

THE VULNERABILITY OF KNOWLEDGE AND MANAGE- MENT

Gergana Koleva
Copenhagen Business School
Department of Operations Management
Solbjerg Plads 2
DK – 2000 Frederiksberg
Phone: + 45 3815 2419
Fax: + 45 3815 2440
E-Mail: gk.om@cbs.dk

THE VULNERABILITY OF KNOWLEDGE AND MANAGE- MENT

This essay is an exploration of ideas on knowledge and on the dualisms which penetrate thinking, making the knowledge vulnerable to their immanent tensions. It traces ideas on knowledge and the inherent dualisms which penetrate thinking, without proposing a solution in form of a dialectical synthesis. Rather it analyses the dualistic pattern throughout mythological, magical, religious and scientific thinking that totalise mental processes and makes knowledge and management fragile. Instead of a linear progression and replacement of these modes, I propose to see them as layers of the same thought and not as separated entities. In this essay I am looking for examples of thinking, which is free from the dualistic pattern. Knowledge is vulnerable, because it is articulated with arguments from one of the poles mind-matter, while being rooted in both extremes: knowledge of matter (profits) is explained idealistically (saving the world), while idealistic knowledge is justified with materialistic claims (application). This paper explores the moments, when knowledge is not anymore materialistic (Marx) nor idealistic (Hegel) concept, nor a synthesis, but reveals these as layers of its development.

THINKING AND BEING

Dualistic Patterns and Knowledge

A fundamental occidental dualism consists of mind and matter. They are the two basic organising principles, the two basic components, which compose all Being and to which all Being can be reduced. The mind, rational and calculative, the matter – without active properties, it is made. While the mind forms, the matter is formed, absorbing the idea, the creations of the mind. While the mind actively produces the idea, the matter follows it. This is not only an existential dualism, but also an epistemological one: it frames thinking and sets the limits to what is possible to know, to imagination, to creativity. All processes, all elements, all nuances of thinking, knowledge, action are inevitably translated into these boundaries, which serve both as a way to invent, but also as a rhetoric to convince, to answer each question in a given intellectual reference system. This dualism has to acknowledge an idea, a thought, an invention, in order for them to be understood and accepted. Functioning as a reservoir of judgment power, the dualistic mode makes life much easier: it governs and structures the world, the thinking and the potential possibilities. It limits and it frees in the same time.

Counterpartial thinking within the dualism is so strong that we are inclined to believe, we know the other part, as soon as we are acquainted with the first one. By a way of similarity or of closeness, or of affiliation, the first part – in our perception – with-shapes the image of the second. So, supposing that an event is composed of several parts, all of them produce and reproduce the pattern: victim and criminal are counterparts each creating, defining and reinforcing the other. The elements of this dualistic pattern are suddenly emerging in the concrete. They are real. Do we confuse our mind-model to be a reality, just as we confuse our theories to be valid every time there is no evidence refuting them?

Knowledge is born of and carried by this dualism. And to follow the metamorphosis of dualistic pattern through human history is to find all these moments of uncertainty, of frailty, of emptiness, when knowledge was claimed to be at the one side of the dualism, used more to cover than to reveal, operating in this emptiness, which dissociates it from the actual object, from matter. In these points decision, or for that matter post-modern management – may seem sometimes more a projection, an extension, a ramification of past actions, which roots lay far back and which are still dissociated from the future rather than an act of a free will. How can existential-management decision be fulfilled in such an environment? And how is it that management is performed in these moments of disconnectedness, of absence, where multiple forces and procedures operate? How does the dualistic pattern work in those moments?

Historically, most thinking patterns, symbolic systems can be traced back to the ancient (or-
phic) cults and Plato, and to even older belief systems in the Mesopotamian region. Within this dualism, knowledge can be confirmed, refuted, acknowledged or discredited. But the meta-formula is seldom questioned, often masked and even masqueraded. In human history, however, there are intense moments, when knowledge is not yet present; it is an insecure, fragile potentiality, which has to survive the tests of oblivion, painful, but nevertheless present. Its future potential can be revealed. Knowledge presents itself as an objective truth and – through the dualisms, the patterns - accumulates force, acquires shape and durability, becomes integrated. At its foundations, the security dissolves, when the epistemological status of mind and matter is questioned.

How sophisticated fragmentation the dualism is capable of producing! Knowledge domains, specialisations, productivities, categorisations, taxonomies, rhetoric, languages, discourses, arguments. The whole epistemological system today is based on and sustained through fragmenting, so that the very attempts to de-fragmentise knowledge produce further inclusion and exclusion, ramifications of that initial condition. The basic epistemological pre-conditions

create finer and finer details, procedures and methods. The present dualistic model is a prerequisite to that out-casting to knowledge, the rejected. It is beyond question how much this dualistic scheme has served human and social evolution, how much it has produced - knowledge, culture, social life. But it has also greatly limited the ability to know by pre-disposing where to look for the objects and their explanation.

Producing the domain of the knowledge-outcasts, of the masked, hidden, prohibited knowledge, has this dualism not reduced all points of tension, all possibilities to two and only two? What new could such a dualism contribute? Does it not create a limiting space, a territory, which cannot encompass more than it already contains?

