more fully in the next chapter, this literature is undergoing robust development. It is premature to draw confident conclusions regarding ethical potentials. However, the central place occupied by social constructionist dialogues within the postmodern literature, do provide some useful leverage. In particular, social constructionist analyses typically favor a relativistic stance concerning ethical premises. Thus, they stand as bulwark against any potentially hegemonic articulation of the good. Simultaneously, constructionism places a strong emphasis on relationships as the font of both ontology and ethics (see Gergen, 1994). In doing so, they shift the focus from individuals or social structures to processes of ongoing interchange, processes we may characterize as relational. In the present context, I wish to propose a conception of relational process as a pivotal metaphor for achieving the dual ends of organizational sustenance and ethical wellbeing. Let us explore.

At the outset, an emphasis on relational process abandons two central features of the modern organization, namely the assumption of self-contained units and of structural solidity. From the relational standpoint, the primary concern is not with recognizable units (e.g. headquarters, subsidiaries, the marketing division), and their structural arrangement, but with continuous processes of relationship. By foregrounding relationship we call attention to the domain of interdependence, the forms of coordinated activity from which the very conceptions of headquarters, subsidiaries and marketing division derive. In this sense, there are no single individuals, making autonomous decisions, but forms of relationship out of which actions that we index as decisions become intelligible. An individual, then, is the common locus for a multiplicity of relationships. His/her intelligibility (capacity for reasoned action) is

chiefly dependent on participating in processes of relational coordination.

To the extent that parties to a relationship continue to communicate, they will generate an internal domain of intelligibility (a sense of "the true" and "the good," as indicated earlier). Thus, as organizations segment relationships in various ways - geographically, functionally, hierarchically - so do they generate multiple centers of intelligibility. We may view organizational configuration, then, in terms of a range of relational nuclei, each striving to coordinate internal meaning. As internal meanings are stabilized, so is the internal efficacy of the nucleus enhanced. However, as its intelligibilities ossify, so is its capacity for coordination with other nuclei potentially reduced (see Gergen, 1994). A premium is thus to be placed on avoiding closures of intelligibility, that is, allowing any construction of the true and the good to become sedimented, or simply "common sense." Within the nuclei, multiple logics should be encouraged, and a healthy appreciation for incoherent policies prevail. Further, all decisions and policies may be construed as contingent, formalizations of "the conversation at this moment." In this way space remains for a continuation of the dialogue, and a revisioning of policies and practices.

Finally, and most important for present purposes, we see that the adequacy of a decision or policy does not rest on the intellectual capacity of the single decision maker (or decision making group.) Rather, maximal reliance must be placed on relational processes linking those responsible for the decision or policy to those who will be affected. This is not to recapitulate the modern presumption that effective decisions should be based on information about target characteristics (e.g. attitudes, motivation, cultural habits, income). Rather, it is to say that "the targets" should optimally join in fashioning the character of those decisions. The decision making process then, should be permeable, interactively embedded within the context of consequence. In effect, relational nuclei within the organization should be multiply enmeshed with other nuclei, engaged in dialogues in which multiple intelligibilities are shared, interpenetrate, modify, concatenate or act with critical reflection on each other. Similar processes of inter-interpolation should characterize relations with various "target audiences" of concern to the organization.

Outlined thus far is a vision of postmodern organizational process, one in which the chief emphasis is placed on relational process. Its contours have been importantly fashioned by conversations with managers across the globe concerned with organizational viability. More will be said about the efficacy of this vision of organizational process. However, we must finally return to our major challenge, that of envisioning globalizing organizations as positive forces for ethical generativity. Specifically, in what sense does relational process furnish a basis for ethical vision? On what grounds can it be argued that relational process is intrinsically ethical? The answer to this question can be traced to the earlier proposal that ethics themselves are communal creations; conceptions of the good emerge in the process of relationship. In this sense, an organization in which relational process of the present kind are preeminent, is also one in which the generative conditions for ethical sensibility are continuously restored. That is, no preconceived conception of the good enters the

relationship unchallenged; no voice of the good - developed from afar - remains inviolate. The preexisting relations offer resources from which participants will surely draw; but the off-stage ethics are not binding within the new context. Conceptions of the good are thus born and reborn within their specific contexts of usage.

Toward Ethically Generative Practice

What I am proposing here is essentially a shift from a conception of ethical principles from which proper practices are derived, to forms of ethically generative practice - practices that give rise to conjoint valuing and the synergistic blending of realities. By shifting the emphasis to practice, we avoid the endless contestatation on the nature of the good, stripped from history and culture. There is no ethical a priori from which, indeed, springs the very sense of the evil other. Rather, the focus is on developing relational practices which are themselves the sources of the communal sense of the good. Can we, however, offer a blueprint for ethically generative practices, a set of criteria or activities that will guarantee the emergence of a collaborative sense of the good? In my view, such a temptation is to be avoided; for to do so would be again to close out the possibility for broad participation. Every practice will necessarily favor certain groups, skills, or traditions. Rather than articulating such practices in bold script, I am drawn rather to a process by which we as scholars join with practitioners to develop a range of potentials - concepts, visions, metaphors, stories - that may encourage the development of ethically generative practices on sites of local action.

