

Special file (one of many .PDF files accessible by Acrobat Reader 3.0) - portion of Program - started Aug/Sept, 97 by The UniS Institute, WITH INFOQUE & OTHERS. This new program includes email / INDIVIDUAL / GROUP & ORGANIZATION INTERACTIONS relevant to, "WITNESSING OUR PRESENT MOMENT LIFE-WORK", as initiated by participants Aug / Sept 1997

DIALOG with J. G. Bennett (JGB) and Saul Kuchinsky (SK) at Sherborne, England, February, 1972

Chapter One from book, "Systematics - Search for Miraculous Management", by Saul Kuchinsky available from The UniS Institute.

JGB

We have agreed that you and I should get together and talk to those who want to know what SYSTEMATICS is and how to apply it in running a business organization. I expect that you and I are as well qualified to do this as anyone because the idea of SYSTEMATICS originated with me and it has evolved over the past twenty years of investigation by our institute into what an organization, whether natural or man made, is and how it works. And you, for your part, have many years of experience in higher management and have done more than anyone else in applying SYSTEMATICS in the actual running of an organization in front of real problems and on a sufficient scale to see what results it could give. Is that a sufficient introduction?

S K

Yes. I would like to emphasize what SYSTEMATICS provides that is essentially different from what we normally consider "Systems". But first, a summary of SYSTEMATICS by yourself is in order.

JGB

Well, now supposing you start by putting some questions to me to help me bring out my picture of what SYSTEMATICS is at this stage of its development.

S K

One of the problems in describing SYSTEMATICS to others is its universality. There are so many ways that you can look at SYSTEMATICS advantageously; yet, it is hard to describe in a simple manner that really clarifies that universality. You could help clarify this.

JGB

Why do we call SYSTEMATICS universal? What made you speak of this universality? I think this is the first characteristic of SYSTEMATICS as distinct from, say, General Systems Theory, or from Systems Analysis, or Operational Research and other management tools that make use of the ideas of systems. All of them are concerned with systems but not in the same universal way. The reason for this is that SYSTEMATICS started with an investigation into the way in which nature works in the living and the non-living. Not only living and non-living natural systems, but also, man-made forms, human organizations, human artifacts, machines and so on. We found that there are in every working situation, every kind of organization, certain characteristics that always show themselves and repeat over and over again in any kind of situation. For example, when we meet with a new problem or a new object that we are trying to understand, we have to begin by asking ourselves the question, What is it that I am looking at? What is it as a whole? What is it that I am going to deal with? In dealing with it, what am I going to include - what am I going to leave out? This is a primary act of judgment in defining

one's problem, one's subject matter and this is the first step in the application of SYSTEMATICS. It is a step that is universal. It has to be made before we deal with any kind of situation, simple or complex. In SYSTEMATICS we call this defining the MONAD, that is, defining a system as one whole, as one term. If this step is not made properly, many troubles arise in dealing with even quite simple problems because we start dealing with them and afterwards discover there is something we failed to include and take into account, or we have become involved in something irrelevant that we ought to have cut out before we started.

S K

Yes, the MONAD is one of the more difficult of the systems. One reason is because it appears so deceptively simple and many managers will not appreciate the importance of having it all inclusive. We often found we could not adequately define our MONAD when we started with this as the first model in a SYSTEMATICS' investigation. In such cases, we had to go back to it after some effort on the "higher" systems. While this procedure is worthwhile with any of the models, it is especially true of the MONAD.

JGB

Yes, that can be so, but once this is properly done, you've got your MONAD. The next step is to look at the way it naturally divides itself. The first kind of division that occurs in nature as, for example, in the defertilized cell, is one division, division into opposites; and there are polarities in every situation. For example, in dealing with a business organization there is a polarity of short-term and long-term objectives and activities. Then again, the organization has to deal with its environment; so there is the duality of inside and outside. Where there is decision-making, there is the duality of authority and subordination. All of these polarities lead to gradients, that is, the transition from one pole to the other by a number of steps. Take the example of an organization engaged in the transformation of raw material into a finished product. There is a transformation polarity between the input of raw material and components and the output of finished products. Exactly the same gradient is found in every living organism in the way it assimilates, metabolizes food. It is present in a manufacturing organization or in a service organization. This second way of looking at a system we call the DYAD.

This is also universal and necessary. When the SYSTEMATICS' user studies any problem, he has to decide for himself which of the polar opposites he has to take into account; but he will always have polar opposites. He will always have the DYAD and this is the second universal character of SYSTEMATICS. It is through this polarity that any organization has its driving force. The separation of poles is like the separation of the poles of a magnet and with any opposition or contradiction we have to make a judgment as to the critical threshold, or the intensity of gradient that we can tolerate. But this is not the whole story. Even when we have seen the polarity, it doesn't explain to us how the system works. You've got to go further and see how the different forces are related, how they interact with one another. This means that we have to look at the dynamism of the situation.

Everything that is living, everything that can maintain itself in an environment has its own dynamism. There are definite ways in which its parts are related and act upon one another. In anything that is living and moving, there must be a driving force. This can be called "the will to live", or the need for survival, which is just as significant in a human organization, a business organization, as it is in a living animal or plant. This need for survival is the primary driving force. There are of course other driving forces, but whatever they are, they do meet with,

sometimes they even arouse, different kinds of resistance or opposition and this will make it seem as if we are coming back to another DYAD. The fact is that there is always something else that adjusts, regulates, harmonizes and really makes the dynamism of interaction between force and opposition. This can be seen very obviously in an organization which depends upon the capacity and intelligence of managers, as well as upon the need for survival and all the resistances, the passive, inert or even definite hostile forces that it may meet in competition, for example. So there are the three factors which we can represent as a dynamic relationship of three terms and obviously this results in a whole variety of different dynamic situations. We have three forces that have to be taken into account: the urge to achieve; resistances and oppositions; the intelligence, experience and understanding that enables these to be reconciled. This principle of dynamism, or relationship of forces, is also a principle of universal meaning, but dynamism itself is not a description of activity. It is simply a description of the particular form of activity that an organization has at any given moment.

In order to get the organization as it is working, we have to combine two quite distinct fields of interest. In the simplest terms, we have a motivational or value field of interest, which sets corporate and individual goals and objectives. The other is the instrumental field which deals with the resources and operations of the organization. At every point there is an interaction between motives, resources and operations. We can't study the two fields separately without getting into real trouble, and that is why we treat it not as two DYADS but as one TETRAD, one four-term system.

When people do try to separate these two, perhaps in order to simplify it or because there are different specialists dealing with each kind of field, the motivational and instrumental, we come up against a fundamental weakness in management development. This happens, for example, when we introduce behavioral science into an organization to deal with motives in human relationships, and also another technique such as operational research or systems analysis which deals with operations and processes. We find that the two just don't coalesce into a working picture of what is actually going on. This is one way in which SYSTEMATICS has the advantage. It does enable you to look at all the interactions between such nonmeasurable imponderables as motivation, human relations and the measurable things like resources and operations. This is the four-term system, or TETRAD, which gives us the model of an organization in terms of its activity.