It can be transcended not only through a new idea of knowing, through a new opposition. A search for a way of thinking encompassing dualisms, a system of thinking has to be explored that breaks away from the dualisms and fulfils the transformation of intelligence, which can simultaneously be both form and matter.

Showing only one piece at the time, dualisms have quite a different dynamic from thinking that contains them both. Traditional science appreciates the relative stability of a scientific object. What would be the linguistic of a process-orientation?

This dualism of mind and matter orders knowledge, establishes predictability, explains. And precise as it is, this dualism also hides, misunderstands, misrepresents, constructs elements of knowledge to fit into it.

Here I do not propose anarchy as an alternative, but an event, a moment, when knowledge can be several things in the same time, it can contain the contradictions, be matter and mind in the same time, is magic and scientific method. What we are sometimes trying to grasp may be an illusion of the separation between the object and our image of it, of the intention and of actually grasping it.

To manage means to be able to see beyond the patterns, dualisms, traditional current beliefs, because it includes the sensitivity for potentials that have not yet been realised, that are yet invisible. In seeing through the limitations of cultural, intellectual and religious systems and exploring those pivotal points, when knowledge seems less obvious, surprising, when it demands more sophisticated judgments than rationality, lies the art of management.

Discourse

The problem with totalising systems of thought is that they cannot sustain themselves over time efficiently enough through the identities they create and the surveillance they use to penetrate to the deepest structures of the human being. The internal dynamic of beliefs is that they can be questioned at each moment through the very action they enable. Beliefs shape identity, and action can question both of them, because it has a dialogical structure, it is contained in the identity, but can contest it in the same time.

Mind control is as ancient as the human race and its architectural expression can be tracked to the ancient cities of Sumer and Egypt, where the temple of the Almighty was placed in the city centre. From this observational point, the priests could observe and control the population. Architecturally, life was organised around the all-seeing eye of God and so it has been transmitted to present day imagination, where seeing, visualising, imaging, and surveilling is inherently and strongly connected to power, to domination. Words acquire properties of visualisation – they are transparent, they represent (representation is related to presence: a connotation of visualisation), signify. This pervasive visibility and transparency of life is immanent to language as a tool for the creation and spreading of ideas. Language is the space, the territory, where ideas, identities are explored and tested and where they acquire and manage the mass of arguments and emotions, which makes them dominant in a particular social setting. Thus, surveillance and discourse can be instruments for propaganda and mind control, but

they may as well be used to break it, to oppose to it: they can imprison the surveilling priests. Historically, management has properties of surveillance and of control (Taylor), while the modern concept of management is influenced rather by the resistance, the opposition: the observers, the speakers are on the other side and are (at least seemingly) controlling management. However, this is a game of reciprocity and positions and interests can change quite quickly so the direction of action is difficult to follow.

Discourse – as a mode of production of identity and an action imperative (Foucault, 1980) - is dictated from God, passes through the priest as His representative and ultimate truth; it is often used to control in combination with suffering experiences – torture or victimisation, which can serve to alter personality. Language contains knowledge, which is in this discourse of domination and suffering, inevitably related to heroism, loneliness, pain, even torture and death. From these old pre-historical times, discourse dominates identities – individual as well as social. These identities are fragmented into different domains of life: the church, the state, the university, the hospital, the family. They are endowed with power over aspects of the human life and integrity, while the attempts to reconcile them and bridge the gap between sciences, arts, philosophy, music, creating one universal knowledge-power domain with one language have proved to be problematic and were not yet realised. These tensions of the totalising and fragmenting / individualising tendencies are where present day management has to be carefully performed.

Discourse contains the patterns of dualism; it uses them and re-produces them and simultaneously enabling change and transformation. Thinking in such a discourse is pre-programmed by the stabilised routine beliefs, as it may change the rules for the production of truth at different stages. However, it is based on and using the same general foundations.

The dualistic thinking mode does not illustrate the complex relationships between individual and context; it draws deliberately borders between subject and environment. This way of talk-

ing about a subject and an object, an object and a context (Figur-Grund), means to bracket the transformations between them, to simplify their presence at a fixed place. It is to isolate the final points of a movement. Thinking that way, the limits can be pushed further away, until they dissolve. What would then thinking and being feel like?

Reflecting upon thinking, there is a chance to challenge the terror of concepts, the domination of fixations, and the perpetuation of dominations, which have become a discourse. It would then disturb the clean shapes of models and concepts, having the chance to renew itself, to be disturbed, to be defocused, and displaced.

The Knowledge of Magic

As Popper argues, the scientific propositions and logic can be traced to ancient mythological beliefs and magical practices, from which they have evolved. The analogy between the magical and the scientific conceptions of the world is visible in the perfectly regular and certain succession of events, being determined by immutable laws, the operation of which can be foreseen and calculated precisely; the elements of caprice of chance, and of accident are banished from the course of nature (Frazer, 1994: 45).

Magic is based on a unity between the powers of man and the forces of nature. By a set of procedures the magician controls the anonymous forces of nature to bring about a predictable effect and to ensure the relation between these procedures and the desired outcome, he/she follows an exactly pre-defined procedure. Not a single element of this sequence could be surpassed or changed. The knowledge of magic was unquestioned, it represented the ultimate truth and who controlled this knowledge occupied a central position in the community.

