

Spectacles of Organization
Towards Ahimsa festivals of production and consumption

David M. Boje
January 4, 1999

PART I. WHAT IS SPECTACLE ORGANIZATION THEORY?

Chapter 6: Spectacle View Five

Postmodern Spectacle

Postmodernism is one of the worldviews on spectacle being discussed in contrast to Knowledge Work/Knowledge Management, Corporate Imperialism, Ahimsa, and Political Economy spectacles. Within each view there is ample disagreement, and this is certainly the case for postmodernism. In this chapter I will review just the disagreements about the varieties of postmodernism to apply to organization studies. In the final section of the book I will relate this chapter to developments in postmodern narratives (Chapter 11), and postmodern theatrics (Chapter 12). Chapters 13 and 14 provide applications.

Postmodern Organization Writings Best and Kellner (1997: 11) state “postmodernism is itself a contested terrain” in philosophy. In OT it is also a “contested terrain” says Burrell (1997: 16), now that “modernity in its late or postmodern phases questions bureaucratic organization and its legitimacy almost as much as it was interrogated in those far-off pre-modern times before industrialization.” Skeptics (e.g. critical Marxists and deconstructionists) do not think that change is possible, while affirmatives (some of these are New Age spiritualists) are apt to pose activist solutions to modern problems. In OT writing, there are many debates between skeptics and affirmatives over even the idea and possibility of a “postmodern organization.”

Table One: Part 5 Postmodern Spectacle Worldview

<p>5. Postmodern This worldview includes has much internal controversy. Philosophers (“*”) such as Lyotard, Bauman, Best, Kellner, Deleuze, Guattari, and Rosenau look at a broad range of disciplines. In OT, there are Skeptics and Affirmatives. Skeptics (“-“) Hassard & Parker, Alvesson & Deetz, and Kilduff & Mehra dispute the need for Affirmatives. Skeptics favor a Marxist labor process reading. The Affirmatives “+” include Boje, Dennehy, Gephart, Thatchenkery, Bergquist, Clegg, Hatch, Mills and Simmons. Affirmatives seek solutions including activism, spirituality, direct democratic governance, and ecology. There are other approaches which mix Skeptical and Affirmative positions or steer clear of the duality altogether. These “?” would include Townley, Cooper and Burrell.</p> <p>Firat and Dholakia look at postmodern theatrics from a marketing perspective, however, they, like the current work seek to transcend artificial discipline-boundaries between production (management) and consumption (consumers).</p> <p>Festival is seen as a middle ground position between Skeptical and Affirmative postmodern.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ *Lyotard (1984) Postmodern Condition ✓ *Deleuze & Guattari (1987) A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia ✓ *Rosenau (1991) Postmodernism and the Social Sciences ✓ *Best and Kellner (1992) Postmodern Theory; (1997) The Postmodern Turn ✓ *Bauman (1989) Modernity and the Holocaust ✓ ?Cooper & Burrell (Burrell, 1988, 1994; Cooper, 1988; Cooper & Burrell, 1988) ✓ +Clegg (1990) Modern Organization: Organizational Studies in the Postmodern World ✓ -Hassard and Parker (1993) Postmodernism and Organizations (Thompson, 1993) ✓ -Kilduff & Mehra (1993) ARM article ✓ -Alvesson & Deetz (1996) Chapter in Handbook of Organizations Book. ✓ +Boje, Gephart & Thatchenkery (1996) Postmodern Management and Organization Theory ✓ Hatch (1997) OT: Modern Symbolic and Postmodern Perspectives ✓ Mills & Simmons (1995) Reading OT: A Critical Approach ✓ +Bergquist (1993) Postmodern Organization: Mastering the Art if Irreversible Change ✓ +Boje & Dennehy (1993) Managing in the Postmodern Word ✓ +Boje, Gephart, and Thatchenkery (1996) Postmodern Management and Organization Theory ✓ ?Townley (1993) ✓ +Hatch (1997) Organization Theory: A Postmodern Perspective ✓ ?Burrell (1998) Pandemonium : Towards a Retro-Organization Theory ✓ +Cilliers (1998) Complexity and Postmodernism ✓ +Firat and Dholakia (1998) consuming People: From Political Economy to Theaters of Consumption
---	--