Now, if we want to go further, we have to ask ourselves such questions as: How does the organization relate to its environment? What is the connection between its inner working and its outer working? What are its norms and values? What are its minimum requirements for survival? What is its maximum potential for development? How does it depend upon its environment for maintaining its activity, and in return what can it do for its environment in the form of products, services, not only just commercial products, but also its social contribution? For this kind of survey we go beyond the four-term system but we can find all that we require in a five-term system or PENTAD.

First, there is the organization as a whole. An organization finding and realizing its own identity, its own corporate identity. Then on one side there is the immediate need for survival, short-term interests of all who depend on the organization, all who are working in it and for it, and its minimum activity to maintain its own identity. On the other side there is another term which represents the goal, its potential for the people who belong to it, what it can hope for, what it

can expect to do within its own sphere of action and the input that is available to it in the form of resources, financial and material.

We can't look at the value system which these three terms gives us from the inside only, and so in the evaluation of any system, even of an operation within an organization, we have to take into account what it requires from its environment; where it can be situated in order to be viable in terms of personnel, supply of raw materials and components, financial resources, all the things that feed into the organization and keep it alive. It is also necessary to look at it in terms of what it gives out not only in terms of its actual services to the community, but the image it presents to the community, its social role that at its highest is a service to mankind. A powerful industrial organization has an obligation towards the community in which it operates and this obligation is an independent term of its value system which has to be reconciled with the others.

So you see, there are five terms and the surprising thing is that you can make a very complete value analysis by taking these five terms into account. I have just described it in terms of an organization as a whole, but it can be done in terms of any well defined operation such as the launching of a new product where you have to decide what is the minimum that this product must achieve in order to be worth putting on the market, and what is the utmost that you can hope for it; what demands is it going to make on your resources and what is it going to contribute to the organization as a whole; how does it fit in with the total plans and aims of the organization. So here once again, you have a five-term system.

I could go on of course to talk about some of the more complex systems. For example, there are systems which combine two. There is a particularly interesting nine-term system which we found very powerful for showing how processes interlock in any scheme of development, but I think that most organization problems can be dealt with if we make full use of the five models I described. What would you say about this from your own experience?

S K

I would agree. We did look at some of the "higher" systems, but the five systems you described were quite adequate, despite the complexity of our organization. Of course, in practice, each of the five models are used in at least several different ways, as well as undergoing continuous revisions as circumstances and awareness change. For example, it was not only necessary and useful to look at the MONAD of our whole operation, but many of the parts themselves: Marketing, Engineering, Manufacturing and so on, and even down within these groups to the subsidiary smaller groups such as advertising, drafting, machine shop or whatever seemed of interest.

In a like manner, with the system of DYADS, we also found several opportunities for using the same model. The model analyzing Intentionality Barriers was especially effective in improving interrelationships that were involved. Using the same model in studying oppositions and contradictions, and establishing critical thresholds within the limits of these polarities was most important in improving our judgments.

This idea of a critical threshold within the limits of the DYAD is one that has been taken for granted by managers, but has been difficult to describe before SYSTEMATICS. Now, with the DYAD model, we can discuss the threshold of acceptability that we must achieve in a myriad of cases, and where we could sacrifice a DYAD with insurmountable difficulties by substituting or improving performance of another DYAD.

In the models of the TRIAD, there were two versions that initially were important to us. These were the TRIADS relating to communications and to management decision-making (strategies). The communications TRIAD produced the change in attitudes that was so important to us. It developed the type of communication we needed for that particular situation. The decision-making strategy achieved a common commitment.

My experience convinced me that the only way we could change the application of our resources fully and quickly, as we require in a crisis, was to communicate a full understanding of the management decision-making process and to verify top management's commitment to it.

Another thing the six basic TRIADS of communication did for us was to develop the understanding between superior and subordinate on all the strategies of communications in general, and emphasize that particular one that would solve a major problem.

The system of TETRADS turned out to be one of the more popular models because it could be easily understood, even by those that were not familiar with the SYSTEMATICS' procedures. We found this could be most useful at any time in reviewing new insights, or new awareness to evaluate and accept change.

Another version of the TETRAD was used to identify and balance our various management styles that our particular senior managers had developed over their long careers. It permitted them to talk openly about their own exaggerated styles of management and recognize where they could best be applied and how they could limit their application where it was necessary. This actually transformed the relationships between these managers from what was previously one of negative controversy to a positive coordination, which incidentally, relieved me of much of my previous role as arbitrator in ridiculous situations.

JGB

Could I just ask you, did you also bring in the TRIADS in getting this over, or was it almost entirely done in term of the Tetrad?

S K

No, this proved best with the use of the tetrad.

The system of PENTADS was especially effective in dealing with the potential of our proposed new products, since this was the creative nature of our organization. At first, it clarified that we had difficulty in properly defining "what we were talking about" - the focal point for the PENTAD. Once we did this, it proved to be a most realistic tool for sharing understanding on the facts of "what we are sure of," as well as the intangible of "what is possible;" and it helped us to make judgments of what efforts were necessary to transform a "possibility" into a "positivity." We could better understand those major factors we had "internal control" over and how to relate them to the unpredictable "outer hazards" or "what will society do with this;" or "what society needs;" or "how will society support or oppose our potential?" I credit this system, as much as any, with the success of our new product programs which resulted thereafter.

Of course, as you described, the model of the PENTAD applied to any corporation as a whole could be even more significant. I am confident that having a top management team develop the PENTAD in depth will result in many new insights and have a profound effect on the operation of the corporation.

JGB

Yes, I think that's right. It isn't that you've simply got a number of separate and distinct problems, but MODELS that form a series, carrying on from one to another and building up to a more complete understanding of what it is that you are doing and what possibilities lie in front of you. Of course, each model taken separately is complete in itself. The MONAD is a picture of the organization as a whole, but when you go forward through the series of models from the MONAD, DYAD, TRIAD, TETRAD, PENTAD and so on, you're looking at the organization from a different perspective. You are getting deeper and deeper into its workings, and you do this in an orderly way.

This has been a great benefit to us because no one can carry in his mind at one moment the full complexity of any model organization, so, I think you could say that SYSTEMATICS deals with the intangibles in the same way that mathematics deals with quantities. One can't get hold of a number of very complicated quantitative factors and work on them in one's head without the help of mathematical formulae. Mathematical formulae enormously enhance our power to deal with quantities. I think it is fair to say that SYSTEMATICS enormously enhances our capacity to deal with not only the non-measurable, but the entire situation - qualitative as well as quantitative. It really goes beyond the distinction between quantity and quality, but because the qualitative side is the difficult one, you see more quickly how SYSTEMATICS is giving you a total view.

S K

Yes, the surprising thing about this is that we had previously taken for granted we could not hold all the factual complexities together, and now we have a system that will permit us not only to do that, but combine them with the value factors, the intangibles. Now we can do this, all together, in the presence of the whole organization where everyone who should have this common understanding. This is most significant in avoiding making many mistakes that previously repeated themselves over and over with time as personnel and programs changed.