His/her body was invested with sources of power, of impact and they brought fertility and wealth. Between the object that was acted upon (a part of the body or a place attached to it) and the object that was affected, was the space for magical intervention, where the magician

performed knowledge-practices, and was perceived as the ultimate truth. Thus, the magician's role was to en-act the space and time separating him/her from the desired outcome in the material world. What distinguished the magician from the ordinary man were the secret procedures and rules, which constituted knowledge and were transmitted from generation to generation. These procedures filled the space and enabled the magician to connect action and outcome. The virtuosity of magic rested upon the perception that all things compose one whole, that acting on one part ultimately affects all other. In fact, parts were not recognised, only the whole. Truly, the magician had special skills, but not this knowledge constituted him/her as a central power for the tribe. It was the shared belief in the fullness of the (in our civilisation perceived as) empty space enabling action at a distance. This fullness of space endowed him with a special status and over this space religion later claimed its right. And it is this space, which magic, religion, and science deploy and fill out with their own procedures, rules, tactics. This space establishes the legitimate links between objects and subjects, the ultimate identity, hierarchy and limitations. In history, this space has been an object of a gradual (and sometimes violent) transformation. Inside it the kingly priests in Frazer's text established their identity as a union of spirit and body, of Divine and Human, of strength and vulnerability. The unity between flesh and spirit was essential for unconditional power, supported through special initiation rituals, because it gave to the priestly king the unquestionable right to rule both over nature and over divinity mediating between them. His knowledge was complete, his wisdom – profound as he connected to the other world, where he was given perfect knowledge directly from the gods.

In the course of the mythological development of human history, beliefs shape the transformations between the human and the absolute. The separation between them slowly evolved and it was not until the triumph of religion that it was completed. The union of man and nature, of ideal and material, of thought and action-effect by virtue of the fullness of space,

which connected and melted identities instead of separating and dividing, was broken into its elements, which became more numerous and weaker in their expression and the articulation of their identity, in the utilisation of their powers.

Religion and Knowledge

Gradually, religion invested the space between humans and nature with qualitative conditions. It separated individuals from their own bodies, while making the body an object of different belief-practices than the mind. Religion invented behaviour models reflecting this separation, which had to be internalised by individuals in order to access the Divine through the mediation of the (in particular Catholic) Church. They were supplemented by complicated rituals performed on sacred places, while the blending of magic beliefs and theological (idealistically philosophical) thought facilitated the birth of moral consciousness. Later, through the influence of quasi-scientific instincts and elements of philosophy (those serving the church), a code of conduct evolved, directing the focus towards the individual human being and his personal drama at the tension between unity and fragmentation – the desire to speak, to confess and to be free of the sin is the ritual for returning to innocence, to whole-ness. Moral consciousness became the main accomplice for spreading the influence of religious practice. Human energies, which were once spent in orgies, ritual dances, sacrifices, consuming rituals, laborious efforts to please the moods of nature, had to be put to use in the emerging new world of separation, division and increasing existential isolation from the Enlightenment and the Renaissance. It was not a one-way movement of destinies towards a pre-given end, but there were rather many opposing strategies and trends. Surviving in diverse forms through the Middle (Dark) Ages, by the end of the Middle Ages pre-religious magical practices were re-grouped; they became a way to resist the increasing division of labour, the specialisation and development of inclusion-exclusion instruments, of taxonomies. Separating God as a Spirit from His physical manifestation, in the Middle Ages, the church filled the gap with new rules,

identities, language and meaning. The distance between the acting subject and the object of action became longer, more difficult to follow and comprehend. In fact, there was no way to connect to God, without the mediation of the clerks. Knowledge was a matter of illumination, a state where all relationships become clear through the mercy of a Divine power. In a world such as ours, where most of the relationships are discredited in the modern and post-modern life-attitude – including the relationship between man and his own body; a world, where further developments mainly perpetuate the established pattern of separation, ramification and division, this is difficult to comprehend. Knowledge thus has a double role – one in relationship to the right, beautiful and included and another for the sinful, ugly and excluded. Passing from polytheistic to monotheistic religion, knowledge develops into a schizophrenic master of human behaviour, because it both leads to salvation and to the hell of the own conscience.

While polytheistic religions personify the gods endowing them with human properties and a biography, the monotheistic religions finally exclude all possible comparison between God and humans, establishing a firm anti-thesis between them. The Grundursache for the existence of the world had created less glorified and at the end rather insignificant position for humans and their ability to create. It appears that - if we follow the line from the beginnings of primitive fertility cults to the most sophisticated theological reflections - the faith of humans has passed slowly into greater segmentation and particularisation of body, soul, spirit and mind within a single human being. It has also been separated from the object of belief –isolating the religious rituals more and more from the essence they represent. In the course of human development the work of priestly kings, magicians-doctors, etc. has been distributed to different “specialists”, who have been able to become experts in their field. The king in ancient Egypt, who united God and Man in his person slowly with the increase of the population and therefore the centres of resistance, was forced to give up aspects of his power: the mediating role between humans and god, the secret rituals for the initiation and unquestioned power. This

separation of areas of responsibility has brought further the development of our civilisation at a high price: the polarisation of forces pulling inside the single human being. The separation of areas associated with mind and matter brought about by polytheistic religion was developed even further with particularisations within mind and within matter. The opposition between Jehovah¹ and the Cesar as Jesus said: "Give God what is God's and to the Cesar, what is Cesar's" has become an expression of the fundamental dualism in the Christian civilisation.

