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Editorial

Homage to the New Dragon! Have you seen what participation and how many contributions there are in the various sections of this issue of SNW? I take it as a gift to mark the last number of the newsletter to be published in Trento with me as editor; a present that I dedicate to the future publications of SCOS and, in particular, to the new-look Dragon. The SCOS network is the major source of scientific contributions that have interdisciplinary character, that deal with themes to do with culture and symbolism, and that engage in predominantly qualitative analysis of organizational life. The vitality and generosity of this network emerges clearly in Dragon: The Journal of SCOS, for whose existence we owe our gratitude to Vincent Degot, who conceived it and brought into being as a forum for unconventional contributions, as well as a source of inspiration for those preparing research projects or papers on culture and
symbolism in organizations. Since Dragon is a journal, the generosity of the SCOS network towards this newsletter is even more notable. Writing for SNW means above all participating in the collective and social construction of a community of people, images and ideas. This, the new Dragon will have to pay heed to. But, as Bob Grafton-Small has written to me, "What did we do to deserve the dreaded Linstead?".

Congratulations Zeynep! To you, to Giritli, and to your other colleagues who helped to organize the workshop and, especially, host SCOS during a turbulent phase of change. Heartfelt thanks also go to Gurol who drew the picture on the cover specially for SNW. And not just for his fine drawing, but also for watching with curiosity and concentration a rite that was not his own and which was conducted in a foreign language.

Istanbul - fascinating, cosmopolitan, poor, dense with testimony to its past as one of the centres of the world - struck me by its ability to accommodate stories, events and games that did not belong to it. The modest contributions on the theme of organizational culture in different civilizations were counterbalanced by the amount of attention given to the ongoing changes in SCOS. We emerge from Istanbul with a much longer list of future events than arose out of the 1984 Lund Conference; with no fewer than five future meetings in the pipeline: Fontainebleau (1989), Santa Fe (1990), Copenhagen (1991), Exeter (1992), Barcelona (1993)! Santa Fe and Barcelona are still being discussed; Fontainebleau is already under way in the hands of Susan Schneider, with the theme, "The Symbolics of Leadership", not wholly extraneous to the life of SCOS itself.

Innocence on the Board. The Board is no sinecure! Susan Schneider is organizing the Fontainebleau conference, Steve Linstead is secretary and SNW editor, Majken Schultz is treasurer: three of the people elected to the Board since the conference in Milan, their admirable commitment to SCOS represents the continuation of an organizational style that we were accustomed to but feared might come to an end. But never fear! Not even on the election of the new Chairman, Barry Turner was elected because everyone wanted him, despite his reluctance. As for myself, although urged to take the appointment and although fully aware of the reasons for this and for the support given me, I continued to back Barry's candidature. We persuaded him to accept without making him feel forced to bow to a foregone conclusion. In all this, there was a profound rapport between the Board and the Advisory Board, whether old or new. This is a style of leadership that is intrinsic to SCOS; a style based on friendship, enthusiasm and a touch of fantasy.

However, these are neither simple nor linear choices. Nevertheless, they evidence the striking vitality of the SCOS network and of the Board, something that I hope will always characterise the ephemeral nature of SCOS.

Send your contributions to Steve! Now that he takes over, the commitment of Trento's Department of Social Policy to the editing of SNW comes to an end. The support of my colleagues in the Department has been marvellous. Just think: it began when SCOS was still in its infancy.
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The deadline for contributions is now the 10th of February. Please mail your contribution to Leeds, not to Trento.

The illustration on the front cover is by Gurol Sözen. Proof-reading is by Adrian Belton, and the McApple work is by Antonella Cava, Co-op Prisma.

What can you do to help us produce this newsletter? The answer is simple and painless: become a member of SCOS and contribute to SCOS Note-Work.
Future SCOS Activities

Board. Barry Turner is organizing the next Board Meeting in Milan. The meeting will address day-to-day business issues of SCOS, but will also concentrate on the planning of the 4th International Conference at Fontainebleau on the symbolics of leadership, and on the journal Dragon. The Board meeting will commence at 10.30 a.m. on Sunday, 11th December and will continue on Monday 12th. The venue has yet to be arranged. Board and Advisory Board are kindly asked to keep in contact with Barry at his new address (until next August) published in the Board Members list in this issue.

The Symbolics of Leadership
Fontainebleau
June 28-30
1989

SCOS*
The Standing Conference on Organizational Symbolism
and

INSEAD**
The European Institute for Business Administration
announce a
CALL FOR PAPERS
for the

4th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON
ORGANIZATIONAL SYMBOLISM AND CORPORATE CULTURE
"THE SYMBOLICS OF LEADERSHIP"

...
The basis for selection of papers will be their fit with the conference theme - The Symbolics of Leadership - and, above all, their quality as judged by the Board of SCOS. The number of papers accepted will be limited to encourage discussion and alternative conference formats, e.g. theme-based workshops and panels.

Please note that the language of the conference will be English.

The DEADLINE for submitting papers is March 1, 1989.

Send papers and/or conference application form to:
Susan Schneider/Marianne Ugé
INSEAD
Boulevard de Constance
77305 Fontainebleau Cedex
France
Tel: (33-1) 60-72-41-89
Telefax: (33-1) 60-72-42-42

APPLICATION FORM

4th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON ORGANIZATIONAL SYMBOLISM AND CORPORATE CULTURE

INSEAD, Fontainebleau, France
June 28-30, 1989

Name: ......................................................

University/Organization: ............................

Address: ..................................................

Telephone: ............................(office) ............................(home)

I will prepare a paper yes no

If yes, please write brief description:

..................................................

..................................................

..................................................

..................................................

..................................................

..................................................

We hereby invite researchers and groups of researchers working in the field of organizational culture and symbolism to participate in an international research initiative, named Valhalla. The aim of Valhalla is to stimulate and facilitate empirical research on culture and symbolism as it applies to various forms of formally organized contexts. The research will not be focused on one specific theme, but rather on the development and empirical application of new perspectives on organization culture.

The idea of Valhalla was introduced at the SCOS Conference in Istanbul this summer. The SCOS Conference in Copenhagen in 1991 will be devoted to the presentation and discussion of this research initiative. Since Istanbul, many people have wanted to join the Valhalla initiative and some have sent us constructive and inspiring criticism on the paper presented in Istanbul. Thank you! We are working hard on the foundation on which to erect Valhalla and will let you know personally about the future activities during this autumn.

Information from the Valhalla initiative will be given in SCOS Note-Work. But if you want to be an active part of the Valhalla and create future research activities within the idea of Valhalla, please let us know in Copenhagen.

Kristian Kreiner, Jan Molin, Majken Schulte, Jesper Strandgaard Pedersen
Institute of Organization and Industrial Sociology, Copenhagen Business University,
23 B, Blagardsgade, DK-2200 Copenhagen N
Phone (+45) 1-37 05 55
"A CALL FOR RESEARCH"

The "Call for Research" is an invitation to researchers to participate in a collective effort in preparation for the Copenhagen conference. Researchers joining Valhalla will take on the task of:

- developing and elaborating a distinct research perspective on organization culture;
- formulating a set of research questions within such a perspective on organization culture, and addressing these in empirical studies;
- discussing and developing methodologies appropriate for such studies.

The collective effort will be organized around a series of workshops. Each researcher will be completely responsible for his/her own research.

Against this backdrop, it will be understood that the Copenhagen conference will be a-typical. The conference is not planned as an unrehearsed, "first-and-final" exchange of views and results among anonymous participants. It is planned as the culmination of an ongoing interaction within a tailor-made network of researchers. Needless to say, the conference will not exclude others from participating, but the possibility for presenting non-Valhalla papers will be very limited.

A tentative schedule for the Valhalla program has been developed as follows:

Workshop 1 will be held in Denmark and will seek to establish comparable aims and strategies for the various projects. A secretariat will be established in Copenhagen too. Workshops 2 and 3 will be organized by other research teams.

We have sketched out some of the questions which have motivated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Events</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 88</td>
<td>Announcement &amp; Enlistment</td>
<td>Proposal. Funding Recruitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 89</td>
<td>Workshop 1: Design</td>
<td>Definition of problem. Pilot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autumn 89</td>
<td>Workshop 2: Methodology</td>
<td>Data collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 91</td>
<td>CONFERENCE</td>
<td>Manuscript. Publisher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 92</td>
<td>Publication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The idea of Valhalla and possible perspectives on organization culture to be developed in the Valhalla context. We hope that these questions will stir criticism and the desire to enter Valhalla.

Questions to organization culture research

In the domain of organization culture research we can identify two major traditions of culture research, one which regards culture as an internal or external variable, and the other one which uses culture as a root metaphor.
Research within the first tradition understands culture as yet another aspect of organizational reality which, for instrumental reasons, must be manipulated and controlled. The underlying assumption is that people's behavior is influenced by what they know, believe, and value. And the research questions deal with the ways in which organizations try to maintain or increase efficiency by impressing appropriate knowledge, beliefs, and values on their members.

Research within the second tradition takes a different approach. Reality is seen as socially constructed, the organization as a reification, and culture as unique sets of knowledge, meanings, and symbolic codes which guide the enactment of reality. A "native-view" predominates, and the research questions deal with the ways in which subjective meanings, through cohabitation in a specific cognitive or symbolic universe, translate into organized (rule-like) action. In this tradition an organization is a culture, while in the former tradition an organization has a culture.

It will be immediately understood why these two traditions of culture research do not communicate well. However, in some respects they are strikingly similar:

1. they both rely on the assumption that culture is "real";
2. they both rely on the assumption that culture has "real" behavioral relevance.

We will briefly question each of these assumptions.

ad (1): Culture is "real"

By nature, what people know, believe and value, as well as the cognitive or symbolic universe within which such knowledge, beliefs and values emerge, are not visible qualities. They can only be deduced from the ways in which they become empirically represented - through behavior or communication. This does not in itself disqualify these notions of organization culture. Organizational members may possibly share knowledge, beliefs and values, and they may share "technologies" for creating meaning and defining reality, whether or not we can see it directly. However, being aware of the potential reification of culture we ought to take a careful look at the empirical observations which are put forward as justification for the assumption that culture in the above senses exists.

We believe that, at best, empirical observations are conflicting and confusing. We need to be much more precise in specifying which kind of meaning and symbolism we talk about when invoking the culture metaphor. There may be an official (public) meaning and symbolic mode, which nobody really believes; and there may be a private meaning and symbolic mode, which nobody really expresses in his/her behavior.

ad (2): "Real" behavioral relevance of culture

It would be difficult to legitimate an interest in culture if we did not believe it had behavioral consequences. We will assume that culture has such consequences, but then again, behavior is so many different things in organizations. Both traditions of culture research seem to assume that culture's influence on behavior is all-embracing. Heavy reliance on rituals and ceremonies, myths and other exotic types of data would testify to the existence of such underlying assumptions.

The researchers' interest in rituals, ceremonies, myths etc. is perhaps easily understood. These represent the most "pure" enactment of values, systems of beliefs, universes of symbols etc. However, understanding rituals in organizations is different from understanding organizations. The theoretical assumption seems to be that the belief system and symbolic universe which can be glimpsed in rituals, ceremonies, myths, etc. is the same as that which is enacted outside the ritual, ceremonial and mythical frames of activity. Yet, the literature contains enough ethnographic material to question such a generally shared foundation for all kinds of behavior in organizations. We all know examples of how, for example, the company picnic gives a picture of the organization as one big, happy family, which then resumes its internal fighting and fierce competition on the following workday.

If culture has behavioral consequences, but cannot credibly be assumed to influence all kinds of behavior, we need to distinguish between different types of behavior, and settings for behavior in organization, on which culture may exert different types of influence. We assume that it would be possible to distinguish between types of behavior and behavioral
settings according to their organizational significance. For example, instrumentally productive action is probably in most cases more significant from an organizational point of view than idle talk in a private office.

Awareness of the fact that behavior in organizations is of many different types, not all of which are equally significant, and that culture may relate to these types of behavior in different ways, would seem to pave the road for analytically more stringent studies of organization culture and its relevance for the understanding of organizations.

TOWARDS A NEW METAPHOR FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

To counteract tendencies of reification and accommodate for the fact that ethnographic accounts often give a confusing and fragmented picture of daily life in organizations, we propose to shift culture from its traditional location as the underlying, often subconscious, foundation for people’s thinking and acting, closer to the surface or appearance of thinking and acting in organizations. We argue that acting and representing action at the public, collective level may indeed be disjointed processes. Organization culture, understood as the (organization-specific) rules governing such representations in what we called public discourse, potentially takes on an important existence in its own right.

Consider first culture as the “accounting system” of organizational behavior. Accounting reports give an orderly and coherent picture of a multitude of highly varied, individual economic transactions. The rules governing the structuring of accounting reports are highly institutionalized, and the presumption of the correctness of the book-keeping is seldom publicly questioned. In all these respects, accounting systems have a similar role to the one we want to ascribe to organization culture.

While the raison d’être of accounting systems would clearly seem to be the control of economic transactions, it is not difficult to recognize some of the paradoxical implications of the presumption of control through accounting systems. The primary notion of the effect of accounting systems, namely that they provide transparency to economic transactions and therefore regulate them, has the paradoxical implication of normalizing the appearance of whatever illegitimate transaction that may find it way into the books. Salesmen’s private consumption, managers’ excesses with women of easy virtue, or the lavish company picnic, all receive an impenetrable appearance of orderliness by ending up as company expenses. The regulated aura which the mere existence of accounts systems lends to economic transactions is exactly the way in which they achieve a potentially licensing function.

Organization culture is in many ways different from, and probably in many respects less “mathematically stringent” than, accounting systems. However, culture may have the same licensing potentiality as account systems. And for the same reasons. Organization culture may perhaps be conceived as a lens which distorts the official perspective on organizational realities and behavioral practices. While culture is perhaps meant to regulate organizational behavior, it may primary regulate the public expression of sound skepticism and doubts as to the authenticity of the represented acts and the sincerity of the expressed emotions and intentions. The implied civility in cultured organizations does in fact preserve a freedom of choice for the individual members - in terms of behavior, personality, and emotions. How people then handle such freedom of choice is a different question which deserves careful empirical studies.

Organization culture, understood as a lens, might make us appreciate the role of culture along quite different lines than traditionally. Organization theory seems already pre-occupied with studying regulatory mechanisms. Adding culture to this is yet another regulating mechanism would perhaps be superfluous. First of all, it would fail to address one critical question, namely, how, in spite of all these regulatory mechanisms in organizations, ethnographic accounts of organizational life still reveal differences, individuality and uncontrolled conduct. To us, the vision of a culture understood as the preserving of differences, individuality and freedom of choice in organizations, has the nice attraction of appearing much more “cultivated” than the ordinary notion of culture as the programming of minds and control of behavior.

* * *

These are some of our questions and ideas so far. They change rapidly in a stream of reactions, research and rebellions within the Copenhagen group. Our aim is to look for the mystery of the ordinary in
search of the unexpected ...

NOTE:
In Scandinavian mythology VALHALLA is the “hall assigned to those who have died in battle, in which they feast with Odin being the chief deity” (Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles, Oxford University Press, 1973).

SANTA FE 1990

Dear Scos Members,

Ever since leaving Istanbul I’ve been thinking about a conference in 1990, in Santa Fe and its possibilities. The purpose of this letter is to stimulate a conversation, not to propose a final product.

The more I’ve thought about this concept of producing a conference-cum-workshop, the more I’ve seen a multitude of possibilities. What I see as the intended purpose of this conference is to create breakthroughs in the domains of organizational symbolism and corporate culture. Perhaps an appropriate title might be: IN SEARCH OF A NEW PARADIGM FOR ORGANIZATIONAL REALITIES.

To achieve this, we would need to create an atmosphere that is conducive to creativity (the act of creation) and the ability to look at organizational symbolism and culture issues from an entirely new and different point of view (perhaps even questioning the basic assumptions concerning organizations and their purposes). We would also need to allow free time so that new relationships and new work may be forged. Thirdly, I see this “conference” as providing a forum for people to present their current work in a way that is useful to the authors as well as the audience. It would be an opportunity to present ideas and works in progress and advance them to the next stage. I am strongly considering the idea of creating a series of exercise/mini-workshops to promote creativity, team building, transformation and vision. In other words, participants have a chance to grow in ways typically not associated with “conferences”. What follows is a first pass at a structure/schedule to accomplish what I perceive to be the goals.

What I ask of each of you is to take some time articulating your vision of this type of conference/workshop and particularly identify those qualities that you feel are important and necessary to manifest throughout the process. For instance, what is important to me is a sense of being nurtured, having fun and being known while creating a breakthrough in thinking.

Please forward any and all ideas to me. One other thing that is important is for you to know that Santa Fe is a very special place in the southwest; its culture is much more native than nouveau American. It is for this reason that I think it is entirely appropriate for a Scos conference.

Ellee Koss
18 Prospect St.
W. Nembury, MA 09985
USA

SCHEDULE FOR A FOUR DAY CONFERENCE

This schedule is based on a four day conference, say Tuesday through Friday so people can stay through the weekend if they desire; and welcoming activities both on Monday night (informal) and Tuesday morning.