JGB

The point is that you and the group of managers working with you, can put all your attention at a meeting on one aspect of the problem, with confidence that the other aspects will come up as you go through the work on the other models. You can safely concentrate on one point, yet not lose touch with the whole. You don't have the time to ask yourself all the questions all the time, but just what is it we're dealing with? has our total whole changed? what changes have there been in the polarities? what forces are working? what are the tactics? what are the strategies that we are following as a whole and in different parts? what are the operational styles working in different departments? how are the motivations and resources balanced? how are we related to our minimum need for survival and our maximum potential achievement? and so on and so on --- all the things that are essential for effectual management, but that nobody can be thinking of all the time. The advantage of having a system of models is that they take care of the part that you are not thinking of at a given moment.

S K

Yes, that is true. It's quite a comfort to know that you can refer to these when you need to. It's also a greater comfort to know that you have the ability to select those more important matters

and concentrate your whole attention on them. SYSTEMATICS demonstrated how much more capable we can be under these conditions. We also find that we are talking the same language. We can anticipate what the problems will be, and we are finding a way to cope with these problems and meeting our objectives.

JGB

We have so far spoken about SYSTEMATICS as helping us to think more completely, totally to avoid making mistakes, but you have just brought up the point that SYSTEMATICS can be regarded as an instrument of communication to help talk the same language, promote better understanding between people, and I take it this means especially people at different levels of management and people who bring very different specialities to bear and have different attitudes towards the working of the organization. Now this should be a field in which SYSTEMATICS can help in something that every organization knows to be a real problem in securing efficiency. Would you say this - that you do get out of SYSTEMATICS a language which can be shared by people who are perfectly good at talking about their own specialities, but very poor at understanding the specialities and languages of others? There should be, once you have something in the way of a common language, not only an improvement of communications, but a much greater acceptance of one another.

S K

I think all this becomes very true with SYSTEMATICS. Previously, we knew that our language was a limiting factor. We knew there were certain things we couldn't talk about with people that were specialists, that came from different disciplines. SYSTEMATICS removes this limitation. We have models now and we can involve everyone with the entire picture, the whole, and the relevance of the parts. Now, once you can do this, your whole organization can be more effective and efficient. They do relate to each other because they have greater confidence on what their part is in the whole. This is a very unusual situation to find and I think that those people who use SYSTEMATICS will experience this. This is especially true in the rapid coordination between different areas of skills and knowledge, such as new materials, components, applications and systems. In such cases, we may even require an invention or certainly innovation, that cuts across all these disciplines requiring team creativity. I wonder if you would talk more about why the SYSTEMATICS approach does not limit creativity in such situations.

JGB

Yes. I think we must face this, that as we have been presenting SYSTEMATICS one may think of it as a constraint that's placed upon people to make sure that they all think and talk the same way, and you might think that this would be very effective in getting coordination but very poor for any kind of creative action, and in practice, it turns out just the opposite.

The use of SYSTEMATICS creates creativity, but we must understand why this is. To be creative one must have one's feet firmly on the ground. One has to be creative from what one

already knows and understands, and one must feel this, an awareness of where is the unknown, the intangible. This is what is difficult to describe, but very often it turns out that if you have some kind of a model that has been proved effective by use, that this model actually encourages you to take a leap in the dark. It allows you to do something that can be done sometimes by an individual, but very seldom by a group of people, if they haven't got something which can bring their mental operations in line, into harmony with one another. But I have seen a group share in taking a creative step in solving a problem that perhaps just couldn't have been done if each of them had been working separately. I don't know if you have ever seen that happen yourself?

S K

Yes. In fact, in today's technology, I think the only way to be competitive is to achieve this. You somehow have to get these different disciplines together to act as one organism where individuals would not have the full knowledge to be able to achieve that complex a creativity. I believe every SYSTEMATICS' case history will verify this.

JGB

The question is using the models as a means of transmitting experience from one man to another. One of the heaviest burdens upon an experienced manager, is to find some means of bringing along his subordinates so that they can take responsibility, increase the effectiveness of the organization and leave him free to do the work for which he is best qualified; but everyone knows how very hard it is to transfer experience from one situation to another. A very fine manager with experience and genuine insight into the way his organization works can himself see the whole and he will, in dealing with his subordinates, be able to recognize where they are making mistakes or missing opportunities and point it out to them; but in doing this, the real "know-how," the real insight remains with him and they only see that they've done something, or they could improve what they've done. The vision of wholeness which the top man has and the grasp he has of the way in which something can be changed for the better, just doesn't pass over and he may waste an enormous amount of time in talking to them and afterwards be disappointed to see how little he has got over. Now I do think it's fair to say that SYSTEMATICS does enable just this very thing to be done. A vision can be passed from one man to the other by means of the models. This is something any experienced manager very badly needs. What do you think? Have you seen this in your own working?

S K

It certainly surprised me how these visions could be transmitted with the use of SYSTEMATICS' models, and not only to subordinates, but even to lower levels where previously you felt it was not possible or not useful. In fact, I might mention here that a lot of our performance improvement resulted from being able to transmit such visions several levels down, where people could do much more than you had previously thought - even those with less relevant experience. But another thing that this does, besides helping to transmit this, it helps to assure the senior manager that he has not overlooked things because he now can get contributions from his subordinates in the process; and he is also defining models for which these subordinates can take charge themselves. They can assume the responsibility for handling many consequential changes that are bound to take place and cannot be forecasted completely, that really shouldn't require the attention of the senior manager. So it does get all of the managers involved in the whole process and makes the whole organization alive to the universality of the situation. They are acting as a single unit in their communications, their actions and their performance.

JGB

Right. Now what about speed? Does SYSTEMATICS hold things up because people have to get together, and instead of talking directly about the problem, first of all, put it in terms of models? Or would you say it actually can help to speed up diagnosis and decision-making? After all, there is nothing more important in modern business than speed. You don't have so many chances of taking an opportunity as you used to, especially where a very big organization has to move very fast because of changes in markets, raw material or supplies, technologies or inventions, politics, and so on. All of these things come so quickly that the organization that can adapt first is the one that is going to get to the top.

S K

For someone who is experienced in communications, anyone questioning the speed of SYSTEMATICS is rather amusing. I know of nowhere else that you can take five models and talk about any facet of your organization that you wish to, and present a picture of any detail of it in relation to the whole. And of course, the necessity to be able to do this is most important. Today, you don't generally get more than one or two chances to perform correctly. Previously, corporations by their very size and magnitude of resources, could sometimes overcome repeated large failures. They had enough time to repeat programs as much as was necessary to succeed. Now this is not necessarily possible. The competition is too fierce, the necessity too urgent. There is a right time and it must happen fast, so you are not permitted the "luxury" of too many mistakes.

Of course, you do this with SYSTEMATICS by establishing the discovery means for all of the departments, all of the personnel. The entire organization can function as much as possible in parallel to relate to each other, rather than operating in the old serial fashion. For example, with SYSTEMATICS experience, you can review all the systems at one sitting if necessary, to fully monitor a dynamic situation at one time. This provides unusual control and the power to adjust, to do it properly the first time.

