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Introduction

What I call middle-class society is any society that becomes rigidified in predetermined forms, forbidding all evolution, all gains, all progress, all discovery. I call middle-class a closed society in which life has no taste, in which the air is tainted, in which ideas and men are corrupt. And I think that a man who takes a stand against this death is in a sense a revolutionary. (Fanon, 1967, p. 224)

Today’s middle managers can act in ways to enhance their chances of promotion within an organisation, if, while simultaneously serving self-interest, they also choose to serve both “tops and bottoms” (Oshry, 1994). Consequently, middle managers need to be in constant temporal and spatial compromise: they must show multiple allegiances by maintaining diverse relationships while attending to task. Middle power decreases when perceptual boundaries become stonewalled to the extent that synchronistic consideration of other(s’) contextual spaces is eliminated. Without the desire to better invest through paradigmatic transformation, the middle manager is unable to become divested of ‘bad’ values, attitudes and beliefs, which therefore, impedes leadership toward the establishment of ‘good’ cultural norms (Hall, 1990). By learning to co-create negative capability (French, 2001) middle managers can help self and others instead of self or others. This passage through space and time occurs by continually moving through intermediaries to split differences between contraries or between master or slave (Aristotle, circa 344-322 BC/1961; Hegel, 1807/1977). To survive in today’s organisations, middle managers need to be, synchronistically, masters and slaves. In post-modern parlance, being well in the middle is to do well as servant leader (Daft, 1998; Greenleaf, 1998, 2003; Kofman & Senge, 1995; Senge, 1990; Wituk et al., 2003). Being a servant leader means achieving perfection of life and perfection of work by doing more than what is expected now. It means being and doing to achieve results that cannot yet be fathomed but for ends that one has faith will better society as a whole later by serving one person at a time, now:

Serving….requires that the concerned individual accept the problems he or she sees in the world as his or her own personal task, as a means of achieving his or her own integrity. He or she sees the external manifestation of this internal achievement as beginning with caring for individual persons, in ways that require dedication and skill and that help them grow and become healthier, stronger, and more autonomous. The servant will move from this to larger spheres of influence, leading and showing the way to larger groups – institutions, perhaps vast culture-shaping institutions. One consequence of the contemporary revolution, as I see it, is that there will not be enough trust in any other kind of leader to make a viable society possible. (Greenleaf, 1970/2003, p. 37)

Psychodynamically, being and doing well in the middle entails continual moving away from modern times’ ‘bad’ egoistic defences toward post-modern times’ ‘good’ egoistic offences. This means enacting synchronous splitting of differences between the ‘bad’ and ‘good’ of self and others, because self and others are at the same time, ‘good’ and ‘bad’. However, lack of desire, anxiety, and or inability to do or to make these changes creates the post-modern mid-life crisis and fear of stagnation. We are masters and slaves (Carr, 2003a; Hegel, 1807/1977); leaders and servants and paradoxically, splitting is the means by which different personalities are able come together to share in servant leadership. The purpose of this paper is to explore the necessity to have to halve to have while being in the middle in changing time’s space.

Methodology

By following Czander, Jacobsberg, Mersky, & Nunberg’s (2002) lead to reread a case study for its deeper and alternative implications, we apply a different analytic lens to data from a wider qualitative study on shared authority and control or degrees to which employees were allowed to be self-directed in the initiation and use of organisational and personal development processes (Boychuk-Lapp, 1999). The organisation studied was one for-profit company, Partners’ that provided business education programs to adult students who had lost or who were about to lose their jobs. Data presented were gathered through semi-structured interviews of Partner’s chief executive officer
(CEO) Brett’s, chief officer of operations (COO) Dale’s, and the middle managers (MM), comprised of Robbie’s, Pete’s, and Pat’s views on sharing authority and control as the organisation reacted to environmental complexity and instability. Partners was experiencing environmental pressure from government modifications to revenue sourcing:

Now we’re dealing with the whole new system of student finance which has just changed in Alberta. We’re always on a learning curve. Everyone is because everything is always in a state of flux in this business.

(Brett, CEO)

Robbie, Pete, and Pat’s positions were middle management because as operations managers and classroom instructors they were between the tops or the executive layer and the bottoms, the administrative-secretarial and then customer layers of respectively, the organisation’s internal and external environment:

There is one staff in the classroom for 12 clients. They are working with these different individuals, one-on-one with a support group behind them. But, they are the company when they are in that classroom.

(Brett, CEO)

Data revealed here help illustrate the undercurrents of being in the middle of master and slave and servant leader from perceptions of those in changing time’s middle space. Where relevant, we continue to interject with organisational studies data and analysis to illustrate the theory. We commence our discussion on a philosophical note, initially turning our attention to the works of Aristotle and Hegel.

Separate Connections: Pre-postmodern middles

On the surface, the notion of servant leadership seems to be oxymoronic: How is it that one can use the development of self-consciousness to understand that at the same time, one needs to be a server so as to be served? To answer this question, we first need to provide a foundation for the concept of ‘middleness’ by articulating Aristotle’s (circa 344-322 BC/1961) conceptualizations of “contrariety” (pp. 313-315) and “the nature of intermediaries” (pp. 320-321). We then look to Hegel’s (1807/1977) conceptualization of “lordship and bondage” (pp. 111-119) or what is more widely known as the dialectic relationship between master and slave (Carr, 2003a).

The mechanics of middles: Aristotle

Aristotle’s Unity and Kindred Notions: Book I (circa 344-322 BC/1961), uses the concept of contraries to label opposite extremes and establish the space between them. For example, Figures 1a and 1b below show that on a one dimensional plane X, ‘good’ and ‘bad’, providing they are considered within the same genus or that they are logically and reasonably descriptive of the same genus “… may differ from one another in a greater or less degree, but there is a maximum difference which I call contrariety” (Aristotle, 1956/1961, p. 313).

*Figure 1a. Plane X: More contrariety*  
*Figure 1b. Less contrariety*
The wider the distance between contraries, the more contrariety and therefore, the more definitive each extreme becomes. An extreme that loses its contrary can no longer exist because the differences between them no longer exist. This means without ‘bad’ there can be no ‘good’.

Figures 1a and 1b above, show the wider the distance separating each extreme, the more differences there are between them; and the shorter the distance between extremes, the more their relationship contains fewer differences. Figures 2a and 2b below, demonstrate that the closer one comes to one extreme, the more its contrary experiences privation, lack, or loss. The faster one comes closer to one extreme, the faster the other becomes deprived. So, the more ‘good’ something is the less ‘bad’ it becomes; and the more ‘bad’ something is the less ‘good’ it becomes while still being ‘good’ and ‘bad’ indicating that less contrariety produces more ambiguity.

For Aristotle, being in the middle, as depicted in Figures 2a and 2b below, means that one is neither ‘good’ nor ‘bad’ but is some of each: “…contraries admit of an intermediate, and in the great majority of cases have one, intermediates must be composed out of contraries” (p. 320). It follows that because extremes are extremes they cannot become any more or less of themselves. But, the plane in which extremes reside becomes more or less of each contrary depending upon the direction in which the intermediary moves. It is not therefore, only the contraries that have the intermediary, but also the plane or space the contraries construct. Thus, every plane or space has varying degrees of ambiguity and ambivalence.