Postmodern organization reviewers such as Hassard and Parker (1993), Alvesson and Deetz (1996), and Kilduff and Mehra (1997) have charged themselves as a skeptic’s council to suppress the subversion of “unnamed” affirmative postmodern organization writers (probably Boje & Dennehy, 1993;

Bergquist, 1993).¹ Affirmative postmodern OT writers would also include Boje, Gephart and Thatchenkery (1996); Hatch (1997); and Hirshhorn (1997). Each has its own epistemological and ontological critique of OT. Skeptics include Benson, 1977; Steffy and Grimes, 1986; Frost, 1980; Jermier, 1981; Hollway, 1984; Townley, 1993; Hassard and Parker, 1993; Alvesson & Willmott, 1996. The skeptics accuse mostly “unnamed” affirmatives of two transgressions. First, they are too positive to see the abyss around them. Martin Parker (1997) told me in a review that “Boje needs to stare into the Nietzschean abyss.” Second, Affirmatives charge the Skeptics use an episodic narrative, rather than an epistemological understanding of knowledge. The sentence is banishment.

How does this banishment occur? At the skeptical end of the spectrum, Hassard and Parker (1993), Thompson (1993), Parker (1993), Alvesson and Deetz (1996), and Kilduff and Mehra (1997) dismiss any so-called “postmodern organization” and “episodic” research and theory with ironic pronouncements:

1. “Nonsense” (Thompson, 1993: 188),
2. “A distraction from rigorous analysis” (Parker, 1993: 212),
3. Unreflective “in regard to cultural elitism and modern conditions of power” if it does not include critical theory (p. 211).
4. “Little is to be gained by ... talking about postmodern organizations” (Alvesson & Deetz, 1996: 192),
5. Merely “relabeling” so-called organic, adhocratic or post-Fordist organizations as postmodern (Alvesson and Deetz, 1996: 192).
6. “McPostmodern” (Parker, 1997).
7. The work of “self-declared organizational postmodernists” (Kilduff & Mehra, (1997: 454, footnote 1).

These replies are ironic because each dismissive defines what is and is not within the “official” boundary of “authentic” postmodern epistemologies (ways of knowing) and ontologies (worlds we live). I seek therefore to show how the Skeptic’s Council exercises its power over the knowledge crafted by affirmative (no) bodies. I seek space for grassroots activism, even for Ahimsa itself.

¹ Certainly ecology is something that as Rosenau (1992: 186) says is “left out, and generally forgotten” in modernist OT writing, but why is it forgotten in much of the postmodern OT writing? I suspect a clue resides in the margins, the first footnote of Kilduff and Mehra (1997: 454). They “warn readers to expect a radical departure from what passes as conventional thinking among self-declared organizational postmodernists.”

The Affirmative Postmodernists' Reply. The Skeptics' reviews have been valuable. They articulate important dimensions missing in modernist OT texts ranging from racism, feminist critiques, positivist critique, colonial critiques, class analysis, ideological critique, representation, fragmented instead of unitary personality, etc. I am more interested here in what is being excluded. First, from the perspective of other reviews (Boje & Dennehy, 1993; Boje, Gephart, & Thatchenkery, 1996; Hatch, 1997) the Skeptic's Council can be critiqued for marginalizing nature (See Table Three). The Skeptic position does not embrace an ecological perspective, rather, the democratic workplace and direct control of production tools by labor is sought to right the exploitative imbalance. I count in Alvesson and Deetz (1996) just four sentence-fragments of a long essay: "widespread ecological problems" (p. 193), "the instrumentalization of people and nature" in positivist knowledge (p. 194), Enlightenment's dark side: "destruction of the environment" (p. 195), and an objectivist-science aimed at "controlling nature" (p. 205). The reviews by Kilduff and Mehra (1997) and Hassard and Parker (1993) also dismiss postmodern organization, but in their representational epistemologies, have nothing at all to say about natured and de-natured environment in postmodern perspectives. Though one could argue, I think, that when the simulacrum is more real than the real, the ecology is converted to hyperreality.