JGB

One kind of trouble comes in dealing with situations where personal and technical practice are both vitally important. With purely technical work having good design knowledge and experienced engineers, everyone can see more or less how to make effective changes and pretty well calculate the consequential adjustments that will have to be made. It is much more difficult when you are dealing with people, especially in large organizations where change is bound to be slow - or, if they try to make changes too fast, disruption is caused, then time is lost getting back to normal working. How do you think SYSTEMATICS helps in making adjustments to new situations, new needs that arise in an organization, or unavoidable changes in personnel, changes in responsibilities, in dealing with new outside contacts, suppliers, markets, government and so on?

S K

Yes, change in internal human relation factors are generally the most difficult to achieve. Internal human relation factors are far more difficult than changing the application of material resources for example. Each of the highly specialized disciplines do tend to live in their own world and in order to have change implemented quickly and accepted objectively you do need

SYSTEMATICS. You must reach a shared understanding of most of the systems and they must understand that management is committed to supporting what these systems show! Once you have done this you have given everyone the means of looking at their own and each other's new situations objectively. We can now express differences in an objective, almost technical manner and accordingly, see where we differ and to what extent we differ, and what must be done to resolve our differences. Once you are in control of your internal operations, you have the support of all your specialists and you have an "on-going" plan. This is the best basis for dealing effectively with outside operations, or suppliers, markets, governments and so on. These outside people will quickly sense they are dealing with a high performance organization that "can do," can deliver, that will respond to the necessary changes and adjustments that make their own efforts in turn, worthwhile.

JGB

Let's come back to this internal relationship. To get people from different departments, different disciplines, such as marketing, engineering, design, finance and quality control, who ordinarily tolerate each other and are mainly concerned with protecting the interests of their own specialty -- if you can get them together talking around the models, we find that you get more objectivity. Just this alone makes a great difference to the working.

S K

There is no question about it. It becomes a very objective practice and it is beautiful to watch in operation. They all become interested in the overall picture. They become concerned with their own responsibility. They become interested in the other person's job; how they can interface with each other, how they can help one another and also how the other persons can assist them.

JGB

There is a difficulty in lateral communications between parallel departments to promote better communications between managers who have to cooperate but don't have direct responsibility towards one another. Of course, very many communication failures of this kind result in serious holdups in new developments. But there is another big problem. That is the one of securing upward communications. Nowadays, most people pay lip service to the principle that cooperative management must come. Upward communication must be taken seriously. There must be an understanding between upper and lower echelons of the management of a big corporation; but people just don't dare to trust themselves to introduce this and actually make it work. Many senior managers, I think most senior managers, are afraid of the misunderstandings that will arise, the misuse of the facilities that the lower levels of management are going to be given. They feel that to allow people to tell them what they think will already disrupt the working of the organization, reduce their authority and this is not good.

We can't afford to go on like this. Serious mistakes are made because the knowledge, the actual concrete direct knowledge of what is happening in the organization may be much clearer, more specific at lower levels. But subordinates either don't dare or don't know how to tell their chief that a mistake is being made or that an opportunity is being missed, and he may very badly need that very kind of knowledge. He may not only need knowledge, he may actually need opposition, an "obstruction" to a cause that will enable him to have time to see that he has to re- think what he is doing. But how hard it is to get a situation set up where a man can talk objectively with

a senior without some kind of trouble, and how difficult it is for a senior to do so without feeling that his authority somehow is affected. It is so different when you are on a purely technical matter. A foreman will speak out quite openly about a technical defect that he himself knows and he knows perfectly well that his knowledge and experience are being respected; but apart from this purely technical, plain speaking, the human relationships side, the operational side, the administrative side, all these things are all closed in upward communication. If we can only find a way, with the help of SYSTEMATICS, to enable people to talk about just anything in the organization with the same objectivity that they'll talk about a tolerance on a machining job, how much of the present troubles of our organization would be removed.

S K

Yes, that is so, and isn't that what SYSTEMATICS exactly does! Here you have a model in front of you -- the value terms, the intangible terms are just as much of the technical discussion as the factual terms and this is so in practice. Very shortly there is no difference between presenting an intangible factor, a value "difference" and presenting a technical "difference." And of course permitting, even encouraging, the man down below to express what he knows will avoid failures. There is little question in my mind that all program failures do result from the fact that, previously, this upward communications barrier existed. The men down below knew that something was wrong, perhaps they didn't know how to express it or didn't have the confidence and knowledge to be sure of it. Too often they accept that there is no means for them to see the whole picture, so they cannot be positive or understand the urgency of the process. SYSTEMATICS permits them to do all this and gives them a means to verify and transmit it to higher management objectively. It gives them that power not only to discover the potential failure for themselves, but also to discover and communicate a constructive solution to the problem.

Every major task that a large organization undertakes is bound to have many of these failure modes that you must either go through or avoid before you can succeed. SYSTEMATICS gives you that means for observing and anticipating these in an objective manner, talking about them in a way that the senior manager and his subordinate can really communicate. With the use of SYSTEMATICS one can witness this process really working repeatedly. Now it was not uncommon in the past for a manufacturing manager to sound dire warnings to marketing, engineering and purchasing on subtle but significant factors; in fact, on all factors relating to product design, yields, specifications, start-up costs, features, quantities and so forth. But it is unusual to have these other departments recognize their necessity, in proper perspective, to the whole operation; and this SYSTEMATICS achieves. SYSTEMATICS achieves this by providing the full means for constructive criticism in light of the whole, of the relevant parts, to allow judgment on when and how to shift committed resources and respond on ones own initiative where possible.

JGB

Are marketing people really prepared to listen if they are exposed to manufacturing, engineering, purchasing and other warnings as to what can and what can't be done?

S K

Now they have a means for understanding it. Marketing people not only accept it, they begin to appreciate the need for this direct challenge of their activities and even of their customers'

activities, especially at the front end of a new product program. They begin to recognize when it is necessary and timely, to become "part of" the manufacturing group or the engineering group or purchasing, to see if changes would either become or solve a problem. This awareness applies to the interaction between all other departments also. This is the type of effectiveness that SYSTEMATICS can achieve that cannot be ordered by top management with the same results.

JGB

They have not been ordered by top management. Now all that you have been saying sounds marvelous, but might not someone say, that sounds very good but it simply means that you yourself are a very good manager, you handle your team very well, you give confidence to your subordinates. Is there really any evidence that SYSTEMATICS was a big factor in getting the kind of relationship and better communications that you described?

S K

This evidence is not easily definable, even though it was not difficult to experience. Our performance before we used SYSTEMATICS was not unsatisfactory and we could have assumed we used most of what SYSTEMATICS promises before we had evidence to the contrary. Before we used SYSTEMATICS, we knew there was much untapped potential in our organization, as every manager realizes, and while appearing to make a great effort to correct this, we generally settled for a relatively token effort justified on the basis that it would sacrifice other more vital matters, or that we only had so much effort to spare, to do otherwise. The practice of SYSTEMATICS proved to me that this potential of our organization was far greater than I had appreciated and that SYSTEMATICS was the means for effectively putting it to work with relatively little or no increased effort. I stress this because there is a direct correlation between establishing the management relationships we were talking about and increasing the potential of an organization.

