

Inheritance Organizations

Trevor Israelsen
Penn State University

Roy Suddaby
University of Victoria

Introduction

In a study titled *The role of institutionalization in cultural persistence*, Lynn Zucker (1977) observed that formal organizations are more effective than other entities at transmitting cultural understandings across generations of successive actors. Nearly fifty years later, what remains remarkable about this observation is that it still runs contrary to our received wisdom about organizations. We still tend to think of intergenerational transmission as a process that occurs *outside* of formal organizations.

Decades before Zucker's study, German sociologist, Max Weber (2019) differentiated formal organizations (what he termed "bureaucracies") from "traditional" forms of social organization such as the family, the tribe, the guild system, religion, monarchies, etc. He theorized that formal organizations operated on forms of authority that were distinct from those that were cultivated through intergenerational transmission.

It would appear that organizational theorists have largely sided with Weber over Zucker on this point. The concept of intergenerational transmission rarely features into current organization theory and research. When organization theorists do seek to explain institutional persistence, they regularly substitute Berger and Luckmann's (1966, p. 77) focus on "the process of transmission from generation to generation" with more abstract concepts such as "historically situated webs of meaning" (Ocasio, Mausekapp & Steele, 2016, p. 676) or "the stability of

‘stamped in’ features” (Marquis & Tilcsik, 2013, p. 203). On the whole, organization theorists have devoted very little attention to the role of intergenerational transmission in organizations.

However, there are a growing number of recent exceptions. Suddaby and colleagues (2023), for example, explore how a founding family’s values are transmitted and sacralized across generations within Cadbury, a British chocolate company. Sasaki, Ravasi and Micelotta (2019) observe how multi-centenary Japanese family firms maintain high social status in their communities. Frake and Harmon (2023) study the intergenerational transmission of misconduct in the Chicago police department. Dacin, Dacin and Kent (2019) survey management research on the topic of tradition to introduce what they term a “custodianship framework” focused on “vested actors (individual or collective) who seek to maintain institutionalized practices such as traditions” (p. 343). There is also a growing interest in how the legacies of specific past actors (e.g., founders, colonizers, business leaders, etc.) are carried forward in organizations (e.g., Maclean, Harvey, Suddaby & Coraiola, 2023; Radu-Lefebvre, Davis & Gartner, 2024).

Despite such recent work, intergenerational transmission is not a central theme or unit of analysis in any major theory of organization. So, while this recent work identifies some of the local mechanisms involved in transmission (ranging from sacralization to status preservation and from custodianship to legacy maintenance), we lack an understanding of how such mechanisms relate to one another within a more general framework. As a result, the recent interest in intergenerational transmission is scattered across a wide array of empirical research settings including, for example, family-owned businesses, philanthropic foundations, museums, religious organizations, business trusts, crafts and trades, indigenous communities, etc. So, while we are beginning to understand something about the heterogeneity of mechanisms and organizations in

which intergenerational transmission occurs, it remains unclear what might hold such a wide range of different organizations together within a common category of analysis.

In this chapter, we introduce the label *inheritance organizations* to describe forms of economic, social and political organization that are dedicated specifically to managing the present residuals left behind by past generations. Whereas intergenerational transmission may be a *means* through which the institutions emerge and are maintained in a general sense (e.g., Berger & Luckmann, 1966; Zucker, 1977), inheritance organizations adopt intergenerational transmission as an *end* in itself. Because inheritance organizations render transmission readily observable for empirical analysis, we argue that studying inheritance organizations can provide theoretical insights for understanding how institutions transmit assets, values, and other residuals across generations in a more general sense.

In this chapter we also suggest a specific concept through which this occurs which we label *conflation*. We use the term conflation as an abstract concept that explains how diverse actors—who are distributed across wide spans of space and time—see themselves as part of something bigger than their own lives and interests such that they work to preserve, pass down and receive across generations. Before introducing this concept, however, it is necessary to first explain the phenomena of inheritance and inheritance organizations.

Inheritance

Inheritance is a prominent topic of study in disciplines such as law (Busch, Halliday & Gutmann, 2022; Cunliffe & Erreygers, 2013; Friedman, 2009; Kendrick, 2011; Miller & McNamee, 1998; Mumford, 2007), philosophy (e.g., Brassington, 2019; de Tocqueville, 1945 [1835]; Halliday, 2018; Mill, 1961 [1848]; Pedersen & Bøyum, 2020), anthropology (Hann, 2008; Goody, 1976; Ingold, 2016), economics (Braun & Stuhler, 2018; Erreygers & Vandeveld,

1997; Menchik & Jianakopulos, 1998; Piketty & Saez, 2013), sociology (Beckert, 2007; 2008; Bourdieu, 1998; Clignet, Bekcert & Harrington, 2018; Collier, 1948; Glass, Bengtson & Durham, 1986; McNamee & Miller, 1989; Weber, 1985 [1922])), gerontology (Angel & Mudrazija, 2011; Kohli, 2004), and evolutionary biology (Mendel, 2013 [1865]; Lewens, 2015; Pontarotti, 2015; Sukhoverkhov & Gontier, 2021), but is a much less prominent concept in organizational theory (e.g., Vermeulen, 2018). Across such disciplines, the word “inheritance” has two interrelated meanings: First, it refers to the present residuals left behind by past generations. Such residuals can take several different forms ranging, for example, from property, assets and status to values, traits and identities. Second, the term inheritance also refers to the *processes* through which such residuals are transmitted and managed from one generation to the next. In this chapter, we focus primarily on the second meaning of inheritance as a process of transmitting and managing residuals left behind by past generations.