Monday
P.M. (5-7): Informal get-together, cocktails and hors d’oeuvres.

Tuesday
A.M. (9-12): Welcoming address (short) explaining the vision, purpose and intended results. Relationship/creativity/new paradigm exercises.
Lunch: Catered lunch with featured speaker, also setting the tone and the possibility of the conference.
P.M. (2-5): Presentations - either 3 concurrent with 4 people each, or 4 concurrent with 3 people each.

Wednesday
A.M. (9-12): Presentations
P.M. (2-5): Team building/outdoor/creativity exercises.
Evening: Dinner arranged at some special local restaurant (included in conference fee).

Thursday
A.M. (9-12): Structured brainstorming time, or free time.
P.M. (2-5): Presentations
Evening: Cultural Event.

Friday
A.M. (9-12): Presentations
Lunch (12-3): Lunch in groups for further brainstorming - action oriented.
P.M. (3-5): Reporting of groups and discussion on where do we go from here. Closing remarks and acknowledgements.
Barcelona 1993

Many authors have written in recent years a large number of articles, papers and books trying to propose new insights to the traditional approaches to the organizational reality which could overcome the constraints of present frameworks and improve our knowledge about how organizations really work in their social context.

The concept of Culture, in spite of the existent lack of homogeneity, and although it could seem paradoxically sometimes “undercultural”, has emerged as a dominant issue in the literature and research in Organizational Theory as the “panacea” to obtaining a wider and clearer understanding of organizational reality. Proof of this is the proliferation of references, journals, conferences and related associations which have appeared in the last ten years.

However, the results seem to be far from the “a priori” expectations, and some criticisms are appearing which try to present the constraints on the concept and its methodology, and also the results of the Conferences organized in the field. In spite of these, the authors of this note are convinced that the “cultural approach“ has just started to run and the preliminary expectations are still promising.

After being in this field for several years as academics and consultants, and after having participated in the SCOS Conferences held in Milan and Istanbul, this note aims to propose some aspects to guide future researches as well as future conferences to be carried out on this subject.

1. Organizations and Organizational Culture have a multidimensional character. So, it requires the contribution of other social disciplines like Sociology, Psychology, Anthropology, Philosophy, Art, History, Linguistics, Semiotics, and so on, to enrich our perspective and reinforce what is already known but hardly specified. But the difficulties of working in an interdisciplinary way are not easy to overcome!

2. Organizational Culture Theories focus on a western context and mostly on the 1980’s. However Culture is not only a western reality nor a new concept. For this reason a refreshing empirical and theoretical enrichment could be reached from the study of other past and present contexts and civilizations different from dominant ones. By the way, we cannot forget that the research that dominates worldwide has a clear Anglo-Saxon orientation, which through different mechanisms of socialization and colonization restricts other views and perspectives. We think that SCOS has a strong advantage in this. The balance between a stronger northern orientation and an increasing southern one could be a promising way to enrich present perspectives.

3. Most of the work on Culture relies on a conception of culture where it is viewed as a mechanism of consensus, making scant reference to the idea of culture as a mechanism of social control and legitimation of a certain reality and social structure. An increasing effort should be devoted to the research of the dialectical and radical perspective of organizational culture.

4. Knowing organizational reality requires wider and empirical research. In the present stage of research on the subject the use of qualitative methodologies and depth studies of the organizations and about the micro-and-macro-context where they operate are more appropriate than quantitative approaches.

5. Most of the conferences on the subject have been too academic and too theoretical. This has restricted the participation of consultants and managers, in spite of their experience in managing organizations and cultures. A stronger link between academics and practitioners could allow a greater enrichment of research in the field.

6. Mostly, conferences have had a passive orientation emphasizing the presentation of papers and constraining time for further discussion. Sending the papers before the beginning of the conference could allow participants to prepare deeply the papers and could foster discussion about them.
7. The place where the congress is held is not only a conference room in a quite suitable hotel but also a place where there exists a culture or cultures. Knowledge of the culture of the town and country where the congress is held is a point to be emphasized.

Those considerations, together with enthusiasm over organizing a conference on culture, the emergence of a promising change taking place in Spain, and the raising of a new culture in Spanish organizations, have moved the authors, in cooperation with José M. de Anzizu, to offer SCOS the possibility of organizing the 1993 Conference in Barcelona.

This idea started after our attendance at the Milan Conference, where we were impressed with the quality of the Congress and the possibilities that organizing such a meeting could present the Spanish academic world. From Milan a small group of 9 people, academics and consultants from Business Schools and from such fields as Philosophy Anthropology, Psychology, Psychoanalysis, Economics and Organization Theory, began to work interdisciplinarily on the subject of culture, trying to widen our views and prepare a joint research project.

Depending on the work of this small but gradually increasing group and the international contacts that such a conference demands, different issues will appear as the dominant streams for preparation of the 1993 Barcelona SCOS Congress.

Joan M. Amat, Ceferi Soler

For further information please contact Joan at:
E.A.D.A.,
Aragon 204,
Barcelona 08011,
Spain

News

Addresses

Please check for any changes in the addresses and phone numbers given in the Board list. Note the following:

J.D. Batista, PO Box 68, Maynard, Mass. 017511, USA.
Burghardt Kornelius, 4 Bryn Road, Aberystwyth Dyfed, Wales SY23 2EJ, UK.
Hope Finney Botti, Via degli Orsini, 34, 00186 Roma, Italy.
Gerry Johnson, Cranfield School of Management, Cranfield, Bedford, MK 43 ML, UK.
Michael Muetzelfeldt, School of Social Science, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria 3217, Australia.
Robert Westwood, School of Business Administration, University of East Asia, PO Box 3001, Macau, China.

New SCOS Members:
Domenico Bodega, CRORA, Università Bocconi, Via Sarfatti 25, I-20136 Milano, Italy.
Henri Broms, Helsinki School of Economics and Business, The Library, Runebergink, 22, 00100 Helsinki, Finland.
Emilio Castelli, REMCO Italia, Rivoltana nuova 53/A, I-20060 S. Pedrino, Milano, Italy.
Barbara Czarniawska-Joerges, Handelshogskolan 1, Box 6501, 11383 Stockholm, Sweden.
Kerstin Dahlen, Lulea University, Dept. of Industrial Economy & Social Science, S-95187 Lulea, Sweden.
Bertil Ekroll, Vekans Affarer, Teknologgatan 1, 113 60 Stockholm, Sweden.
Donata Fabbri Munari, 16 Rue J. Dalphin, 1227 Carouge, Geneva, Switzerland.
Luigi Ferro, LUISS, Viale Pia 12, 00198 Roma, Italy.
Stephen Fineman, School of Management, University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY, Avon, UK.
Alain Forgeot, Ste Forgeot, WEEKS, 50 Rue St. Ferdinand, 75017 Paris, France.
Micheal Foster, The Tavistock Centre, 120 Belsize Lane, London NW2 5BA, UK.
Silvia Gherardi, Dipartimento di Politica Sociale, Università di Trento, Via Verdi 26, I-38100 Trento, Italy.
Jeffrey Goldstein, 750 Kappock St., 108, Riverdale, Bronx, New York 10463, N.Y., USA.
Richard Goodman, John Anderson Graduate School of Management, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1481, USA.
G.R. Mallory, School of Business, Carlton University, Ottawa, KIS 56B, Canada.
Alberto Melucci, Dipartimento di Politica Sociale, Università di Trento, Via Verdi, 26, I-38100 Trento, Italy.
Albert Mok, Universitaire Instelling Antwerpen, Departement Politieke ed Sociale Wetenschappen, Universiteitsplein 2, 2610 Wilrijk, Belgium.
Tatiana Pihan, Via A. Poerio 56B, 00152 Roma, Italy.
Antonio Piu, VBM, Via Mazzini, 6, I-37121 Verona, Italy.
W. Polet, Oudegracht 219, NH-3511 Utrecht, Holland.
Hans Rutqvist, Högskolan I Sundsvall, Harmsand, Box 860, S-85124 Sundsvall, Sweden.
Peder Sletten, ULA-NTH, N-7034 Trondheim, Norway.
Vicente Cefeir Soler, Escola de Formaco, La Caixa, Ganduxer 122, 08022 Barcelona, Spain.
Uğur Tanyeli, Itu Mimarlik Fakultesi, Mimarlik Tarihi Anabilim Dali, Taskisla-Taksim 80191, Istanbul, Turkey.
B.L. Udvikling, APS, Korsgardsvej, 28, 2920 Charlottenlund, Sweden.
Hugh Willmott, 97, Copthorne Road, Shrewsbury, SY38ND, UK.
Edward Wondolowski, Bentley College, Room G327, Waltham, MA 02254, USA.

Events, meetings, curricula, visiting scholars and cultural exchanges

Berlin-West. 9th EGOS COLLOQUIUM, 11-14 July, 1989 at WZB (Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, Science Centre for Social Research), Berlin-West ON THEORY AND PRACTICE OF ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSITION AND TRANSFORMATION.

(3) Cultural and Symbolic Implications of Organizational Transitions and Transformations

Convenor: Burkard Sievers, Bergische Universität, Fachbereich 6, Gauss-Str. 20, Postfach 10 01 27, D-5600 Wuppertal 1.

The working hypothesis for this subgroup is this: Organizational transitions and transformations are systematically - symbolically and operationally - interrelated with changing perceptions, conceptualizations, and acceptances of organizational realities on the part of individuals relating to social systems both in the internal and external environment of the organization. It can therefore be postulated that every major systemic change in an organization's gestalt, processes, products, members and markets may have an impact on its cultural and symbolic interpretation, i.e. its images, metaphors, stories, myths, concepts, norms etc. and vice versa. To the extent that organizational transformations coincide with cultural-symbolic transitions, the question may be raised how, to what an extent and according to what "logic" these transitions are understood and regarded "objectively" as being interrelated.

The answer to these questions has an immediate impact on the management of organizational transition processes, their design, time frame, and effectiveness. At the same time the respective experience and understanding of culture itself will have a direct influence on the imagination of how it can be managed. If the culture is regarded as an objective reality, it then appears to be alterable by mere changes of objects in the outer world, e.g. logos, corporate identities, buildings etc.

If, on the other hand, the culture is seen as a social product or symbolisation of individuals' attempts to use their personal authority to relate their own subjective inner world meaningfully to the outer objective one, cultural changes can no longer be regarded as a matter of social
engineering.

The focus of this subgroup can be applied to a whole range of discrete subject matters of organizational transition and transformation phenomena: e.g. design, corporate strategy, technical innovations, entrepreneurial joint ventures, career development, management and leadership training, democratic participation. Papers are welcomed which show and interpret the importance of cultural and symbolic factors across either or several of these facets and functions or organizations.

As you may already know, Burkard Sievers has been asked by the SCOS and EGOS Board to be the convenor of Section 3 of the colloquium. In view of this "delegation" he would be very pleased if as many as possible of SCOS-Members would take this opportunity to present some of their work on organizational symbolism and culture to a broader audience of colleagues in the field or organization theory. He therefore would be glad if SCOS-Members would take this opportunity and send him proposals for their contributions.

He writes:
"There will be a special work group addressing aspects of "Cultural and Symbolic Implications of Organizational Transitions and Transformations" which I am delighted to organize and to chair. I hope that this colloquium, in general, as well as this work group, in particular, will be not only a good opportunity to meet again and to discuss further our research and concerns but also to present our work on organizational symbolism and culture to a wider audience of colleagues in the field or organizational studies. As the participation at this colloquium is conditional upon acceptance of a paper, although the official deadline for submitting a paper or outline is March 31, 1989, I would be glad to receive your proposal as soon as possible".

**Birmingham.** Call for papers for the 7th Annual Conference on Organization and Control of the Labour Process, to be held on 25th - 31st March 1989.

Papers are invited that illuminate all aspects of the organization and control of the labour process - including the meaning of work, issues of management control and worker resistance, the significance of occupational ideologies and cultures. Previous conferences have begun to develop and international dimensions which the organizers want to promote.

As in previous years preference will be given to papers informed by a critical perspective that (i) integrate empirical material with theoretical argument or (ii) make a substantial theoretical contribution to the study of the organization and control of the labour process.

For examples of papers presented in past years, see Knights et al., (eds), *Job Redesign* (Gower: 1985); *Knights and Willmott* (eds), *Gender and the Labour Process*, (Gower: 1986); *Managing the Labour Process*, (Gower: 1986); and the *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy* (1986). The series has now been adopted by Macmillan, who are to publish volumes in the areas of *New Technology, Labour Process Theory* and the *Non-Manual Labour Process*.

Prospective contributors are asked to send a detailed synopsis (750-1,000 words) of their paper to the conference organizers. Papers must be available for duplication by 31st January 1989 so that they may be circulated to the participants well in advance of the conference. Prospective participants are invited to write for details to David Knights and Bernard Burnes, Department of Management Sciences, UMIST, PO Box 88, Sackville Street, Manchester M60 1QD, UK.

**Cambridge.** Call for papers on Operational Research and the Social Sciences, an IFORS specialized conference. This conference is to be held in the beautiful setting of Queen's College, Cambridge from Monday 10 to Thursday 13 April 1989. It marks the anniversary of a conference on the same theme held at Cambridge in 1964 (proceedings published as *Operational Research and the Social Sciences*, J.R. Lawrence ed., Tavistock). Twenty-five years is a long time and it is appropriate to mark the date with another event looking forward to future prospects for interaction between OR and the various social science disciplines. This conference aims to set the agenda for the next 25 years.

The conference will comprise plenary talks by internationally known speakers, various stream sessions, exhibitions, a banquet and social events. The all-inclusive cost will be around £295 and numbers are being limited to 200.

Among the numerous stream sessions, papers are invited for the following: Operational Research as a Social Science, Knowledge and Ideology; Post-Industrial Society; The Quality of Working Life;
medium and large sized companies which contribute to the financing of
the research team. Relations between micro-cultures and corporate
identity, and those between technological change and cultural norms
have been among their research interests. For more information, please contact
them at the Institute for Management Research, Lyon Graduate School of
Business, 93, Chemin des Mouilles, B.P. 26, 69131 Ecully Cedex, France.

**Publications**

*Kontorsfolket* (Stockholm, 1988) is the title of an ethnological study
into corporate culture and office life by Birgitta Conradson.

*Journal of Theoretical Politics* will publish a special issue on
"Political Entry". Four copies of each manuscript which deal with the
entry of agents into the political arena should be submitted before April
15 1989 to Manfred Holler, Institute of Economics, University of Aarhus,
DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark.

XVII, No. 3, has published an issue dedicated to ideology and culture. It
contains articles by Mats Alvesson, Vincent Degot, David Knights and
Hugh Willmott, Pippa Carter and Norman Jackson, Paul Shrivastava and
Ian Mitroff.

*Organization Science*, a new international journal published by The
Institute of Management Sciences, seeks original manuscripts that report
empirical or theoretical research about organization. Submissions are
encouraged from multiple disciplines and perspectives. The editors are
especially interested in innovative manuscripts in traditional topic areas
as well as manuscripts in areas considered emerging or peripheral to
mainstream organizational theory. Special issues now under
consideration include: organizational learning, the design of high
reliability organizations, conducting real time longitudinal field research.
If scholars have ideas or suggestions for future special issues, please contact Richard Daft, Department of Management, Texas A&M
University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA.

---

**Research in the field of organizational symbolism and corporate culture**

Paolo Bonfanti has completed research into corporate culture as seen
by the CEOs of a sample of Italian corporations. The research was
conducted at three levels: 16 in-depth interviews with CEOs of big
companies; 500 questionnaires on different samples of CEOs; a
secondary analysis on documents (house organs, annual reports, etc.)
edited by 16 different corporations. The research was conducted in
cooperation with the Italian management magazine *Espansione*, which
has published two articles on the basis of a partial but significant set of
data. For the final results, please contact him at Miniconsult, via Gaffurio
5, 20124 Milano, Italy.

Yves-Frédéric Livian, Philippe Sarnin and David Courpasson
started a research programme on "Strategy and Organizational Cultures"
in 1985. They use mainly sociological and anthropological approaches,
and put emphasis on empirical research, working with a group of French

---

**Trento.** A seminar on culture in the industrial organization and on the
meanings of "face" in everyday industrial life will be given by Krzysztof
Konecki. The meeting is being organized by Silvia Gherardi and will be
held in the Department of Social Policy, University of Trento, on
Organization Studies. OS is expanding its volume of pages by 50%. From its first 1988 issue OS will thus have more pages for thoroughly researched, innovative, shrewd, thought-provoking and well-written papers, more pages for sensible, critical and striking book reviews, and more pages for topical and informative news & notes.

Mark Ebers is editor of OS' News & Notes section. More news and notes can now circulate in what is not only a quantitative but also a qualitative expansion. Traditionally, conference announcements, calls for papers and for research contacts have formed the major part of the News & Notes sections. But there are so many other things going on in the community which deserve to be brought to the attention of our colleagues, like conference reports (regrettably, more announcements that reports) letters to the editor, news from organizational practice, the founding of new professional bodies and research groups, anecdotes, etc.