What once was an undifferentiated union between man and nature, personalised relationships with multiple gods and goddesses has become a detailed and desperate opposition between the pull of the physical needs and the pull of an unreachable otherworldly God. Life has been distributed into the pull of Church and State, of Spirit and Body, of Light-Knowledge and unconscious Darkness. All knowledge was preserved and censored by the church, while all bodily matter was under the sovereignty of the king. This is not quite true, because the Church, while claiming to have the keys to heaven did not miss the opportunity to give its spiritual power an earthly expression; to materialise and to stabilise it in an institution, to make it unquestionable, un-contested. And the Kings required the spiritual power over the souls of people through the symbols of religion. In this sense religion and politics became useful for each other to build arguments for power, but remained caught in the dualistic patterns reproducing them even further. The space, which mythology and magic filled with direct connections, with desires, pleas, similarity and the moment, when chaos was to be organised, has become throughout the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and especially with the Enlightenment a carefully regulated zone, where different powers meet and distribute, categorise and

¹ Jehovah (n.) A Scripture name of the Supreme Being, by which he was revealed to the Jews as their covenant God or Sovereign of the theocracy; the "ineffable name" of the Supreme Being, which was not pronounced by the Jews. Jahve - A modern transliteration of the Hebrew word translated Jehovah in the Bible; -- used by some critics to discriminate the tribal god of the ancient Hebrews from the Christian Jehovah. Yahweh or Yahwe is the spelling now generally adopted by scholars. Merriam Webster's Dictionary.

identify. In this zone - the zone of beliefs and thinking structures - the outcomes re-enforce the power of tradition rather than questioning it; the predictability of this power is its main disadvantage. Throughout time, these structures dissolve from the actual argument, from the story-line; they evolve independently, and continue to determine its perceptions, dissociated from the actual content.

Not only have mind and body become separate domains subjected to different institutional powers, they have also been deprived of any power at all, have been forbidden to express desire and force, because power comes only from and through God. The Conscious suppresses the Subconscious (Jung, 2003) with the institutionalisation of the Christian religion and the rejection of heretic practices and beliefs. In sorcery all legitimisation to control outcomes came from the knowledge investing and operating at the space between resembling practice and the resembled object.

The fight over human minds and bodies in religion was translated within them, within spirits inhabiting bodies, not identical with their essence. The separation between church and sorcery – the first representing the conscious mind and the second the sub-conscious has become radical, even if many of the religious practices melted with heretical cults. Even if it was developed from the sub-conscious and responsible for the adaptation and communication with the outside world (Freud, 2003), the conscious has become an enemy of its former ally – it has denied the knowledge-ability of the later and has put itself as the master of human existence, rejecting the greater part of life into the shameful side of humanity. The tension within the so separated single human being creates a space of hesitating indecision, which church and state gladly fill up with their own judgment of truth. Particularised in inner conflicts, in unknowing and illusions, the individual had to often abdicate his own truth and delegate it to institutions with the rise of science and industrial productivity. The increasing division of labour force within society produced economy, where dependence and decreased self-

sufficiency entangled in the system of segregation. The order preserved itself by the utilisation of bodies and souls, which were part of it (but not a whole).

Not only did the Church claim the spiritual sphere of mankind, it also created a space for itself where it could monopolistically define the meaning and consequences of good and bad, moral and immoral, perform ethical judgments upon human life choices and program them into the existential systems of human beings by its pervasive presence, by its speech. The church, as an instance of speech with its own psychic and mental instruments controlled mental and emotional sense making: feelings of guilt and fear (Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Calvin) were the tools to segregate the inner substance and to categorise it. Local (non-dogmatic) knowledges, which were regarded as stable in the pre-Christian (pre-catholic) world (the world of magic, the world of polytheism), were deprived from their statute, and labelled later with the development of science the “unconscious of humanity”. Monotheistic religion and later science occupied the white spectrum in the mentioned dualism, thus perpetuating it: the position of light, objective knowledge, truth, justified true belief. All un-fitting elements were excluded. The dark pole of the dualism was defined by negation. It is an action of drawing borders, of defining and mapping space. In this sense both Christian religion and science are direct successors of platonic thinking, having its origins in ancient orphic cults related to mythological beliefs and practices. It is clear that religion and science – segregating the world – simultaneously suppress and absorb their roots through the invention of new procedures and new criteria for knowledge acquisition. The access to this source of knowledge has been blocked; its potential for knowledge creation – denied and in the same time profoundly utilised. The separation between magic as dark and subconscious and religion as light and conscious is one of negotiation, because there cannot be a clear divide, only a smooth transition, which is not a matter of dualism, but of perception, of opinion. It is an outcome of negotiated conventions and not an absolute and objective truth.

Using the common origin, the new knowledge order invented new procedures, new language, new rituals, thus rejecting the “subconscious”, the “dark”. It needed to do that, because it had to define itself against something, to be contrasted to it. The empty spaces were filled with new justifications, often not very different from the ones rejected, but regulating new constellations of power. In an attempt to legitimise its power, the church rejected its orphic roots, manifested itself by the very means, which it denied – matter – and invested the souls with the burden of separation, while by definition was meant to unite, to be universal. Ironically, meant to unite (re-align) humans with God, it produced the deepest separation within and between them and from God. It claimed the mediating role as God’s representative, thus deciding upon entry and exit of people into Gods grace (and into life itself) and upon the right to live or to die. Another irony is that the church derived its definition of light and unity (catholic) by rejecting all competing knowledges, thus deciding what knowledge is and excluding from its scope main parts of human life.