Inheritance is related to other concepts such as tradition, legacy, lineage and heritage. The term “tradition” is used to connote how practices (sometimes labeled “traditia”) are carried forward across generations through processes (sometimes labeled “tradere”) and by actors with vested interests in such practices (sometimes labeled “custodians”) (e.g., Shils, 1981; Suddaby & Jaskiewicz, 2020; Dacin et al., 2019). The term “legacy” is used to connote how past actors (sometimes labeled “legators”, “legacy senders”, or “organizational ghosts”) are carried forward and remembered by subsequent actors (sometimes labeled “legatees” or “legacy receivers”) (e.g., Bednar & Brown, 2023; Colquitt et al., 2020; Radu-Lefebvre et al., 2024).

Like the concepts of tradition and legacy, the term inheritance refers to processes through which residuals left behind by past generations are transmitted to subsequent generations. Indeed, legacy is sometimes understood as a form of inheritance that is associated with a specific

individual or collective actor from the past. Tradition is likewise understood as a form of inheritance, but one whose point of origin has been forgotten or de-emphasized. Together legacy and tradition comprise common dynamics involved in the transmission and management of residuals from past generations.

The concept of heritage shares with inheritance a common etymology (along with concepts such as hereditary, heritability and heir). These concepts all locate in the present the act of receiving some residual from the past. The concept of heritage refers to a specific type of residual left behind from past generations that is selected and specifically designated for preservation by a social entity, often by a society or culture (e.g., Caust & Vecco, 2017).

The concept of lineage typically refers to the specific institutional vehicle of hereditary (often biological, family) relations through which intergenerational transmission and inheritance can occur (Durkheim, 1921). However, inheritance is not exclusively a family matter (Vermeulen, 2018), is not limited to sociobiological considerations (Lewens, 2015) and, as we will argue in this chapter, is often nested, and distributed across a variety of different forms of economic, social and political organization.

Inheritance is, thus, a term that denotes how present actors work to manage their relationship with the residuals left behind from past generations after they are gone. It is, thus, important to note that the concept of inheritance used in this chapter assigns primary agency in the transmission of such residuals to actors in the present. Indeed, we shall argue using the concept of “conflation” that inheritance involves a type of perdurance that “lies not in the transmission, across generations, of an already constructed world but in the continual bringing forth, or production, of a world that—from generation to generation—is ever in formation” (Ingold, 2019, p. S37).ⁱ In the remainder of this chapter, we introduce the concept of conflation

and explain its role in the perdurance and regeneration of residuals (such as assets, values and power) across generations. Before doing so, however, it is necessary to first describe the historical origins of inheritance organizations.

The historical origins of inheritance organizations

The notion of inheritance—as the management of residuals left behind by past generations—is a very old one. Inheritance appears in ancient texts such as *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (which mentions brothers dividing an inheritance) or *The Iliad* and *The Odessey* (which focus on the heritability of land, wealth and reputation within family lineage). Inheritance and related concepts also appear in sacred texts. The Hebrew Bible uses the concept of “birthright” to connote both a material transmission from parent to child and a sign of a covenant (or spiritual bequeathment) between G-d and the descendants of Abraham. The Four Books of Confucianism emphasize the importance of intergenerational filial piety to parents, elders and ancestors. The Daozang highlight the importance of transmitting Taoist teachings across generations from masters to disciples. The Hindu Dharmashastras includes detailed rules regarding the succession and distribution of property. The New Testament uses the concept of inheritance to both teach about the importance of forgiveness (e.g., the prodigal son) and to describe the ultimate rewards of righteousness (e.g., ‘inheriting’ eternal life). The Quran also contains detailed instructions regarding the rights of heirs and the importance of the equitable distribution of the estates of deceased.

As is obvious from the range of different uses and points of emphasis, the notion of inheritance is a flexible concept that can be applied to explain the perdurance of various different types of phenomena over time. Indeed, such semantic flexibility provided by the concept of inheritance was helpful in the conceptual formulation and invention of modern institutions. That

is, the ancient idea of inheritance provided a conceptual architecture through which legal entities such as trusts, foundations, and ultimately joint stock companies were invented as institutions that can persist beyond the involvement or lifetimes of their founders.

In *Power and the Structure of Society*, Coleman's (1974) explains how our modern idea of the corporation originated in legal disputes surrounding property ownership in churches. It was clear to legal scholars that priests did not own all of the land or assets of the church. They were only stewards of such assets. And yet the law required an owner. The solution was to

"declare the saint for whom the church was named as the owner. Thus many centuries after their deaths, St. Peter and St. Paul and St. James became extensive property owners. The law had found a solution. When property associated with St. Paul's church was transferred, the seller would be St. Paul, while the guardian of St. Paul's property, who acted to protect his interests, was the priest currently installed in St. Paul's church" (p. 17)

In this way, the legal doctrine of “the trust” emerged that would (in the context of religious organizations) allow for a distinction between owners (e.g., grantors), stewards (e.g., trustees) and the congregation (e.g., beneficiaries). The original application of this doctrine was to codify a social structure wherein predecessors could transmit assets to their heirs in a manner that could be recognized as legally binding. Over time, this same logic of inheritance was applied beyond families and churches to other entities such as hospitals and universities.