A first instance of the attempted broadening of scope of news & notes topics has been published in the no. 1 issue, 1988. This is a series called "Where the Money Comes From", providing information on where and how scholars may obtain funding for research in various countries.

Moreover, a Working Papers section has been planned. The aim is to provide information on work in progress, bring out-of-the-ordinary-research to the attention of journal readers, and promote research contacts. In the Working Paper section papers announcements may be made in the following format: Author(s) name(s); Title of Working paper; Abstract (100 words max); Mailing address.

Of course, the usefulness of OS' News & Notes section depends on the active support of organization scholars. So please send every news- and note-worthy item you come across to Mark Ebers, Fakultät für Betriebswirtschaftslehre, Universität Mannheim, Schloss, 6800 Mannheim, West Germany.

Organization Theory and Technocratic Consciousness, de Gruyter, Berlin/New York, 1988, is a book by Mats Alvesson where two chapters concern, among other subjects, culture and ideology in organizational life.

Trajectoria - nowego - w organizacji przemysłowej is an article on the trajectory of a newcomer in the industrial organization by Krzysztof Konecki, published in Kultura i Społeczeństwo 1987, 4.
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"The cobbler's children are always the worst shod": a family of sayings follows this pattern and asserts that psychologists always have personal problems, that sociologists are socially inept and that decision-theorists are incapable of making decisions. Does this mean that we should expect a group or organizational specialists to be ill-organized? Well, maybe we are in SCOS, but I think that the reasons for this may be interesting to think about. For one thing, we may all be a little too close to organizations of various kinds, and a little too aware of their characteristics to feel entirely wholehearted about creating another organization which reproduces the features of those which we spend our time studying. We all hold back from over-institutionalization because we have enough of this in all of the other areas of our life.

SCOS started up as a network organization, a way of bringing together people with common concerns about organizations, their symbols and their cultures, and maybe such organizations have special requirements. We started by trying to embody both a spirit of playfulness and a spirit of inquiry, and I have been amazed at how far this early naive intention has taken us, with a succession of Conferences and Workshops, the journal Dragon and our substantial newsletter Scos Note-Work.

But the pressures to institutionalize are always there, as we were made aware, for example, in Milan in 1987 when we felt the need of formalizing our voting procedures for the Board. The need for some degree of "regularization" of our activities continues to be felt, as we have rationalized the system of subscriptions to cover two year membership, and as we continue to look for the 'one best way' of organizing a conference.

I think all of us who were able to get to Istanbul to give our thanks to Zeynep Sözen and her colleagues for organizing a diverse and stimulating occasion, and for wrestling with the problems of organizing a Conference in what may at times have been an unpromising environment. In the event, and in spite of the difficulties and uncertainties which some of us felt about our postal communications with Turkey, the Conference took place with banners and flags flying out in the street proclaiming our presence, with a range of papers on cross-cultural aspects of organizations, and with a full complement of cultural events. Discussions in Scos Note-Work have made it clear that some members had anxieties about our presence in Turkey: the Board discussed this matter at length and advice was taken from a number of Turkish specialists and government bodies outside Turkey before we decided to go ahead. I recognize the concerns of those who did argue against this location, but my personal feeling is that, in the end, we were right to see our presence in Turkey, not as a political event, but as a gesture of support, as an occasion for active networking with our Turkish members who provided the venue for our consideration of cross-cultural matters.

I do have to report, however, that the pressures for greater rigour within SCOS were present in Istanbul: in the General Meeting, there was a strong, and I think, unanimous call for a closer scrutiny of papers at future conferences: I know that Susan Schneider had already taken the twin requirements of quality and relevance as her starting point for the 1989 Conference, which she is organizing at Insead, at Fontainebleau. The Board are strongly supporting her in this policy which is clearly expressed in the Call for Papers. We look forward to enlightening discussion of the phenomenon of leadership set against a symbolic backdrop.

When the Board met in Istanbul, it also took account of Vincent Degot's decision to withdraw from the Editorship of Dragon and actively assumed the task of seeking out a publisher under the initial guidance of Pasquale Gagliardi. This task is still in hand, so if anyone has suggestions or proposals which could help to propagate Dragon in the future, Pasquale or I would be very happy to hear from you. We shall be taking the opportunity of this shift in the management of the journal to take a few more institutionalizing steps by creating an editorial board and a
reviewing procedure for the journal, to remove difficulties which some potential contributors have felt impeded them in the past. Dragon has, however, made a mark under its founding editor, Vincent Degot, and we would not want to let his considerable achievements in setting it up slip away.

Antonio Strati, who was responsible for a quantum leap in the quality, format and presentation of SCOS Note-Work is also handing on his Editorship to Stephen Linstead, so that future coordination will take place in Leeds rather than Trento. We are all grateful to Antonio for providing a series of graceful documents, and we look forward to the new components which Leeds has to offer. A newsletter is nothing without news, though, so start now on the contribution you want to send for the next issue.

The final comment I have to make after Istanbul is to record my thanks to the Board for electing me as Chairman of this curious, shifting and unique organization. I have watched it spring up with delight, I have watched it do the impossible with ease and I wait to see what surprises its next phase of development will have for all of us. I should here express my concern, in spite of the string of references to routinization above, that SCOS should continue to see research as fun, for all possible kinds of reasons, and that it should retain its openness, its willingness to experiment and its ability to embrace diversity in a positive spirit. Insofar as I have any influence in nudging it in this direction as Chairman, I shall certainly try to use it. Let me know if you have any ideas about what we should be doing to keep these qualities in SCOS.

I should also note here the great job which Kristian Kreiner has done in steering SCOS: I am grateful that we shall continue to have his advice and support from the lofty heights of our mythical Advisory Board.

On a practical note, can I ask you please to write to me at Exeter before September 1989, as I am spending a year as a Visitor at the EC Joint Research Centre at Ispra (Systems Engineering, Ed. 32A) 21020 Ispra, Varese, Italy, Tel. (0332) 789111 x5024; sec. x9063. Majken Schulz has taken up the burden of the Treasurership, so all correspondence relating to subscriptions should be addressed to her in Copenhagen. Please note, however, that because of the complexities of international money transfer, subscriptions should still be made out to her in pounds sterling.

Until the Insead Conference,
Best wishes,
Barry Turner.

---

SCOS
STANDING CONFERENCE ON ORGANIZATIONAL SYMBOLISM

To Majken Schulz
SCOS Treasurer
Institute of Organization and Industrial Sociology
Copenhagen Business University
23 B Blagardsgade, 2200 Copenhagen N
Denmark

I wish to renew my subscription/to subscribe to SCOS until July 1990, and I propose to pay as follows:

- I am authorising a bank transfer of £10 Sterling to Bituben Bank, International Division, Silkegade 8, DK-1113 Copenhagen K Registration no: 0213 - Account no. 213-88-62766.
- I enclose a cheque international money order for £10 Sterling (£11 if not in sterling)
- I enclose a Eurocheque for £10 Sterling

My mailing address is:

[Address]

P.S.: To save administration costs, SCos will ask you to make a bank transfer, if possible.
Looking back now to the Istanbul Workshop on Organizational Culture in Different Civilizations, I remember how the idea of holding a conference in Istanbul first arose. To confess, the first suggester was Omar Aktouf ... (in a café in Trento, in 1985).

I am trying to recollect now how I originally imagined the conference contents-wise. As I sat through the sessions, I knew that my impressions were influenced by my preoccupation about the heritage of the Ottoman Empire; whether there really was an intermediate category between the individual and the group; whether ways of thinking, notions of legitimation, 'logical definitions' in Vincent Degot's terms differed.

At the risk of being accused of taking a 'one-dimensional' view, I will look at the papers in the first two sessions from the viewpoint of their treatment of the issues of individuality versus collectivity.

Ugur Tanyeli's paper, which was the first paper presented in the first session 'Civilization', and which was entitled 'Organizational Weltanschaung and Architecture in Ottoman Turkey' analysed Ottoman society, discussing a fundamental issue: the question of individuality versus 'cumulative personality'. This was a society, which, in Tanyeli's terms, 'prohibited individuality', which meant there was no discourse of aesthetics in Ottoman culture.

This very impressive paper carried hints for the analysis of modern Turkish society.

José de Anzizu discussed the problem of individuality as well in 'Tradition, Ideology and Change: Reflections on the Organizational Development Process in the People's Republic of China', although on a different level, in terms of the priority of the group over the individual.

Omar Aktouf's analysis of the ethics of northern and southern Europe between 13th -18th centuries (in "corporate Culture, the Catholic Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism: A Quebec Experience") related individualistic rationalism to the rise of capitalism, called "capitalist metaphysics" by Cooke.

This brings us to further questions about the relationship of the corporation with the Western civilization, an issue treated in Degot's paper entitled "Corporation and Civilization: Some Foci of Reflection", in the second session "Competing Cultural Contexts".

The third session was entitled "Control and Performance`. Eilee Koss's paper ("Culture as Context for Productivity") was particularly interesting for me in terms of its treatment of the concept of productivity, which is one of the key concepts of the 'construction management' world in which I normally operate.

It was also particularly interesting to note that one paper in the session (J.F. Brisby, "The School Progress Report in Belgium as Simulacrum: A Case Study of Two Secondary Schools") treated the concept of fetish in terms of organizational control.

The session on methodology brought with it questions of categorization, notions of precision and measurement. In fact, Joanna Dodd and Peter Lawley's paper ("Understanding Organizational Culture From the Interactions of Small Groups") took me back to my original preoccupation through their view of culture "as being reflected in and moulded by the tensions between the individual and the group as a uniform body". Could the categorization of the relationship between the individual and the group be applied universally? What happens if no clear distinction is drawn between the individual and the group?

Silvia Gherardi's very interesting paper entitled "Same Phenomenon, Several Social Meanings: Does the Researcher Need Hermeneutics?" (which was not presented), treated the influence of cultural differences on the social meanings of the same phenomenon in six cultural milieux.

The final session was entitled "Plus Ça Change ... (Plus C'est la même chose)" by Susan Schneider during the previous Board Meeting in Istanbul in the spring. Organizational change brings with it the analysis of
the correlate of change: the effects of computer technology were analyzed by Bjorn Hennestad in “Computing Organizational Cultures - Trojan Horse of Imperialism?”, raising questions, once more, of what is viewed as rational in organizations.

This concludes my very brief, one-dimensional and informal treatment of some of the papers submitted to the Istanbul Workshop.

Looking back now, I cannot help thinking that I learned more about Western civilization. What about the East or the passageways between the East and the West? It is difficult to analyse civilizations that are not Western with glasses that are Western.

Barry A. Turner
Ispra

The first session which I attended at Istanbul was a debate on methodology which I was also scheduled to chair. In this session, Güliz Ger, Stephen Linstedt and Silvia Gherardi were asked to initiate a general discussion by offering comments, based upon their varying experiences of research, on ‘Why do research?’ The sub-text of the arrangement was that they were also supposed to exemplify divergent approaches. There clearly had been divergent approaches when the panellists met privately to discuss the direction which the session might take, for I was warned that it might be impossible for any debate or any meaningful cross-communication to take place at all. In the event, as I perceived it from the chair, at least, there was not such a degree of divergence between the positions of those on the panel, although it may be that I am an inveterate syncretist, always denying differences and seizing upon similarities. I gain a degree of support for my view, though, from the general debate which followed: the discussion made for one of the liveliest and most worthwhile sessions of the Istanbul Conference, but it did not pick up differences which the panellists had felt so deeply, concentrating instead on the substantive issue of the nature of research, how and why it should be done, on the way that this interpenetrated with the approach of SCOS to research, and also on the way in which that approach might be reflected in the organization of future conferences.

Güliz had started the session with a lucid and an elegantly expressed account of how and why she sought to do research. There was a sense in which she was supposed to be reporting a kind of a ‘mainstream’ or a traditional approach to research, but to my mind, she built in caveats and qualifications which minimised the differences which might then have appeared between her and the other contributors. For her, research was concerned first of all with reporting, with a task of description which embraced both the cognitive and the affective aspects of the situations under study. On the basis of this description, whether case study or experiment, the researcher’s responsibility was to produce some form of explanation. As Güliz phrased it, she would expect that this explanation would display a modest form of cause and effect. At its most basic, this meant asking, “If I change something, will it make a difference?” She would want to guarantee the quality of the information collected as far as possible by seeking for a pluralism of methods, by seeking to avoid an ethnocentric perspective and by looking for multiple interactions between variables. What I would have liked to have heard more about was the issues of how such multiple views could be assembled once invoked, of whether the idea of ‘paradigm’ was being over-rationalised, and of whether the cautious about the impossibility of cross-paradigm communication discussed by Dan Bednarz in his excellent Quality and Quantity article a couple of years ago were being fully taken into account.

Steve Linstedt said that he did research because he could see no alternative. He saw it as a search for understanding in a variety of languages, a search for a kind of professionalised common sense, and he drew support from the ideas of Schutz and Heidegger especially. He assumed from the start that language is transparent, and that the code system of any given account of the world will suppress much: indeed, it will be persuasive precisely because it is exclusive … As Barthes sees a text as a series of signs, the researcher sees the surface and behind it poses meaning. He welcomed the invitation to us from Calas and Smircich to deconstruct our own writings, although he saw problems arising in this context because of the plurality of methodologies and epistemologies.

Silvia Gherardi, too, saw the researcher as having to handle the uncertainties posed by competing epistemologies and ontologies, by the variety of languages, by the difficulties of communicating between
paradigms and by the existence of the ‘double hermeneutic’ which requires us to acknowledge that the interpretation must also be interpreted. As one example of the complexities and subtleties of meaning, she pointed out from her own research into co-operatives that the meaning of the term “worker takeover” varied quite radically according to whether it was being used in Britain, in Italy or in Denmark. The social researcher could not assume that facts could be considered without regard to meaning, that nomothetic research could be pursued at the expense of the ideographic, and research must always be regarded as provisional rather than foundational.

One clue to the different views on research presented in this lively session may be found in Stephen’s suggestion that the business of research was to set out to catch the world and to come back with the lines and the nets, or at least with the holes. By contrast, Silvia thought that research was crocheting a whole cloth out of an assembly of holes. Güliz did not mention nets, crocheting or holes.

**Heyecan Giritli**

*Istanbul*

When Zeynep first asked me to organize a SCOS workshop in Istanbul I thought it would be a good opportunity for me to meet the SCOS people about whom I had heard so much. Yet, I knew that it would be a very demanding job. Especially after the very successful Milan Conference it was challenging to organize a conference at the same level of excellence in Istanbul. Because, when compared with the staff and budget of Istanbul, we lacked the necessary funding and the staff to cope with hard work and administrative demands.

Nevertheless, we did it for fun. However, protests, which we found unjust but which we decided not to answer, sometimes disturbed our fun.

During the conference being far from our work place might have created some inconveniences. And the weather! What a misfortune!

Whenever there was a special request (booking a taxi, finding a good restaurant, listening to typical Turkish music, reading and interpreting instructions for pills against diarrhoea) we felt challenged.

One special memory for me was my first service as a bar-tender on the boat. As I was very inexperienced I got confused with the requests and served vodka to someone with an ulcer.

Aslı was very good in fortune telling from Turkish coffee cups. There was a queue for this particular service.

I would like to take this opportunity to apologize for any inconvenience that may be due to matters beyond our control.

I truly enjoyed meeting the SCOS family and feeling the SCOS approach to life.

**Güliz Ger**

*Maltepe*

I was asked to write about my impressions of the Istanbul Conference as if I would in a letter to a friend, so that’s exactly what I will do.

I had met a few people from SCOS in April, and I was told that this group does research for fun. So, I came in with a set of expectations about the types of studies I would hear about - maybe unconventional, but interesting; and anticipations about social interactions - open and informal. My area of interest is not organizational studies, but marketing and psychology. Furthermore, this was my first time at a SCOS Conference. So, what follows are the first and biased impressions of an outsider.

The weather was unusually hot and humid; however, the participants took that very positively and good-naturedly. Did I have “fun” at the conference? The answer is “yes” for a few interactions: I met several people whom I found intellectually stimulating and challenging, and had informative and interesting discussions with them. However, for the rest of the experience I cannot say I had a lot of fun. Let me elaborate.

Although one’s own perspective defines which papers are or are not interesting, the quality of investigations may also influence the level of interest and respect for the work even among those uninterested in the topic. I felt that I would have had more fun, that is to say, my level of interest and curiosity could have been increased much more, if some of the
papers had been products of more rigorous thinking, reading, and investigation.

I could also have had more fun with respect to socializing. Contrary to my expectations, I found out that, as is the case in many other meetings, there were in-groups and out-groups, and the in-group was fairly exclusive, closed, and not particularly interested in others or others’ ideas. SCOS was not that different after all!