Freedom seems completely abandoned as an existential choice. And freedom in this constellation of powers means the will to participate in the sustaining of the present order or to oppose to it. Practicing the opposite of what it preached, the church established its power on earth by the very means it rejected in its theological-philosophical foundations. Dominating the swinging doors to knowledge, the church split humans even further – and strengthened its own position, its own fortress of innocence. This truth, however, on the way to become universal, was weakened by the awakening of a new rival – scientific rationale. The logic of production and accumulation coupled with series of social practices perpetuated the segregation and prevented the Church from monopolising knowledge. The firm beliefs around which the Catholic world of the Middle Ages was built and which were considered institutionalised knowledge, were becoming fragile and with them slowly the domination of the church. The separation, which put in place the power of the Church as a counterpart to the State power, brought fur-

ther ramification of domination into all aspects of existence – language, nature, economy, art, social sciences, health and the private sphere.

All these were elements of a process – multiplication of segments, negotiating parties, specialisations. And this unstoppable ramification inflated subsequently the power that had interest in it: the Church. Not only were there physical, testable and objective proofs for the truth – in terms of science – in society knowledge was also produced under the emerging patterns of fragmentation, of separation and reproduction.

Science and the Immortal Knowledge

Science, with the main objective to analytically understand, test and validate knowledge, built its strategies around one part of the mind-body-soul unity. As a way to conquer and fill out the space, it emphasises also a new quality of knowing – the positive probability, the empirical, material, useful side of it. It differentiated itself from all other parts of the human life and insisted that separation is ultimate – the thinking brain, the gazing eye looking at the world behind the glass wall and still so dependent in its references on the empirical objects to which it has only a cognitive access – as Descartes (2003) or Kant (1998) would claim. Knowledge is ordered across this divide – inventing the adequate system of thinking, theories about the world, which is beyond objective reach; of constructing the rules for such thinking and for the study of empirical facts. Epistemology versus ontology: a happy ontology independent from its epistemological prison, and an epistemology, naively trying to grasp a moment in the essence of things, desperate to validate pieces of its immortality.

To know on such a level is obviously very impoverished, because it legitimises only one narrow part of thinking/knowing and is based on exclusion, refutation and rejection, on separation instead on synthesis of many elements simultaneously. It does not become more versatile even with the introduction of Hegel's dialectics – it allows more space for asking questions,

but it does not change profoundly the dualism mind-matter. Not even a recursive approach to knowledge and discursive consciousness (Giddens, 1984; Latour, 1999) does offer a convincing argument, an option for the transformation of dualisms. Such a theoretical frame reduces multiplicity under the mask of a quasi-union between apparent oppositions, while failing to perceive the different dimensions simultaneously.

Institutionalised interests had to fight knowledge battles, whose outcomes were often a matter of negotiation and secular sinfulness, rather than an objective truth. The winner established his right to speak the truth, to allocate resources and to dominate spaces often just because he was louder and not because he was obviously just and right. The fundamentals of knowledge changed from a firm fundament (in the ages of religious domination) to a vulnerable effect, which became itself an administrative procedure, an exchange coin rather than a triumphant victory.

Furthermore, the localisation and distribution continued within the mind space – the division of knowledge into disciplines, fields, expert areas and languages. Forcefully evolving into a third source of authority over the mind-body system, science aspired the space for its pivotal code for creation of the Desirable and the Useful. The space between the scientist and the object has been emptied for the scientific method to separate existence into even more constitutive elements, which need to be studied, explained, mapped. The ramifications have become a self-sustaining business, dissolved from the value of the knowledge produced. They have become dissociated from their actual purpose and commenced a life on their own. Interdisciplinary discovery is blocked by the borders and fragments between domains of knowledge and knowledge disciplines, between expert areas and specialisation. Interestingly, rejected and excluded, non-scientific procedures and inspirations are used to query institutionalised limitations, lack of grand-ness in science's systems, emptiness of structures. Life – or knowledge for that matter – is somewhere else.

Science and the Supernatural

With the emergence of science the world, which was before inhabited by supernatural creatures: God Father, Son, the Holy Spirit, Lucifer, human souls, heretic gods and goddesses, and where all its objects - rivers, trees, temples, forests, houses, human bodies - were invested by spirits, had a will on their own, this world disappeared from the contemporary perception in the 16th and 17th centuries. Nature was slowly objectified as a resource for production and a source of knowledge, and started to be meticulously examined to deliver an ultimate, final explanation. To perform its analysis, science had to transform the nature from a locus invested with living creatures into a dead matter without past and future, only present distributed at different points of the timeline, a model, a substance that could be separated into smallest elements, susceptible to examination, to validation and predictability. Mind multiplied and so did matter. We can trace the barbarian cults, the magic practices, the religious beliefs, the unofficial, shadowy areas of lost innocence in the period, when the world transformed slowly from a self-repeating endless mythical story into a historical multiplicity of choices in the linear time, from a symbolic subject into a historical-scientific object. The inherited practices were not diminished – they were simultaneously absorbed in the new knowledge and partly rejected, suppressed: religion melted with heretic traditions and practices, theology melted with ancient philosophy, politics melted with functions of kings and priests, science with mythology against religion, mythology with religion against science. Science and religion for economy etc. All these belief systems participated in the conceptualising and arguing for a new and productive order. Useful elements from diverse domains were absorbed into the new order of knowledge in different combinations. Usefulness was precisely the reason why the church tolerated the heretical beliefs – they stabilised it by uniting and mobilising its power against an external enemy, legitimising its actions, its repressive strategies, its violent argu-

ments, they justified the decisions of the Church authority to supply all the cruelty against all and everybody, who was denounced an enemy.

