scholars and see what happened. Sometimes the outcomes were not read-
ily apparent by the end of the conference. But over time, stakeholder-
oriented theory and research began to appear in a number of places,
including some of the most significant management publication outlets.
Often, one could trace the research or thinking back to a Toronto confer-
ence. Clearly, Max has become the grandfather or at least godfather of
many projects.

Max as role model is quite an inspiration. He was mature and also
young at heart. His enthusiasm for solving real problems in practical ways
and his stubborn unwillingness to be halted by obstacles encourages us to
act on our ideals. His interests were broad, but he didn't try to do every-
thing. He seemed to know his own strengths and he seemed to relish know-
ing how to create opportunities for others. And what a charming person to
share a meal with! Some people want to "be like Mike," but my choice is to
"be like Max."

Thank you, Max, for coming into our lives.

Max Clarkson, Architect

RONALD K. MITCHELL
University of Victoria

It has at times been fashionable to associate the craft of architecture with
social art and science, due to architecture's dual emphasis on structure and
creativity. The use of this metaphor enables us to acknowledge the high
esteem in which we hold individuals who possess social perception that
transcends present patterns to enact new tangibles. As a student of the
business and society interface, and one who is somewhat familiar with the
work of Max Clarkson in stakeholder theory, I wish to suggest that to the
many accolades and honors that apply to him should be added the appella-
tion, architect. It is my privilege in the following paragraphs to explain why.

Although the notions that relate *social* to *responsibility* or to *perform-
ance* have been around for a while (as the many publications on the topic
attest), they have nevertheless failed—so far at least—to achieve full theo-
retical status. Max suggested (paraphrasing) that this is due to a lack of
architecture (systematic organization and analysis of corporate data)
(Clarkson, 1995, p. 92). But then, through the ceaseless, inclusive, ener-
gizing of his colleagues, he set us to filling the gap: "conferencing" and
redefining our way toward the creation and building of new social struc-
ture. And along the way, he offered a few design points that I have found to

be elegant and illuminating, although he, himself, maintained that they were nevertheless imperfect. I have found two of these points to be particularly useful.

First, although he did not claim to have originated the point, Max chose to emphasize and to expand on the notion of primary and secondary stakeholders (Clarkson, 1995). A primary stakeholder group is one without whose continuing participation the corporation cannot survive as a going concern, whereas secondary stakeholder groups are those who do not transact with the corporation and are not essential for its survival (1995, pp. 111-112). I find these distinctions to be quite helpful in research that deals with the formation, success, and failure of entrepreneurial organizations. With these definitions, one can confidently ask, for example: If your primary stakeholders support you, just how can your firm fail? With this notion employed, the writing of the proverbial business plan can be reconceptualized as the creation of a stakeholder plan. The focus can then be widened from planning to satisfy only shareholders (which, by the way, continues to produce new ventures with a 50% to 80% failure rate, depending on measures), to planning to add value to all primary stakeholders, by definition an improvement of success prospects. Indeed, Max's emphasis on the primary-secondary notion has been, and continues to be, architectural in the entrepreneurship arena, because it provides the structure needed to engender the creative and pragmatic solutions needed by the relatively new field of stakeholder entrepreneurship.

Architectural creations nevertheless prompt comparisons and consequent interest in reconciliations among other designs and structures. For example, some have viewed the primary-secondary stakeholder notion to be in competition with the power, legitimacy, urgency (P, L, U) framework (Mitchell, Agle, & Wood, 1997) and have called on me to account for one superseding the other. This question reveals—in my view—the need for a deeper analysis, specifically with respect to the fact that the intended outcomes cannot be compared. In the case of the primary-secondary notion, the outcome of interest is the survival of the organization as a going concern, about which the framework for stakeholder identification and salience makes no claims. In the case of P, L, U attribute analysis, the outcomes of interest are stakeholder identification and stakeholder salience to managers, which may or may not result in the growth or demise of the firm. I therefore consider both dynamic frameworks (e.g., that a secondary stakeholder can begin to transact with a firm, thus becoming primary; or that a powerful, legitimate stakeholder can add urgency to become "definitive") to be complementary (e.g., "dormant" stakeholders can be either primary or secondary depending on their transacting profile).