I hope my comments will be interpreted constructively. I think this can be an important group, and improvements in quality would help achieve that. Maybe what I think the objectives of SCOS should be is different to what its current objectives are; or may be it is time the group re-thought its objectives and/or the fit between its objectives and strategies/tactics.

**Hope Botti**

**Roma**

This little contribution to the present Newsletter is in itself a feedback on Antonio’s editorship: a reciprocation to his generosity and a recognition of all the time, affection and effort he has put into something which until now has been a pleasure to simply receive.

As for the Istanbul Conference - for those who were in Milan but couldn’t make it this time - I’d like to set the considerations that follow within two more pervasive and lingering impressions. First of all, there weren’t too many of us present, so it was possible to get a feeling of the quality of the people - the quality of the relationships giving rise to the network itself. Secondly, we were in Istanbul: cosmopolitan, beautiful, on the Bosphorus and - at least for those of us coming from Italy - surprisingly unexotic. Istanbul was very much a presence among us at the conference and behind the city so was Turkey itself - a vast, fascinating and strangely not-foreign country to visit afterwards.

So there we were in Istanbul, and compared to Milan there weren’t too many of us, and compared to Milan there weren’t too many interesting papers presented either.

All of which made for what I, personally, found to be an interesting situation, and which certainly invites a series of very interesting considerations on the respective advantages and disadvantages of cultural movements vs. stabilized scientific communities. Problems which - as we all know - can be approached from an organizational viewpoint; and that is more or less what was “actually” going on the whole time.

Personally, I’d be inclined to gloss over the movement/institution issue. For one thing, SCOS defines itself as a movement, and as a new member I have to admit to how promising and how very pleasant it is to be able to work within a movement ethos. For another, there isn’t much sign of the power and ideology-laden atmosphere which typically accompanies an institutionalization process. In itself, the fact that there isn’t all that co-opting going on brings up a point which isn’t organizational, which all movements face, and which wasn’t to my knowledge addressed in Istanbul. The question, that is, of the movement’s changing relationship to whatever is going on “out there”.

Be that as it may, there certainly are organizational aspects to the fostering of “memory”, “quality” and “pertinence” - terms which were used with reference to the more general problems of cultural mobilization and integration. So while the pros and cons of stricter reviewing were being considered in the corridors, a group of sweet-mannered, soft-spoken Danes (referred to as “the Vikings”) were presenting a concrete, rather structured “channelling” proposal for a three-year project (entitled ... “Valhalla”).

Quite frankly, I felt the atmosphere so pleasurable that “pertinence” seemed to become a matter of “tuning in”, and as far as “memory” is concerned, I found myself interested in rereading old papers to better understand the intellectual routes that new friends had followed in the past. “Quality”, as everybody knows, is a real stinker. And in this third case, alas, the movement ethos is of no avail.

So attentive reviewing by a carefully chosen board which offers constructive feedback for submission might not be a bad idea at this point. Of course this implies the investment of considerable unpaid time and energy. What’s more, selection and mobilization don’t go hand in hand, and I personally wouldn’t like to see this idea pursued without some provision being simultaneously made for legitimate auditing.

As far as “channelling” projects are concerned, they filter rather
than censor, and clearly, they are aggregating. Although they present very
real financial and logistical problems, there is a lot to be said for the
possibilities offered by invisible colleges emerging from their latency. In
the long run, I guess it all depends on the project itself. But why did they
call this one “Valhalla”?

I can’t help worrying. Will I have to be a hero and die in battle? Let’s
say I do get in. Do I want to be admitted to that immense room with lances
for rafters and five hundred and forty windows— that steamy, screaming
brawl of boisterous, red-blooded warriors separating the men from the
boys forever? What do I wear? What’s a nice organizational symbolist like
me doing in a place like this?

Richard Goodman
Los Angeles

Where do I fit? ... This may seem a strange opening question to this
essay, but it is a platform from which to explore “culture”, behavior, and
the organization. As I compose this essay, am I patterning my approach
to emulate the form and substance of European Scholarship or am I
following the American Research Tradition? While this may very well be
a false dichotomy, nevertheless it is illustrative of the main point of this
essay. As I have been trained, lived, taught and researched in both North
America and Europe my behavior is directly affected by both cultural
traditions at one and the same time. Thus, one issue that I wish to raise is
that of cultural mono-cohabitation. That is, elements from very different
cultural traditions are often found to cohabit within a single person and
certainly within a single organization. The more traditional starting point
that suggests otherwise is an assumption that must be reexamined as our
field begins to transition to next generation development.

At the Istanbul workshop it was clear that we had solved, to some
extent, the basic existence theorem. That is, we could at various levels of
analysis (sub-group, group or organization) demonstrate that there were
elements of the situation which could be attributable to “culture”. We
could in a given situation be descriptive; we could paint a fairly clear
“culture-scape”. But, still, we were less sure of how culture was created

and even more unclear about the implications that various cultural
elements had for organizational life and development. Regardless of the
popular books on managing your organizational culture, we remain on
rather shaky ground when we assert that organizational culture could
actually be managed (meaning that we understand the creation process),
and if managed would give us some specific organizational result
(meaning that we understand the implications of one or another element
of culture).

We need to base our future research praxis on far richer assumptions
then those which have brought us this far in our field. This essay attempts
to state some of the essential assumptions which we must overtly
articulate and then seriously employ in our future research designs as we
engage the higher level of complexity which I believe is necessary for the
next generation.

Inclusion, dynamics, and interpenetration issues present for us
difficulties which need help from conceptualizations of a more basic
nature. Since culture is a phenomenon attributed to the workforce, albeit
discernible through both artifactual observation and direct inquisition, it
is important to have guidance to extend and/or limit our search—
particularly if we are concerned with causality as well as existence. What
should be included in the domain of a research effort is problematic
because organizational boundaries are exceedingly permeable. Such
permeability is both a real part of organizational life and an intellectual
device adopted by the researcher. First, there is the permeability or
external occurrences. We can see that events in the organization’s
resource and client systems reflect into the organization and require
reaction and often adaptation - “changes in the way we do things here” -
and occasionally reformulations of assumptions and beliefs. Additionally,
there is the permeability of the workforce. The organization is constantly
altering the specific composition of its workforce through
normal acquisition and attrition processes. Finally, there is the
permeability of the personnel themselves. the workforce is itself
constantly engaged with the outside world - engaged in family
development, moving through their own cycle of life, traveling, etc.
- events which often require reaction and adaptation by the individual. All
these events and processes permeate the organizational boundary and
affect the extant and the evolving culture; thereby compounding our basic research problem.

In addition to the active organizational permeability, we as researchers make conscious choices regarding the membership we propose to study. That is, who will be included and/or to excluded from our unit of analysis or our unit of explanation. This represents intellectual permeability. Does the subsystem we are looking at include the next largest system, is that system within the “legal” boundaries of the organization? For instance, are students part of educational organization or are they clients; are clients part of any other organization; are major suppliers and/or “captive” suppliers (those whose major customer is the “organization” in question) part of our organization or not; does the small sales office in Barcelona affect our “culture”? Do prospective members or ex-members provide a force for the retention or adoption of assumptions or beliefs? Are new members or old members part of this unit? As such, the permeability phenomenon means that, on both an active and an intellectual basis, the “membership” of an organization is an ever-fluctuating concept.

A second assumption that should be in the forefront of our research design is one of cultural “dynamics”. Culture is constantly evolving, due such phenomena as the impact of internal and external events and the turnover of personnel. In addition to the creation process we must account for the transmission process. There is a teaching/learning process which proceeds at a different pace for each of the various members of the organization. What we find in an organizational study is an imperfect picture that is confused by the “as yet” uninformed informants, and further confused by the everyday events that are already reshaping the culture. Thus, a slice-in-time analysis has difficulty in capturing the evolutionary process which is proceeding with a great deal of evenness throughout the organization. Quite often, the uneven dynamics of the situation require the researcher to look behind the mask of the organization and to select what is to be reported as the “culture” - a selection process that might very well be different depending on the descriptive or predictive intent of the researcher.

Reflecting back on the original paragraph, one must admit to the interpenetration of many sources of beliefs and assumptions deriving variously from internal organizational activities as well as action and events external to the organization. These activities might be classified as individual, familial, cultural, industrial, regional, national, ethnic, etc. Time and inductive research might very well offer us a better classification system, but the current concern is the understanding that organization and the individuals which make up the organization.

Important research design issues arise when we admit to the permeability of organizational boundaries and the dynamics of culture. These issues, plus the complicated interpenetration of various sources of assumptions and beliefs, must lead one to posit simultaneous cohabitation of such various cultural elements within one and the same person as well as within one and the same organization.

The question, then, that we must face as the next generation of cultural research begins is that of selecting or creating appropriate methods for generating knowledge about such a very complicated conceptual arena. That is why the development of organizational knowledge will be slow, and determined as if one is slogging through a viscous field making only measured progress and needing many forms of assistance. Since the members of SCOS seem to be slogging together, metaphorically, the results of third generation research will truly be one of high “viz-SCOS-ity”: a multi-source, sometimes sluggish, process building to a high level of knowledge about culture, behavior and the organization.

Jens Aggerbeck
Copenhagen

As a new member of SCOS with only a little knowledge of previous conferences, previous discussions etc., it may be a difficult task to evaluate the progress within the organization up to the point of the Istanbul conference.

However, as a neutral participant in the event I was aware of a growing frustration as the days went by among various participants, and I believe I was able to distinguish a few major trouble sources at the conference - in my opinion at least. From what I could understand these
invitation will drag SCOS in a certain direction that might not prove to be the right one, but at present I believe that SCOS has no alternative if we want to compare experiences from around the world on a comparable basis. Personally, I would favor a more user-oriented SCOS in the future. The research of SCOS members have already proved to be valuable in many ways and I believe it natural to raise the question: Who is going to profit from the research? I heard many voices against a more widespread commercial use of SCOS research among unqualified persons - and I agree that the upsurge of corporate identity programmes, corporate culture and even the use of the word “symbol” is in many ways regrettable, in the way it is being mistreated by consultants and PR agencies. But I also believe that most of the mistakes are made due to the lack of publicity of qualified guidelines from SCOS to the actual end-users - the corporations, national and international.

On the final day of the Istanbul Workshop the debate once again turned pragmatic, despite a marketing-oriented, operational presentation on the theme which, to my regret, received little interest. By nature, Symbolic Management, no matter the topic, is operationally-oriented - so why not let the research in the future become more operational - thus opening a forum for both a scientific oriented, pragmatic debate, as well as a user-oriented, operational one?

SCOS cannot prevent anyone from using the research falsely interpreted - but by appearing on the stage, SCOS researchers would inevitably create the correct interpretations, thus creating the appropriate standards of use. Otherwise I fear SCOS faces the threat of seeing its work mutilated before is appears on a wider published scale, or worse: useless to anyone but the scientists. I believe SCOS deserves better.

So, summarizing, I would like:
- a fine-tuning of the role SCOS is to have in the future;
- coordinated, multinational research;
- user-oriented research, as well as purely scientific research;
- thus leading to less pragmatism, more “constructionalism”.

Please correct if I am just another you-know-what...
I also met very interesting people. I'll never forget Dick Raspa and his Perrier, which we spent some time finding in Istanbul in that hot weather. Luckily, we got it and according to him it was cheap compared to the Hilton's prices. He also wanted to acquire some information about Turkish culture; unfortunately, no time for that.

Interestingly enough, I will also never forget Silvia Gherardi and her knowledge of exotic perfumes. She took me to a place in the Spice Bazaar where as a citizen of Istanbul I had never seen and been in. She carefully smelled every perfume mixture and made her expertise known to the shopkeeper. Luckily, she got what she was looking for and we safely left the shop. Otherwise, we would have been in trouble with the shopkeeper. Thank God, she did not understand the shopkeeper's sentiments about her diligence.

I will also never forget the SCOS event: Boat tour on the Bosphorus. That tour was not only interesting for SCOS members but was also enjoyable as well. My personal thanks to Zeynep Sözen for the tour and the delicious sandwiches she offered us.

From all aspects, Istanbul workshop was a great success. It did not fail those who put their faith in organizing it in Istanbul, I enjoyed being part of it. I am sure those days will be remembered in the future events of SCOS by all.

Egbert Kahle
Lüneburg

In spite of the terrible heat, the conference was a success for all participants, as far as I could tell. The concentration on one track of sessions - due to a smaller number of participants - makes it easier to follow the run of the discussion throughout the conference. Although coming from very different backgrounds and experiences, and having therefore different concepts of some of the central topics, in the end we came to some understanding of important issues. One of these important issues, which should be followed up on the way up to Valhalla, is the detection of "what is going on behind the back". The existence of organizational behavior going on "behind the back" seemed to be an
appalling thought for some of the participants, whereas others took it as a normal experience.

This is not the place to repeat all the points of discussions, but my thanks to the organizers, Z. Sözen and H. Giritli, who prepared and conducted the conference efficiently and good-humoredly. Conference-programme and by-programme were enlightening.

_Nylda Aktouf_
_Montreal_

We will not forget our trip to Istanbul. This city is a real precious stone cut by millenia of history, whose reminiscences jostle each other in our memories, making us feel dizzy.

Istanbul, crossroads of civilizations, melting-pot of peoples coming from everywhere. Its inhabitants have inherited the sobriety and the distinction that are only bequeathed by great civilizations. We are impressed by the affability, the generosity and the refinement of our Turkish friends.

Istanbul and its charming way of life. After the swarming activity and the scorching heat of the day, the evening brings appeasement and coolness. The restaurants which abound on the Bosphorus and Marmara coasts are crowded with people seeking good food and the refreshing breeze coming from the sea. Sometimes, entire families resolutely gather together along the banks, sitting on the ground around the traditional Turkish coffee.

Istanbul, reckless city. The traffic is incredibly chaotic, giving rise to really comic situations. Who cares about the highway code! Everybody threads his way through the streets at breakneck speed, vying with each other, disregarding roadsigns, lights, cars arriving from the opposite direction and policemen who, given the circumstances, have a purely formal and ornamental role. But there is a never-ending miracle: a consensus in the transgression of regulations which, within this apparent anarchy, maintains the fluidity of traffic, and all this without any damage! Since everybody drives "anarchically", the relationships among the car drivers are of mutual kindness and leniency. Once, we were the amazed witnesses of an exchange of courtesy and salamalecs between the drivers of a bus and a Volkswagen each of them begging the other to pass first. The Volkswagen driver (we were in the car) wanted to do a U-turn right in the middle of the street, which in "normal" conditions would have been strictly forbidden and highly dangerous. Finally, we did the U-turn, the engine spectacularly throbbing, and with the benediction of the bus driver who shamelessly stopped all the cars behind him to let us pass!

Istanbul, Ali Baba’s cavern, the city of the Great Bazaar. The Great Bazaar is a boundless forum where nearly 4000 shops, some no bigger than a pocket handkerchief, are placed side by side along several kilometers of alleys. It is a city within a city, where one can stroll around, buy goods, eat, drink, sleep, go to the Turkish baths, pray, have a haircut, be shaven, etc. We are dazzled by its shops, with its jewelry stores overflowing with gold and silver, its twinkling coppers, odorous leathers, shimmering fabrics and fabulous rugs.

But as pleasant as the tourist status is, it is full of pitfalls for the uninitiated. In addition, none of us spoke Turkish. But actually, most of the Great Bazaar shopkeepers handled many languages with an astonishing virtuosity (at least the rudiments necessary to the practice of their trade), including Japanese! No, the difficulty was not one of communication; the problem was with the prices. The beginning prices were extremely high, but they had the magic capacity to fluctuate according two main factors. First, the look of the tourist. If he seemed to be an American, he was supposed to be as rich as Crousus (who was, in fact, one of the kings of Asia Minor which included the territory of present day Turkey) and was pitilessly "taxed". Secondly, the bargaining skills of the customer. Bargaining! A key-word in the transaction taking place between the seller and the buyer, and which will result in an agreement honourable for both parties. But one must not be mistaken. This is not a trite mercantile negotiation aimed at a simple exchange of merchandise. It is an authentic and important social ritual by which the two parties seal a pact. The customer is not a king in the occidental meaning of the term, but a lord with whom the seller engages in an oratorical encounter, a duel from which each emerges victorious. All oratorical devices are allowed, from praise to scoffing through puns and indignation. But how to practise this art when one is a foreigner? At this point, good fortune came to our
aid: among our horde of infidels who set out to invade the Great Bazaar, was a lucky man: Omar Aksur. Omar who, by a quirk of fate, was endowed with a Turkish mother (born in Izmir, the ancient Smyrne, precisely the native city of most of the sellers met) and with a truly Ottoman look! Omar had another privilege which, in the circumstances, turned him into a real saviour: He was Moslem, therefore a member of the Islamic umma, which meant that his relationship with the merchants must be characterized by a mutual requirement of fairness and honesty. With such an aura, Omar was unilaterally designated as the mentor of our group. Now, all he had to do was to explain to the sellers why he did not speak Turkish, which he did conscientiously with abundant gestures and giberish, where the most intelligible sentence for us was "mama is Turkish". Thus chaperoned by our guide, we were gratified by additional demonstrations of friendship, and of warm hospitality by the shopkeepers. But above all, we were spared the exorbitant prices applied to occidental - and reputedly rich - tourists. Omar, who began to take his mission very seriously, acted as an intermediary for several commercial transactions of our group members. Sitting around him in the shops, we observed him attentively while he held animated discussions with the sellers, following with anguish the progressive lowering of the prices. When the pact was concluded, that is when the two "adversaries" began to shake hands, both obviously satisfied, we let our a sigh of relief, really surprised be the sometimes enormous difference between the initial price and the negotiated one.