*Figure 2a. Plane X: Example of intermediary differences*  
*Figure 2b. Plane X: Splitting differences*
The space changes when its contraries' intermediary, their mean, becomes more of the extreme it nears and less of the extreme from which it travels. For instance, before one can move toward 'good' and therefore, privation of 'bad' there must be movement through or change to the intermediary, 'okay'. As its path is road blocked by each extreme, the intermediary remains held between them and is therefore still comprised of its contraries but to differing degrees. More important, if only this one space, X, is considered, the intermediate is the only aspect that can change the entire plane. As it moves from one extreme toward and away from the other, the intermediary’s movement changes the character of the entire plane. Within the space, every shift creates a new distance or space between extremes, thereby creating a new and different intermediary, at the same time. New intermediaries split the distance and therefore the differences between new extremes, which are actually, for the space itself, less extreme. The question now becomes, what is it that leverages, one way or another, the existing intermediary? That lever is an intersecting plane Y that changes plane X’s intermediary and plane X and creates a new multidimensional plane XY:

Now from the contraries there arises something such that change reaches it before reaching the contraries; for there must be something that is less than the one and more than the other. (Aristotle, circa 344-322 BC/1961, p. 321)

With time and over time, the more splits there are moving in the same direction, the fewer the differences; and the more the extremes come together as can also be seen in Figure 2b. If (any of) the intermediary(ies) never change(s), the space never changes. For Aristotle, on a one dimensional plane, the means justify the ends.

Changes to the plane of ‘good’ and ‘bad’ occur when one or many of its intermediaries moves to become more of one extreme than the other or by splitting differences that are triggered by intersections of other planes of contrary differentiae such as activity and passivity:

Wherefore, this intermediate differentia also comes between the contrary differentiae, as the intermediate species come between the contrary species. Hence all the other intermediates also are composite; for that which as a quality in a higher degree than X and in a lower degree than Y must be somehow composed of both X and Y. (Aristotle, circa 344-322 BC/1961, p. 321)

This also means that each plane has more than one intermediary or that each given segment of the plane has its own intermediary differentia or attribute. Intersections between or among planes occurs at various intermediaries. These changes are experienced together:

Instead of supposing that different contents (such as sound and a flash of light) are experienced together by virtue of falling under a single awareness, we say that these contents are ‘co-conscious’; that is, they are joined by the basic relationship of ‘being experienced together’. (Dainton, 2001, p. 104)

Within changing time’s space, if any plane, regardless of its constituent extremes, does not have an intermediary that can be influenced or split by other planes so it can continually split its own plane, the intermediary’s plane and the point of intersection where it meets another plane, are stable and over time, become stagnant:
Think of water flowing over a stone in a riverbed. The water contains the stone, but the water in contact with the stone is constantly changing; consequently, if we were to say that the stone’s place is the inner surface of the surrounding water, we would be committing ourselves to the view that the stone was constantly changing place, which is absurd. So Aristotle suggests that we identify the stone’s place with the inner surface of the nearest stationary body: the river bed. (Dainton, 2001, p. 339)

Here, the contraries are the river and the bed. One intermediary is the water. The stone is an intersecting plane or another space that continually changes the path of the water and therefore, the characteristics of the river bed. Leave the stone where it lays and by virtue of variables such as evaporation and flow-speed, the water continually changes the plane; move the stone and again, the water changes the riverbed. If the water freezes, if it does not move, the riverbed remains the same. A shifting intermediary continually works to split the distance between the contraries’ differentiae so as to shift the character of or add dimensionality to the plane. What cannot be recognized is the absolute degree to which the riverbed has changed, other than in one specious moment of time. That which is experienced together over time, or which is co-conscious, is only transitive for a limited period of time (Dainton, 2001). Because the rock is inanimate it does not have a self-conscious and so to move so as to keep from being eroded, it must be dependent upon some intersecting intermediary in space in time -- unless the placement of the rock changes, the points of erosion will not change and eventually, the rock will dissolve.

Partners with Aristotle

Partner’s is analogous to being the rock, in the company’s environment, the riverbed was being constantly changed by consumers’ needs, the water. If Partner’s, as one intermediary in the market space, did not change its position by offering better services to a new client base, over time the organisation would erode and dissolve. Consequently, Partners’ general spatial and temporal plane needed to change for the better. From a strategic perspective, Partners recruited and hired only those who during the interview process and probationary period of employment demonstrated the willingness to be more rather than less independent. The need for these types of employees was to change Partner’s service plane from one offering education to highly skilled displaced, employees with more disposable income to those who were less skilled and less affluent. In this way, privation of ‘bad’ company (i.e. not being able to meet market needs) occurred by hiring intermediaries who were ready, willing, and able in changing times to attend to the new market, making Partners’ better:

...there is continuous change in the community in which we work in. The environment in which we work in changes and students’ needs change. Five years ago especially, we found that people with very high skills but with a lot of resources were being laid off. Now, we’re getting into a much lower level of skilled people without the money to spend.
We have had success in hiring people who have a lot of pride in their own professionalism....They are always looking at improving things.

(Brett, CEO)

We are different in that when we hire people we try to hire people who are better than ourselves. It is their attitude that is most important. Not necessarily that they want to change the world but that they want to make things a little better.

(Dale, COO)

Officially I am the facilitator for the self-employment program. [Unofficially, I am] Mother Hen. It’s never been said but I do most of the scheduling. I take on all the hard clients. I take on all the difficult things. I’ve done a lot of work with them coordinating the marking materials just because I have the skills and the aptitude. As well I have the background that handles the programs. If someone is sick or if something goes wrong I go in.

(Pat, MM)

My role is to facilitate in a self-employment program offering small business training and counselling both in class in one-on-one situations. Those are primarily my main
roles. Unofficial roles end up being computer guy, Mr. Fix-it – yesterday, I fixed the answering machine. I also provide unofficial support to some of the employees. I take on things that need to be done. They need to be done, so I just do them.

(Peter, MM)

I am responsible for doing all the marketing of the different programs – selling them to our funders and customers. I spend a lot of time out in the community talking to different service providers and going out to various human resources offices and basically doing a lot of networking. I do all of the advertising brochures, marketing materials, and then I do all of the screening – screening potential students for entry into the various programs.

(Robbie, MM)

Hiring employees who were ready, willing and able to meet environmental changes, parallels the water moving over the rock: Partners used intermediaries to lessen the amount of contrariety between itself and the marketplace. More important, out of the three MM’s, Pat and Pete were practised at doing more than what was boundaryed in job descriptions. However, Partner’s composition would also have to change because it would have as its intermediaries, employees always looking for change, which of course and especially in terms of resource expenditures, is ‘good’ and ‘bad’:

Pete is always working on his spreadsheet skills. He is always looking at spreadsheets and asking, ‘well, if we change this formula, will this work?’ So, he is continually updating it, which is very frustrating for some of the rest of us – ‘Well, that doesn’t work like it did last week’ – ‘Well, I (Pete) fixed it, I changed it’.

(Brett, CEO)

On the intake before, I would do one thing, Sammy would walk in and do another and then Pete would come in and do another. It was becoming a mess. The partners don’t always like what I have to say but they listen and they acknowledge it and they are not intimidated by it. It just wasn’t balanced. So they [executives] balanced it out.

(Pat, MM)

On the one hand, hiring people practised at being positively reactive and proactive to change can result in various degrees of adverse consequences or the creation of an intersecting plane. From a temporal perspective, taking more time to find employees to fill the right gap at the right time ensures faster organisational change. Because Partner’s wanted to decrease contrariety between what services it offered the community or riverbed and what the community needed, change in organisational bedrock to help stabilize unemployment rates, Partners created increased ambiguity by slowly hiring those who would most quickly be what the organisation wanted and these were change makers, the water.