When a good management team uses SYSTEMATICS to share understanding in most of the system models, they do know what is vital, they do know what is going on and what should be going on, and what initiative they must take to establish the necessary positive relationships. This initiative extends to dealing directly with each other whenever possible. One of the results that proved to me that SYSTEMATICS was giving me something other systems could not, was that it provided me with so much more time and resources to attend to top management matters.

JGB

That's fine, but couldn't the same thing have been done by using any well-designed management system? There are many that are presently available. How could we show, do you think we can show that SYSTEMATICS provides something more than just a framework, that it really does enable you to go beyond the previously supposed potential of your organization? Do you think we can?

S K

Well, I believe we are talking about factors that can be understood both intellectually and emotionally. Of course, in the end you do need to experience an actual case history that can be measured from many perspectives. We have experienced that, and the advantages we have cited so far for SYSTEMATICS, while they may appear intangible and unmeasurable, really have a precise meaning that is significantly beyond what other practices and systems have or can achieve.

We are not just talking about improved styles of communications. SYSTEMATICS describes discriminating BASIC forms of communications that can be totally effective.

We are not generalizing about good judgment with vague or even specific formulae. SYSTEMATICS defines the basic type of judgment associated with each system and verified by nature itself as being universal and appropriate.

We are not just talking about various techniques for motivating initiative. SYSTEMATICS achieves knowledgeable initiative and common positive attitudes by sharing understanding of the whole and the relevance of its parts in a manner that can be seen by the average good manager.

We are not just talking about techniques for management development. SYSTEMATICS provides the means for transmitting basic experience in a continuous progression for all those participating, whenever they are ready for it.

We are not just talking about techniques for being more efficient. SYSTEMATICS provides the models for conserving vital energies and directing them with creative human decisions beyond the capability of any foreseeable computer.

We are not just talking about group cooperation. SYSTEMATICS provides the means for objectively resolving differences and combining various types of extreme management styles into a unified organization.

We are not just talking about techniques for developing team spirit. SYSTEMATICS provides the means for developing bonds of understanding and actions that cut across barriers of conditioned backgrounds, nationalities, religions, educations, disciplines and so on, to form a strong, unified "organism."

Systematics does not measure facts and values in a separate vacuum. It provides the basis for insight necessary for their integration.

Perhaps the most important factor of all is that SYSTEMATICS does not allow individuals or groups to get lost or identified with either the obsolete past or the false expectations of the future. While it is sensitive to the traces of the past and the possibilities of the future, it is totally demanding of the realities of the present moment and the necessity to be open and responsive to that.

As for speed, I know of no other system that can present the whole picture and the relevance of all its parts so simply, and give any good manager the basis for communicating understanding to the degree of his capability as quickly as possible. Of course, the real proof of the value of SYSTEMATICS is what actually happens when good managers seriously apply it. Each case history will give examples of that. There is no doubt in my mind that managers that apply it will experience the proof in the process itself, and further, that the stockholders or owners will be able to measure the difference in increased revenues, orders, profits, new products, and the general level of management and worker competency.

JGB

I think that most people will agree that we have laid out a good case for looking into SYSTEMATICS, but I don't think we have shown them how SYSTEMATICS actually does it. I know that we are coming to case histories to help us see how SYSTEMATICS works, but let's

take another kind of situation. There's a problem diagnosing whether you are moving toward some kind of serious holdup. The earlier you can foresee this, the less time is lost and possibly even enormous losses are avoided. You, yourself, in the position of the senior manager don't have all the data to enable you to make the diagnosis yourself. You want to bring people together to see if they can arrive with you at a picture of something threatening in the future. The same applies to the positive side. You can see that an opening is going to come, possibly a new product, market or application, which you half suspect but you don't know enough to make a decision. For a whole variety of reasons, you are bound to hesitate -- design, production, marketing, financial resources, acceptability by highly sophisticated customers, availability of personnel to take advantage of the opportunity and turn it into account. This kind of complex operational forecasting which takes products, markets, people, circumstances into account, it's usually just the matter of a hunch, insight and experience of the senior manager. He can make mistakes which might be avoided if he could only draw on the experience of others, but how is he to do it? Do the models in SYSTEMATICS in practice actually help this?

S K

Let's take an example like that. It's a very good one for SYSTEMATICS. You can't separate your forecasting, your marketing from your operations, and this kind of problem happens all the time. You have an opportunity and your organization is working towards that opportunity. You made forecasts and plans that require certain results and you discover they are not happening. How do you go about seeing what's wrong and correcting that? Now this normally happens in a large organization and by brute force, by experience, by instinct. The senior manager applies his judgment and makes a decision. If this is wrong, or partially wrong, as it very often can be, it will result in greater monies being expended, greater energies and resources "going down the drain," and longer, costlier periods of time before results are achieved. Many companies cannot afford to do this too often and survive.

If we review such a case, we can see that SYSTEMATICS will achieve results that otherwise would not be achieved. For example, you have an opportunity of coming out with a variation of an existing product, which is a common opportunity. This requires new engineering, new marketing, new manufacturing; and in the average modern organization such an undertaking could not be lightly started and perhaps, for this reason, a worthwhile opportunity lost. Achieving new cooperation and coordination between these groups never just happens. It requires all the skills and understanding of so many different people. It can normally take a great effort and an appreciable time. It requires special means of assuring that the too easy, too often used excuse of "what shall I not do in order to do this" be exposed for what it is! It requires the vision of SYSTEMATICS to support not only that this can be done but the very nature of the situation requires that it should be done. If it is right, SYSTEMATICS will establish the fact that the goal that has been set is a good one. It will do this by obtaining all of the inputs, both positive and negative, of marketing, manufacturing, engineering, purchasing and so on and consolidate these in a form that all can relate to. It will provide the means of examining the outer and inner hazards with relative objectivity.

Of course, the right questions have to be asked and the responses require the combined judgments of all the available talent. With SYSTEMATICS the odds are far better that all the important variables will be exposed and dealt with, relationships will be balanced and right attitudes will result. This kind of success is a rare one, but SYSTEMATICS is the key to

achieving it. Of course, to assure this you have to go through all of the systems and update them in a regular timely manner or otherwise you are just not going to make it, at least not with a minimum of effort, time, cost and mistakes.

As another example, we usually face the normal situation to begin with that marketing people don't even know what engineering and manufacturing can do. They may not even be quite sure what the customer really needs since the customer himself may have erroneous ideas on that subject. SYSTEMATICS not only brings out these variables, but allows them to be reconciled. It provides the means for communicating this type of information in parallel to all parties concerned in the clearest and quickest manner. Our chances are far reduced to miss any important factors that could result in catastrophic failure. We have all these things together before us. They do provide for everything that is vitally necessary. I can't even imagine any other way of doing this.