I would like to propose that instead of throwing out the bath water (ecology) with the baby (visions of postmodern organization), it may be advisable to cooperate. In banishing each other, not paying attention to less glamorous writing in textbooks, not seeing the resistance move in posing a postmodern organization, and ignoring postmodern ecology writers, our postmodern polyphony can be as one dimensional as the modernist writing we otherwise critique.

Very few OT texts include an environmental critique of the unsustainability of modernist business practices. Boje & Dennehy (1993) and Hatch (1997) while celebrating the affirmative aspects of a postmodern OT and contribute a critique of the de-natured modernist OT discourse.

The postmodernists imagine reconstructions of the social order based on alternative, non-modernist conceptions... For example, the belief of native American Indians that their role in life is to protect the environment (personalized as Mother Earth, provider of the sustenance of life), is contrasted with modern exploitative practices such as strip mining, traditional logging, hunting species to extinction, overgrazing prairies, and burning the rainforests (Hatch, 1997: 95).

Boje, Gephart & Thatchenkery (1996) and Hatch (1997) do propose an ecological postmodernism. Boje, Gephart and Thatchenkery (1996) approach postmodernism as both episodic and epistemology (hereafter, BGT). BGT pick up on Lyotard (1984) to suggest that postmodernism is a period chronologically subsequent to modernism, but one that is still unfolding. Late modernism (flexible production and differentiated global markets) still dominates. Following Rosenau (1991: 4) they view postmodernism as a cultural movement or worldview (BGT, 1996: 2). BGT pick up on Habermas (1973: 41-42) critical modernism (a counter-point to systemic modernism as in Taylorism, Fordism, and structural functionalism) to propose an ecological postmodern organization theory. Critical modernism looks at the unrealized promises of systemic modernism and its focus on managerialism and performativity. Managerialism looks at the organization and ecology from the viewpoint of managers as agents of capital owners. Performativity (Lyotard, 1984) is working labor until the last bit of blood is squeezed out for the lowest possible wage rate.

Economic exploitation of nature occurs as natural phenomena are commodified, and economic crises can emerge when increases of technical rationality fail to offset competitive economic forces in the market, and/or when real ecosystemic limits are encountered ... The result of increased productivity in the constrained ecosystem is simply the production of greater volumes of goods using fewer inputs, including laborers and managers; hence the extensive downsizing, reengineering, and displacement of labor and managerial labor in recent years (BGT, 1996: 4).

In terms of epistemological position, BGT look at the crises of representation. Science as a grand narrative is being delegitimated as the only legitimate source

of valid knowledge (p. 7). Instead more 'ironic' forms of writing about society and organization are emerging (Calas & Smircich, 1991) including more inclusion of qualitative writing in an otherwise quantitative organizational science. There is also an appreciation of native forms of knowledge that provide spiritual, medicinal, and ecological guidance beyond what is defined as science-knowledge.

Skeptics accuse Affirmatives of not looking at the dark side of the postmodern condition, a failure to critique the idealism, nostalgia, and progress myth of postmodern organization. Yet, within the Affirmative writing, one does find a critique of postmodern organization. For example, Montuori and Purser (1996), in BGT, are also critical of a postmodern organization theory that is not conversant with the ecological project. They want to make the wedding between ecological and postmodern organizational theory less awkward (p. 182). Montuori and Purser (1996: 184-186) are boldly critical of Lyotard's (1984) rendition of systems theories of organization. They do not want to limit systems theory to just a modernist epistemology. They argue Lyotard is caught up in a cybernetic perspective on systems theory. Systems philosophers such as Mauro Ceruti (1986), they argue, have moved from cybernetic to ecological-knowledge systems theory.