Bob Witkin, who attempted at the beginning of his stay to make a solitary incursion into the Great Bazaar, left immediately, frightened by the motley crowd, the deafening racket, the jostle and the aggressive merchants. But when Omar accompanied him to the market, he felt secure and made his purchases, while following with a strong and amused interest the salamalecs between his guide and the merchants. He was so absorbed by the picturesque situation that he even forgot the suffocating heat which had turned the shop into an oven, participating in the discussion and savouring the traditional apple tea which was profusely offered to us everywhere. Overwhelmed by the heat, we welcomed with evident pleasure this extraordinarily refreshing and reviving beverage. Bob, with his camera, immortalized the scene of the shop tea ceremony, amazed by this decor coming straight from a Thousand and One Nights and wondering how a simple purchase could be accompanied by this interminable ceremonial. He had the revelation of his life: time, with the orientals, is not money. It is much more. It is an inestimable wealth, a gift that must be offered to the guest, and as such, must be spent without counting (it is the same with hospitality). Moreover, Bob discovered that the customer must be careful not to show that he is naive and ignorant. Bargaining, to be a game worth playing, must take place between two equal parties. The merchant must negotiate with an "opponent" worthy of him. The buyer must therefore be ... or pretend to be a connoisseur. Omar, caught in the game, argued peremptorily and with an imperturbable self-confidence: "No, this is not the right price, I know that this does not cost the price you are asking for, and you know it as well!" Bob, flabbergasted, was repeating: "This is the most extraordinary cultural experience I ever had in my life!"

Dick Raspa, too, escaped, but only just, the special treatment reserved to "American" tourists, thanks to the diligence of our "cicerone" who was there just on time to stop Dick from paying without discussion the exaggerated prices asked by the merchants. Here, it is important to point out another mistake that the unwarned tourist spontaneously commits, and which is unforgivable: one must never show how much he covets an item! If he does not want to be "harpooned" by the merchant, he must exhibit a certain detachment, examine the "coveted" object with a pretended indifference, almost with disdain, put it back in its place conspicuously to show that the item is not worth buying, and that there are plenty of other merchants ready to sell the same "junk" for next to nothing! This subtle game will reverse the situation, creating a balance of powers. Omar who learned the lesson, and more than ever making use of his semipaternal "Mama is Turkish", warned the shopkeepers that Dick, even though American, was his friend and that it would be indecent to try to trick him. The friends of our friends are our friends ...

Taxi drivers, also, were asking the most exorbitant rates. Barry Turner, for instance, was asked, for a drive from the airport to the hotel, no less than ... 200 dollars! The normal price was 10 dollars! Barry, although he did not have the privilege of having a Turkish mother, was endowed with an excellent capacity of judgement. He refused categorically to pay this excessive amount. So he paid 20 dollars ... double the normal rate!

All these adventure added spice to our journey to Istanbul and contributed largely to its pleasure and its charm. But mainly they proved one thing: You are strongly recommended when travelling to Turkey to have a Turkish mother!
It is already known that the waqfs (pious foundations) had assumed important roles in the social life of the Islamic world and especially in that of the Ottoman Turkey. The pious foundations do not only pertain to Islamic societies, but in this culture they realize various functions in a more widespread manner than they do in the others. This fact has resulted in the accumulation of quite a rich amount of publications on waqf. But some aspects of the waqf are still unrevealed, and there is a lot more to be said about it. In many ways it still seems to be uninvestigated at all. Besides, most of the scholarly studies which attribute it such roles which are not played by the waqf, show an inclination to idealize or sublimate it. For example, it has been suggested that waqf was an institution capable of balancing the inequality of the distribution of wealth (1) or that it could have functioned as a stimulator of the economic development which made the take-off stage of an underdeveloped country easy (2). Naturally, the waqf has been most frequently emphasized and idealized as being a philanthropic institution. It is for this reason that in most of the studies waqf has been explained in connection with the Islamic ideals of solidarity. Some scholars, on the other hand, do not idealize the character and functions of the waqf, but tend to distort them. For example, a Turkish scholar, O.N. Ergin, has written that (3) the old Ottoman municipal system totally depended on management based on the waqf method. As a matter of fact, considering that the first municipality in Turkey was established in 1863, it is possible to interpret the waqf system as a municipal organization, because, until the period of Turkish modernization, it undertook most of the urban services which were rendered by the municipalities in Europe. But it is incorrect to explain the waqf in an analogous way by drawing parallels with other institutions that are characteristic of other cultures. In this essay, I will try to clarify the meaning of the waqf in the society to which it belongs and will investigate only one of its numerous “complications”; that is, the role it played during the formation of the urban environment.

As stated above, studies on waqf have usually not discussed its operational mechanism or its structure; scholars have tended to concentrate on its objectives or functions. In other words, they have not questioned the organization and management of the waqf as an institution, but have examined the reasons for its establishment. However, this approach by itself is insufficient to explain an institution, since it is not possible to highlight the functions and roles it assumes in social life without concise information on its organizational structure. Because of this structure, waqfs undertook many important functions beyond the actual goals and intentions of their founders. The founders’ aims, and the limits and functions which they foresaw for the waqf, could only partially determine the role it played or could play. In my essay, I will try to discuss this concealed role and the structure which produced it - aspects of the waqf system which are almost never written into the foundation documents (vakıfes) or which were never stated by the founders at all.

There were two kinds of waqfs in the Ottoman World, with different reasons for establishment and different structures of organization: a) Family waqfs, b) waqfs of public benefit. I will mainly discuss the latter and will only shortly define the former, using them as an example to point out the mentality which created the system of waqf in general.

The family waqfs were actually regarded as foundations only nominally or as legal procedures. Ö.L. Barkan has long argued that such waqfs should be regarded as a kind of testament (4), because they were not
intended to work for any public benefit. The main reason which lay behind the aim to establish such a foundation was to force an inheritance to be shared outside the method imposed by the Islamic Law. In this manner, the founder (vakif) was able to share his wealth according to his own will, to be realized posthumously. He also defined the conditions how and by whom it would be managed. In order to find such a waqf, it was sufficient to prepare a foundation deed (vakfiye) which had to be registered by the shari’a court. The exact European counterpart of this procedure would be to have it notarially certified. In most cases the founder appointed somebody from the successive generations of his family as a trustee and by making him the administrator of his inheritance, he guaranteed that its revenues were shared fairly among his off-spring as he had intended. Thus, nobody outside the family (or except the people the founder had stated in the vakfiye) could benefit from the possessions of the waqf and their revenues. By making use of a sort of legal trick, private property remained private, and this kind of conduct resulted from the anxiety over losing the wealth that might be dispersed into small units in the future. But these waqfs were not as wealthy as might be supposed; the property of a family waqf usually comprised a house and a small quantity of ready money (5). Although the family waqf was actually a longterm inheritance strictly limiting the activities of successive generations, it was consumed and disappeared even more rapidly than a “real” private property. In other words, the founder’s aim to protect his wealth generally could not be realized. It is still more surprising fact that, for centuries, no notice was given to the shortlived character of these waqfs, and numerous new family waqfs continued to be established. Most people still thought it was more advantageous to have their wealth inherited in this way. This phenomenon can only be explained by the economic mentality and ideological substructure that was valid in the Ottoman world: as a matter of fact, both of the two kinds of waqfs were by-products of these. That is, the Ottoman waqf is the natural result of an economic understanding which defines wealth as a “pile” or a triplet of land, buildings and money. As in all pre-capitalist economies, wealth in the Ottoman economy was not something that could reproduce itself, but was an “accumulation” that was only earned and expended. Therefore, the waqf founder thought that he could grant his wealth long life as long as he could control the expenditure by the articles he put into the foundation document, whether his wealth was to be appropriated by his family or was a fund to be used for public benefit; but he was mistaken. It will be shown in the next paragraphs that this and similar mistakes were made in all kinds of waqfs: from the first phase of their establishment to the last stage of their management.

The foundations of public benefit show almost no difference from the family waqfs with respect to the “notarial” procedures that had to be performed to establish them. But they show great differences in their goals and in their organizational mechanism. As a matter of fact, the founders of these waqfs also took measures to assure the welfare of the next generations of their family by making it possible for them to benefit from the revenues of the waqf (6). In this kind of waqf, however, there are more complicated drives and social motives involved, besides the wish to secure the family wealth and to distribute the revenues in the desired manner; the founder of such a waqf had other goals in mind than just making a philanthropic demonstration of religious content. In order to be able to identify these goals, it is necessary to study the characteristics of the members of the social group that established foundations for public benefit. Theoretically, everybody, except slaves, was free to establish whatever kind of waqf he wanted; but in practice, in order to establish a pious foundation for public benefit, the possession of enormous wealth was a prerequisite. And in the Ottoman world the most prosperous people belonged to the bureaucratic upper class (7). However, the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a definite social group was not enough for the establishment of a waqf; there had to be certain impulses as well. In Ottoman society these impulses were of an economical and cultural character. As a result of such impulses of restrictions, the upper class member lost the chance of orienting his huge wealth to productive investments, and it become inevitable for him to establish a waqf, because in the Ottoman systems wealth, and especially the wealth of a member of the bureaucratic upper class, had no investment function or no market function, according to K. Polanyi. The only functions it performed were redistribution and reciprocity (8). This means that the wealth of the ruling upper class member was redistributed among the subordinate classes, as well as being spent on mutual hierarchical gift-giving among the ruling
class members. The establishment of a *waqf* should be regarded in connection with this function of redistribution, because, if one way of transferring wealth to the members of the subordinate class was to bestow alms, the other way was to spend it on large public projects. The Ottoman upper classes realized both of these in to an extent that would be regarded as excessive even for a pre-capitalist society.

We can conclude that the act of founding a *waqf* had only an indirect connection with the desire to satisfy a public requirement. In other words, there was a sum of wealth that "had to be spent" for the public benefit, and the possessor made a venture to spend this wealth by making use of the only possible means in the Ottoman world. As has been clearly shown, the system of *waqf* has no similarity with that of a company or a municipal organization, even in its initial step of formation. A municipality, and the services it offers, exists primarily to fulfill a public requirement; in other words, the service produces indirectly the organization that will give itself; it is the *raison d’être* of this organization. The *raison d’être* of a *waqf* on the other hand, is not the existence of an unsatisfied need; on the contrary, it is created by the existence of a wealth waiting to be spent under the cover of charity. In the end, here again public needs are fulfilled and services offered, but because of this character of the *waqf*, services are offered in a much different way from a municipality. This means that the public services of a *waqf* do not equal the services given by a municipal organization - neither in its content nor in its form of realization. Sometimes it gives services in such fields which a European municipality of the past or present would not even imagine, while omitting some of the services a municipality would necessarily give. For example, there were *waqfs* for the payment of the *avaris* taxes of the inhabitants of a certain neighbourhood in the city to the government (9). The inhabitants of this neighbourhood unit had their taxes paid without spending a single penny, because someone had granted his wealth to be used for this reason. There were even such *waqfs* to feed stray cats, dogs and birds (10). But on the other hand, for example, there was no *waqf* that was responsible for the paving and repair of the streets of a city. In fact, there were many people who paved or repaired a street by founding a *waqf*, but these sorts of activities never gained a systematic continuity. In other words, such urban services are accidental; somebody may ensure that a certain street be paved an constantly repaired by the sources he has granted for it. But, the same *waqf* which was founded by him cannot make new streets. It can only keep the street designated as the object of the *waqf* in the foundation deed in good condition. In order to make and pave new streets, new *waqfs* had to be founded by other people who were interested in them.

In order to observe the nature of the public services which were rendered by a *waqf*, it is necessary to know how decisions were made at the first stage of its establishment. Naturally, the decision that started the establishment process was made by the founder of the *waqf*. The founder had probably observed that a certain service at a certain place was given insufficiently or totally non-existent attention, and wanted to overcome this urban deficiency, because he has the resources to devote to this aim. If the *waqf* founder was a sultan it was enough for him to realize his imperial wish by setting the Organization of Royal Architects in motion. Since this kind of public project always necessitated important construction, the problem imposed by the *waqf* founder primarily concerned the Royal Architects. These were responsible for all the architectural and constructional procedures, from planning to opening for public use. At this stage, however, the *waqf* did not exist as a legally organized and autonomous institution. What was done was just to build a public service building, which would make the establishment of a *waqf* an unavoidable necessity. The foundation deed which certified the establishment of the *waqf* was prepared after all the construction was done, even after the service which constituted the subject of the *waqf* started to be provided (11). Generally, there was a period left between the beginning of the service activities and the legal establishment of the *waqf* in order to solve the problems that might arise at the beginning of a foundation by the founder himself and by his own means, instead of by the trustee and by spending the very resources of the *waqf*. Thus, when the *waqf* started to work as determined by the articles in the foundation document, it left the formative phase behind. This founding process was equally valid for the sultan *waqfs* and for those founded by the members of the bureaucratic upper class. Members of the upper class also made the initial step through the Organization of Royal Architects, and the Organization built the buildings of the proposed *waqf* with the money they transferred to it. It was not even necessary for a member of the upper class
to be present at the city where his waqf’s service buildings was to be built. The Organization of Royal Architects constructed any building wherever he wanted, if he only obtained the money and made an official appeal to the court (12). More modest waqf founders who were not members of the ruling class and, consequently, who could not benefit from the service of the royal Architects, had their waqf buildings constructed by “civilian” architects.

It is obvious that in the phase of establishment of a waqf everything depended on the personal will of the initiator. Even when the construction of the waqf buildings were carried on by a bureaucratic organization such as the Royal Architects, all decisions, except the architectural and technological aspects of the building process, were made by them. They decided where the waqf’s building was to be constructed and determined the scope and aims of the waqf and imposed how it would be managed by the trustee in the future. It seems that one of the most easily observable characteristics of the waqf, the accidental and arbitrary nature of its service activities, depended on the structure formed by the absolute decisions of the initiator. It is possible to see the traces and reflections of these characteristics in the urban environment. For example, it sometimes happened that a waqf founder wanted to offer some urban services in the wrong place and in an inadequate form. The building complex in Istanbul which was built for Piyale Pasha (1573) and which comprises a mosque, a hamnam, a public laundry and a tomb could never become an urban nucleus, and its vicinity has always been unoccupied, because of the Pasha’s inadequate choice of place. What made the market complexes (arastas) of Sultanahmet in Istanbul and of Selimiye in Edirne almost deserted up to recent times, apart from their locations outside the city center, was the decisions made during the stages of establishment of these waqfs. Nevertheless, it cannot be claimed that all waqf founders always made wrong decisions, and, even if their decisions were perfect in the sense of Ottoman urbanism, they had to have an unavoidable impact on the environment. For example, a public service for which a waqf was to be founded has also to satisfy the desire of the founder, who insisted on erecting a monument to his own memory. This predilection made the integration of an urban service building with an existing one impossible. A detached and independent one was generally preferred. For this reason, only those who did not possess enough money to found a totally new waqf made new additions to already working establishments. For example, constantly new water sources and lines were added to the Suleymaniye water maintenance system, which increased its capacity in the course of the two centuries after its first building. However, these additions have always been too small and were never of such dimensions as to develop the system totally or to modernize it (13). Indeed, the person who attempted to found a waqf did not have such a wish at all; he usually intended to render a service by constructing a wholly new establishment, because he could not consent to his “sign of benevolence” being lost in a complex named after another person. Establishing a waqf was also a sign of prestige, so it had to be noticed easily and it could not be kept hidden by an existing waqf. The reflection of this attitude of the waqf founder on the formation of the Ottoman city was in the direction of accelerating its tendency towards over-expansion. The waqf founders preferred to invest in, and to populate, new, loosely inhabited areas on the outskirts of the city, instead of improving the existing but insufficiently installed parts of an urban settlement.

This was one of the reason for the continuous horizontal “boom” of the city, keeping the density extremely low. The waqf founders inevitably sought new unequipped areas ready to be urbanized. This was unavoidable, since the waqf mostly offered such urban services as mosques, schools, almshouses, fountains, bazaars, hamnams etc. This meant that the motives that directed the waqf founder dispersed the services and caused the city to scatter.

One of the most important factors that determine the fate of the Ottoman city has been the characteristics of the waqf. For example, the great differences between the concepts of urban development in Europe and Turkey may be explained to a great extent as related to waqf-originated urban services. As is known, from the Middle Ages to the 18th century, cities in Europe usually expanded in density rather than area. In the Western world it was realized that, in order to localize population in some area, it was necessary to concentrate services in the same place. In Ottoman Turkey, however, not even the city center gained the multifunctional character of European city centers, and this must be in some part the result of the tendencies of the waqf founders to disperse services
in the urban area. The Ottoman city centers only, inevitably, gathered commercial functions together (14), but the other functions were almost homogeneously scattered around the city, producing a low-density settlement pattern.