We all have seen executives who are relatively successful, or who appear successful, yet they go through an un-coordinated and fragmented management process time and time again. They undoubtedly possess certain useful characteristics and talents that are invaluable in their current situations. Their success may in large part result from their ability to compensate or counter-balance past weaknesses and take advantage of past resources that lay untapped or became ripe with time, or even because their competitors made even more mistakes. These successful managers would be far more successful if they were able to seriously apply SYSTEMATICS.

JGB

The way you describe it now does raise one more question in my mind. I don't know how you operated with this. You are dealing with new situations that no one understands before they arise and their understanding has to grow in dealing with them. That is, you can't have a model prepared in advance.

The beauty of SYSTEMATICS is that you don't have fixed models learned once and for all like rules and formulae. The models are tools that you develop with each problem so that you are constantly improving and changing your models.

Now when you are faced with this kind of situation, a changing model, is it something that just occurs during the course of the working, or is it something that you set yourself to do? Do you choose one particular model that is needed for a particular situation and adapt that to your need at that moment?

SK

Well, let us understand first that SYSTEMATICS still depends on the skills, experience, the understanding of the manager just as much as any management requirement, because these skills are what the manager will use in determining what model is most critical. It is these skills that will help give him the insight as to what relationship between which terms is most significant. The model gives him the means of looking at this and helps him discover this and helps him transmit this to others who in turn may modify or add something that completely alters the picture. He can also go through all the models, and in practice will, to make sure that the answer to his problem doesn't lie elsewhere than he had previously assumed. This often happens. Or, he can take the models in succession and, if it is necessary, emphasize the one or several that may be appropriate.

For example, you start out realizing you have a communications problem and so you might work on the attitudes of the people (or your own) by reviewing how we are communicating and how we might better communicate. With the system of TRIADS, we can investigate the six basic communications strategies and implement, for example, that important strategy where we must achieve the proper manager/subordinate relationship - that is, where it is necessary that the subordinate takes charge of some important program or some significant aspect of a program. We realize that some subordinates are not assuming the full involvement and the full responsibility. The strategy of "you take charge," is one that can be developed and demonstrated with a model. Its significance can be understood by both the superior and the subordinate. They can make this strategy strong and successful to the degree they are able to understand what's involved. The senior manager must learn how to relinquish some of his authority to give the subordinate a chance to achieve the unknown. The subordinate, on the other hand, must respect the objectives of the organization and those of his senior manager. These are factors that can be taught by SYSTEMATICS in an objective manner. What is really unbelievable to someone new to SYSTEMATICS is how so few models really can encompass and reduce to its simplest form of significance every new and spontaneous aspect of a complex creative management situation.

In a relatively short time a group of managers will be able to go through all of the SYSTEMS once or twice while relating them to their specific problems and situations. They will discover, if they are able to pay close attention, that somehow the organization is better balanced, things are beginning to flow, goals are better defined and take on new meanings, and right attitudes reflect self-confidence and team-confidence that seem to have come by an unprovable coincidence.

It will be realized over and over, that SYSTEMATICS is at its best when there is a high sensitivity to spontaneity, the "nowness" of time and an "openness" to the objectivity it reveals and the sacrifices it demands. And its beauty is, as you say, there are no fixed models nor any fixed answers. Each model applies only at that instant you are working at it and every significant change, whether physical or one of awareness, demands re-examining some and probably all of the SYSTEMS again. But, with SYSTEMATICS, this is not necessarily either difficult or time consuming.

JGB

I think you have laid out a case for looking into SYSTEMATICS as a management tool. It is, of course, very strongly supported by your own experience, which you will be talking about later. Before we come to that, I want to make one important comment upon the models of SYSTEMATICS that we've been using. As a scientist, I am of course, accustomed to using models in my own discipline. We look upon a model not only as a means of organizing our own thinking or of helping us to communicate, although these are very important, but the real significance of models in scientific research is that they are heuristic instruments. They help us to look where otherwise we would not have thought of looking. It helps us to open up new ideas, new possibilities, new experiments, new lines of investigation and that is what constitutes a fruitful model. Now would you say that this sort of fruitfulness, which is the real scientific merit of a model, is also true for SYSTEMATICS as it is used in management?

S K

Well, it was very true for myself -- the ability to look at a MONAD and to make sure I was looking at all of the parts to begin with that might lead to a discovery, looking at the polarity

of forces, the critical thresholds involved, the relationships and so forth. This gave me a positive means of reviewing the situation without being diverted by imagination - by emotions. It was an objective way to set the stage for possible creative discovery and without expending a great deal of energy and time on the obviously impossible situations, as we often do. I personally thought it would help me immeasurably as an individual. But more important than that, you can get a group together, say a group of five capable specialists, and they can act as one organism, all of a sudden, because you have the language, you have the system. You open the door to direct creative feedback from one to another, to another and back again immediately on the spot, in a situation that would be almost impossible to duplicate except over a great period of time and then the time itself would defeat such creativity. And so group fruitfulness becomes especially powerful with SYSTEMATICS, so much more powerful than the common brainstorm because here you have a framework, but an unlimiting one, with which you are assured you have a complete and significant background and you can concentrate all the energies on the problem or the potential and still leave the way wide open for creativity.

JGB

Good. I think this has brought us out with important claims for what SYSTEMATICS can do. Now the question is how can it be introduced? You yourself were able to introduce it in your organization because you were the top manager and had a pretty free hand from your parent management and group headquarters in applying this. Do you think that in introducing it that one of those methods, one of those things which is said about a great majority of management techniques, that they can be introduced only from the top? I am sure you would agree that it simply would not be enough to write a paper and say to people, "you can do this, read this paper and go ahead and apply SYSTEMATICS." Nothing very much would happen, would it?

S K

You certainly could not expect too much to happen right away from reading a paper. SYSTEMATICS must be experienced and it really will become alive in day-to-day application. This will be verified in fact by the understanding achieved both by individuals and shared by groups and, in most cases, one should be able to measure the results. For general use I would say SYSTEMATICS must be introduced from the top or certainly have unqualified support from there. The man at the top is making the final decisions and is usually a most capable man and this type of man accepts that the teaching and developing of managers is a prime responsibility and the best way to run his operations.

Many such excellent managers are the first to admit that they have been unable to significantly raise the level of the great majority of their subordinates even after many years of effort! I believe this is where SYSTEMATICS will really prove itself. Here is a tool which cannot only raise everyone's level proportionately to that of the most capable man, as well as to that of the combined group, to the degree they share understanding, but each successive level becomes higher by their very nature of becoming the staging point for the next advancement. This will be the proof of SYSTEMATICS' ability to transmit and share basic understanding.

JGB

I believe this is so, but doesn't SYSTEMATICS require a pretty careful preparation on the subordinate levels of management? Can you introduce it without having first prepared the ground with the second level or possibly even the third level of management?

S K

If you have an experienced manager introducing SYSTEMATICS, you do not necessarily have to spend time with subordinate management in training them to the SYSTEMATICS' concept. They can be brought in immediately without special preparation. This is because with the help of the models you can begin right away, in parallel with their own language, and most of them will recognize and understand how SYSTEMATICS is effective the very first time it is used. We actually found it useful to involve most of management from the top down to the general foreman or the first line supervisor, and there is good reason to believe that it could be applied on some basis to direct labor assembly personnel to attain a highly motivated group concern in the present and future success of the organization. But the main point is that SYSTEMATICS is best worked by being experienced; and so with anyone, it can be introduced directly without any prior special training.