In Ceruti's view, we find different historical contexts, with different problems and questions, approaching knowledge in different ways and with different interests, as opposed to a univocal, homogenous, developmental process of edifice building (Montuori & Purser, 1996: 186).

And the observer is part of the construction of the plurality of perspectives (a position opposed to managerialism). Unlike the modernist epistemology, they believe that a privileged ontological or linguistic access to reality is passe (p. 186-7). "The postmodernists' monolithic view of systems theorists is clearly untenable, as is their claim that (all?) 'System theorists' operate with a modernist epistemology" (p. 187, additions theirs). A postmodern organization "may develop the capacity for knowledge in a radically distributed network throughout

the organization and its environment” (p. 198). As a postmodern solution, they propose participative design search conferences where participants examine the ecosystem in a democratic setting. Direct participation is in opposition to agency forms of managerialism (a manager thinking like each stakeholder), and to representative governance (voting in a Workers’ Council to represent worker interests). This relates to spectacle theory. For Adam Smith, the partial spectator was only able to think of their own utilities, and disregarded viewing the spectacle from any other viewpoint. Smith proposed that the impartial spectator, like the agency-managerialist, could internalize the vantage point of other spectators and reach impartial judgements. Montuori and Purser (1996) are arguing for the participation of the “real” spectators, not their surrogates, or imagined characters.

Skeptics resist all these solutions of direct spectator participation, since spectators are too easily appropriated into the spectacle of late modernism (e.g. ecology being saved through technology). Indeed it appears that even with worker participation, the pyramid of power and domination, as well as ecological appropriation is reenacted, as before. Affirmatives, however, argue that participants can learn not only the constraints of ecosystem realities but also the possibility of co-creating new relationships with the environment (1996: 198-200). Instead of continuing to promote the grand narrative of non-sustainability, Affirmatives advocate forming small ecological learning communities (p. 200).

Affirmative and Skeptic is a duality, one that begs for deconstruction. The Skeptics are taking hierarchic privilege over the Affirmatives, defining a narrow and exclusionary definition of the postmodern project. The approach by the Skeptics marginalizes the Affirmatives. Yet, it is possible to find common ground. Both the Affirmatives and the Skeptics seek to critique (systemic) modernist constructions.

Gephart (1996) in BGT gives a postmodern perspective on organizational environment theory that bridges Affirmative and Skeptical positions. He proposes radical (simulacra) and endogenous (social construction) reflexivity to integrate ecological issues into organization and management theories (p. 202).

Endogenous reflexivity is illustrated by (re) conceptualizing environment, ecology, and Nature as socially constructed phenomena. The radically reflexive investigation and postmodern reconceptualization of Nature, ecology, and environments are illustrated by using simulation and simulacra (Baudrillard, 1983, 1994) to uncover the paradox that, as a result of neglect of reflexivity, “factual” scientific and literary representations of the natural environment are simulations of the natural environment.

Gephart proposes a postmodern turn to this stretching of modernist OT that resituates the duality of Affirmative and Skeptic. He asserts that stretching modernism still leaves us with the “mirror” view of science and Nature which still leaves us with a conservative theory (Rorty, 1979). Gephart’s endogenous reflexivity is more radical and appeals, I think, to both Skeptic and Affirmative postmodernists. Both realist modernist ontologies that assume a “real world” exists, but is only known through sense making. There is a material condition of ecology and the degradation or entropy of planet resources. Gephart seeks to de-reify how environment is constructed in modernist OT texts and to show how environmental sense making is inherently political (p. 208-9). Best and Kellner (1997) also argue that the planet’s resources have, in many cases, finite limits, and that species diversity is now subject to an accelerated entropy brought about by short-term capitalist thinking and action.

In Table Three, the contested terrain of postmodern positions are mapped to show middle ground, interactive positions. The horizontal differences concern episodic and epistemological polemics. Episodic positions see a shift from pre-modern, to modern, to postmodern institutions. The vertical dimension maps differences between the Affirmative and Skeptical postmodern theories. There are however hybrid and middle ground positions that make the polemic dualities problematic.