Inheritance has long been recognized as something bigger than the intergenerational perpetuation of capital. It was obvious, for example, in the perpetuation of property by medieval churches that the priest was not the authority per se but was standing in a chain of priesthood that was transmitted intergenerationally. This chain of authority was bigger than the priest and, because of the practices of celibacy within the Christian church, bigger also than the lineage of any specific family.

Ideas about the inheritance of authority were also at the very fabric of medieval political systems. Kings, for example, maintained legitimacy by virtue of a noble lineage that bestowed a ‘divine right’ to act as sovereign authorities over their kingdoms (Weber, 2019). In some cases, however, this legitimacy came into question—leading to early theorization regarding the notion of inheritance. When kings were too young, too old, or otherwise incapable of making authoritative decisions, it became important to differentiate between the king as an individual and the king as an instantiation of a sovereign lineage. The resulting legal theory of the “corporate sole” held that political inheritance had a perdurance that extended some degrees beyond the flesh-and-blood person of the monarch. As Coleman (1974) writes:

"the king had two bodies, the physical body and the body politic. The 'body politic,' who ... knew no minority, no infirmity, no old age, knew neither birth nor death... [with] an explicit separation of 'The Crown' from the particular king who was the current possessor of the Crown... a separation of the idea of the monarchy from the particular monarch" (p. 19-20)

In such examples the notion of inheritance takes the form of legacy (e.g., St. Peter) or tradition (e.g., the body politic) which provide the conceptual infrastructure for institutions (e.g., the church, the monarchy). Over the centuries, the underlying notion of inheritance (as codified in the institutions of priesthood, monarchy and trusts) evolved and were manifest in different forms to include philanthropic foundations, guilds, etc. More recently, patterns of inheritance have been adapted for use within more formal, bureaucratic systems (e.g., Weber, 2019) such as joint-stock companies and modern corporations.

Inheritance continues to play an important role in the underlying fabric and perdurance of institutions today. This role is most obvious in inheritance organizations—in family businesses, trusts, foundations, family offices, monarchies, churches, museums and other organizations—

that treat the transmission and management of residuals left behind by past generations as an end in itself.

The Role of Conflation in Inheritance Organizations

One of the core challenges involved in studying inheritance organizations is that residuals from past generations are often nested and distributed across a variety of different entities and organizations in the present. Trusts, for example, are organizations. But they are not organizations in the way that we are used to thinking about organizations as discrete, bounded, formal legal entities—such as corporations, associations, or clubs. They are organizations that bring together different entities (individuals or organizations) in the roles of grantor, trustee, and beneficiary (Bove & Langa, 2021; Silk & Linott, 2011). Inheritance organizations bring together and compress the interests of multiple interfacing entities—weaving a fabric across both time and space.

Inheritance involves weaving individual stories that are distributed over wide spans of time into a tapestry that blends lives and values together back across generations. In order to observe and study inheritance organizations we first need a concept that can explain how diverse actors—who are distributed across wide spans of space and time—see themselves are part of something bigger than their own lives and interests such that they work to preserve, pass down and receive across generations. We use the term *conflation* to explain how this occurs.

Conflation involves the use of figurative language (such as synecdoche and metonymy)ⁱⁱ to blend objects of discourse together. The Oxford dictionary (2023) defines conflation as “the merging of two or more sets of information, texts, ideas, etc. into one.” To conflate means to blend or fuse to form a composite. In its prevailing colloquial usage, conflation is typically seen as a fallacy that occurs when cognitive biases cloud the exercise of better judgement.

However, in this chapter, we use the term conflation in a specific technical sense where conflation is not a priori negative and can be generative—even a force for good in the world. We thus use the label conflation in a value neutral sense to denote a symbolic process of weaving the identities and motives of different entities together to comprise a conceptual-institutional system. What the notion of conflation provides to our understanding of inheritance organizations is a conceptual architecture that explains how actors and entities who are distributed across wide spans of historical time see themselves as being bound together. As a practice, conflation provides grounds upon which present actors make claims on the residuals which are left behind after mortal lives. That is, conflation provides a sociocognitive link that orients individual thought and action toward entities in the distant past and future.

While conflation is an abstract concept, inheritance organizations provide concrete and often taken-for-granted vocabularies for rationalizing the process of conflation. Trusts, for example, provide a legal vocabulary for conflating the motives of grantors, trustees and beneficiaries. Family businesses, similarly, operate on the conflation of motive and identity between founders and their successors. Private philanthropic foundations provide a language that rationalizes synecdoche between philanthropists and the social entity of the foundation. Biographical museums (such as presidential libraries, celebrity museums, etc.) also act as institutional frameworks for stretching a legacy through time. Perhaps the most extreme form of conflation is that which occurs within a political dynasty—where disparate elements of a political regime are routinely described as if they were acts of a sovereign ruler.

In this way, inheritance organizations rationalize the conflation involved in binding actors of different generations together for carrying forward the residuals left behind by generations distributed over disparate times and contexts. We now explore how inheritance organizations act

as vocabularies of conflation for transmitting and managing three illustrative types of present residuals left behind by past generations: (1) assets, (2) values, (3) power.

Inheritance organizations and the conflation of assets

Assets are a common type of residual left behind by past generations. Assets that are subject to transmission and inheritance can take a number of different forms. These include financial assets such as cash, stocks, bonds, etc.; real assets such as land, buildings, commodities, etc.; as well as intangibles such as intellectual property, brand equity, etc.