In "Islamic-Ottoman law, the concept of waqf shows an extraordinary flexibility, which almost makes it possible to offer every kind of service in every possible way, allowing a freedom of organization. But this freedom only exists in theory. The rigidly standardized and inflexible organizational structure of the waqf inhibits the use of this theoretical freedom. The static nature of this organization assumed two forms: firstly, those who founded waqfs and prepared foundation deeds tended to impose very detailed articles, making strict restrictions and putting in certain conditions; secondly, the Ottoman and, in general, the Islamic waqfs did not possess a mechanism of decision-making. The tendency to make detailed foundation deeds created great obstacles in the long term. For example, if a waqf was founded as a center to give the poor a cup of soup a day, it was impossible in the future to change this, for economical reasons, to giving a vegetable dish instead. For instance, if the employment of 3 cooks, 6 helpers and 10 servants with certain wages was anticipated for cooking and serving this food, this meant that it was not possible to make new arrangements and to change the wages and the number of employees according to the changing economic conditions of the country of the waqf itself.

Having once decided how a certain waqf would function in the foundation document, it was thought that the need to make a decision would almost never rise again. The only function of the future waqf management was seen as being confined to routine administrative business. This administration had two functions: collecting the revenues of the sources granted to the waqf and spending these as determined by the foundation document. It seems that all this mechanism existed just to transfer the sums from one column of the account-book to the other. Such administration resembles a "suction pump": it collected money from the establishments which practically made no expenditures and transferred it to other establishments which did not perform any revenue-raising activities. This meant that the system functioned in a very simple manner; and it had do so, because the administration of the waqf had an inactive relation both with its sources of income and with the services it offered. It did not perform any activity; it only "observed" the one-directional flow of resources before it.

As a matter of fact, the administrative organization of the waqf necessitated such management. In the Süleymaniye Complex waqf, which is one of the most important waqfs, the organizational structure was as follows (16): at the top of the administration there is the Grand Vizier with the function of a supervisor (nazir). He has no function except appointing the trustee. The trustee, who is the absolute ruler of the waqf, performs his duty as long as he lives. He is accompanied by a clerk who acts as an interdant. This staff works as such: the cabis collected the waqfs' revenues, which primarily consisted of property rents, and gave them to the trustee after having them recorded. The trustee transfers the collected sum of money to the establishments of the waqf through the interdant, and there the directors spend this money by making the necessary purchases. In short, the money flows in a one-way direction. It flows to maintain and work the "object" of the waqf. This "object" may be a mosque, a hospital, a school, a water supply system etc. The exit point of this movement, or the "start" of the money flow is, usually, either a building that has rental income, or agricultural land whose tax revenues from its self-like farmers were granted to a member of the upper class by the government and who then had it transformed into a waqf, or some amount of money yielding interest (18). If only environmental and architectural components of the waqf's property are considered, setting aside the ready money and the agricultural revenues, we are confronted with a system where some building types made the functions of the other types possible. In other words, there are "goal buildings" on one side and "instrumental buildings" on the other side. As a matter of fact, the organizational mechanism of the waqf produces such a separation spontaneously.

It might be inevitable that the management of the waqf took care of the "goal buildings". It can be argued that the waqf administration
evaluated its own property in a hierarchical rather than an equalizing manner. Every year a fund was formed to guarantee the survival of the “goal buildings” in a systematic order, but the maintenance of the rental, “instrumental” buildings was totally left to the tenants. It was assumed that the tenants would naturally maintain their working places and would not let them go to ruin. However, for example, in a great building complex in which there were dozens of working places, the maintenance of each unit in a different quality and form must have resulted in a rapid deterioration of the environmental order. A more important problem arose when such buildings could not be restored or rebuilt when damaged by natural disasters like fire. In the records of the waqfs in Edirne, which have been examined in detail, many waqf properties were found which were burnt down in the 16th or 17th centuries and whose building lots were given to “mukataa” (a sort of land tenancy) or left empty (19). In similar manner, in Konya, almost none of the commercial buildings which were mentioned in Altunaba’s waqf document, dated 1202, could be found in the Ottoman waqf records of the 16th century (20). They had disappeared over three centuries. Another example of deterioration is seen in the rows of rooms for rent frequently mentioned in the foundation documents, of which only single building remained in a very ruinous condition (21). All these rows of rooms were demolished in time and their building lots were first rented and later turned into private property.

The waqf administrations had no means of preventing or compensating for this deterioration or damage. The waqf administrators give the impression of just watching their resources. An administrative system which was only organized to collect revenues and to transfer them to the place of expenditure inhibited the modes of action. It seems that as long as the service intended by the waqf founder was provided, and the establishment giving this service continued to exist, everything was thought to be working well. However, a waqf could still function according to its original purpose even though its resources were diminishing rapidly. For example, the money from the waqfs which yielded interest gradually diminished in the 16th and 17th centuries. Of the 845 waqfs in Istanbul in the year 953 AH/1546-47 AD which only exploited ready money, only 15 survived in 986 AH/1578-79 AD (22). This rapid decline was caused by the inflexible nature of the waqf administrations. The waqfs yielded their money at an interest rate of 10-11%, although actual, “real”, rates of interest in the 16th and 17th centuries were 30-60% (23). This means that the money of the waqf was being stolen; for example, many people including the trustees of the waqfs borrowed money from the waqfs and lent it to secondary borrowers at higher rates of interest (24). In the 16th and 17th centuries, which was a period of inflation in Turkey, this play of rates of interest annihilated the money of the waqfs.

As can be clearly seen, the waqf managements evaluated the money and property they had with no economical concern at all. Thus, the mismanaged wealth could not continue to exist, and the managements who could not reproduce the wealth actually destroyed it. On the other hand, service buildings of the waqf which actually had no economic function, like mosques, were maintained until the sources of the waqf were annihilated. What is more interesting is that no attempt was made to change this uneconomical system until the reforms made in the 19th century, because of the ideological substructure of Ottoman society. And almost no modern historians took up this peculiarity of the system, which wasted away the resources.

The fate of the environment must have been primarily caused by the waqf’s comprehension of its own property as a dual, hierarchical classification, because the percentage of the waqf’s possessions in the urban building stock was so high that, in the end, the manner in which the waqfs evaluated their own buildings determined the logic that created whole of the city. For example, in the Fatih Waqf document of 1495, in order to meet the expenditures of the “goal buildings” consisting of only 7 mosques, 16 medreses, 2 almshouses, 1 guest house and 1 hospital, 5 hans (commercial inns), 17 hamams, 148 storerooms, 48 mills, 227 rooms, 1063 houses and 2,300 shops were granted by the sultan in Istanbul (25). Thanks to a statistical record made in 1477 in Istanbul (26) we can gain an approximate idea of the percentage of these buildings in the city. What has been learned from these documents is that a single waqf, only in Istanbul, possessed 6.5% of the total 16324 houses and 58% of the total 3927 shops. This quantitative analysis leads us to two important conclusions: the goal buildings of the waqf, whatever prestige or architectural quality they possessed, constituted a very small part of the
urban building stock; the buildings granted for their maintenance on the other land constituted an important part of the city. Especially, almost all commercial buildings belonged to the waqfs (27). Consequently, the manner in which the waqf management evaluated its building stock shows how the urban building stock as a whole was treated in the Ottoman city. The waqf treated its property according to a dual classification: as those "to be preserved" and as those "to be given up"; the same logic applied to the evaluation of the whole building stock of the city.

The administrative structure of the waqf, as explained above, resulted in the continuation of the present state, gradually reducing its quality, and this fact caused the deterioration of the urban environment because of the enormous amount of waqf property in the city. From an architectural point of view, this meant that, apart from the goal buildings of the waqf, the previously existing architectural pattern gradually and inevitably degenerated. Usually, the waqf administration could neither restore the deformed pattern nor make great investments to reorganize the environment according to new conditions. It could only continue its inactive observation of its resources and was content with its continuing revenue, whatever the conditions of the waqf's urban properties. Such a structure of management could only preserve the goal buildings of the waqf, and the rental buildings were constantly demolished in great quantities. From an economic point of view, however, such a system always requires a feed-back. To keep the system operating, new waqfs (the functions of the disappearing ones would be taken over by them) had to be founded, while the older ones had to be supported by new resources granted by new waqf founders. Since it was impossible to achieve this in the first half of the 19th century, the system reached the point of bankruptcy and it had to be organized in a totally new form by the Ottoman government.

(1) For example, A.Muhammad, "Endowments of Mosques and their Effects on Growth and Distribution of Wealth", Abstracts of Presented at the Second International Conference on Islamic Economics, Islamabad March 19-23, 1983, School of Economics, Islamic University, Islamabad.


(3) O.N. Ermen, Türkiye'de Şehirciligin Tarihi İnkısafı, (Historical Evolution of Urbanism in Turkey), Istanbul, 1936, s. 46.


(6) Ibid., p. XXIV.

(7) For example, in the 18th century, 90% of the waqf founders were members of the bureaucratic upper class. See. B. Yeniyıldız, "Türk Vakıf Kurucularının Sosyal Tabakalımsidaki Yeri, 1700-1800" (Turkish Waqf Founders' Place in the Social Stratification), Osmanlı Araştırmaları-Journal of Ottoman Studies, III, Istanbul, 1981, pp. 143-164, especially p. 151.

(8) My concept of "functions of the money" is based on K. Polanyi's "models" which were re-interpreted in the context of Ottoman society by S. Maroon, "Tanzimat'ın Sonsu Asiri Batılılaşma", (Over-Westernization after the Tanzimat) in Türkiye, Cograf ve Sosyal Arastırmalar, E. Tuner, F. Manus, P. Benedict (ed.), Istanbul, 1971, pp. 416, 430-432.

(9) I.E. Koçar, op. cit., p. 33.


(11) For this reason, the date of a vakıfyede (foundation deed) seldom corresponds to the exact construction date of a building to which it belongs.

(12) See document no. 27 in A. Reşit, On Alıcici Astırda İstanbul Hayatı (1553-1591) (Istanbul Life in the 16th Century), Istanbul, 2nd impression 1935, pp. 28-29, concerning Kılıç Ali Paşa's demand to build a hamam (public bath-house) in Istanbul when he was the governor of Algeria. The document reveals that he sent money to Istanbul for the building.

(13) On these modest contributions to the system, which were called kama (additional line) in Turkish, see. K. Çeçen, Sıleymanıye Suyolları (Sıleymanıye Water Maintenance System), Istanbul, 1986, pp. 52-57, 57-64.


(15) A detailed analysis of the legal aspects of waqf in Ottoman-Islamic law is in O.N. Bilmen, Hukuk-ı İslamiyye ve İstilahat-ı Fıkhiyye Kamusu (Lexicon of Islamic
Egbert Kahle
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Book Review


The book attempts a comprehensive view on the phenomenon of corporate culture and on its impact on theory and practice of Business Administration. It consists of six parts, each of which has been contributed by one or two of the authors; all of them are members of the Institute of Business Administration at Munich University (FRG). The topics of the six contributions are:

- Corporate culture as a topic of business administration (Heinen)
- Concepts of culture in the general theory of culture (in Cultural Science)
- Bases of conceptional thoughts on corporate culture (Dormayer/Ketten)
- Some thoughts on the paradigmatic dimension of the actual discussion of corporate culture in business administration theory (Ochsenbauer/Klofath)
- Some focal points for a theory of corporate culture (Gussmann/Breit)
- Corporate culture and leadership in business organizations - focal points of a culture-conscious management (Dill/Hügler)
- Corporate culture: A challenge for the theory of the firm? (Dietel)

The first part begins with a review of the development of the discussion of the concept of corporate culture, giving a comprehensive recollection of the German perception (more precisely: the perception in the German-speaking countries of Western Europe) of the problem, and showing the roots of this discussion in the ethno-cultural comparison of Japan and USA. Going on from that starting point, corporate culture is visualized by the “root metaphor” of the organization as an individual - or
better a specific - identity which can be reified by symbols or artifacts. This basic concept of corporate culture is then integrated into the "decision-oriented theory of Business Administration" (which is one of the leading "schools" in German Business Administration Theory, whose most important teacher is Heinen). In this decision-oriented theory of Business Administration, decisions are the focal point of management: there are choices to be made according to goals; the goals are related to or derived from values and norms; shared values and norms are the focal points of corporate culture; thus from this (drastically reduced by the reviewer) interpretation of corporate culture Heinen develops a typology of corporate cultures measured with the three dimensions:

- degree of anchoring
- degree of accordance
- system compatibility.

Anchoring means the depth to which value and norms are engraved in the organizational members; accordance relates to the differences between the values and norms of organizational members; and compatibility is looked upon as between the formal system of the organization and the values and norms. By using these measures, he obtains eight types of corporate culture ranging from a strong system-based corporate culture to a firm without leadership and culture. According to the basic concept of decision-oriented theory, values and norms are analyzed for their contribution to the decision process and opportunities are looked for to form the corporate culture according to the goals of the firm.

The second part gives an overview of general concepts of culture. It starts with an etymological definition of culture and describes the different paradigms which are used in culture theory: in an anthropological interpretation culture is either a descriptive concept based on cultural perceptions or it is an explicative concept based on conceptions of culture. This is followed by an explication of the Allaire-Firstirotou typology of cultural concepts and of the various socio-cultural schools. The last set of concepts described in this part are those which understand culture as a system of ideas.

The third part attempts to provide a paradigmatic foundation for the discussion of corporate culture in the theory of Business Administration. It relies on the conceptual frame of Burrell/Morgan, who start from the two questions: "How do we interpret or understand science?" and "What is the essence of society?". From the various answers to these questions, different categories of paradigms of social sciences are derived; they are focused into two parts of sociology: the sociology of regulation and the sociology of radical change. These types and their implications for a research program on corporate culture are then discussed by Oechsner and Kofaf. They demonstrate four paradigmatic alternatives in the theory of corporate culture: the functionalistic-system-oriented, the interpretative, the radical humanistic, and the radical structuralist concepts of corporate culture, and then accept the functionalist concept of Schein as a reliable paradigm for corporate culture discussion.

Having set the paradigms in Part Three, Part Four follows up with the focal points of this theory of corporate culture. Gussmann and Breit point out the importance of symbols as the media of corporate culture and discuss the important types of symbols as language and its various forms, like stories, narratives and myths and as other artifacts. From there on, they try to explicate different forms of corporate culture using the three dimensions used for the typology of corporate cultures in Part One. In these explications various theories on individual behavior, group behavior and social change are discussed.

The fifth part provides a concept for a culture-conscious management, where culture is somehow instrumentalized. Dill and Hugler start with a discussion of the functions of corporate culture, where they see a coordination function, an integration function and a motivation function, and from there some derivative functions on efficiency and effectiveness. From these functions of a strong and positive corporate culture they look into different areas of Business Administration theory for implications. One connection they describe is the setting of overall goals and the corporate culture; the overall goals are formulated as principles or images of the firm and they have an additional legitimation function. In these principles or images, the norms and values are expressed and actions are legitimated by them. From there on, the implementation of "management principles" is discussed as a part of creating corporate culture. The second connection are strategic decisions and corporate
culture, where the relations of changes and risks and strengths and weaknesses of the firm are discussed; in this connection the corporate culture has a mediation function according to Dill and Hüglcr, especially in the handling of misfits between different risks. The third area is leadership and corporate culture; values and norms have to be lived to be of instrumental value in leadership; management has to be symbolic and communicative to be useful in leadership relations. In this leadership-oriented management, consensus is more important than the traditional aims-and-means analysis. These three areas are combined into a value-oriented management of human resources as the instrumental answer to the findings of corporate culture; some strategies of such human resource management are demonstrated.

In the sixth and last part Dietel tries discussion of the implications of the concept of corporate culture on the theory of the firm. This theory of the firm is based on the theory of incentives and contributions and on coalition theory. In this interpretation of the firm the (possible) member of the organization will assess the corporate culture as one element of the incentive system and will look for the necessary contributions s/he will have to give into this culture. By integrating the corporate culture concept into the theory of the firm the scientist is enabled to accept and to explicate different goal systems in firms which are in all other aspects similar. By the integration of corporate culture into the theory of the firm, this theory is more realistic and is enabled to give more reliable answers. The message of the discussion of corporate culture is, according to Dietel, that the focal point of organization theory will be the management of evolution.