Table Three: The Contested Terrain of Postmodern OT

Positions among Postmodern OT	Episodic Postmodern Organization Theories Of Modernity-Postmodernity	Middle Ground Theories	Epistemological Postmodern Theories of Modernism and Postmodernism
Affirmative Postmodernism Theories	Postmodern ways of knowing can offer solutions to organizing - Bergquist (1993) Hatch (1997). There are postmodern organizational forms.	Postmodern approaches can appreciate potentialities - Hassard (1993) Gergen (1989, 1992)	Postmodern organizations are not independent of modernism - Cooper & Burrell (1987)
Middle Ground Theories	Postmodern organization has potential but needs to be deconstructed to prevent modernist appropriation; Each organization is a hybrid of premodern, modern, and postmodern episodes - Boje & Dennehy (1993)	There are multiple postmodern perspectives that give different viewpoints - Boje, Gephart & Thatchenkery (1996)	Contemporary management and OT texts do not attend sufficiently to issues of class, race and gender - Mills & Simmons (1995)
Skeptical Postmodernism Theories	The transition from Fordism to Post-Fordism does not obviate the framework of power - Clegg (1990)	The violence of capitalism to the peasantry has been ignored by management and OT - Burrell (1997)	Theorizing postmodern organization forms is a naïve distraction and delusion - Parker (1993) Thompson (1993) Hassard & Parker (1993) Alvesson & Deetz (1996) Kilduff & Mehra (1997)

Episodic versus Epistemological Positions. First, there are differences in episodic versus epistemological postmodern positions in the books and scholarly reviews. An episodic position, such as Modernity-Postmodernity eras (Best & Kellner, 1991, 1997), says that there have been such major shifts in technology, information access, global markets, multinational corporations, quantum physics models of science, etc. that a paradigm shift has occurred. On the other hand an epistemological postmodern theory, such as Modernism-Postmodernism (Best & Kellner, 1991, 1997) either denies vehemently that such a shift occurred or ignores episodes in favor of epistemological representation, aesthetic and cultural style critiques (See Hassard, 1993 for an excellent review

of this dimension). Hassard (1993), to me, falls within the middle of the contested terrain, by introducing a middle ground. I acknowledge him gratefully for keeping this display from being prison cells in an otherwise two by two duality. Hassard (1993: 20) argues that Gergen (1989, 1992) presents a middle ground between epoch and epistemology positions: “the empirical reality of organizations and the fragile nature of their reproduction.”

Parker (1993), on the other hand, does not like the episodic position and is also hostile to affirmative postmodern organization writers. He would include the material and empirical conditions of the labor process, but is uncomfortable with relativist epistemologies of some postmodern philosophers (e.g. Baudrillard, perhaps Lyotard) that only bemoan the problems or representation. He would prefer to follow an epistemological critique with a meta-theoretic ethical one (p. 209). Note that this way of theorizing dismisses the episodic postmodernists as too sadly misguided to even review. A rhetorical act of exclusion that Thompson (1993), then Alvesson and Deetz (1996) and Kilduff and Mehra (1997) openly acknowledge and replicate, with out checking to see if the “other” excluded by this skeptic’s council, even has an ethical critique or epistemological, even middle-ground position.

Is there a Postmodernity era? Bergquist (1993) and Hatch (1997) says, “yes, I can see it now.” Clegg (1990) says “no, but if it is here it has a dark side.” Boje & Dennehy (1993) say “maybe it is not here, if I story it, it will come.” Hassard and Parker (1993), Alvesson & Deetz (1996), Kilduff and Mehra (1997) and others just say “no and no way.” Burrell (1997) has some middle ground. He is episodic in his genealogical construction of a pre-modern, pre-Enlightenment history of OT (Burrell, 1997: 27). He is also skeptical, seeing “modernity in its late or postmodern phases,” but with OT still in the grip of Right Weberian” (p. 16). I locate him on middle ground, because, the episodic journey, is a genealogy of epistemological recovery of the peasantry. Before looking for differences in the extremes, lets look at Clegg’s (1994: ix) skeptical, episodic position. In the foreword to Boje and Dennehy (1993) argues three points that crisscross the false divide of epistemological and episodic dualities:

1. "Recipes of modernism were epoch or era specific and may be past their use-by date in some areas of organizational life."
2. "For as long as the lenses through which we focus on organizational life are made to modernist specifications, so they focus on variables such as formalization, standardization, centralization, etc., ... we will be condemned to doing the 'time-warp' over and over again, stuck in the modernist frame while the spectacle outside turns ever more postmodern."
3. "Postmodernism offers an integrative focus which will aid us as teachers, students, researchers and practitioners in overcoming the excessive differentiation which has fragmented our intellectual and praxeological communities.
4. "In doing so it will serve to re-vitalize the study of management and organizations by opening it up to the cutting-edge of contemporary social science currents."

In the era recipes of modernism there is an epistemology, a lens that keeps recycling, keeping the intellectual community divided, and closing out our studies to topics well situated in other social (and physical) sciences. Clegg reads in Boje and Dennehy' (1993), not a "yes" or a "no," but a defiant act of radical resistance; a Trojan horse, infiltrating modernism/modernity language in the dead framework of planning, organizing, influencing, leading, and control by importing contrary terms and redefining sacred texts. OT is "a system of discipline, obedience, surveillance, and prescriptions that keep [people in organizations] from doing much other than exploitation" (p. xxi). Boje and Dennehy (1993: 31) seek a middle ground between affirmative and skeptical. They say modernity/modernism dominates and several features challenge a postmodern future:

1. Managers continue to rely on modern principles ...
2. Traditional paternalistic, male model or style ... remain widespread
3. The postmodern will require greater dialogue among diverse subcultures and groups of all types" gender, race, and ethnicity.

My point is that not all affirmatives are saying postmodern has arrived. They are saying that modernism is still the dominant discourse, pre-modern is not dead, and postmodern is struggling to resist and survive. Some projects are subversive. Boje and Dennehy (1993) ask undergraduate students do content analyses of organizational dialogues to analyze what portions of pre-modern,

modern, and postmodern discourse are in each organization. A group of undergraduate students “illustrates in their analysis the point that in Carl’s Jr., as with other corporate discourse, *there are roots of all three discourses*” (p. 39, emphasis in original).

Ironically, postmodern philosophers Steven Best and Douglas Kellner (1997) who are surprised to see “even” business fields make the postmodern turn, are more open to affirmative postmodern OT alternatives than several OT reviews (Hassard & Parker, 1993; Alvesson & Deetz, 1996; Kilduff & Mehra, 1997). Best and Kellner (1997: 255) cite several, for the skeptic’s council forbidden and excluded postmodern organization writers, that are working environmental issues into the postmodern turn in their writing.

Even the fields of business organization and management have been reconceptualized, and in practice are being reconstituted, around the post-modern paradigm (see, e.g., the studies of postmodern management in Boje and Dennehy, 1993; Boje et. al, 1996; and Hirshhorn, 1997).

There is also the question of practicing what we preach. “Postmodernists” say Kilduff and Mehra (1997: 464) “refuse to exempt any text from rhetorical examination, no matter how objective sounding, no matter how matter-of-fact the text may appear to be.” But, in their examination, they exempt much that is important in the postmodern turn, as observed by Best and Kellner (1997) across a variety of arts and sciences. I think that Best and Kellner (1997) would agree with Kilduff and Mehra in many respects. I do. For example Best and Kellner (1997: 224) argue that: “both modern and postmodern science utilize experimental and empirical methods of hypothesis, observation, experiment, and prediction.” But postmodern science rejects the immutable order and absolute truth of capitalism and look to the “self-organizing, dynamic cosmos that is constantly changing and evolving” (p. 224).