We do understand that using such a narrative has its own rocks. Drawing lessons for space and time from the natural sciences is fraught with danger regarding issues such as reification etc., but it does highlight some issues that could be posed in the social sciences. It is in such a context that this concept of dissolution can be gainfully explored, in our view, through the work of Hegel (1807/1977). It is Hegel who speaks to the dialectic plane of self and other that has as its intermediaries self-consciousness and desire, the movements of which split this plane so self becomes more like other that becomes more like self.

Neither self nor other; neither master nor slave: Hegel’ relationships of middles

In Phenomenology of Spirit, Hegel (1807/1977) puts forward Aristotle-like extremes that are “lordship and bondage” (pp. 111-119) or master (M) and slave (S) and within this plane, the intermediary is self-consciousness (SC).

Figure 3. Plane Y
According to Rycroft (1968), the term self is “...the subject regarded as an AGENT, as being aware of his own IDENTITY and of his role as subject and agent” (p. 149); and so, self-consciousness is: “...awareness of the possibility that someone else is aware of oneself” (p. 149). For Hegel, the reality of self and self-consciousness can only occur through recognition by an other’s self-consciousness in a life process of attempts to minimize contrariety.

Similar to Aristotle, Hegel believes that movement in the space between extremes occurs, but that this movement is dependent upon recognition by slave of master. Therefore, with Hegel in Aristotle and Aristotle in Hegel, the intermediary between slave and master is self-consciousness that is mutually constituted by both extremes: “Outside of space and without the other, I am lost” (Strohmayer, 1997, p. 165). This is to say that without recognition by master there can be no slave; and without recognition by slave, there can be no master. For our purposes, more important is the parallel to Aristotle’s notion of non-existence in the spatial plane: in self-consciousness, if there is no master there cannot be a slave; but if there are both, self-consciousness as dependent, independent intermediary is comprised of both master and slave and to differing degrees, depending on the states of self and other’s self-consciousness.

**Figure 4. Spaces X and Y = X and Y and Z**

As shaped by self-consciousness, the characteristics of the relationship, in terms of how good and how bad, are contextually bound and reside in that space where flux of dependent, independence occurs. In the case of Figure 4 above, Plane Y’s intersection or split of Plane X creates four quadrants, which now have their own contraries and intermediaries. In its entirety, this, new space Z, is comprised of elements that when taken together, create a whole that is different than just the sum of its pieces. Such synthesis and synergy occur because:

The independent members are for themselves; but this being-for-itself is really no less immediately their reflection into the unity than this unity is the splitting-up into independent shapes. The unity is divided within itself because it is an absolutely negative or infinite unity; and because it is what subsists, the difference, too, has independence only in it. (Hegel, 1807/1977, p. 107)
In Adorno’s (1963/1998) view, object and subject separation is both existent and token. It is real by virtue of the contrariety between object and subject that becomes unmediated truth, and over time, an ideology. Specifically, the subject comes to believe itself capable of attaining unconditional independence, which creates dependence upon that ideology from fear of being undifferentiated from or engulfed by the other. If the other can be conquered; if the other can be made to be like self, then self cannot be consumed by other: a much different someone else cannot engulf and de-differentiate me.

If, within this space, there is only the process of one conquest or one split, which is that the master always recognizes the slave to be slave and the slave’s self-consciousness always recognizes the other to be master, the change to that space will be that the master, regardless of other intersections or splits, remains dependent upon the slave and that for both master and slave, the result is privation of independence. On the other hand, if that space continually splits, if the self-conscious recognizes there to be more than one intermediary or alternative others in the plane, more spaces or shapes are created and destroyed to develop self-consciousness, which in that space, creates change and therefore, individualism, differentiation, and identity:

Thus the simple substance of Life is the splitting-up of itself into shapes and at the same time the dissolution of these existent differences; and the dissolution of the splitting-up is just as much a splitting-up and a forming of members. (Hegel, 1807/1977, p. 108)

This is to say that intermediaries propel self-consciousness by dividing and conquering differences so the space between master and slave is decreased: “… All distinctions are mind, by mind, in mind, of mind. No distinctions no mind to distinguish” (Laing, 1971, p. 82).

At first, the master negates the slave, because of the desire to control the other as the means to become only for itself, the treating it as an object to use to satisfy desire:

Desire wishes to have the other, control the other, assert itself as the center, the real, the significant, but in fact it illuminates the resistance, the independence, the difficulty of having, the other. It illuminates the other’s reality. (Kain, 1998, p. 110)

The slave is the means by which desire for differentiation is attained. The master becomes more dependent upon the slave but therefore, over time, more de-differentiated from the slave. Over time and through continual work for the master, the slave learns how to become increasingly independent of the master, which is synonymous with privation of slave so that: “The slave’s self-consciousness is forced back on itself” (Carr, 2003a, p. 121). “The deeply meaningful paradox illustrated here is the master’s failure to see that he needed the other to recognize the fact that he does not need the other at all” (Carr, 2003a, p. 121; see also Bernstein, 1971, pp. 26-28; Kain, 1998, p. 111).

Additionally, it can be said that in a recursive process, once contrariety between master and slave is at its maximum minimum, one cannot tell the difference between the two. Figure 5 below, shows this state of engulfment or identity de-differentiation in terms of being ‘too good’ or at the topmost extreme. On a two dimensional plane master and slave in good and bad could mean that one becomes the best one can be in terms of being both lord and bondsman; a master who is also a willing servant. This occurs by splitting the space’s difference in the middle of ‘master’ and ‘good’ that splits and negates its contrary, ‘slave’ and ‘bad’ creating independent dependence or dependent independence located in the upper half of Figure 5. Alternatively, one can also become the worst that one can be by not recognizing the consequences of negative splitting or by maintaining a stagnate plane.

A downward spiral may occur so either the master nor slave ever overcome these failures. That is, neither the master nor the slave recognizes that at different times, their desires to be unlike each other makes them more of themselves, which means they remain at opposite poles. Or, if splitting does occur and its intermediary first becomes lodged between ‘master’ and ‘bad’, ‘good’ and ‘slave’ is negated. Realizing consequences from splitting is to determine the reasons for the split so the ends justify the means and so the new mean justifies the ends. If self-consciousness is being, then splitting differences is doing.

On the other hand, even if the master does not overcome the failure, time and both psychological and physical work should eventually enable the slave to realize that he [sic] needed the other but for only some period of time in some type of space to recognize the fact that he no longer needs the master. The corollary here of course, is that given the master’s unwillingness or incapability to recognize his dependence, the slave’s ability to escape ‘being’ a slave also
necessitates, for a time, ‘doing’ as a slave. This synthesis of such ‘being’ and ‘doing’ of course, results in action learning or re-experiencing leading to transformation. Desire is both a centring and decentring aspect that moves between contraries of self-consciousness and unconsciousness. That is, as long as desire continues to act as divisor to conquer differences between self-consciousness and unconsciousness, movement from one extreme (independence), without becoming one extreme or the other (dependence), can occur. The occurrence is that of transforming dependent, dependence or engulfment toward independent, independence or negation and isolation through dependent independence.