The inheritance of assets often takes the form of legacy, wherein an identifiable legator is understood to transmit assets to legatees who are entrusted with their ownership or control. The means of this entrustment vary depending on the type of inheritance organization—including family lineage, trusts, foundations, corporations—through which the transmission is facilitated. Because such entities are often nested together in processes of inheritance, it is important to define the respective vocabularies through which they provide a legally and pragmatically acceptable justification for the transmission of assets across generations. Only by doing so, can their complex, nested interactions be adequately understood.

The institution of family lineage provides one such vocabulary for conflating entities of different generations. Family lineage is among the most ancient of institutions (Durkheim, 1921) and is often understood as the primary vehicle through which societies and social structures reproduce themselves across generations (Mead, [1934] 2015; Zimmerman, 2014). Families reproduce society both biologically through procreation and also culturally through early childhood processes of socialization. Despite this, we often forget that the notion of “reproduction” in family lineage is itself a figure of speech.

In his (2012) book *Far from the Tree: Parents, Children and the Search for Identity* Andrew Solomon argues that narratives of intergenerational family continuity are sometimes veiled attempts to immortalize or perpetuate personal identity.

“There is no such thing as reproduction. When two people decide to have a baby, they engage in an act of production, and the widespread use of the word reproduction for this activity, with its implication that two people are but braiding themselves together, is at best a euphemism to comfort prospective parents before they get in over their heads. In the subconscious fantasies that make conception look so alluring, it is often ourselves that we would like to see live forever, not someone with a personality of his own.” (Solomon, 2012, p. 1)

The notion of family lineage is not only a biological fact but also a deeply institutionalized vocabulary for conflating the identities of parents and children across successive generations.

The vocabulary of family lineage is so effective that most legal systems around the world are built around the concept of family lineage as the default means of distributing assets across generations. As previously noted, in some cultures, such as those influenced by feudal or tribal systems, inheritance rights based on lineage are deeply embedded in traditional customs and laws. Despite this, modern legal systems also provide mechanisms for individuals to determine the distribution of their assets through wills, trusts and other estate planning tools, allowing them to deviate from strict familial inheritance patterns if they choose to do so.

The rules through which entities of different generations are conflated together differs slightly in the context of a trust as compared to the context of family lineage. The defining characteristic of a trust is the organization of assets between grantors, trustees and beneficiaries. Grantors, trustees and beneficiaries may be distributed over vast spans of space and time. This is most likely when trusts take the form of irrevocable trusts and testamentary trusts which, unlike living trusts or revocable grantor trusts, externalize assets beyond the direct control of

individuals, and often across generations. In this way, trusts bring a defined assemblage of people together in an organized, rationalized mobilization of assets over time and space.

What is particularly interesting about the vocabulary of grantor, trustee(s) and beneficiaries is the flexibility that they provide in the conflation of entities and motives in the management of assets. Grantors, trustees and beneficiaries can be individuals. But they can also be families (either conjugal or lineal). Furthermore, the language of grantor, trustee and beneficiary can be used to bring together organizations—and sometimes very large organizations—as owners or controllers of assets. So, for example, American chocolatier Milton Hershey, established an irrevocable inter vivos trust and, thereby, designated a board of trustees as controllers of majority shares in Hershey Company where a beneficiary of this arrangement was an orphanage. He described this arrangement by saying “I have no heirs, so I have decided to make the orphan boys of America my heirs”.

We can all think of examples of cases where the vocabulary of grantors, trustees, beneficiaries is, like in Hershey’s case, intended as a force for good in the world. However, trusts—like other inheritance organizations—can also be used for less than noble purposes. During the gilded age in the United States, for example, trusts became a favored instrument for the monopolistic business practices of so called “robber barons”. It is for this reason that anti-monopoly legislation in the US carry the label “anti-trust laws”.

Despite this, many trusts retain freedoms that more formal organizations (such as corporations) do not have. While regulations vary, some trusts can be established simply by the signature of a single individual (sometimes even without witnesses or notaries). Many trusts are not required to be legally registered and are often not required to file reports to regulators.

Philanthropic foundations provide an additional vocabulary, in addition to family lineage or trusts, for conflating entities, assets, systems and stretching these over extended periods of time. The concept of the foundation was invented as a means of perpetuating organization beyond its founder. In the late 14th century the English word “foundation” simply meant “that which is founded” and was applied to entities such as colleges or hospitals that had financial endowments that supported them. It was only in the 15th century that the term was used to refer specifically to benevolent or charitable purposes (Online Etymology Dictionary, 2024).

Today the term philanthropic foundation is used to describe a formal organization that is legally registered for charitable purposes that is supported by assets provided by its founder and sometimes others. In this way, foundations provide a vocabulary and legal instrument for conflating a founder with his or her assets and extending this relationship through time beyond the founder’s lifetime. This process of inheritance involved in philanthropic foundations is often more formalized than the transmission of assets through family lineages or trusts. Despite this, the intergenerational transmission of assets through philanthropic foundations is not as heavily regulated as corporations.

Corporations can act as inheritance organizations. Indeed, the legal entity of the corporation was invented with the express purpose of perpetuating organization beyond the lifetime of its founders (Coleman, 1974). This process is illustrated by family-owned corporations. The ownership and control of family-owned businesses are regularly transmitted to successors within owning families across two or three generations. Some families are even able to own and control businesses over hundreds of years. Because failures of intergenerational transmission are a common reason for failures of businesses, intergenerational succession within families is an important strategic consideration within family-owned firms (e.g., Miller, Steier &

Le Breton-Miller, 2003). Like the concept of family lineage, the concept of intrafamily succession provides a vocabulary that rationalizes the conflation of successive generations within a family.