The book as a whole gives a broad insight in both aspects of the corporate culture discussion. The theoretical side of the problem is described, as well as the practical implications. This is simultaneously good and bad: the positive aspect to this combining of the theoretical and the practical side is that it gives a general concept for the discussion as a whole. The negative aspect is that the different paradigms in the theoretical discussion of corporate culture and in the consulting practice on corporate culture are obscured by this simultaneity. People emphasizing the theoretical concept will ask how the authors managed to do their looping from a broad theoretical concept in Part Two and Three to the instrumental view of culture in Parts Five and Six: they did it with the decision-oriented interpretation of the theory of the firm and of the corporate culture and with the three dimensions of the corporate culture typology of Parts One and Four. The book will be a "must" for every German-speaking researcher of corporate culture, may he accept or refuse the underlying assumptions. It would be worthwhile to have an English version of it available for all of the "corporate culture science community".

Krystof Konecki
Łódź

BOOK REVIEW

The book by A.L. Strauss has been so far the fullest interpretation of the qualitative methodology in social sciences called "methodology of grounded theory". This book is a continuation of the methodological interests of A.L. Strauss, who wrote with B. Glaser the first work on grounded theory (1967). This new book is a brilliant and very instructive handbook for every social researcher. It contains analytic procedures connected with generating and testing a theory based on empirical data. Such procedures are presented not only in a formal language, as is usually the case in methodological handbooks, but also through illustrative materials. These materials include ways of using the procedures in situations where categories and hypotheses are generated. At the end of many chapters, the author presents rules of thumb emerging from his experience and referring to ways of using research procedures. Illustrative materials, i.e. records from seminar discussions, consultations, class sessions with students working on generating theory, are interesting in themselves and constitute very absorbing reading. These materials inform us of the works and principles of the A.L. Strauss sociological school. Through illustrative materials, his version of symbolic interactionism and his conception is smuggled into the methodological book of sociology of work.
I am sure that every empirical researcher is the social sciences will find something interesting in this work. Qualitative analysis is an indispensable aspect of the thinking process in every empirical investigation. Social scientists very often pass over this process in silence: they take it for granted that it is not worth working on and controlling. A.L. Strauss seeks to show from the inside what the process of generating categories and hypothesis looks like. Moreover, he tries to make the process of qualitative analysis methodical. Although the procedures have a relative nature, that is, the technical aspects of open coding, coding cards, etc., can take different forms according to the personal experience and inclinations of the researcher, some of procedures are indispensable to creating and grounding theoretical propositions. It is impossible to generate a theory without gathering data, coding and writing theoretical memos. The coding of categories is not real coding unless it takes into account the interactions, strategies and tactics of actors, the conditions and consequences of functioning theoretical category describing empirical phenomena.

Beyond making qualitative analysis methodical, Strauss seeks to oppose theoretical speculations ungrounded in empirical research. If he opposes the ungrounded speculations, he opposes a deductionist way of building theory. Such an opinion coincides with the first declarations by the architects of the aforementioned methodology (B. Glaser, A.L. Strauss, 1967, pp. 1, 4). The authors say that theory should be discovered from empirical data that are systematically gathered and analyzed during social research. They want to oppose the rhetoric of verification in social research, where early logically formulated and ungrounded hypotheses have lately been usually verified empirically. B. Glaser and A. Strauss (1967) propose a new methodological language, so-called "generating rhetoric", as a counterweight to "rhetoric of verification". This "generation rhetoric" systematizes the whole process of building theory, because generating a theory includes the whole process of research.

Everything said indicates that in this methodology we have a logic of induction in formulating theoretical statements. The authors stress that the method of deduction should be subordinated to the method of induction (B. Glaser, A.L. Strauss, 1967, pp. 5, 114; B. Glaser, 1978, pp. 37, 39).

However, his latest book A.L. Strauss says that since publication in 1967, many persons have incorrectly referred to grounded theory as inductive theory, in order to contrast it with the deductive theories of Blau or Parsons. To his mind, deduction without verification or even negation leads to cursory analysis. Verification is impossible without deduction; but is impossible without induction i.e. without experience leading to the formulation of hypotheses and the theoretical questions (pp. 11 - 14). I think that there is a noticeable shift in thinking on the process of generating theory. In spite of the unclear and problematic reservations expressed by A.L. Strauss, it seems that induction i.e. activity leading to the discovery of hypothesis is a primary method of generating a grounded theory. The additional plea stems from reading illustrative materials of book, where we are clearly shown the activity of researchers eliciting intuitions or thoughts which are the basis for the formulating of a hypothesis and estimating whether it functions in some conditions.

The second vagueness of A.L. Strauss handbook is a shortage of description concerning the nature of the relation of the methodology to the paradigmatic entanglement of epistemological and ontological assumptions of grounded theory methodology (compare S. Gherardi, B. Turner, 1987, pp. 34 - 36). A.L. Strauss (1987, pp. 1) claims that his procedures of qualitative analysis can be used by researchers from different disciplines without regard to the tradition or theoretical approach.

But it seems that the methodology of grounded theory contains, at bottom, some more general assumptions. When the author talks of "in vivo codes" or "in vivo hypotheses", which elicit imaginative picture of described phenomena, it seems that he wants to maintain the sensitizing nature of concepts (in H. Blumer's sense).

Creating sensitizing concepts gives us, as near as possible, insight into social reality and its contexts. At the same time concepts maintain some analytic power. These features characterize the nature of concepts created and used in symbolic interactionism. In this tradition theorists want more to understand society by using specific concepts that to explain it. A.L. Strauss tries to connect these two aspects because understanding can be also a basis for explanation; and explanation can give us the basis for understanding of society.
Moreover, the illustrative materials reveal a particular commitment to a processual approach to researching social reality. Even structural elements, e.g. organizational hierarchy, positions can be researched as processes if they are analyzed from the inside i.e. through the actions of social actors over the long term (pp. 230 - 240). Such an approach to the structure is rooted in the philosophy of pragmatism and later in symbolic interactionism. Structure is there understood as a certain possibility, which can become a fact in the situational and practical encounter hic and nunc of social actors. Structure is then treated as an emergent process.

Further, the idea of field studies so greatly popularized by A.L. Strauss is fitted in with the methods used in symbolic interactionism. The “in-the-field” researcher can fully understand reality created by people. Conversations with persons in their natural setting can uncover nuances of meanings from which are built perspectives and definitions of situations.

The aforementioned points indicate that the methodology of grounded theory has some connections with the general assumptions of symbolic interactionism. In my opinion, the researcher’s particular assumptions about social reality influence the formulation of a particular research methodology. A.L. Strauss passes over this problem in silence, although in the illustrative materials we see very clearly the influence of general assumptions of symbolic interactionism. In the analysis of, for example, the conception of time in the situation of chronically ill patients or an autodefinition of body and self (pp. 191 - 214) we see clearly roots of this type of interest in the works of G.H. Mead, the father of symbolic interactionism.

This objection could be answered, of course by saying that methods in themselves are neutral and only their use in a particular theoretical and philosophical context or paradigm determines the paradigmatic sense of research procedures. However, in A.L. Strauss’s handbook we do not find any explanation of the relation of methodology to the paradigmatic entanglement of these method.

Moreover, it should be said that the methodology of grounded theory is not only connected with using qualitative methods. Such an association might arise form reading of this handbook, because A.L. Strauss’s work refers only to the qualitative methods in generating grounded theories. However, we know about the possibilities of using quantitative methods in generating theory, and we should remember this when reading the book (see B. Glaser, A.L. Strauss, 1967, ch. VIII).

Finally I would like to stress that the work of A.L. Strauss shows us fully the interactional/discussional aspects of producing theoretical knowledge (an opinion similar to that expressed by the physicist W. Heisenberg). Records of seminar discussions, sessions, consultations show that skills are needed to discuss and cooperate in conversation. What can be called “grounded theory culture” is needed (pp. 303 - 304).

Discussions among researchers give the impression that concepts, hypothesis, integrative diagrams come into being during conversation and interaction, when researchers exchange theoretical notes and discuss them. Theoretical knowledge in the social sciences is, then, created on the level of social interaction where negotiations, persuasions, controversies are normal phenomena. We already know that, but A.L. Strauss has contributed to our attainment of this knowledge in methodical terms. He tries to open this permanently closed black-box in sociological thought. We usually look at the end-product of researcher discussions (theory), but we do not know in what way this product has been developed. This raises difficulties over finding the proper criteria for estimation of the validity and reliability of a particular theory.

I think that every social scientist will profit by reading A.L. Strauss book; every social scientist who believes that conversation is primarily a way of producing theoretical knowledge, leading to its cumulation and practical usage.

The work by A.L. Strauss is surely one of the most important methodological handbooks in social sciences in the nineteen eighties.
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Organization and control of the labour process,  
6th annual Aston/Umist Conference,  
on 23-25 March, 1988, Aston University.

The Labour Process Conference has moved away from the earlier preoccupation with the debate around the deskilling thesis. This is to be welcomed because it resulted in a Conference this year which was more diverse, and more relevant to the problems being faced by management and workers in the here and now.

If there is any single issue which looks like replacing deskilling as the centre of labour process discussions, it is "flexibility", in all its multifarious forms. "Flexibility" is currently the top buzzword in industrial relations, and so it is not surprising that it should be an ideological and a contested concept. For example, the British television companies now have the backing of the Government in their efforts to achieve "flexible working deals" with their technicians and to overcome the "restrictive practices" of the industry's unions. Hopefully, discussions in settings such as the Labour Process Conference will be able to offer a more clear-sighted evaluation of "flexibility", and an assessment of whether it consists of anything more than the familiar fare of union-bashing, job cuts and speed-ups dressed up in a not very new ideological guise.

Pollert's paper, From 'Core Periphery' to 'Flexible Specialization' was the centre-piece of the Conference discussion on flexibility. In a sharp polemical she argues that "flexibility" is both internally contradictory as a concept and so woolly as to be useless. What will be particularly contested is her argument that what she calls the "left-reformist" writing which advocates "flexible specialization" as a panacea has a conceptual affinity with the management literature on the "flexible firm". Pollert enjoyed a relatively free rein at the Conference, possibly because, as she says herself, "flexibility" has an aura of progressiveness and inevitability, so much so that its advocates hardly expect to be challenged on it. Well now they have been challenged, and no doubt the replies to Pollert's paper are already being written. What was refreshing about the debate around flexibility was that there appeared to be a genuine concern from all sides with the quality of working people's lives under the impact of contemporary changes. This humanistic approach characterized much of the Conference.

Nichols and Beynon's earlier work came under critical scrutiny from Harris, who has been back to the Chemco plant. In her paper, Power and Powerlessness: Chemco Revisited, she argues that they failed even to think about the real extent of co-operation that existed because of their one-sided theoretical assumption that it is the existence of hostility, as evidence of class warfare, that is important. The Conference provided a valuable forum in which Nichols could try to answer some of Harri's criticisms.

Nichols has moved on to more macro-sociological issues, such as worker productivity, and the related question, the subject of his conference paper, of Economic Fluctuation and Industrial Injury. His conclusion is that there is a positive relationship between injury rates in manufacturing and fluctuations, because, he argues, increased economic activity is associated with a greater intensity of labour, which results in more injuries. Not the least of Nichols' difficulties is the inconsistency in official data from the Health and Safety Executive. Perhaps it is not surprising that, when any and every evidence is being dragged up to support arguments for flexibility, the state has been less than keen to chart the fate of those workers who could be seen as the victims of flexibility, and who Nichols argues are most at risk of injury: those employed in smaller establishments lacking the protection of trade unions. From the discussion it became clear that if his argument is to be sustained there will have to be some qualitative research into the causes of "accidents".

Of related interest again to the flexibility debate is Phizacklea's examination of Industrial restructuring and the labour process in the fashion industry, and here again there is a problem of quantification, because the appropriate statistics are not collected in Britain for firms employing less than fifty. Nevertheless, Phizacklea argues convincingly that subcontracting and sweating are inherent in the fashion industry, with extremely low-paid home workers making clothes for the large chain stores. Less tenable is her assertion that there has always been "flexible
specialization” in the clothing industry, and that the industry lacks automation in part because its workers have always been skilled; this rests on a very loose notion of skill. Even so, the relevance of her paper can hardly be questioned when clothing is the only growth industry in the West Midlands region, employing some 20,000 people, many of them homeworkers who are paid less than the wages’ council minimum.

One of the positive outcomes of the move away from the deskillng debate is that gender, and the position of women workers had a more central place in the Conference. For example, Wheelock’s paper, *Economic Restructuring and the Household Labour Process: Changing Gender Dimensions in the North East of England*, examines the effects of the changes in the labour market on the household division of labour. From her admittedly small sample of families in which the men were unemployed while the women worked part time, it appears that families in this position often pursue sensible household work strategies, even though their ideological assumptions often make them uncomfortable about men doing their share of the household work. That many of the women continued to work in spite of the financial disincentives put in their way by the state benefit system, surely says something about the source of the real obstacles to flexibility?

A humanistic approach also characterised some of the more theoretical papers, such as Hassard’s *Working-Time, Industrial Sociology, and The Labour Process* in which he tries to “build an ethnographic paradigm for work-time research”. In doing so he rejects the more structuralist approaches to time, of either the functionalist or radical varieties. Although, he argues, ethnographic studies which emphasis the qualitative aspect of time-reckoning can offer very different answers to the question of control, from an anticipation of the “new conservatism” of ethnomethodology to a “radical humanism” more in the style of conflict theory.

There was something of an epistemological gap between some of the other more programmatic theoretical papers which take a tilt at empiricism and the more familiar empirical labour process papers. Foucault was in evidence in some of the former, but it is not clear that any real connection has yet been made between his work and the humanistic concerns of empirical labour process research. Since this theoretical trend is certain to develop further, it is to be hoped that some of the “empiricists” might have gone away inspired to read Foucault, in anticipation of further discussions when there might be more common ground.

There is no need to claim that to be useful a concept has to be a panacea. Alvesson’s discussions of the “corporate culture” in a Swedish computer consultancy company, Corporate Culture, consciousness and work in a professional service organization, is a good example of how to use a concept because it is particularly applicable to the situation being studied. Corporate culture appears to be a layer of control which, although not always necessary, is particularly applicable in some organizations - such as the one Alvesson examines - which are exhibitionist in relation to their culture, “ceremonies” and “rites”. One of these consists of the company paying for all its employees to spend three days in Rhodes so that they can get together.

Less enticing than Rhodes, maybe, the Conference attracted a number of international delegates to the Aston campus in the centre of Birmingham. This gave a stimulating comparative aspect to the discussions and indicates the reputation which the Conference now has. The only real historical piece or research came from the U.S.A., in Noakes examination of the late nineteenth century transition from hand to machine composition in the Philadelphia printing industry. His paper, A condition not a Theory, indicates how much work is needed to furnish just one historical counter-example. Future conferences will need more of this kind of detailed historical research if assertions such as Pollert’s that “flexibility is far from new”, are to be challenged, and if the qualitative changes represented by “new technology” are to be teased out from the futurological baggage which surrounds the term.

The Labour Process Conference is not focused at several different levels on issues such as corporate cultures, new technology and flexibility which are of direct relevance to people’s working lives. Hopefully the conference has stimulated further labour process research which will give an input into the debates around such issues which is unlikely to come from other quarters.
Upon the inversion of insanity

Ten years ago, in June 1978, the Roman parliament issued a decree which had repercussions far beyond the borders of Italy: this law provided for the dissolution of all public mental hospitals and the discharge of their inmates into their regional environments. With this act, a social institution introduced in the heyday of the Absolutism of the middle of the 17th century to “delimitate unreason”, was deprived of its certitude that it was necessary. Therefore, it was obviously not any subtle concern for the handicapped persons, but more sheer fury over having lost a martial instrument for the stigmatization of “insanity” that caused indignation against this legal act.

For, actually at the same time as when this law was passed, efforts were under way in many regions to overcome the rigid structures of mental hospitals. These initiatives corresponded to the understanding that there were no objectifiable criteria which made it possible to judge whether subjective attitudes towards the social order “conformed to reality” or were “insane”. And, finally, the certain knowledge could not be denied any longer that society itself formed the socialization of characters.

Therefore, the “mistake” of this Roman decision could only be found in the fact that it had transformed a sensible move into a political act. Being of liberal spirit, parliament had conceded this form of responsibility to society, one which it had already claimed as a consequence of its basic democratic conviction. It realised that society was sufficiently mature to look after itself in such a manner; that the existing order, in its turn, had the potential to deal with conflicts and unconventional ideas. If, therefore, a mere rumour was able to arouse aggressions - chiefly in regions north of the Alps, as if “dangerous criminals” were now to be let loose on “innocent citizens” - a type of unbalanced mentality revealed itself; a mentality that was unable to work out a personality of its own, but needed the internalization of spiritual suggestions and institutionalized compulsions for it.

In this climate of obsessive reaction the question arises. Which structural options keep the social in fact together, and who has to be safeguarded against whom in view of these options?

One has to remember, in this regard, that the mental hospitals at least offered the legal pretext of protecting the handicapped against a hostile society, although in reality it was more the absolutist state that had to fear being confronted with non-conformist ideas. For, up to the times of industrialization, it was solely the raison d’état, which was reinforced among of the population by means of religious conditioning, that was capable of determining what and what not was to be considered as a criterion for social unreason. The industrial conditions of the division of labour, however, which gradually spread eastwards throughout Europe during the 19th century, initiated a fundamental change in the understanding of the socially normative principle.