Table 1. *Dialectical Middles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Master</th>
<th>Desire for:</th>
<th>Dependence (D)</th>
<th>Independence (I)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependent (D)</td>
<td>Engulfment</td>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent (I)</td>
<td>Mutual Support</td>
<td>Isolation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is opportunity for privation of slave and privation of master -- the ability of self-consciousness to enable the process of becoming that which is synonymous with decreases or partial dissolution of contrariety. Desire is the intermediary of splitting and stagnation. In changing time’s space, both master and slave continually have to want to be self-conscious of self and other to have to halve to have to be like one another so as to negate one another to become free of one another.

Figure 5. Splitting differences to minimise domination and negation

Such mutually constituted self-consciousness, co-conscious, is the foundation for master’s recognition of self in slave and slave’s recognition of self in master:

In its proper place...the relationship of subject and object would lie in a peace achieved between human beings as well as between them and their other. Peace is the state of differentiation without domination, with the differentiated participating in each other. (Adorno, 1963/1998, p. 247)
Being both master and slave in a world of others means *halving to have* a subject to subject relationship rather than a subject to object relationship.

**Partners with Hegel**

From Adorno’s perspective, it is implied that regardless of circumstance, once people learn how to achieve peace, peace will remain. For Partners the overriding belief was that the organisation and its employees were dependently independent upon one another. That is, during times when neither state of master nor slave was perceived, there was residence in a state of peace.

If you set up a workspace that has respect for people and treats them with dignity and respect, and has a philosophy of professionalism, that what I call a quality workspace. There is a capacity to recognize individual skills and individual needs within the framework of the task that has to be achieved. There’s always freedom for people to say ‘I’d like to look at this!’ and we’d say ‘Wow, great, look at it, let us know what happens and bring it back so we can look at it!’ If this were a lousy place to work and people were unhappy, of course they wouldn’t learn – they would be looking for work someplace else. They would probably say ‘It doesn’t make any difference what I do – the hell with it, I’ll just do my job’.

(Brett, CEO)

When people feel that they are being controlled, they have less tendency to want to learn something or want to do something – they have less enthusiasm. When I have choices, I have the personal control over learning. In the workplace, when you are respected you have the desire to learn more.

(Dale, COO)

Based on all my education there are certain soft skills that I know I need. So, I asked for some counselling training and some soft skills or people skills training. They saw that as something that I needed. I don’t feel that I need any more on the business side. I think that they recognized that I would take a little offence if they tried to give me more business skills training.

(Pete, MM)

If people are judging you and you feel that you are being judged – or even if you are not being judged but if you are feeling like you’re being judged or criticised – you are not comfortable with sticking your neck out. It’s a safe environment. One in which you are not being judged but where you are being supported through decisions. It’s also about not having people rescue you all the time.

(Pat, MM)

I told Brett that I had limited skills for using computers and he made an allowance for that. He gave me time to learn on my own and he guided me as well. I think that they appreciate the knowledge that I bring to the company...things that I have been learning along the way and bringing that knowledge to them. I think that it goes both ways.

(�bbie, MM)

However, peace is achieved and then destroyed when lack of diversity intervenes to create ‘war’. When contrariety between master and slave is at its maximum minimum, feelings of engulfment occur so more distance or isolation is the remedy. In Partners, both the CEO and MM’s would use isolation and negation, the CEO to ensure company resources were being used to satisfy the company first, and the employee second or not at all. At the same time members of MM used threats of isolating themselves from the company as leverage to maintain de-differentiation:

We’re not a big company. If someone wants to learn something that’s irrelevant to the company we may support them to do that. We support our people. We say go out and do as long as we see that it will relate to the company or a future role in the company. If they want to go and take sanscrit, well, I don’t think I could support that.
I learn at quite a quick pace and I get bored. And, if I don’t have some job variety soon, they will lose me and they know that. I need to branch out into some of these areas to keep my interest up.

They are in a people business. Their people business counts on the people working there. I think that they have learned that the hard way in the last six months. They have learned that if they find someone who is valuable and a good contributor that the organisation had better keep him or her and had also better keep him or her happy.

Within Partner’s one can see that through testing and applying values and voicing their needs, leaders and two of their middle employees were attempting to minimize contrariety by negotiating middle ground. Pat and Pete had both realized that because they had been recognized and ipso facto been rewarded by Partners as being change leaders, they have more freedom within the organisation. More important, both Pat and Pete realized that in order to survive, they really did not need Partners at all. On the other hand, Robbie had not reached that stage of independence and this also was recognized in the organisation and in different ways:

I had met Dale and a previous manager at a workshop and the job sounded really intriguing so I came over. I went through three interviews which were pretty intense. I needed a change desperately. I had been in my previous job for over eight years and I was tired of it. I was doing a lot of career counselling which I enjoyed but I just needed a change.

I have heard of other people being involved in different things. Some people are able to do things that they are interesting that don’t really mesh with their current jobs. Back in January or February, I was supposed to attend a course but it fell by the wayside and was cancelled on our part at the last minute. Dale was supposed to make the arrangements but he left it until the last minute.

I was given the opportunity to facilitate some government round table think tanks. Well, I went to Dale to talk to him about it. His first comment was ‘are you getting paid for it?’ I said, ‘I don’t know. I didn’t ask’. He said ‘if you want we’ll pay you for that day if you say that you are one of our facilitators’. He saw it as an opportunity for me to learn and grow. And he also saw it as an opportunity to get their name out there. They provide us with time. I wouldn’t say that everyone gets that. I think that it is something that you earn around here. If you give, they give you back. I challenge management in places where they don’t want to be challenged and Partners accepts that. I needed a little time to do a few things and it was given to me without question. I know that other people have asked for this time and have not been given it. So I think that it depends on who you are.

From the leaders’ perspectives, intrapersonal doubts about one of the MM’s abilities or value created negative splits that reintroduced contrariety or isolation and negation within Robbie. In a downward split, the more distance the executive placed between the weakest middle, Robbie, the more isolated Robbie became because no or less time was given to meet her needs in comparison to that which was offered to Pat. Francis-Smythe & Robertson (1999) suggest for caregivers, processing time or time to think and to do is appreciated more than clock time. Clock time is valued more by caretakers or those who are more devoted to task than relationship within that plane. The time or lack of time given to Robbie in the Partners Robbie plane fell to ‘bad’ clock time (see Chaplin, 1994, p. 415) when what was wanted was ‘good’ process time.

In Partners, the middle ground also changed for any employee who wanted to be supported by the company for something the CEO could not fathom to benefit the company in either the short or
long term, which once again intimates a clock time orientation. This caused contrariety to increase and ambiguity to decrease so as to make it clear about who was master and who was not. Such separations or alienation of worker from work process are vestiges of pre-modern and modern management, such as Taylorism (Boje, 1995; Boje & Rosile, 2001; Boje & Winsor, 1993; Carr, 1994a; Robbins, Coulter, & Langton, 2006).