Family offices are, perhaps, the latest arrival on the scene of organizational forms dedicated specifically to the management of asset inheritance. Not surprisingly, given this recency, family offices have yet to establish an overarching vocabulary for legitimating the intergenerational transmission of assets. Despite this, family offices bring together experts in the management and control of vast amount of wealth. George Marcus (1992) used to the term “surrogate” to refer to individuals or entities (such as family offices) that act as proxies or substitutes for the direct management of wealth by family members within a wealthy business dynasty across generations. He writes that such surrogates “have both a sociological reality for family members and a totally separate, but parallel, technical reality for specialists, particularly within the legal system” across generations this surrogate comes to be viewed by family member “as a monolithic legacy which controls extended family relationships more than it is controlled by them” (Marcus, 1992, p. 25). The metaphor of surrogacy may, thus, provide an emergent vocabulary of conflation for explaining the role that wealth management experts play in the intergenerational transmission of assets.

Inheritance organizations and the conflation of values

The phenomenon of inheritance is not limited to the intergenerational transmission of assets. Some organizations are dedicated specifically to the perpetuation of specific values across generations in the form of tradition, heritage or legacy. Religious organizations, for example, are theorized as a means of bringing people together as stewards of a chain of memory that reaches from the distant past into the present and future (Hervieu-Léger, 2000). In addition, many

museums, arts organizations, heritage organizations, and craft-based organizations see their purpose as the preservation of values from the past.

One of the core challenges involved in the effort to transmit values over time is the tension that arises between values (as abstract ideals) and their carriers (as concrete, situated entities). Values are, by definition, bigger than their carriers and more broadly applicable than any specific situation or desirable world state (Kraatz, Florez & Chandler, 2020). Selznick, for example, worked to understand “the conditions and processes which frustrate ideals or instead give them life and hope” (Selznick, 1992, p. x). This tension between values and their carriers is illustrated by the phenomenon in which elites within organizations work to co-opt values (“Bolshevism”, “democratic grass roots”, etc.) for purposes that seem, at times, distant from the idealized end states indicated by values themselves.ⁱⁱⁱ

One way of transmitting values is by blurring the distinction between ideals and their human carriers. This can involve stretching individuals through time and space by conflating their actions (which are necessarily limited in consciousness, time and virtue) with the broader motives and actions of institutions. Thus Milton S. Hershey becomes a moral legacy—a representation of higher motives crystalized in organizations such as the Milton S. Hershey School which owns the majority stock of the chocolate firm, Hershey Company, and uses this wealth to educate orphans. By so doing the actions of many stakeholders are conflated with the actions of a hero who is infused with extra significance and meaning. In this manner Milton Hershey becomes more than a person—he becomes a narrative character to whom values are ascribed and from whom inspiration is drawn for moral and ethical behavior in the present. Of course, one risk involved in such a strategy for the transmission of values in organizations relates to the jarring experience that audiences may experience when they realize the limitations of those

characters with whom values are conflated. The conflation of values is, thus, a practice that involves collapsing distinctions between unlimited values and their limited carriers.

Values can be transmitted in organizations by encapsulating those values in individuals who serve as the characters (heroes and villains) of a tale of good and evil. Because values are, by definition, better than their carriers and bigger than specific situations, the narrative choice to cast limited individuals as representations of unlimited values requires substantial creativity and artistic license. Sometimes we have no better way of transporting values than by personifying them. And, within the western literary cannon, heroic protagonists are, almost invariably, super-human (Campbell, 2008; Frazer, 1922; Frye, 2006). Such literary characters are prescient, hypermuscular, and sometimes even cheat death. But flesh-and-blood persons depend heavily on others and have limited attention and mortality.

As noted, values transcend specific situations. However, values must be carried out and transmitted in specific situations. This dualism means that situations must somehow be blurred with other past and future situations that can elevate human activity to a broader, transhistorical realm of metaphysical meaning. This is accomplished not only by collapsing distinctions between values and their carriers but also by the use of narratives to conflate events with other events. This involves “the conflation of time past and time present, [in which] the mere act of remembering is invested with the power to see and perhaps shape the future” (Ballenger, 1997, p. 790; See also Reed, 2007). Morality tales “take the form of a narrative conflation of various epochs ... into a timeless continuum, thus undermining the belief in a linear developmental personal and historical narrative” (Beispiel, 2008, p. 3). Conflation of events involves a temporal compression. Stories that take values from the past and make them relevant in the present. This enables the mobility of values over time—imposing the future on the past and vice versa.

In this way, the intergenerational transmission of values is often made possible through complex assemblages of stories set within an overarching frame narrative (e.g., Fletcher, 2021). This process of weaving stories together for the preservation and transmission of values is illustrated in the discourse of ancient civilizations ranging from Mesopotamia (e.g., ‘Epic of Gilgamesh’), to India (e.g., the Vedas), to Palestine (e.g., the Bible), to Greece (e.g., the Iliad/Odessey), etc. A story told a single time to a passive audience is much less powerful than a chorus of voices, captivated by a story, who tell that story again and again to new audiences. This process of weaving stories together over time bundles stories together to enable inheritance organizations to extend and carry values through time.