In the beginning, industrial production recruited unskilled workmen, from mental hospitals amongst other institutions, to make them do the unqualified work that no “normal being” wanted to carry out. Thus, the mentally ill as a first step were deprived of the protection that the asylums pretended to grant. On the premise of physical exploitation, all conventional patterns of differentiation were levelled out, and adaptation to market conditions was proclaimed as the measure of “normality”. About the middle of the 19th century, capitalist liberalism was therefore confronted with a fait accompli whereby following its own consequences, it could not exclude anybody from the public for mental reasons, if it did not want to arouse the suspicion that its instrumental rationality could give rise to doubts.

It was only in this confrontation that a new version of the definition of “unreasonable attitudes” could originate. According to this version, it was unrealistic not to follow the predominant common understanding of economic rationality. This included a blind belief in continuous technological progress, as well as the conviction that subjective feeling, being uncontrolled “simulations of reality”, necessarily had to be repressed. Therefore, only those issues were accepted as “reasonable” that the one dimensional logic of political economy defined as such.

In this respect, the “negation of the institution”, that democratic or social psychiatry carried out at that time was the offspring of a social
organization constructed by abstractions. Ten years later the term “insanity” is hardly a subject for public debate any longer. The functions of the psychiatric departments of most European countries have been reduced to the ambulant treatment of people who could critically endanger their own physical well-being or that of their environment. On the one hand, this has helped to diminish stigmatizations equally; although, on the other, it has increased the indifference of the community towards those who suffer under the prevailing conditions. This affects minorities, who are excluded from the market, as well as intellectual sceptics in as much as they give utterance to their disquiet. For those who do not celebrate existing conditions as if they were “sane” are despised.

This euphemism - including its psychotic features - can be explained by the expansive constraints of the supply economy. Opening up new markets for the present and the future shows no obvious demand for critical understanding of reality. While, therefore, production as a first step appropriated physical strength, as a second step it aligned the implementations of the brain with the help of the logic of supply. Therefore, these simulations stand for the “realistic” that the market actually pretends to be realistic. Accordingly, an explanation has to be provided for a “corporate culture” which constitutes itself tautologically in compliance with an “organizational development”. By using the mechanisms of self-fulfilling prophecies, it evens out “normality” according to the prevailing proviso of the corporation. This implies however, that a suspensions of historical orientations is artificially installed in it. The spectacularly agitated “crises of modernity” are just one example of this. Bearing this background in mind, a slogan like the “end of the social”, has only one implication: that is, to let the designation of the social be unrestrictedly ruled by the means of production.

But the power of production, as a third step, eventually also occupies the mode of life. While the consumption of products equalizes reality and fiction without noticeable distinctions, it at the same time excuses the individual from his/her responsibility of differentiating between the one and the other. The identification of souls with a corporation becomes the entrance ticket into an uterus that promises to ridicule every resistance by self-confidence as obsolete. For the corporation on the one hand pretends to remove the anxiety of individual loneliness, and, on the other hand, to absolve the individual from an obligation towards the process of civilization. This mentality is integrated into a “home”, where life and death lose their contours.

To fulfil this intention, the system of corporate cultures obtains its support through a narcotizing dispensation of “therapies”. The procedures of these instil external orientations in individuals instead of revealing their subjective impulses analytically. Social interests become disguised, instead of being intrinsically activated. Unlike the obviously martial methods of the former psychiatric institutions, the authoritarian character of these therapies is sublime but nevertheless repressive. For whatever the corporate regulatives may call “community” and “participation”, by its economic designation it becomes excluding and therefore inherently illiberal.

One decade after the ostentative Roman decree was issued, it is evident that, for socio-psychiatry, the social reason has undergone a precarious change: now insanity is on the side of the majority. While the mental hospitals gradually emptied all over Europe, the “asylums of a simulated reality” became more and more dominant. Analytical reason can hardly protect the individual from these arrangements; for their brutality is introverted as well as seductive - because they pay their inmates!

Sławomir Magala
Rotterdam

Shepherds and Functionaries
(on symbols and intellectuals in periods of social turmoil)

When intellectuals had to choose sides in the thirties they opted either for the role of the functionaries of mankind or for the role of the shepherds of being. This is the lesson from the most intriguing difference in the self-definition of the role of a philosopher in the modern era. Edmund Husserl, already repressed by the Nazis, spoke at a congress in Prague and defined philosophers as the functionaries of mankind. In fact, he was speaking about philosophers as part pro toto, i.e. as the
representatives of the intellectuals who were directly concerned with symbols and the meaning of European culture. All professionals who produced and manipulated knowledge were implicitly included under this heading. The intersubjective agreement on norms and values, on procedures and verifications was a conditio sine qua non of the functioning of the whole profession.

At about the same time, the most promising pupil of Husserl, Martin Heidegger, welcomed the Nazi take-over as the romantic reinvention of the folk spirit of German nation and was already busy defining the role of a philosopher as the guardian, custodian, shepherd of being. His definition of the role of an intellectual was based on a recognition of the right of members of this profession to draw directly on their innermost experience to forge meaning not out of an intersubjective, institutionally guaranteed agreement but from an individual, subjective, profound experience of meaning in action.

In an ongoing social construction of reality, an intellectual has thus two distinct roles. According to the founder of phenomenology he is to be a functionary of mankind. According to his bright pupil, he has to be the shepherd of being. Most modern organizations leave space for the former role, but most interesting cases of organizational change are usually linked to the interplay of both.

An intellectual is a functionary of mankind, but he is usually responsible not to mankind as a whole but to its segment, structured institutionally and marked off by a language, a state, a nation, a religion or a culture. But some intellectuals are also shepherds of being, i.e. they try to communicate the meaning of social actions on the basis of their own subjective experience, usually a negative one. They attempt to provide a correctional device for the functionaries who "lost" their independent vision due to the institutional framework.

The Polish predicament offers a useful lesson on the interchangeability of these two roles. First, one witnesses a struggle for symbols. The Polish national symbols are being fought for both by the workers and by the ruling class. Second, there is a struggle for intellectuals: the government fights with censorship and legal intervention while "Solidarity" fights with the tradition of the Polish struggles for independence. An interesting exchange of roles occurs. On the one hand, the ruling class is definitely swinging from the revolutionary rhetoric towards the legal one. The state is at stake, and the state is being defended against all kinds of non-state forces. One might therefore say that "solidarity" is using national symbols as a shepherd of the Polish "being", while the ruling class is taking care of the very same symbols as the "functionaries" of the Polish segment of mankind. However, the overall situation clearly shows that there is an intersubjective consensus among the intellectuals that, by struggling for the recognition of "solidarity", they are simply articulating an intersubjective agreement as to the will of the nation. The ruling class, on the other hand, sees itself as the defender of the holy core, the essence of socialism's being, here and now. Thus, one might conclude, the "Solidarity" intellectuals are shepherds of the national being fighting the functionaries of the state, while the government intellectuals are shepherds of socialist being fighting the intersubjective coalition of functionaries of the nation. In both roles, i.e. the one of shepherds and the one of the functionaries, intellectuals remain the same. They are, to put it bluntly, the same intellectuals. More so. Sometimes they function both as government and "Solidarity" intellectuals at the same time, by fulfilling various social roles and taking different initiatives. This astonishing thesis is trivially true. One has to have a job, and in a socialist state any intellectual job must be within the state controlled institutions, with the notable exception of the Catholic ones, which, however, are few that they do not offer a realistic alternative to most of the job-seeking intellectuals. The above does not prevent an intellectual from voicing a critical opinion of the government actions, from writing to the underground periodicals, etc.

In other words, what I can see in times of turmoil in the Polish case is a constant restructuring of the symbolic field by a more or less constant pool or intellectuals who can be categorized according both to their position within the social division of labor (which is almost totally state-controlled) and according to their choices with respect to the political attitude (which is almost totally critical and oppositional). The symbols are a given, they remain remarkably constant - national, religious and organizing ones. The organizing ones are linked to the idea and brief tradition of "solidarity". On the other side of the political divide the symbols are also constant - they are national, revolutionary and
organizing. The organizing ones are linked to the state. What follows is that one has a continuous struggle for the common symbols - i.e. the national ones and one tries to establish the social space for the game between the state and "Solidarity". The middle factor, i.e. religious vs. revolutionary ideologies is less relevant. Religious ideology is vastly more popular but it does not have a direct political edge. Revolutionary ideology is very unpopular (especially in view of the fact that in this case revolution has been imported from abroad), but it has a political edge over the state. They do not clash head on, since the state does not wish to undermine its legitimacy by asking, for instance in a referendum, how many individuals prefer Marx to Jesus Christ, while the Church does not wish to proclaim a holy war against the communists.

There is, thus, a common ground - a national pool of symbols - and there is a direct institutional articulation: "Solidarity" versus the state.

The introduction of martial law was an attempt to wipe out the organizational threat and to secure monopoly for the state. The assumption of Jaruzelski was that, once the practical social activity becomes totally dominated by the state, the national pool of symbols will be expertly put to use by the sole functionaries who remain - i.e. the state ones. Now, after the April and August 1988 strikes, it becomes clear that the wipe-out operation failed, that "Solidarity" is returning to the public arena and that years after martial law have not allowed the state to claim monopoly of the national pool of symbols. What remains is thus to try structuring this arena so that the new player does not have a chance of becoming the sole alternative. Props are thus promptly set up, and they include the composition of the round table which should be an official platform for negotiations between the ruling class and the workers.

Among the props set up as a buffer between the actual "real" partners of the forthcoming dialogue there are:

a) the Patriotic Front of National Renewal, which is a front organization set up for the generation of gestures of support for the military after martial law. Its role is political life is not clear, but it is presumably the representation of society as the ruling class would like it to be;

b) the official trade unions which have been set up to replace "Solidarity" and which are being tutored so as to appear independent of the state (they are even allowed to voice criticism in parliament and to ask for the resignation of the prime minister, but at the same time they are the main instrument for fighting the introduction of trade union plurality in the factories);

c) the peasant and the middle class parties (United Peasant Party and Democratic Party), which had always been front organizations allegedly legitimizing the representativeness of the communist party by allying themselves with the latter in the parliament and in staffing some minor posts in the government.

Those four or three props (four, if we take both parts of the third separately) will be sitting around the table when Walesa's and Jaruzelski's proxies arrive in Warsaw. Their role is to generate some noise and use some of the national symbols to prevent "Solidarity" from gaining too much ground too quickly. Their role is to be the functionaries of a fake intersubjectivity against the shepherds of national solidarity. But their role - on an explicit level - is to be the shepherds of national solidarity against the functionaries of an intersubjective tacit agreement of the Poles to have "solidarity" and to limit the monopoly of the communists.

The role of the ruling class in this game is clear. They are trying to prolong the negotiations in hope that some major disaster in the Soviet Union (an uprising or a campaign for total independence in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania or Armenia causing a crack-down) followed by restoration of state terror will finally give them a chance to forego the reforms and restructuring. Their hope is in timing. Should the Soviet elite decide to put an end to the Gorbatchev experiments (limited as they are), the local political élites would have a much freer hand with their own uses of the state apparatus. They could then safely revive the obsolete revolutionary ideology, knowing that although the ideology itself is dead, the tanks behind it are still operational. They could roll, giving the local political élites a necessary defence of their monopoly as the shepherds of the socialist being against the functionaries of a national intersubjective agreement on civil society.

Should they fail to roll, or should the Soviet political elite refrain from a crack-down, the round table will force the ruling elite to play the role of the functionaries of a illegitimate and unwanted state against the shepherds of national being. The results of the game are, as usual, unpredictable. From the same pool of symbols and from the same pool of intellectuals new constellations constantly arise and new games are being played.
Robert Grafton-Small
Glasgow

'That You See Is What You Get' or 'The Marketing of Meaning: Paul de Man, Unmanned By Demand'

The sub-editors on one of the newspapers I read have a well-deserved reputation for headlines built around bad puns and fortuitous ambiguities. Consequently, I was not at all surprised to see ‘Tina Turner sold for record amount’ in a recent edition, though I did wonder for a moment which of her songs could possibly be so dear to anyone’s heart. It was hardly a pressing matter even so, and my curiosity lapsed until a day or two later when I was making up a parcel of old papers to be put out with the rubbish. I soon released the now out-of-date issue from an equally passe press, but I had to read every page twice before I found what I was looking for. In heavy type, over an article on Phillips, the London Auctioneers, was a simple statement of fact: ‘Tina Turner sold for record amount’: £ 400,000 as I recall.

I also recall that after my most recent examination, my optician told me my left eye was a mere one hundredth of millimetre from physical perfection though my right has the shape and much of the optical quality of a pickled onion. However, I cannot simply grit my teeth and swallow this tasteless morsel for I have in addition, and in the manner of Gunter Grass, a congenital and therefore authentic probathy or underbite, and the dentistry of a snarl to prove it. Hence, I suspect, the heavy moustaches and the vain attempts at balance, though I could live without the more Jungian overtones of this fearful symmetry. I admit that Jane Austen died of Addison’s Disease at the very age when I was stricken with it and yes, John Updike and poor Dennis Potter do suffer worse psoriasis than I, but are all our scratchings to be dismissed as mere sublimation?

“Take it from me, you little monster, there’s nothing sublime about your poxy hand!”

Thank you, Steve, if only for winding me towards the decay of meaning and the meaning of decay that escapes even Oliver Sacks and the Notes Of A Certain Anatomist. Consider, for example, the estate of Paul de Man, and what has become of his work. I gather from at least one journal, issued by the University of Chicago, that there ar those in the American press corps whose belief in the spirit of rational inquiry, if not The National Enquirer, will allow the youthful de Man to be held responsible for ‘anti-Semitic articles’ written in a ‘pro-Nazi newspaper’ and published in war-time Belgium.

Setting aside, for the moment, the question of why an eminent Professor of Yale University should be left unchallenged for the last 40 years of his life then brought to account in his absence, when it might be argued that he has already been called to a Higher Authority, there is the additional difficulty of evidence. I know that what we make of our past tends very much to be a product of whatever circumstances we find ourselves in at the moment, but what am I to infer from an historical assessment that claims to be based on de Man’s own writings from an occupied country yet appears to precede the translation of many of the articles in question?

I shall leave it for others to decide why, if these claims are justified, de Man should then betray his own betrayal by abandoning his collaborators in 1942. I wonder, though, was it writing in Flemish or writing in French that made him so inaccessible? Is it too late to ask? Are de Man’s critics now interviewing Woody Allen about the autobiography in which Ingmar Bergman confesses that his father often voted for the Swedish Nazi Party his brother helped to found, and that, for many years, he himself ‘was on Hitler’s side, delighted by his successes and saddened by his defeats’?

Wasn’t it William Burroughs who suggested that language is a parasitical virus which thrives on the frustrations and the misunderstandings of its victims? If I remember correctly, sufferers from this terrible disease first became blind to their own identities and to the nature of reality, then, as the existence of their illness, these misfortunes are finally rendered incapable of viewing the world with anything other than a palsied eye.

Whatever the case, I know that citing one’s own work is at best an indulgence, if not an open admission of terminal reflexivity, but after my passing and essentially frivolous reference in last Autumn’s Scos Note-Work to the late arrival of PS2, The Plaid Shirt Proletarian Solidarity Movement, at our conference in Milan, I was hardly expecting PS2 to be the venue for a recent exhibition, entitled Arrival/Departure and held at a Glasgow Arts Centre which is notorious for its determinedly avant-garde aesthetics and an aggressively left-wing audience. I eat there often.

What am I to make of all this? Have I become a seer? A savant?
Somehow, I think not, though the problem is real enough. As Kristian and the Istanbul Conference have shown, we are still confronted with a desperate need to come to terms with ourselves and the world as we find it. In one sense, of course, the question of what we do and what we feel we ought to be doing is impossible because none of us can separate our language from either our actions or our history yet, as Primo Levi might wonder, if not us, who? We are, after all, responsible for the resolution of our own contradictions, no matter what they may be.

By the same token, we cannot dismiss this or any other of our individual and collective shortcomings as the inevitable and unavoidable result of zeitgeist or zugzwang or whatever. We must act, we have no choice, but as Kazuo Ishiguro points out, we do so knowing we are neither sehnsucht nor sensei.

"We at least acted on what we believed and did our utmost, It’s just that it the end we turned out to be ordinary men. Ordinary men with no special gifts of insight. It was simply our misfortune to have been ordinary men during such times”.

Such times, perhaps, as last Saturday when I came across a small spoil heap in Sauchichall Street, capped by a young redhead with a loudhailer and a very Gauche view of the world.

"The Government that tortures the Irish is the same Tory Government that inflicts Poll Tax on Scotland and Clause 28 on all of us!" "I cannae hear” said the man in front of me.
His wife, reeling from the Unflagging Red, turned on him in disbelief.
"Are you kiddin’ me?"
He said nothing but grinned and looked away, a small purple hearing aid nestling in his ear like a bruise.

So Long, Antonio, And Thanks For All The Fish.