In contrast, it can also be seen that the two stronger MM’s considered ways and means of minimizing contrariety by maintaining their stance of master, at least within their own domain, which is not surprising. One would rather remain as master of some space than fall to slave of all spaces: ‘Personality’ thus entails not merely a choice of, and adherence to, ‘certain ultimate “values” and “meanings of life” but also the choice of, and adherence to, a particular life-sphere. Weber’s point here is that this-worldly rational-teleological action in modernity can only express itself through labour in a given life-sphere, where this labour involves commitment to norms and obligations which are irreconcilable with those of the other life-spheres … (Owen, 1998)

These modern middle managers chose to protect self-interest using their resources to serve those at the top albeit at the expense of those at the bottom, the customer, once again perpetuating past privileges such as those during feudalism (Hornstein, 2003; Ketelbey, 1929; Krahm & Lowe, 1988; Sjoberg, 1965; Thompson, 1967; Whipp, 1987). Such downward spirals are indicative of non-productive conflict resolution that has as its constituents forcing, accommodation, and avoidance (Clarke, 2001; Crocker, 2002; Geller, 2002). Forcing creates a co-dependent relationship between the accommodators and the forcer, which results in collusive relationships (Argyris, 2004; Kets de Vries, 1991, 1995, 2001; Kets de Vries & Miller, 1989; Lubit, 2004). For Cupack and Spitzberg (1998) this is a fatal attraction as accommodators’ paradigms slowly dissolve and eventually become engulfed by that of the forcer. Engulfment creates the “closed community — one in which a sense of reality gradually disappears and in which practices that would be considered questionable or even irrational in other companies go unchallenged” (Kets de Vries, 1995, p. 207). Such manifestations recreate the master or slave paradigm in organisational relationships (Quinn, 1996).

Aristotle in Hegel means that intermediaries and changes to them are required to change a spatial plane. Hegel in Aristotle indicates that self-consciousness determines the degree to which one believes he or she is or will become master or slave. Movement toward or from either pole is completed by splitting differences of contrariety. What is good for one subject may be bad for the object as was seen through the CEO’s willingness to meet only certain types of MM needs and not the needs of all MM’s or by meeting only the needs of the company and none of the MM’s.

Intrapersonal domination and negation transitions to interpersonal domination and negation when one psychological structure interacts with at least one other, an object, and all parties attempt to minimize displeasures of the object’s unwanted influences. The next part of this paper expands upon this important issue and provides an overview of domination and negation in the realm of object relations. The following is a discussion an application of the psychodynamics of splitting that is both a defensive and offensive reaction to change.

The process of splitting in object relations to join object relationships

The basis for psychoanalytic object-relations theory (Klein, 1975a-d) is the primal interpersonal relationship between the mother or object who is the newborn’s or subject’s first attachment. Klein believes that the release of instincts always presupposes an object interacting with the subject such that objects and memories and perceptions, illusions or fantasies they trigger create two dispositions of relating to the world: one sourced from reassurance and life or Eros; and the other from persecution and death or Thanatos (Carr, 2003b, 2003c; Freud, 1920/1984, 1923/1984). Reassurance’s manifestations are adoration, care, and love. Persecution is comprised of destructiveness, hatred, envy, and spite that emerge because all the infant understands is that ‘perceived’ unwanted experiences, such as separations from the breast and therefore the mother, by the mother, are only ‘bad’. In the earliest time’s of primal object relations, the mother is master and the infant is slave. During times when adults feel persecuted or during a downward spiral toward dependent dependence or independent independence, they revert to infantile psychological activities of splitting and projective identification.
The ‘good’ and the ‘bad’ of the paranoid schizoid position

Primal interpersonal relationships are in fact, based in ambiguity and paradox of mutual causalities, as Figure 6 above illustrates. The infant idealizes the ‘good’ breast and projects love onto it because through the transfer of milk (Suttie, 1935), it triggers feelings of contentment that are absorbed or introjected by the infant: these feelings represent the mother’s reassurance, which is life sustaining.

This ‘good’ object also confounds the infant because it inspires a degree of envy from the emphasis of the infant’s need and dependence upon it. During unwanted disruptions of milk or separations from the breast, the infant experiences the good object as being outside its control, because the infant cannot have what it wants, when it wants it. Because of the undeveloped ability to understand paradox, in the child’s mind, the breast becomes simultaneously, a frustrating, terrifying, omnipotent ‘bad’ object that is perceived to have the persecutory power to destroy both the infant and the ‘good’ object, causing the feeling of negation from this domination. Figure 6 above, illustrates the development of the infant’s loss of self in the space of domination and negation. This space is created when the infant perceives itself, at the same time, to be slave to unwanted separations from and unwanted dependence on the breast. For the infant, the ambiguousness and paradoxical nature of master slave mutual causality causes acute, intrapersonal conflict and anxiety as shown below in Figure 7a.

Through a psychodynamic process called splitting, the child minimizes conflict by attempting to maximize clarity. Splitting, as shown below in Figure 7b, is a psychodynamic in which there is an exaggeration of differences between good and bad objects, to eliminate ‘gray’ areas and to create a ‘black and white picture so part of the object becomes either all ‘good’ or reassuring and the other, all ‘bad’ or persecutorial. Klein termed this as a paranoid-schizoid position, highlighting “the persecutory character of the anxiety and … the schizoid nature of the mechanisms at work” (Laplanche & Pontalis, 1988, p. 298). Anxiety from ambiguity causes the infant to create a false reality that allows persecutorial feelings to dominate.

In an attempt to remove the cause of anxiety derived from the affective state of persecution, destructive urges such as hate and spite emanate but are not wanted by the infant so, as also seen in Figure 7b below, they are projected and contained in the ‘bad’ object: “… a relationship to the original bad object has been created from the destructive force of the death instinct for the purpose of containing the threats posed by that instinct” (Mitchell & Black, 1995, p. 93; see also Suttie, 1935). Setting perceptual boundaries around the ‘bad object’ to prevent its escape from the container is meant to allow unfettered development of the ‘good’ object, or the ‘good’ part of the infant that is supposed to emerge from the split. However, like a slave, the infant is envious of the mother’s power to give and take the breast; to have something the infant does not. The feeling state of envy does not allow a nurturing yield to the split to allow adequate amounts of Eros to emerge and minimize domination and negation. Consequently, the needed ‘good’ core cannot materialize. Klein in Aristotle and Hegel means that due to mutual causation of self and other, what the infant has projected into that space it must also introject from that space so the infant’s self-conscious itself becomes split into ‘good’ and ‘bad’ (Rycroft, 1968).

In a simultaneous process called projective identification, the infant induces in the mother, the feelings toward the bad object for which she must take responsibility: “There is a malevolent breast...
trying to destroy me, and I am trying to escape from and also destroy the bad breast” (Mitchell & Black, 1995, p. 93). In this way the infant attempts to make the mother feel guilty for disrupting the flow of milk, which represented her reassurance. Making the mother feel guilty is an act of self-preservation because the response will be to give the infant what it wants. For the infant, this summons forth Eros to negate Thanatos’ domination. If the mother allows herself to feel guilty, her ego will allow Thanatos to emerge. When these activities are synchronized the slave space is split. As Figures 7a and 7b below depict, the combination of splitting and projective identification changes slave space by splitting it to increase contrariety that will allow the infant to minimize ambiguity. Yet, the wider split, the more isolation because without ‘bad’ there cannot be ‘good’.

Klein’s mother and infant relationship parallels that of the master and slave relationship during feared changing time’s separations from the ‘loved’ object or the object upon which one learns to depend. The fear of having given love rejected stratifies feelings of being a slave as much as the fear of being dependent. In changing time’s space, no or not enough splitting creates feelings of engulfment and the result of too much splitting is isolation and negation:

The feeling that our gifts (love) are not accepted is as intolerable as the feeling that others’ gifts are no longer obtainable. Yet one or the other of these two feelings may dominate individual life. The former feeling (of unwantedness) plays a dominant part in anxiety and frustration symptoms, the latter likewise contributes to aggression. (Suttie, 1935, p. 40)

While in normal development we build reflexivity and wisdom to pass through this phase, the paranoid-schizoid position is a constant threat because through memory and fantasy, it is always available to us and so can never be truly transcended in adulthood.