JGB

We have met situations where someone in a management situation is really convinced and sold on the idea, but hasn't sufficient authority to do something about it. I think it is probably true to say that anyone on any level of management can do something if he knows how to set about it; he can apply it to his own problems. But, even seeing the necessity and possibilities, he can't demand that people in parallel with him or on his own level of authority should do the same.

But suppose you have an Engineering Manager who is inclined to think in long terms and is interested in systems thinking. He has picked up this idea of SYSTEMATICS; he has become convinced of its value. He can't do very much to get marketing and production and finance and so on interested, and it looks, on the face of it, that his help can only come from the top. But would you say that if there is in this kind of position that I have just outlined, somebody who has got the genuine interest and has taken the trouble and time to find out, to get a working knowledge of SYSTEMATICS, he can do something even in a department where higher authority than himself is in final control and where he has to work with other departments who will not be using SYSTEMATICS?

S K

Yes indeed, it could be a powerful tool. It would give him the ability to recognize situations and even to communicate this in varying degrees to his superiors and to others

JGB

Wouldn't they have to know the SYSTEMATICS language?

S K

Well, yes. This would be a limitation and he would have to mostly use their language. Now there are some notable exceptions to this rule of not using SYSTEMATICS openly, that is showing SYSTEMATICS indiscriminately, except as part of a challenging program. There are some portions of SYSTEMATICS that can be so powerful and direct, that with ever so slight a language adjustment they can be used with the "uninitiated", and uncommon understanding may be shared immediately. For example, you can take a group of managers of different disciplines and even different languages who have never heard of SYSTEMATICS and wish to discuss the potential of a new product, and you can use the model of the PENTAD very effectively under

these conditions. The PENTAD is unquestionably the quickest, simplest and clearest way of discussing potential in any and all of its aspects. The five elements: 1. what are we talking about? 2. what are we sure of? 3. what is possible? 4. how does the environment aid or oppose? 5. what will actually happen? are really basic and all-inclusive. Many managers will accept this system in limited fashion after they have tasted its effectiveness without ever learning of its even greater depths. The PENTAD applied to a meeting of the type I have just described can make it a very fruitful, meaningful one in a relatively short time where otherwise, quite often, such a meeting will go on for a very long time without ever resolving what it was they were talking about. There are other instances where SYSTEMATICS' discoveries can be presented in a quasi- conventional way and be of some use, but it is generally true, as with all new teachings, that SYSTEMATICS can develop a natural opposition from those who don't understand it or feel comfortable with it. A very big factor in this opposition is that it will expose situations for what they are and make it quite difficult for anyone to maintain a self-serving narrow view.

JGB

Let me take another case. Suppose that the man at the top of an organization, whether it is the president of a corporation or vice president in charge of an autonomous division, who is running his own division quite freely, he hears about SYSTEMATICS from some friend in another corporation. He knows that it has worked successfully and that they are very satisfied with it, and he wants to introduce it, but he's not prepared to give the time to make himself personally proficient in it. He may even, in principle, think it is a mistake to do so. He may go on the line that his job is not to be a specialist. He then wants to delegate to someone, perhaps in a position like a staff man, to go find out about SYSTEMATICS, himself become a trained expert and bring it back and apply it. Do you think that could work?

S K

I would have some doubts about that succeeding if the staff man was the major thrust in its first introduction. SYSTEMATICS is such a dynamic discovery instrument! To prove its vitality and its strength, it must be used and it must be used by people on the line. It truly can't be applied directly by a staff man or by an industrial relations manager or people somewhat apart from the day-to-day current problems. However, such men could be highly useful in helping line managers and executives prepare, communicate and analyze the workings of the SYSTEMATICS models. It must be, in the final analysis, put together and held together by the responsible line managers or it will be lacking in some vitality.

JGB

Alright, but just let's take my case again. The man at the top wants to try it. He could, in the time that he would likely be able to give to it, go through some kind of course that would give him a clear insight into what SYSTEMATICS can do and then afterwards, say with the help of a personal assistant who would do all the spade work, take over running preliminary discussions and guide the line managers through meetings. Do you think it could be introduced in that way? I am saying the top manager is not prepared himself personally to use it in what he is doing - or do you think that it is necessary, that in order to introduce it, that the top man must be personally involved?

S K

I think it could be introduced in that way since his acceptance and support would be there, and there will be a connection between the workings of SYSTEMATICS and the workings of the top man. This does not necessarily mean that the top man will personally use it excessively. He can choose the degree and the times that he feels it is most applicable for him yet be confident that this discovery tool was contributing to vital facets of his organization and operations.

JGB

I think that's right. The obvious answer is that the man at the top will not despise technical aids that will increase the range of his own communication with others and help him in his own work. I should think that if he once encourages the use of it in his organization, he will be competent enough to put it to work for himself. I think that it is a matter of presentation. I don't believe there is a substantial difficulty. If this is presented showing it as an instrument that enhances the power of a person working on any level, including the top level, and if people are convinced of this, they will want to use it. After all, it doesn't take the place of his own abilities and skills. It doesn't do anything for him that he can't do himself. It only enables him to do it more economically and with better use of his powers. For example, a very competent chief executive is concerned with problems of succession -- you, yourself said you are training and bringing along subordinates -- and the great part of his work must be in management development which he may now be forced to delegate to others because he hasn't time. If he saw that he personally could bring on people, bring them into relationship with his own style, and if he saw what he wants to do more effectively with the help of SYSTEMATICS, I am quite sure that he would use it. Really it must be an extremely effective way of getting across how we handle problems. The chief executive will have his own particular style and he wants his whole organization to understand and adapt itself to this style. I should have thought he would be much better able to achieve what he wants with the help of SYSTEMATICS by using it himself than if he were to stand apart from it and expect other people to use it. So I should say that you could put over to a chief executive - if you use SYSTEMATICS it won't take you much to learn to use it and get other people trained to do it. You'll have your pulse on your organization. You will be able to teach and train the people you want to bring along in your management succession program much more effectively and have them much closer to you.

The point that should be made very clear here is that SYSTEMATICS is not itself a management style. It is an instrument that can be used in any style of management and, therefore, the chief executive who takes up SYSTEMATICS doesn't have to make any changes in his old way of running his business, but is able to communicate his own style better to others and make use of people, as he has to do, who have styles of their own so that the whole thing is built together through the help of SYSTEMATICS. It is just what we were saying at the beginning about the universality of SYSTEMATICS. It is not exclusive to one style; it enables all styles to be welded together where they are most applicable. Would you agree to that?

S K

I certainly would, and this is the sort of thing that will be felt strongly when you are applying and experiencing SYSTEMATICS with your own style. You can see amazing things happening where your style and other managers styles become joined together in a very effective manner and you are really sharing understanding. I believe that once a senior executive has examined

this question with SYSTEMATICS he will become quite willing to accept it for both himself and his people.