Science set this stage anew, although perpetuating the patterns – empirical materialism was among the new knowledge paradigms. Thus objective, empirical references have shaken the ultimate and absolute answers of religion. Knowledge as a dogma is pushed aside by the forceful and energetic arguments of an Enlightenment fuelled by Voltaire's curiosity; by Descartes' systematic logic, by the Kantian and Newtonian revolutions in knowledge and freedom. The other part of the story is the segmentation of knowledge and the beginning of epistemological battles - between subjectivism and objectivism, between humanism and behaviourism, between idealism and empiricism, between positivism and constructivism, between the micro and macro. The ramifications within areas of human knowledge resemble the image of a Babylon tower and the confusion of language: All disciplines developed not only their object, but also their own language, their lifestyle, so communication becomes difficult and value is lost.

In the organisation of experience science occupies a central position, because it provides the basis for human existence – it is at the foundations of technology, production, and economy. The phenomenon of Life distributes itself into different science fields, often based on a common foundation – on a knowledge order. How this knowledge was about to be organised is a matter of scientific institutionalisation which in turn is reflected in the boundaries of thinking and the acknowledgement of its fruits.

Individual Drama and the Scientific Solution

As society and science melted into a complicated weave of new and inherited knowledges, so did individuals become a bundle, a multiplicity of choices, a constellation of beliefs, patterns, habits, biographical events and interpretative schemas (maybe in a ironic way almost a set of

“practical consciousness”). In the individual drama of technological and scientific progress, mind proved its advantage over matter partly also because the antagonism seemed to explain the advancement of civilisation and of the white race (the objective historical determinism of Marx (1992) and the domination of matter over mind is just a mirror image of Hegel’s absolute spirit, and it does not reject or refute it, it only perpetuates it fundamentally in a new context). This separation institutionalised itself through the different disciplines infiltrating the educational system, which develops body and mind as disconnected entities. The role-antagonism between science and religion resembles the antagonism between religion and magic – it claims a space within the very fibres of the social perception, of the social order and in the same time argues for its institutions and for “a way the world simply is”. Science appears on a mythological level as a continuation of magical practices in the circular time of an eternal repetition of patterns. The historical time line introduced with science does not oppose or question the repetitive magical events – it only transfers their repetition to a new level – the level of reliable procedures, testing and validation. The relationships of production of truth, of power over the object use (and serve) the same logic as the eternal re-tours of mythological time consciousness.

Their relationships can be represented as a Science-Magic union through the (involuntary) mediation of the Church – on one side repressing heresy and its impact on human experience and on the other – striving to dominate the production and use of scientific facts to argue its superior position. This double opposition of religion illustrate that the antagonism of magic and science is an instrumental one in the discourse of truth. In fact, magic and science are much older than monotheistic religion and the state as a politico-economical formation. The one, rejected as barbarian, the other prized as the product of modern civilisation. They both have controversial relationship to dogmatic beliefs. Magic and science use the same regulation, the same space and procedures to bring about the desired outcome. Science develops

further the force of mythological practices and magic, because it transforms it into an economical utility. When thinking of the relationships between magic and science, the distribution of licenses to speak has to be considered. Knowledge may often be an effect of a linguistic effort in the existing frame of reference, a construction, rather than a new turn in thinking, an original proposition or a revolution. And it does not need to always be. New knowledge may well just shed new light on an old answer. So it awakes the circle of events in a mythological re-tour, because - identifying with the greatness of a heroic event - the individual drama can dissolve into the circular repetitiveness of time, of the symbolic inter-connection between the personal and the universal, to release the tensions of an individual destiny. Thus, in the symbiosis of mythological and scientific discourse, individual drama can be reunited with a universal human existence, perfectly in line with Dostoevsky's endeavours.

In the course of time, science and not magic proves to be the greatest rebel against religion: it brings down the objects to their composing elements in order to almost defiantly demonstrate their docility, submission to scientific intervention and their logical beauty. Between the object and the result a programmed sequence appears, while chance is carefully calculated.

The Scientific and the A-Historical

Religion strives to reserve at least a morally superior position, where it can separate, regulate and order the two discourses: the heretic myth containing the position of the individual body and the scientific discourse containing the mind. It does not profit from their unity, but from the size of the gap it can produce and maintain between them. It installed itself at the core of the definition of what it means to be human and even so its position as a judge lost importance for the long term. Science simply reduced the importance of moral and emotional arguments. In the context of scientific and technological progress, moral and religion meet no resistance, no visible enemy. The game has new rules, and is there any game to play at all? In the sci-

ence-technology discourse rejection and resistance have a different meaning. Attention has been simply shifted away from the dualisms: they have been transformed into a fusion of mind-matter for the sake of utility and well-being. Mind has become as present and forceful as matter and vice versa – matter has developed an intelligence of its own. The old dualism has been transformed into a new union. How does this transformation influence thinking, imagination and knowing?