Kilduff and Mehra (1997) also state that they are discussing Rosenau’s (1992) skeptical versus affirmative positions, but proceed to dismiss anyone in OT doing affirmative postmodern inquiry or episodic critique. Second, rather

than discuss those doing episodic, mid-range, or epistemological work, only the epistemological work is considered. Clegg's (1990) book includes empirical study, but is dismissed by referencing Parker (1993): "there is considerable skepticism" (p. 459). Third, the roots of postmodern theory are reduced to architectural theory and Derridian post-structuralism (not uncommon in OT reviews). But, differences between post-structuralism and postmodern theory are not discussed. And, the history of the postmodern turn is not just in architecture. Best and Kellner's (1997: 5) argue that:

Major postmodern theorists – Foucault, Lyotard, Baudrillard, Deleuze, Guattari, Jameson, Laclau, Mouffee, Harvey, and others participated in, and were deeply influenced by, the tumult of the 1960s, ... One cannot exaggerate the role of May '68 in France in producing a sense of rupture with the past, a sense that an irreversible turning point had occurred, that a new world was being born.

Fourth, the critique that postmodern research can include empirical work is not news (See Best & Kellner, 1997: 224, as stated above). But, their focus does serve to exclude non-quantitative work in OT from the review. Fifth, instead of reviewing how work by self-declared postmodernists fit into their taxonomy, only work by undeclared postmodernists is reviewed in any detail. The "other" is marginalized in footnote 1 noting the authors' "radical departure ... from existing postmodern critiques within organizational studies." Sixth, postmodern empirical work by Kilduff (1993), Boje (1995), and Martin (1990), while indicated as published in "leading journals in the organizational sciences" is instantly dismissed with not even honorable mention. It is asserted "there is little overt discussion of why and how such research is different from other articles appearing in the same journals" (p. 462). Also, OT research from non-leading journals, where work at the margins first gets published is not mentioned at all. There were two reviews of postmodern management and OT in *Journal of Organizational Change Management* in 1991, including for example, research articles by Willmott (1991) critiquing the Excellence literature. But, is not OT

scholarship the topic of the review (marginal or not, agreed or not)?² And, is not postmodern philosophy concerned with marginalizing scholarship?

Seven, other topics are banished in the reviews in ways that removes the ground on which the review is written. To footnote five, Kilduff and Mehra (1997: 463) banish Cooper and Burrell (Burrell, 1988, 1994; Cooper, 1988; Cooper & Burrell, 1988). They are said to fall into Popper's (1970) "dangerous dogma" by claiming that modernism and postmodernism may be fundamentally incommensurate paradigms. But, is this radical theorizing or is this dogma? If one banishes the epistemological foundation, where do you stand?

I think it is for this very reason that Alvesson and Deetz (1996) as well as Hassard and Parker's (1993) reviews do not banish Cooper and Burrell to the margins. Cooper and Burrell's (1989) distinction between systemic and critical modernism, as well as the interplay of critical and postmodern theory (Burrell, 1994) is a focal point for their four article series. It opened the OT field of study for we who followed. In response to Kilduff and Mehra (1997), I think modern and postmodern are set up as an either/or duality. There are many differences in each position (e.g. between critical and systemic modernism). I would agree that the systemic modernism, the stuff of Taylor and Fordism is incompatible with most postmodern positions. The Sceptics make an important contribution by challenging the Affirmatives not to be co-opted by the rhetoric of late modernism. And the Affirmatives contribute to the Sceptics by proposing solutions, seeing bits of postmodern organizing, in the midst of the modernist project.

Is the dark side of Postmodern missing from the writing of the Affirmative Hoard? Do Affirmatives look at the positive contributions of a postmodern OT, and not at the negative, more skeptical dimension? Bergquist's (1993) postmodern organization is all affirming and salutatory in mixing chaos and postmodern theory to overcome the ills of modern organization. We are "poised on the edge of order and chaos" and "poised on the edge of

² A minor point. They violate their own rule of exclusion, just a wee bit, by listing Kilduff (1993) as "explicitly postmodern research" and also explaining a bit of the study: "... Kilduff (1993) offered a detailed critique of the Taylorist assumptions underlying March and Simon's (1958) modernist

postmodernism” (p. 8,11). While positive, he points to the superficial and fragmented images of the postmodern world (p. 31). I am saying the duality is not as extreme as the skeptic’s courts judgements suggests.