Second, Max boldly redefined the corporation as a "nexus of risks" (Clarkson, 1998, p. 3) that, when taken together with the notion of primary (transacting) stakeholders, sets the stage for a conception of the corporation that is also architectural: both theoretically tractable and useful to managers. Increasingly, the production function view of the firm, which is central to the neoclassical economic macro analysis of price and output, has been challenged by microanalytic conceptions that better explain how and why individuals create transactions in the ways that they do (Williamson, 1996, p. 328). By introducing the notion of shared risk as the gravitational core that draws stakeholders together, Max supported our framing the corporation as an essentially human (versus mechanistic) endeavor, joining other (Nobel Prize-winning) architects of practical economic thought (e.g., Simon, 1985, p. 303) to lay the groundwork for transaction/cognition-based theories of organizational formation, growth, and demise. In my own labors, I have found this formulation to be helpful in explaining for policy makers, scholars, managers, and entrepreneurs why some people seek economic security (avoid risk) whereas others do not, why some security seekers choose jobs rather than entrepreneurship, and why for either choice some succeed while others fail (e.g., Mitchell, 1998). The future challenge posed by this Clarkson conception of the corporation is to further validate its veracity in the empirical world and thereby to refine the definition and boundary conditions of the theory (e.g., what about the "omission risk" that arises from corporate innovations that implicate nontransacting parties?).

In my view, Max, like most architects, sought to transcend for the purpose of effecting transformations that are tangible in the practical world. For his capabilities to evoke "big picture" thought within an already big picture academic community, I add my voice to those of others in thanking, recognizing, and honoring Max Clarkson. For giving a new scholar a career-shaping break, I shall be forever indebted. Thanks, Max.

REFERENCES

Clarkson, M.B.E. (1995). A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(1), 92-117.

Clarkson, M.B.E. (1998). Introduction. In M.B.E. Clarkson (Ed.), *The corporation and its stakeholders: Classic and contemporary readings.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Mitchell, R. K., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D. J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identifica-
    tion and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of
    Management Review, 22*(4), 853-886.
Simon, H. (1985). Human nature in politics: The dialogue of psychology with political sci-
    ence. *American Political Science Review, 79*, 293-304.
Williamson, O. E. (1996). *The mechanisms of governance.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University
    Press.

Max Clarkson, the Standard Bearer: A Personal Tribute

JEAN PASQUERO
Université du Québec à Montréal

Back in the early 1980s, what little I knew of Max Clarkson was his role as
dean of one of the major business schools in Canada and his commitment
to the Canadian business school scene. Then in the mid-1980s, I got wind
through a third party that "someone" was doing pioneering empirical
work about corporate social responsibility in Canada, over at the Univer-
sity of Toronto. I called. Max answered. He was the pioneer, at an age oth-
ers normally think of retirement. Then, he started popping up at the Acad-
emy of Management, and later the International Association for Business
and Society, conferences, each time with more field data, more projects,
more enthusiasm about future research. At the time, stakeholder theory
was taking its first steps, looking for an entrepreneur to champion it. The
two just had to meet. Max gradually established himself as one of the piv-
ots of the development of the stakeholder paradigm.

Looking back at his accomplishments of the past 15 years, I see three
sides of Max, all wrapped up in a unique personality: the achiever, the
scholar, and the gentleman. Each has contributed to the field and to my
personal thinking in different ways.

The Achiever. In my view, Max was before all an achiever. This formi-
dable trait permeated each of his accomplishments. Everyone knows of
his prior career as a successful businessman. The same drive explains his
tireless commitment to the development of a pragmatic approach to better
relationships between business and society. Max was a man of ideals, but
he wouldn't be satisfied until he had found a concrete way to make them