Some inheritance organizations—including, for example, churches, mosques, synagogues, monasteries, temples, volunteer groups, interfaith organizations, museums, arts organizations, social movements, etc.—provide a vocabulary for weaving stories, values and their human carriers together over time. Sacred texts, for example, are typically organized around overarching epics that reveal an existential problem for humankind—sin, suffering, death, self-sufficiency, pride, self-centeredness, etc.—posit a metaphysical solution—salvation, nirvana, peace, submission, etc.—and, thereby, sacralize core values—e.g., mercy, humility, propriety, devotion, connection, etc.^{iv} Sacred texts, thus, provide grounds for individuals to understand themselves within a broader cosmology that is inherited across generations—a process that is enabled by religious organizations.

Outside of the context of religious organizations, similar mechanisms of narrative conflation are used by other inheritance organizations to carry values over time. It is often said, for example, that while the United States has a troubled past, the arc of American history bends toward freedom—meaning that stories used to describe American history are often characterized

by an optimistic metanarrative focused on the gradual integration of an ever more diverse polyphony of voices who took up early American ideals of equality and appropriated these ideas to new circumstances often despite fierce opposition from the original promoters of freedom (Foner, 1999). After this manner, organizations dedicated to civics education—including liberal arts universities—work to weave together historical narratives into assemblages that can not only neutralize value-based threats to national identity but also preserve and carry forward values in the real world.

The core point here is that values are bigger than their carriers and yet the carriers play a critically important, albeit imperfect, role in giving life to (and/or frustrating) values. However, in order for values to be transmitted and carried forward through time, this separation must somehow be subverted. This is accomplished through story bundles that provide accepted vocabularies for blending entities and events together within an overarching frame narrative. Thus, biographical organizations (such as biographical museums, libraries or archives) whose purpose is to perpetuate the legacies of past political leaders, social activists, celebrities, or entrepreneurs do so in ways that infuse past heroes with surplus value and metaphysical content and, thereby, construe them as having a legacy of values that reaches down into the present.

Inheritance organizations and the conflation of power

The central preoccupation of Max Weber's *Economy and Society* (2019 [1922]) was the underlying forms of power used by leaders to coordinate human action in society. The key challenge was how to make raw power seem legitimate and palatable. He argued that this occurs in three ways: charisma, bureaucracy and tradition. Charisma is powerful but inherently unstable since it is held by flesh-and-blood persons within finite lifetimes. However, Weber theorized that the power of charismatic leaders can be routinized after their death. In his theorization, this

routinization occurs either through formal organizations or through traditional authority (Weber, 2019). Formal organizations (bureaucracies) legitimated power through explicit rules. The legitimacy of traditional authority, by contrast, was “based on, and believed in, by virtue of the sanctity of long-established orders and ruling power that have existed ‘time out of mind’” (p. 355).

As previously noted, we do not see formal organizations and traditional authority as mutually exclusive, but rather are interested in the role that organizations play in intergenerational transmission of residuals—including the intergenerational transmission of power. One very effective way to legitimate power in the present is by weaving oneself into an already established tradition or legacy for which one acts as custodian or steward. Weber (2019, p. 227) alluded to this when he noted that in traditional authority “rules which in fact are innovations can be legitimized only by the claim that they have been ‘valid of yore,’ but have only now been recognized by means of wisdom” (p. 227). In this sense, Weber (p. 359) theorized that traditional authority was derived from ancient ideas about lineage and argued that such power is premised on a “superficial analogy to the household” (Ibid., p. 229). Wielding such power in legitimate ways is premised on the ability to be “strictly bound by tradition” (p. 231). This is sometimes achieved through the idea of interpretive originalism—where stewards of inheritance organizations such as philanthropic foundations, trusts, or even political regimes will legitimate decisions by interpreting ‘the will of the founder’.

Monarchies are an extreme example of intergenerational power. Monarchies, and other elite dynasties, share some characteristics with other lineage-based forms of inheritance organizations, only they reach more deeply into the fabric of the societies in which they operate. Whereas the core inheritance for most business-owning families is material assets, monarchies

inherit not only wealth but also title. Inherited monarchic lineage grants extreme political power. At their apex monarchic dynasties were so powerful that they were used to not only command empires but also demarcate historical eras (e.g., the Ming dynasty). In this way, the term dynasty is itself a form of synecdoche in which a lineage is substituted for a political regime.

Today, elite family dynasties have a more complex path for achieving and maintaining power. If they live in non-democratic societies, they can very well do so through the traditional political channels, but even then dynasts must often supplement their legitimacy through economic success. This is because dynastic power is often centrifugal—most are descendants are forced toward the peripheries of traditional authority and it takes enormous effort and social skill for such descendants to maintain access to the core of inherited power.

Family dynasties living in democratic societies must find other ways to establish and command power. They can do so through corporations. They can do so through philanthropy or celebrity. They can do so through political elections. Economic achievement is one way for elites to exhibit charisma and, thereby, reproduce authority across generations (de Pina-Cabral & De Lima, 2020). Even in the twenty first century, the power of elite family dynasties remains unparalleled by any other status group in many parts of the world (Israelsen, 2023).

Conclusion

While we may often associate inheritance organizations with the distant past, organizations dedicated to preserving some economic, cultural and political inheritance remain important forces for good and bad in our time. Inheritance is a source of enormous challenges in our age of increasing inequalities. Yet inheritance also plays an important role in binding people together in intergenerational projects that existed before they were born and will, if they are good

stewards, keep going after they die. Inheritance provides a mechanism and process for the intergenerational transmission of legacies, traditions and heritage and, thereby, helps to constitute the human condition as something that is shared beyond individual lives and goals.