This science-technology discourse is based upon inclusion or exclusion; it is expressed through drawing of borders, through legitimising, or through a networked activity. It is based on a simple and effective mechanism that has become pervasive and invisible. A mechanism that comprises every possible element of existence, all particles linked to comply with these criteria. If they do not, they are simply forgotten, ignored, no energy is wasted on them. The centres are reproducing themselves. They become pervasive, invisible, detailed, without a location or method or an authorship, no particular mode of articulation.

Again, as in the pre-historical times of mythology, a space existed and a circular time, where single human beings had meaning, influence, past and future only in the context of the great events, of the myth and the heroes. They were the mass of followers without knowing who, what and whereto they are following, but it all made sense in that mythological pattern, which to repeat made life bearable. In the present period of our history, structuring of thoughts and time has become main occupation of the estranged, detached, alienated individual Marx (1992) analysed. And yet, is this occupation not a return to this a-historical mode, where individual experience and personal drama is accepted and integrated only in the context of a greater and deeper explanation? Is this alienation process a return to a deeper level of connectedness to a meaningful, though de-individualising existence by the very means individualisation is marching forward? The knowledge and the means for achieving a meaningful ex-

istence are profoundly different from that pre-historical, circular time, because they are a product of fragmentation, disconnectedness and the emptiness of space.

THE VULNERABILITY OF KNOWLEDGE AND MANAGEMENT

Management practice has been evolving and is shaped through these epistemological systems. It is embedded in our cultural and religious heritage, because religious beliefs (which have to be separated from the Church as an institution) are at the foundation of ethical and moral decision making. Knowledge, Management and organising are fragile, because of their diffuse properties: it is unclear who precisely the author is and who executes the action and how they are related. The meaning of management changes, when knowledge is not anymore obvious and objective, when it is not even a construction, but a derivative. Religious beliefs set the frames for the acceptance of new knowledge, they shape its content and integration in the an epistemological system. As knowledge means different things in the different epistemological systems in human history: which was valuable and valid in the first one, was discredited and suppressed in the next one; so do control and organising change their content, and their means. The present concept of management is based on completely different premises than it was the ruling and dominating, the controlling and surveilling, exploiting and suppressing concepts of rude power in the past ages. The management of the future is one of subtlety, of invisibility. It is not anymore located at a concrete place, in a particular position; it is rather a composition, a moving target rather than a firm and stable institution. Management - simultaneously with the development of a new knowledge concept has become disconnected from the actual outcomes. The connection between management actions and practical results are more difficult to know and to trace down. Knowledge about what is actually being done; of the management performance is substituted with indicators, which may not show exactly how well or how productive management behaviour has been. It is a construction, not an objective reality. Management may not know exactly why it is successful, and it still may very well be

so. The knowledge and the explanation of why things happen in this particular scenario is a matter of belief and not of objective truth. This spirituality of the actual meaning and results of management is the useful product of an ancient dualism between mind and matter, and in its core deeply mythological. It is often an expression of these pre-historical beliefs, which tie time and space together to reproduce an old heroic story, which translates the situation here and now into the grandness of the super-hero: Bill Gates. He can serve as identification for all other managers through the repetition of a grand story in each individual destiny.

In the tension between the mythological grandness and the miniatures of management performance in real life, in the fragmentation of power and control, in its invisibility: there management has to be understood.

Management is fragile, because in the course of human development, complexity of relations between intentions and ideas has increased; it seems more remotely related to material expression and outcome that can be measured than it was in the era of scientific management (Taylor). The dualistic pattern separates the idea from the material expression, and measurement is difficult as it has to justify the value of its outcome.

One could argue what is the actual purpose of management, what does it try to accomplish? Making money? Producing value? Enabling a better life for humanity? Saving the world? Benefiting society? All these words are tied to mythological and religious stories and rituals. In its arguments and persuasions management more often than not draws upon religious rhetoric, activates archetypes which speak much stronger to the human sub-conscious than any rational argumentation would ever be able to do so. Example: the benefit of the patient is the ultimate purpose for the profits in the Pharma industry. Is it? Saving the weak, helping the poor is a religious discourse that has established the ethical foundations of our civilisation. To draw upon such arguments is nothing else, but an awakening of these archetypes, of these a-historical stories, which endow management with the Messiah-image increasing Samaritan

credibility and profits even further. Yes, management has to save the world, if it wants to stay on top of it. These moral and ethical considerations of management are not new. What is new is the aggressiveness with which they are propagated and the obviousness with which they are dissociated from empirical reality.

Religious and spiritual knowledge, scientific arguments and deeply rooted archetypes are all mobilised in management discourse and practice, because it is not only about production of value, but also about the conquering of minds, creating identities and scientifically justifying a socially constructed power-value distribution.

CLOSING AND DISCLOSING

This short essay was more an attempt to raise questions rather than to answer them, to illustrate how knowledge and with it the whole experience of rationality constantly transforms between totalising and fragmenting tensions. Epistemological patterns on which thinking is based fundamentally, determine the meaning of management and identity.