**Splitting manifestations in Partners**

Argyris (1957, 1964) has established that adults leave states of maturity and move toward immaturity when they are confronted with situations of having: a) lack of control over their work; b) their conceptual skills ignored; c) specialized work tasks; and d) to sacrifice parts of their self-concept in order to maintain production. This is synonymous with a minimization of participative management, empowerment and non-recognition of the slave by the master. In other words, when the ‘mother’ does not do what the infant believes it is supposed to do, ambiguity is generated that moves the affected employee toward immaturity. Such immaturity becomes manifested in flight and/or flight behaviors (Starke & Sexty, 1998) and the sequencing of these is analogous to splitting and projective identification.
So I think that here the attitude is that it will happen and it's not necessarily taking a workshop – it's something that happens all of the time. On the one hand though learning is supposed to happen but it doesn't really seem to be recognized the way it should be. I think that you need to feel comfortable about learning.

(Robbie, MM)

The day before the workshop I found out that there was no room for me. I was disappointed with that. It left me feeling that there wasn't a real commitment there. I was advised that I wasn't going and it was just left at that. So I don't know if there is a real commitment on their part.

(Robbie, MM)

[Interviewer] Did you talk to [anyone] about it?
[Robbie] No, not really in depth. I was just advised that I wasn't going and it was just left at that.

The thing that keeps me from learning is fear…the fear of feeling stupid. I think that sometimes that time is also a factor. I have to get certain things done during the day and I feel guilty if I try to learn something before those things are done. I feel like I should not be doing things that may enhance my job but that I should be doing my job. I feel guilty because I don't want people to think that I am wasting my time or to question why I am doing that.

(Robbie, MM)

When Robbie’s maturity was threatened by non-recognition of efforts, Partners was split into a ‘bad’ non-supportive container. Not only were Robbie’s feelings of persecution projected into this space, Partners was also blamed. Similarly, such an understanding might alert us to the inclination to idealize leaders that not only carries a set of unreal expectations of them, but simultaneously alerts us to the manner in which we seem to largely relieve ourselves of a responsibility to reflect and consider issues on their merits. Avoidance of conflict can also be embodied by blaming, lying, and misreporting organizational facts (Gibson & Schroeder, 2003; Waung & Highhouse, 1997). Robbie did not take any responsibility for not supplying feedback to Partners; instead the working assumption was that the company did not care. Robbie could not understand why on the one hand, Partner’s supported self-directedness at some times but not at others and with ongoing flight/fight iterations such as these, full knowledge would never be obtained to change Robbie’s position.

When the rules change too rapidly and when the outcomes are perceived to result as reminders of persecution, self-efficacy is minimized. Expectancy theory reminds us that this affects motivation. The outcome is change that results in regression to the mean, toward the state of zero energy and privation of initiative. As motivation to participate in future change nears zero then, the expectancy that future change will be successful is also near zero. Research shows that middle managers are perceived to be especially resistant to change because of the amount of resources needed to continually change but only to achieve the same results (Brooks, 2003; Davis & Fisher, 2002; Hoag, Ritschard, & Cooper, 2002; Huy, 2002; Spreitzer & Quinn, 1996).

When it is believed that worldviews are not appropriately lionized, feelings of persecution arise that erode of self-esteem and self-efficacy, thereby degrading self-concept, which leads to powerlessness (Geller, 2002). To minimize these effects, psychological perceptual distortions (Scherm hern, Hunt, & Osborn, 2003) manifest themselves in defense behaviors that are used to protect identity. Reflexive shortcuts help form illusions or delusions that any change from learning or otherwise will separate the self from personal values or beliefs, which is instrumental in producing change resistance or avoidance (French, 2001). Alternatively, identity sustainment creates potential for change acceptance, and perhaps change leadership, which are propelled by physical and mental “energy and hope” (Carr & Gabriel, 2001, p. 419).

Klein’s ‘good’ and ‘bad

When the child becomes mature enough it begins to feel shame for hating a loved object “toward whom the child feels deep gratitude and concern” (Mitchell & Black, 1995, p. 95). In offensive effort, the child may seek to deny or disavow (Freud, 1940/1986) the reality of the persecutory object because the infant feels shame and becomes depressed about hating a loved object. The process transitions the infant into what Klein labels the depressive position or the understanding that it can
simultaneously hate and love the same breast without persecution as the feeling of persecution from within, has subsided. According to Alford (1989) and Rycroft (1968) the paranoid schizoid position is generally defined as an anxiety ridden state developed from fear of persecution that allows the infant to mismanage release of the death instinct that results in self and other splitting and fragmentation. Ultimately, the purpose of the depressive position is to resolve conflict from losses of the loved object that with integration of Hegel means loss of self. The depressive position is actually the ways and means to minimise negation of self while moving toward caring for others. So for long periods of time one instinct’s domination -- especially the death instinct -- over the other is not allowed to occur. Precursory experiences to splitting and splitting itself are required to transform the depressive position from ‘good’ to ‘better’. This process can be very painful such as when the right splits are made for the wrong reasons and when incorrect splits are needed for the right reasons, which generates moral anxiety, shame, and guilt (Badcock, 1988). No matter what form representation takes, significant time and energy are needed to relinquish a loved object so physically and psychologically, splitting can be an uncomfortable time and energy consuming compromise:

...orders cannot be obeyed at once.... They are carried out bit by bit.... Why this compromise by which the command of reality is carried out piecemeal should be so extraordinarily painful is not at all easy to explain in terms of economics. It is remarkable that this painful unpleasure is taken as a matter of course by us. (Freud, 1917/1984, p. 253)

Being in the depressive position means being able to survive in a space that is not so totally secure that it creates feelings of engulfment nor so totally insecure so as to create perceptions of negation and isolation that are depicted below, in Figure 8. Such a balance reintegrates the infant and mother and creates experiences and memories of being in a reassuring interpersonal relationship. The mother-child relationship however (to the child’s mind) is a true, balanced symbiosis; and the need-to-give is as vital, therefore, as the need-to-get” (Suttie, 1935, p. 40).

Figure 8. A depressive position

The reintegration of infant and mother demonstrates each other’s recognition of self and other as master and slave at the same time but at different times. This is symbolic of learning that is a precursor of transitioning from immaturity to maturity required for paradigmatic transformation:

While the improvement in John’s capacity to conceive the condition of the inside of his mother’s body led to a greater ability to understand and appreciate the outer world, the reduction of his inhibition against really knowing about the inside of his own body at the same time led to a deeper understanding and better control of his own mental processes; he could then clear up and bring order into his own mind. The first resulted in a greater capacity to take in knowledge; the second entailed a better ability to work over, organize and correlate the knowledge obtained, and also to give
it out again, i.e. return it, formulate it or express it – and advance in ego-development. (Klein, 1931, p. 125)

In psychodynamic space, the depressive position has been construed to be ‘good’ being; and paranoid schizoid position, ‘bad’ doing, which in itself is a false depressive position. By enveloping the notion of contraries, it follows that the depressive position is also ‘bad’. One might come to believe that the depressive position has been reached because there are some ‘all good’ and some ‘all bad’ objects in their experience. Or, it might be that there is too much ‘good’ or too much ‘bad’ in any object. These are constituents of a false depressive position that can become stonewalled by the ‘bad’ parts of the paranoid schizoid position. Once the ideal (see ego ideal, Rycroft, 1968, p. 45) depressive position has been reached, no further splits between good and bad occur and adults may become habituated to their values, attitudes and beliefs to the extent that they never change regardless of that which goes on around them:

The depressive mode is one of integration, resolution, and containment, and if unopposed, leads to certainty, stagnation, closure, arrogance, and deadness (Bion, 1962, 1963; Eigen, 1985). (Ogden, 1989, p. 30)

If the ‘good’ depressive position has as its contrary a ‘bad’ paranoid schizoid position, then the corollary is that the ‘bad’ depressive position’s opposite extreme is the ‘good’ schizoid position. According to Alford (1989) and Ogden (1989), the paranoid schizoid position is ‘good’ because in normal development we build reflexivity and wisdom to pass through this phase so through memory and fantasy, it is a constant enabler that is always available to us and so can never be truly transcended in adulthood:

The paranoid-schizoid mode provides the necessary splitting of linkages and opening up of the closures of the depressive position, thus re-establishing the possibility of fresh linkages and fresh thoughts. The integrative thrust of the depressive mode in turn provides the necessary antithesis for the paranoid-schizoid mode in limiting the chaos generated by the fragmentation of thought, the discontinuity of experience, and the splitting of self and object. (Ogden, 1989, p. 30)

Depressing depressive position in Partners

The following shows that Robbie has reached a depressive position of the ‘good’ and ‘bad’ of self-directedness in Partners:

Yes I felt very uncomfortable learning about the business at work and I spent many of my own hours learning. [I felt] resentful because it’s my job and it should have been okay for me to do that kind of learning at work. Then Martha walked in and I thought that she would think that I was just wasting my time so I stopped. But I have never approached anyone with it.

(Robbie, MM)

I remember that before I took this job that I asked Dale about what was available for upgrading, education and taking courses. He said, ‘You know Robbie, everyday will be a learning opportunity’. I remember thinking gee that sounds great. So I think that the attitude is that it will happen it’s something that happens all of the time. It’s again being opened minded about seeing things differently. Things are very open and things are not hidden. I’m sure that there are a lot of things that happen that we don’t know about but I don’t feel that there are a lot of things that we aren’t told or that we need to know. On the one hand though, learning is supposed to happen but it doesn’t really seem to be recognized the way it should be. I think that you need to feel comfortable about learning.

(Robbie, MM)

The passage above shows there was no inclination to risk a change to that worldview perhaps because that change could bring persecutorial consequences such as not being able to have any self-directedness. Evidence of risk aversion and change captaining perhaps could have been manifested earlier with Robbie’s realization that something would have to be done to minimize
these feelings. One of these things would be to resplit that depressive position by adding the planes of being able to give and to take both constructive and flattering feedback. The fear of course, would be that the other would respond only negatively thus the depressive position is maintained and there is no hope for Robbie to obtain more truth or alternatives required for critical thinking (Meuser & Lapp, 2004). If Robbie would have tried to split this paradigm sooner rather than later, it would have been found that:

If someone feels very strongly that there is something here that we need to look at that is a learning opportunity, then everyone else says listen, if that person is really committed to it then we'll say let's take it for a ride and see what it looks like. Our company isn’t driven by whimsy but if someone has a really burning issue that they feel that has to be addressed at a director or staff level, that’s one of the things that triggers opportunities.

If people are supposed to learn something and they don’t its usually one of two things. Either it’s because the person has not bought in that it is an issue for them and therefore they won’t acknowledge that. If I determine that someone has a need and they don’t accept that then I haven’t presented it to them in a way that is cogent enough for them to buy into that vision. Then there is going to be a real problem there to have people change. Well, that’s bullshit; I don’t need to change – you’re wrong! The second one is where the change is so basic. It’s usually a change in attitude rather than skill. That requires that the person move out of their comfort zone. That’s the second real killer – getting people to change themselves. If you can’t see of it it’s too terrifying for you to change your way of communicating or change your attitude toward homosexuals – pick whatever it is I’ll stand on this firm rock.

(Brett, CEO)

By not communicating, Robbie actually maintained the isolation that was unwanted in the first place. Distancing oneself from the other negates not only the bad of the other, but also the good. Robbie fell and stayed between the poles of dependence – bad – independence. In other words, the co-conscious plane was not established so Robbie remained stuck in a ‘bad’ middle until there was another split:

I think that Brett helps me out a lot because I can talk to him. I think that out of everyone he knows me the best and he has provided me with the most guidance. I have been able to tell him when there have been issues for me or I can always go to him to ask how to do things and he will guide me.

I had lost [a family member] and I was learning how to cope with that. I learned a lot in that program. It was three nights a week and I had to leave a half hour early from work three days a week and they supported that without question. I had to leave staff meetings to be able to go and it was never a problem. I felt very supported in that endeavour.

(Robbie, MM)

The re-split for Robbie occurred after reevaluating the workspace to find that not all executives were as threatening as Martha. Reminders of only the ‘bad breast’ are especially prevalent in responses to authoritarian leadership (Grover, 1993; Smith, 1996; Van Vugt, Jepson, Hart & De Cremer, 2003). In this case, the result was that of positive transformation that could not have otherwise occurred without resplitting the plane by synthesizing the ‘good’ participative manager plane to ‘bad’ authoritative manager plane. By reconstituting the depressive position, Robbie learned to become independent of dependence in the Robbie Partners plane of co-consciousness.

Many organizational behavior and management researchers and authors continue to teach that participative management in change processes requires employee involvement so as to minimize resistance to change (Ancona. et al, 2005; Daft, 2001; Dessler, Starke, & Cyr, 2001; Drafke & Kossen, 2002; Goltz & Hietapelto, 2002; Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborne, 2003; Thacker & Blanchard, 2006; Whetton & Cameron, 2002). Employee involvement is instrumental in effecting organizational change but for the reason of maintaining selfconcept through axial, iterative, and recursive transitions from the paranoid schizoid position to the depressive position or through manifestations of punctuated equilibrium (Stacey, 1992, 2003).
The fear of negative transformation is negated through continual courageous attempts at transformation, which is the desire to compromise but with negative capability (French, 2001) or the belief that there is a synthesis between collaboration and subject subject relationships or collabrelations. Collabrelations is our term for willingness to experience, through partial and incremental world-view transformation or partial identity dissolution, the giving of self or serving of others that creates unknown, long term benefit without expectation of receiving a short term return.

In post-modern times, these types of relationships are based in the paradox of choice (Schwartz, 2004) or the ability to dissolve some of one’s self-concept to gain more of one’s self (Spielrein, 1912/1994). In other words, some process is instrumental in leveraging one toward or away from ‘good’ and ‘bad’ that requires partial privation, negation or destruction of one intermediary that simultaneously summons forth reconstruction and therefore, the generation of a new intermediary (Spielrein, 1912/1994). Movement from one pole toward another is synonymous with such change and recognizing or feeling this destructive reconstruction is to be conscious of change: …conscious beliefs (or thoughts) just aren’t to be found; not always, not in every experience of change. If they were, then given that we are continually experiencing change in bodily sensations, auditory and visual perceptions, thoughts and mental images, our consciousness would be flooded, horribly clogged, with thousands of boring beliefs as about what happened before what. But it isn’t. (Dainton, 2001, p. 94)

“Although the paranoid-schizoid position precedes the depressive position, these positions actually coexist, or rather alternate throughout life” (Alford, 1989, p. 33). Their intermediary plane is projection introjection. Ambiguity is one cause of this conscious clogging, experiential memory is another and for the self, both are remedied by projection. More important, projection allows us to be in different spatial planes at the same time and through introjection, it allows us to be embodied in others’ pasts, presents, and futures. In order to have more, one needs to halve more, which occurs through manifestations of splitting. Yet, we are only conscious of few of these planes at the same time and especially in anxiety ridden states. Lack of desire or doubt of one’s ability to captain these alterations creates the post-modern mid-life crisis and the fear of having an unstable, decentred, or a split personality (Alford, 1988, 1989; Carr, 1994a; Fuller, 2003; Glass, 1993, 1995; Laing, 1960; Sievers, 1994).