In management studies we have become accustomed to the notion that organizations resolve strategic questions using prospective discourse laden with future-oriented idioms. However, when an organization adopts as its purpose the stewardship of residuals from past generations, the retrospective notion of inheritance becomes the primary idiom used to justify strategic decisions within that organization. When inheritance organizations seek to justify innovation they do so by construing it as consistent with some deeper, newfound understanding about the past.

Similarly, within inheritance organizations stakeholder commitment is typically established on the sanctity of age-old traditions or on the legacies of past heroes. Such commitment may, for example, involve a sense of belonging as “the visible expression of a lineage which the believer expressly lays claim to and which confers membership of a spiritual community that gathers past, present and future believers” (Hervieu-Léger, 2000, p. 81). Honoring the legacies of past heroes involves a similarly metaphysical extension of the mind beyond finite human lifespans to draw past individuals beyond their mortal lifespan to construe the legator as a proxy for the institution as a whole. In extreme cases, the virtue or charisma of a past leader is treated as an existential imperative for holding the very fabric of the institution together.

In this chapter, we have argued that the transmission and management of present residuals of past generations comprises a central purpose for many organizations around the world. We have introduced the notion of “conflation” as a tentative concept that may help to

explain how such inheritance organizations manage to bring together and compress entities across time and space into a narrativized tapestry that blends lives and values together back across generations. Both concepts demand further refinement as we work toward a more general framework for understanding the role of intergenerational transmission in and by organizations.

References

- Angel, J. L., & Mudrazija, S. (2011). Aging, inheritance, and gift-giving. In *Handbook of aging and the social sciences* (pp. 163-173). Academic Press.
- Beckert, J. (2007). The Longue Durée of Inheritance Law*: Discourses and Institutional Development in France, Germany, and the United States since 1800. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 48(1), 79-120.
- Beckert, J. (2008). *Inherited wealth*. Princeton University Press.
- Bednar, J. S., & Brown, J. A. (2023). Organizational ghosts: How “ghostly encounters” enable former leaders to influence current organizational members. *Academy of Management Journal*, (ja), amj-2022.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *The state nobility: Elite schools in the field of power*. Stanford University Press.
- Bove Jr, A. A., & Langa, M. (2021). *The Complete Book of Wills, Estates & Trusts: Advice That Can Save You Thousands of Dollars in Legal Fees and Taxes*. St. Martin's Griffin.
- Brassington, I. (2019). On rights of inheritance and bequest. *The Journal of Ethics*, 23(2), 119-142.
- Braun, S. T., & Stuhler, J. (2018). The transmission of inequality across multiple generations: testing recent theories with evidence from Germany. *The Economic Journal*, 128(609), 576-611.
- Busch, H. C. S., Halliday, D., & Gutmann, T. (Eds.). (2022). *Inheritance and the Right to Bequeath: Legal and Philosophical Perspectives*. Taylor & Francis.
- Caust, J., & Vecco, M. (2017). Is UNESCO World Heritage recognition a blessing or burden? Evidence from developing Asian countries. *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 27, 1-9.
- Clignet, R., Beckert, J., & Harrington, B. (2018). *Death, deeds, and descendents: inheritance in modern America*. Routledge.
- Collier, K. G., (1948). The inheritance of values. *The Sociological Review*. 40(1), 97-112.
- Colquitt, J. A., Sabey, T. B., Pfarrer, M. D., Rodell, J. B., & Hill, E. T. (2023). Continue the Story or Turn the Page? Coworker Reactions to Inheriting a Legacy. *Academy of Management Review*, 48(1), 11-31.
- Cunliffe, J., & Erreygers, G. (Eds.). (2013). *Inherited wealth, justice and equality*. Routledge.
- Dacin, M. T., Dacin, P. A., & Kent, D. (2019). Tradition in organizations: A custodianship framework. *Academy of management annals*, 13(1), 342-373.

- de Pina-Cabral, J., & De Lima, A. P. (Eds.). (2020). *Elites: Choice, leadership and succession*. Routledge.
- Durkheim, É. (1921). La famille conjugale. *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger*, 91, 1-14.
- Erreygers, G., & Vandavelde, T. (Eds.). (1997). *Is inheritance legitimate?: Ethical and economic aspects of wealth transfers*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Foner, E. (1999). *Story of American freedom*. WW Norton & Company.
- Frake, J., & Harmon, D. (2023). Intergenerational transmission of organizational misconduct: Evidence from the Chicago Police Department. *Management Science*.
<https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.00580>
- Friedman, L. M. (2009). *Dead hands: A social history of wills, trusts, and inheritance law*. Stanford University Press.
- Glass, J., Bengtson, V. L., & Dunham, C. C. (1986). Attitude similarity in three-generation families: Socialization, status inheritance, or reciprocal influence?. *American Sociological Review*, 685-698.
- Goody, J. (1976). *Production and reproduction: a comparative study of the domestic domain* (No. 17). Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, D. (2018). *Inheritance of wealth: Justice, equality, and the right to bequeath*. Oxford University Press.
- Hann, C. (2008). Reproduction and inheritance: Goody revisited. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 37, 145-158.
- Hervieu-Léger, D. (2000). *Religion as a Chain of Memory* (p. 133). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Ingold, T. (2016). *Lines: A brief history*. Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2019). Evolution without inheritance: Steps to an ecology of learning. Working paper
- Israelsen, T. (2023). *Entrepreneurial conflation in American business dynasties* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Victoria).
- Kendrick, L. (2011). The Lockean rights of bequest and inheritance. *Legal Theory*, 17(2), 145-169.
- Kohli, M. (2004). Intergenerational transfers and inheritance: A comparative view. *Annual review of gerontology and geriatrics*, 24(1), 266-289.
- Lewens, T. (2015). *Cultural evolution: conceptual challenges*. OUP Oxford.