JGB

Now just take the case of where an organization is not just run by one single man but there are a few men, two or three people who really are in complete control, who jointly take over the decision-making and know and understand one another and usually they will have a general agreement as to how the organization can be run, but they will have different styles and this constantly makes for difficulties however good friends they may be and how much trust they may have in one another. They do look at things from different perspectives. Now I think that in such a group SYSTEMATICS could be an immense benefit. They would keep their own styles, their own vision of what the organization should be doing and see it in a context much more easily. I think they would become more effective as a group, not just a single manager who runs the business himself and thinks the decisions will be more effective. I think also that this kind of group, which after all is present in many organizations nowadays - a top executive decision-making group - it would work for them too, don't you think?

S K

This certainly should be so. It did happen in our Division where we had strong personalities as marketing manager, manufacturing manager, and engineering manager; and we found that we were able to relate far greater to each other and to sort of put everything on the table where previously all the managers felt they had to cater to the general managers whims, and that was all there was to it. Previously, they would have had to use indirect ways in getting around this and so much time and effort was wasted and many things didn't happen that should have happened.

JGB

Could I just ask you on this question of your own experience whether you have found that when you are reporting to your president, who is after all not versed in SYSTEMATICS language, do you find that your own experience and training in SYSTEMATICS actually helped you in your presentations, or was it an embarrassment?

S K

It was a great help because, there was no question, I felt fully on top of the situation. I had seen the whole picture; I knew the relevance of all the parts. In fact, after working with SYSTEMATICS, I did make a presentation on a major new program to the Operating group committee and was totally prepared. I knew more about it and was able to completely anticipate and respond to all their questions and concerns. In this way, SYSTEMATICS is certainly a powerful support for even an individual, essentially working it by himself. However, it would certainly be a far greater help if he could get at least two or three others to practice it in common with him.

JGB

Tell me now in just coming to another side, about different management styles. Let's take the management style which is aggressive, the man who thinks that if there is something good, the whole organization can be using it. He has this enthusiasm and wants to set himself to sell SYSTEMATICS all around him. If you had such a man, would you do your best to advise him not to, or would you give him some advice as to how he might achieve something?

S K

Well, unless his abilities to influence his peers and superiors are extraordinarily exceptional, I would still recommend he use it discreetly until such time and circumstances develop where acceptance can come more naturally. I would say emphatically not to try to force SYSTEMATICS on anyone. It will not work that way.

JGB

All right. This raises the question - supposing that an interest is aroused in SYSTEMATICS and people begin to say we want to get some of our people to know about it. What kind of training course would you recommend? We've had two extremes, as you know. We've tried the research and development course which we spread over about six months; you and our friend from Canada participated through tape recordings, and the rest used to meet nearly every week and we built up a knowledge by trying it out as we went along in the study of companies, diagnoses and so on, and you in your practical applications is one way. We have tried a three-day intensive course in which we brought in both managers and consultants. The three-day course did not get over except to those who already had some knowledge of it, and that could have been done in one day. So, we have there these two extremes. The six months' course was very time consuming but turned out to be extremely valuable. The six months course included one evening a week, but the three-day course results showed that it didn't get over to those who were completely new to the thing and had no immediate reason to put it into practice. What would you say about this?

S K

I think both courses lacked the main ingredient for understanding SYSTEMATICS. That is, to actually apply it in day-to-day experience. I would say to begin with, something in time between those two extremes you described would represent an appropriate beginning. A series of relatively simple and straightforward talks, supported by a minimal amount of basic concept literature, could be most effective if it were applied at the same time to the current day-to-day problems and practices. Based on my experience, the most important ingredient, no matter how you do it, is the actual application of what you are learning while you are learning in real situations.

JGB

Right. Those people who are going to use it could have comparatively short presentations to get the basic ideas, possibly under guidance of an advisor who is versed in SYSTEMATICS. Then, after that, the advisor could help in developing the use of SYSTEMATICS by answering and asking questions showing how to use it in their actual situation. After a period of time, this man could withdraw, and the other participants could go on with it by themselves, assuming they had reached the conclusion that this was really going to help them and be a major contribution to their individual and combined goals.

S K

No question about it. That would be a quite useful approach. The advisor could not only work with the chief executive or other top manager, but with other men who they may wish to support in this program. One of these, for example, could be a program manager supported by an industrial relations person who could help set up charts, gather and monitor feedback and so on. Ideally, the managers that the advisor works more closely with should be ones that are being groomed for further advancement.

A SYSTEMATICS meeting is really a high level communications interaction where the models permit controversial viewpoints to be presented openly in an objective easily understood way. This is because everyone is trying to reveal an actual model as it truly is and the controversy is transferred to the model rather than directly between people's personalities. Because of this it will often be acceptable for tape recordings to be made for those managers who were unable to attend to determine for themselves what the state of affairs was at that time.

JGB

All right then, you think if interest is aroused, there is no insuperable problem in getting it to be used in an organization so long as the chief executive is supportive of it, there are people available with the experience to teach it, and someone to answer questions during the stages of applying it? I take your point that the real way to learn about SYSTEMATICS is to apply it and one can begin to apply it with very little preparation. Is that right?

S K

This is so, and once it is applied the question of the value of SYSTEMATICS will answer itself.

JGB

Well, we've done all that we usefully can say at this stage of our work. We understand SYSTEMATICS and the ways in which we think it could be used and introduced, but after all, what will convince anyone, convince you and me, would be to be told that someone has really tried it in real situations and that he had found that it works. I am going to ask you now to just tell us what you can about your own experience and what you have observed in your organization where SYSTEMATICS was being used as a major management tool.

S K

Let me present a case history based on an experience involving the open application of SYSTEMATICS over a nine-month period. I will give a brief background of the organization, the management and a summary of the problems. I will then describe the performance as it evolved with the use of SYSTEMATICS which would not have been possible otherwise.

***** End of Dialog and Chapter One File.

SYSTEMATICS: SEARCH FOR MIRACULOUS MANAGEMENT by Saul Kuchinsky - 280 pages, 40 illustrations \$40 + S&H. Available by USA dollar check from the UniS Institute \$4 priority S&H USA & Canada, (\$16 S&H airmail / \$8 parcel post overseas) from, the UniS Institute, P.O. Box 6615 Bridgewater, NJ 8807 USA. Phone 908 722 4875; Fax 908 722 2275. See, "Dialog2.pdf" file for book contents & illustrations.

Disks with this & other sample chapters , plus tables of Contents, "UniS .PDF files" (with optional 'free' acrobat readers) for Windows, Macintosh & Unix, for reading and printing essentially as published, are also available by mail at nominal costs from UniS. Please phone 908 722 4875, for specific details.

See Free Chapter "as published" offer from UniS. Applies to Books published by The UniS Institute and listed at www.infoque.com/unis as available at: <http://www.infoque.com/unis/??????.PDF> for .PDF reading &/or printing on, "Acrobat Reader" 3.0

Books listed are also available by credit card from, By The Way Books, P.O. Box 255869 Sacramento CA 95865 USA Phone 916 482 2444; Fax 916 482 9898.