In this context, I wish to share a number of "stories" growing from experiences while working with an extended multi-national pharmaceutical company. As outlined in the preceding chapter, we deliberated with managers around the world concerning optimal management practices for the future. In particular, we asked them to identity what they were now finding to be the most effective communication practices. Would such practices reflect the traditional, or modernist conception of optimal communication (stressing centralized authority, top-down flow of policies, and the upward flow of information)? Interestingly, the answer was almost univocally in the negative. Repeatedly we were told of management experiences that were relational in character, which emphasized dialogic process, multiple logics, and permeable boundaries within organizational spheres and between the organization and its external context. It is this same set of practices that, in my view, possess ethically generative potential. Consider the following:

- In one organizational restructuring project, top management avoided the usual "independent study" of its operations by outside consultants, and turned the task over to the organization itself. Fourteen teams, representing all sectors of the company, carried out broadscale interviews, met periodically with other relevant teams to explore the total operations of the company, and deliberated on the demands and skills necessary for future success. Finally they and contributed to a seven-volume summary containing their research and recommendations concerning personnel

reductions, training, and the organization of work. A steering committee, headed by the CEO, eventually adopted some 75% of the recommendations. In effect, virtually all sectors of the company were given voice in molding the future of the company.

- The company was placed under sharp critical attack for its research on genetic engineering. An information campaign, mounted to inform the public of the positive effects of such research, did nothing to dissuade an increasingly vocal organization of dissenters. The company then shifted to a relational orientation, in which they proposed to the opposition that they work cooperatively to create a public exhibition informing the public of their diverse views on these complex and emotionally charged issues. After much active discussion, the various participants agreed on a set of informative exhibits that were subsequently displayed at a city cultural center. The exhibition was praised for its balance and open design. Company representatives felt there had also been an informative exchange of opinions with the opposition; both sides had developed more differentiated and appreciative views, and the public had been exposed to the multiple issues involved.

- Pharmaceutical companies in general are placed under close and critical scrutiny by the press. Traditional company policy was to protect internal information and decisions against press intrusion, and to plan information campaigns designed to sway the public through the press. However, the relationship thus spawned between the organization and the press was strategic and adversarial. In two countries under study this policy was abandoned in favor of a collaborative relationship with the press. Press representatives were called in to attend internal briefings within the company; company representatives met frequently and informally with the press for exchanges of views and information. The results, in both cases, proved highly satisfying; distrust and misunderstanding receded.

These several instances are only illustrative of practices that have ethically generative potential. Also resonant, however, were the development of an international research team, in which young researchers from six nationalities devoted six days to work on issues of mutual understanding and respect; an Asia Pacific Workshop in which representatives of 14 countries met to hammer out business policies for the future; and a meeting of Eastern and Middle European Region representatives to consider future markets. Relational process was also evident in the company's communication with numerous "target audiences." In one initiative, for example, the company worked cooperatively with both international and local agencies to develop organ donor programs; in another, a Third World subsidiary set up a program to train youth in technical specialties within the company.

Interestingly, the result of many of these efforts has also been an incorporation of outside values into the corporation itself. For example, rather than seeing ecology activists as a threat to profitable enterprises, the chemical division developed an internal program dedicated to environmental protection; rather than simply letting unused drugs end up in landfills or in the hands of children, French managers took an active role in developing a drug recycling program; and rather than viewing bioethics

as an infringement on research rights, the company took an active role in championing an international policy of bioethics. In effect, external ethical concerns were now incorporated into company policies.

Conclusions

As I am proposing, it the globalization of a particular form of organization, termed modern, that furnishes the primary incitement to invectives of immorality. Yet, as we also find, the unlimited expansion of this organizational form is detrimental to its own existence. Ethical conflict and a deterioration in organizational efficacy are linked. However, as we scanned the postmodern terrain, we located a range of specifically relational practices that offered promise for both a reinvigorated organization, and the coordination of world peoples. Both the instantiation and efficacy of such practices were illustrated in the work of a multi-national pharmaceutical company. While there remain myriad questions to be explored, we find here possible hope for the globalization process. In particular, where nations, religions, ethnic enclaves, and political organizations operate chiefly to serve their own interests, the relational practices of the postmodern organization may serve as a positive force for livable ethics.

Footnote

(*) See for example, Berman (1983); Clegg (1990); Crozier, (1964); Frisby (1985); March and Simon (1958); see also Chpt.10 of the present work.