- Marcus, G. E. (1992). *Lives in trust: The fortunes of dynastic families in late twentieth-century America*. Westview Press.
- McNamee, S. J., & Miller Jr, R. K. (1989). Estate inheritance: a sociological lacuna. *Sociological Inquiry*, 59(1), 7-29.
- Mendel, G. (2013 [1865]). *Mendel's principles of heredity*. (Transl., W. Bateson) Courier Corporation.
- Mill, John Stuart, (1961 [1848]). *Principles of Political Economy*. Augustus M. Kelley. New York.
- Miller, D., Steier, L., & Le Breton-Miller, I. (2003). Lost in time: Intergenerational succession, change, and failure in family business. *Journal of business venturing*, 18(4), 513-531.
- Miller, R. & McNamee, S. J. (1998). *Inheritance and Wealth in America*. Springer Science and Business Media.
- Mumford, A. (2007). Inheritance in Socio-Political Context: The Case for Reviving the Sociological Discourse of Inheritance Tax Law. *Journal of Law and Society*, 34(4), 567-593.
- Pedersen, J., & Bøyum, S. (2020). Inheritance and the Family. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 37(2), 299-313.
- Piketty, T., & Saez, E. (2013). A theory of optimal inheritance taxation. *Econometrica*, 81(5), 1851-1886.
- Pontarotti, G. (2015). Extended inheritance from an organizational point of view. *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, 37, 430-448.
- Radu-Lefebvre, M., Davis, J. H., & Gartner, W. B. (2024). Legacy in Family Business: A Systematic Literature Review and Future Research Agenda. *Family Business Review*, 08944865231224506.
- Shils, E. (1981). *Tradition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Silk, R. D., & Lintott, J. W. (2011). *Managing Foundations and Charitable Trusts: Essential Knowledge, Tools, and Techniques for Donors and Advisors* (Vol. 145). John Wiley & Sons.
- Suddaby, R., & Jaskiewicz, P. (2020). Managing traditions: A critical capability for family business success. *Family Business Review*, 33(3), 234-243.
- Sukhoverkhov, A. V., & Gontier, N. (2021). Non-genetic inheritance: Evolution above the organismal level. *Biosystems*, 200, 104325.

Swartz, D. (1977). Pierre Bourdieu: The cultural transmission of social inequality. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47(4), 545-555.

Szydlik, M. (2004). Inheritance and inequality: Theoretical reasoning and empirical evidence. *European Sociological Review*, 20(1), 31-45.

Tocqueville, Alexis de (1945 [1835]). *Democracy in America*. Vintage Books. New York.

Vermeulen, F. (2018). A basic theory of inheritance: How bad practice prevails. *Strategic Management Journal*, 39(6), 1603-1629.

ⁱ Ingold (2022) adopts a different view of inheritance wherein the term connotes that “whatever is inherited is received essentially un-changed and intact, as an undivided totality” (p. S34). The differences are threefold. First, whereas Ingold (2022) views inheritance as a sending-receiving *event*, we theorize inheritance as a more extended process that involves the transmission and management of residuals left behind by past generations. Second, whereas Ingold (2022) views inheritance as *perfect* transmission, in this chapter we instead introduce the concept of “conflation” to explain how the transmission associated with such residuals appears to be much more seamless (and effortless) than it actually is. Third, whereas Ingold (2022) is primarily concerned with “*ecological* inheritance”, in this chapter we focus primarily on the social construction of inheritance as a human social-organizational process.

ⁱⁱ Synecdoche is a figure of speech in which a part is made to represent the whole or vice versa. Metonymy, by contrast, is a figure of speech that substitutes the name of one thing for that of another with which is it associated.

ⁱⁱⁱ Selznick surmised that values were not only exogenous, aspirational ideals that moved unmanaged through the world but were also endogenous, practical objects of discourse that were managed by specific organizations. But rather than resorting to the nihilistic conclusion that there was nothing sacred or intrinsically inspiring about values, Selznick instead maintained a deep belief that values were so very important that managers (and management scholars) needed to attend explicitly to the gaps between espoused ideals and actual practices. Taking values seriously, then according to Selznick, meant understanding them in the real world. By attending to the gaps between espoused ideals and actual practices, Selznick argued, we could better understand the human ends toward which values are invoked and, thereby, work to preserve the integrity, coherence and character of institutions.

^{iv} Despite this focus on core values, the application of sacred texts to specific moral questions is often fraught in history. As American historian Mark Noll (2022) asks, for example, “How did the same Bible that shone as a beacon of hope to many Black Americans and inspire some Americans to challenge all forms of racism also support others in preaching white supremacy?” (p. 3) “Why did biblical teachings seem to align so unselfconsciously with so many different convictions about the economy, society, politics, gender and race?” (p. 242). In this way, the narratives used to carry values through time and space can be co-opted to include additional (or even contradictory) values.