Transitioning from ‘bad’ to ‘good’ means moving through truer or less false using the intermediary of experiencing knowledge that without ‘doing’ cannot ‘be’ to resolve paradox (Kodama, 2002). Transformational development is an ongoing process of being and doing and remembering and forgetting ‘good’ or ‘bad’ so one is not always only master or slave but so one is not fearful of using splitting and re-splitting to recognize the ‘good’ and ‘bad’ of being master and slave; servant and leader. Desire’s contrary is doubt and their intermediary is trust. In changing time’s space, the ability to learn to trust in oneself is generated by adding the plane of space and time.

To be successful, Partners needed to accept the ‘good’ and ‘bad’ of each individual within it because together, these are the intersecting planes of the company’s self and other topography:

- One is asked then to accept the human condition, its suffering and its joys and to work with its imperfections as the foundation upon which the individual will build his or her wholeness through adventurous creative achievement. What follows...is intended for those who accept their damned rock – the human condition – and accept that other people have rocks as well, and that except for a few extreme deviants who will be restrained, all will live societies and accommodate to each other. (Greenleaf, 1970/1993, pp. 38-39)

More important, Partners was changing the community’s topography by accepting less affluent customers in the first place or by recognising them. Over time as through erosion, the rock will change; the water will take the place of those parts of the rock that have been worn away, creating a void that creates a new middle space, which can be filled by the contrary from which the intermediary moves toward:

You need to advise on a business you never hear of. One woman came in who wanted to do palmistry. Well for palmistry we’d say ‘Here are the basic needs for building a business but what are the special curves that a person needs to market that?’ We had a terrible time getting her in. This woman was on welfare. No one believed in her. We had to actually talk her into taking the course. And, we had to support like heck – she had a welfare demeanor. The staff even took her down to show her how to buy better clothes without very much money because she didn't
have very much money. We took her to a second hand clothing store, hand in hand to show her how she could buy better clothes to enhance her presentation. We carried her through the start-up because she was just panic stricken most of the time. Because everyone told her that this couldn’t be done…you can’t make a living doing this. Now she’s just like a house on fire. She’s making a very good living for the first time in her life. That’s an example of self-directedness. You wouldn’t expect staff to teach something like this in an SE program to take someone out to buy clothes to improve their image. Generally, people would just tell someone to go out and to that.

(Brett, CEO)

Through privation of bed, the rock becomes nearer to river, to the agent that will change the bed in the first place. In the short term, each moment has within it a possibility of different outcomes and experiences that when acted upon in one way and others, leads to positive and negative transformation over the longer term.

In 1998-1999, Partners was one of a few companies out of thousands that was formally recognized as being a leader of human resources development (HRD) because of its unwavering tendency to serve both internal and external clients’ needs. Partners’ middle managers, including but not limited to Pat and Pete (Robbie was not employed by Partners at this time) took the initiative to petition for clients’ satisfaction of the company’s service provisioning, write up the findings, and send a lengthy report to provincial HRD evaluators. Partners won in its category of demonstrating shared authority and control to support employees’ self-directedness. As of 2005, Partners has been in business for almost 20 years and has expanded to serve more than five provincial communities. It is estimated that Partners’ influence has decreased unemployment by as much as 20% in some of these areas.

In this case, Partners learned to serve itself by serving those who, by once again becoming employed would regain the connection between being and doing; to learn they could learn to serve others so they could serve themselves.

We know what happens to people who stay in the middle of the road. They get run over.

(Bevan, 1953)
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This is an important issue has been recognized by many within the social sciences. For example, Derrida argued that words gain “their” meaning from their relationship to other words that may be presented at the same time, i.e. in the same written or spoken discourse and/or from their implied relationship to other words that do not appear in that discourse. For example, if an object is described as ‘hot’ it excludes and self-references itself by the implicit negation of the possibility that it is ‘cold’. The heart of language, Derrida would have us believe, is what he talks about as the “play of difference”. Derrida suggested that a strategy for ‘examining’ a text would be to erase one word/concept and substitute its ‘opposite’ which he argued immediately called into question the hierarchy that was previously being attempted [or as Derrida (1981, p. 41) expresses it, “the hierarchy of a given moment”] (see also Derrida, 1976, 1978).

It was the distance between what is present and what is absent that created an interplay that the surrealists’ employed in attempting to create a strangeness between familiar objects placed in unfamiliar situations and associations (see Carr, 2003d). The juxtaposition created a form of ‘shock’, or an “estrangement-effect”, that caused the observer to question the familiar taken for granted assumptions about the objects.
In another realm of the social sciences it might be recalled that the critical theorist Herbert Marcuse in his work *One Dimensional Man* (1964) argued that intellectual oppositions had become ineffective and impotent as the estrangement-effect had been disarmed by the assimilation mechanisms of the prevailing social order. For Marcuse the estrangement-effect can only be maintained to the extent that it continues to reveal the prevailing order in its opposition and (simultaneously) the opposition in the prevailing order — “that is, to the extent that it maintains a dialectical tension” (Carr, 2003d, p. 16).

iii We make this comment in a very general sense, but readers who would like to explore these issues of using ideas from the natural sciences in the social sciences might wish to read the Sokal and Bricmont's *Intellectual IMPOSTURES* which is an attack on some postmodernists for ‘mis’-using ideas from the natural sciences (see also Carr, 2000, 2004)

iv “An objection to the concept of the death instinct which is often put forward is that it ignores the environment. This is certainly incorrect, since the fusion and modulations of the life and death drives which will determine the eventual development are part of developing relationships to the early objects and, therefore, the real nature of the environment will deeply affect the process” (Segal, 1993, p. 60; see also A. Freud, 1966).

v Another master slave aspect is between the instincts themselves. *Eros* and *Thanatos* are opposites that are “fused, blended, and alloyed with each other” (Freud, 1923/1984, p. 381), so under normal conditions, where *Eros* emigrates, *Thanatos* immigrates (Carr, 2003b, 2003c; Carr & Lapp, 2005; Freud, 1920/1984, 1923/1984). In this way, *Eros* and *Thanatos* are embroiled in constant domination and negation to cancel or modify each other’s energies unless, through any middle management lapses by the ego, one is carelessly allowed to overcome the other to cause extreme behaviour. In these cases, concern for self overrides concern for others: “the more of the one is employed, the more the other becomes depleted” (Freud, 1914/1984, p. 68) (see also Alford, 1988; Carr, 1994b, 1998; Freud, 1921/1985).

vi See also Carr & Lapp (2005) and Winnicott (1971) on transitional objects, which in the context of this paper mean putting something in the middle as a reminder of or binder for reassurance to protect against isolation; and to maintain or increase distance between contraries to protect against engulfment.

vii See also Alford (1989), Carr & Lapp (2005), and Ogden (1989) for schizoid compromise or the preliminary creation of contrariety or distance within the ego and between ego aspects. The schizoid compromise allows introjection of what is being projected, which is protected in the autistic contiguous position and requires at the same time, movement through the paranoid schizoid position to generate a new depressive position.