It was an inspiration to perceive instead of a linear historical transition from one epistemological period to another (e.g. mythos to religion) a simultaneous presence of their elements as choices and beliefs, as a justification. The clean shapes of scientific knowledge contain mythological stories, while religious rituals melt with magic practices. Management and organising have to be understood this dynamic and complex epistemological space.

It was also an exploration how ideas, modes of thinking and being in the world become dominant through the manipulation of the space connecting to objects, effects and outcomes as a multitude of means for organising knowledge and beliefs. This space is used to connect, separate and transform and has a deep impact on social and human experience, in this space knowledge is ordered, integrated. It constructs the arguments, meanings and identities, it acts, performs and de-forms. Knowledge inside these performative spaces is vulnerable, because it

is not a predictable and stable entity; it is an input to, but seldom a durable effect of human development.

Knowledge is not only vulnerable to refutation, it is fragile, because it can be in itself an imprisoning delusion, when it is adopted and accepted- individually and socially, when it is claimed a deterministic and objective truth. This pervasive vulnerability of the knowing, of the moments, when beliefs seem so certain and convincing - enables it to escape the totalising power of discourses. The vulnerability and fragmentation of knowledge objects, and the individual consciousness, which perceives it, the insecurity of its outcomes, the inherent potencies, desires and powers, which transmit and multiply it - these multiplicities of knowing provide both the scepticism and the enthusiasm for any intellectual exploration.

Within these theoretical frames, management as a practice can be traced in its transformations throughout the respective epistemological system. The present-day management utilises heavily mythological archetypes, religious images for moral and ethics, and scientific method for “objective justification” in order to increase credibility, profitability and efficiency. Management (and the economic discourse) of the future will be drawing even more heavily on idealistic arguments such as ethics and aesthetics, culture and justice, moral and humanism to argue for its superiority over religion and politics, to fit into the messiah-image that will pay off enormously uniting human dreams, hopes, beliefs and energies. So if we could finally respond to Marx: not idealism is the teaching to the degrading class groups, but materialism; not idealistic philosophy is dieing out in favour of a teleological and objective materialism, but a pervasive idealistic epistemology is replacing the traditional arguments for the nature of value and the just distribution of profits. To the greatest irony of Marx, the very forces he rejected so furiously are coming back in our age to prove even more materialistic, profit-able and powerful than the apparent materialism so that with their contemporary triumph, the idealistic (in a philosophical sense) forces of production absorb and exponentially enforce materialism.

With this the very dualism of mind and matter, which achieved its political culmination in the cold war between materialistic (communism) and idealistic (capitalism) economy and management, is resolved. It exists no more. It has become one, only one beginning: the ultimate union, melting of mind-matter into one substance having properties of both.

AN EXCURSUS ON ALIENATION

This process of alienation has been advancing slowly with the triumph of industry and science-technology (Fromm, 1991, 2003). The only possibility to connect to the other, to the world, to the nature, to the planet has been destroyed, an empty vacuum in its place. The world has become individual worlds, languages – individual language, things – phenomena, loneliness and isolation – the lifestyle of the winners. No higher creature, no paradise, no ultimate truth is waiting on the other side of it. If God is dead, then everything is allowed and only an endless repetition of events and patterns has any meaning. There is nothing to oppose to, nothing to reveal, no higher meaning. The grid of fragile constellations and spaces is the only thing humans have. It means nothing if they are re-arranged, destroyed or missing, because they have no purpose outside of the grid, they are per definition empty. The individual meaning has shrunk, the belief in the own powers to change or create meaningfulness has been deleted. The only way to connect to the other-worldliness is to come back to the magical, to spiritual and occult practices.

Knowledge does not only have positive implications, but also passes through a negative, because it is an argument for distribution of power. Language in itself contains narratives, stories, images relationships with the other, with individuals' own biography, with the nature.

REFERENCES

Calvin, J. *On Christian life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal Library,

http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/chr_life.html, 20.10.2004. Translated 1845.

Calvin, J. *Institutes of the Christian religion*. Grand Rapids, MI: Christian Classics Ethereal

Library. http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/chr_life.html, 20.10.2004.

Descartes, R. 2003. *Discourse on Method and Meditations*. Mineola: Dover.

Foucault, M. 1980. *Power/Knowledge. Selected interviews and other writings 1972-77*. New

York: Pantheon Books.

Frazer, J. G. 1994. *The golden bough. A study in magic and religion*. Oxford: Oxford Uni-

versity Press.

Freud, S. 2003. *An outline of psychoanalysis*. London: Penguin.

Fromm, E. 1991. *The sane society*. London: Routledge.

Fromm, E. 2001. *The fear of freedom*. London: Routledge.

Giddens, A. 1984. *The constitution of society. Outline of the theory of structuration*. Cam-

bridge: Polity Press.

Jung, C. G. 2003 (1933). *Modern man in search of a soul*. London: Routledge.

Kant, I. 1998 (1787). *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*. Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag.

Latour, B. 1999. *Pandora's hope. Essays on the reality of science studies*. Cambridge: Har-

vard University Press.

Marx, K., Engels, F. 1992. *Gesamtausgabe (MEGA). Abt. 2. Bd. 4 Text. Karl Marx ökonomische*

Manuskripte 1863-1867. Berlin: Dietz.