Hatch (1997: 46) is also very positive and hopeful about postmodern organization. She affirmingly sees in the postmodern organizations the possibility for “... greater levels of participation by marginalized members of organizations such as women, racial and ethnic minorities, and the oldest and youngest employees.” But, Hatch (1997) while not skeptical that we have gone through a time warp, is skeptical in many other ways. She includes alternative epistemological perspectives throughout her text (p. 47-51) that challenge classical OT positions. She has postmodern and interpretative critiques of population ecology, resource dependence, and institutional OT. Yet, by the categories and pronouncements of the skeptic’s council, her work would not be worthy of note or review.

Reading the lack of gender, race, and ethnic issues in modernist OT texts is also the subject of Mills and Simmons (1995) text. While written more from a labor process than a postmodern view, it does present a postmodern and post-structural (deconstruction) re-reading of OT, both in its main text, and in the activities assigned to students. Students are asked to pick leading OT texts and then to deconstruct the writing, looking for silences and exclusions, particularly, in the area of race, ethnicity, and gender.

I would agree with Thompson (1993). There is too much of the positive post-industrial thesis embedded in the work of postmodern organization theorists. Bergquist (1993: 17-18) sees it as a source of postmodernism, but does not offer any critique. Then on p. 150, post-industrial form becomes postmodern form. But, I think other writers (e.g. Hatch, Mills & Simmons, BGT) dismissed as too positive-texts, do offer this critique. This positive portrayal is also the substance of modernist OT texts. As the Cyber Liberal Capitalism story is told, with the shift to service jobs, we are the information society and we are knowledge workers.

manifesto.” In these rhetorical move the “empirical” work of “postmodern organization” theorists is never explicitly addressed in the review of “Postmodernism and Organizational Research.”

But, the negative side of the story is important to explore, with some growth in service jobs, manufacturing is still “the core activity of capitalist societies” (Thompson, 1993: 188). The Internet is a political economy, with most of the world’s population living outside that economy. Plus, the post-industrial “knowledge worker,” in the information society is a nonsense category since all jobs handle information, and these like the service jobs, are very low-paid.

Postmodernism is particularly dependent in its imagery on this notion of an information age that has broken with industrialism or the mode of production. But the ‘reproduction’ of information is not separate from capitalism (Thompson, 1993: 188).

For example, the information worker is still doing the surveillance tasks endemic to accounting. “Postmodernists are only the latest in a long line of academics infatuated with technology” (P. 189). This is a point that Affirmatives are apt to overlook. Thompson (1993: 189) asserts that there are also important labor process critiques of the role of technology in capitalism that get ignored by Affirmatives. Clegg (1990: 17) is an exception. He is critical of Bauman (1988a) for this ‘blind spot’ a failure to look at labor process. Clegg (1990: 5) points out those postmodern forms can still be sites for repression, privilege, and elitist industrial practices. There is nothing liberatory about the postmodern turn in institutions of commerce. You will not find a labor process critique in a modernist OT text.

In sum, we are told that since we all are still within a capitalist society and despite “radical changes,” postmodern organization, and the postmodern turn in capitalism is not possible (Parker, 1993). Secondly, there is a confusion by affirmative postmodernist writers, started in post-industrial theory, migrated uncritically into postmodern theory. But, is this not a focus on the center that ignores the resistance moves at the margins, which Kilduff and Mehra (1997: 460) say Derrida (1988: 68) warns against in our analysis. Yet, I think the divide between Affirmative and Skeptics is being drawn too severely.

Clegg (1990), Jameson (1984), Boje and Dennehy (1993), and Boje, Gephart, and Thatchenkery are critical of the post-industrial thesis for similar, if

not the same reasons as the Skeptics. Boje and Dennehy (1993: 325-328) ask, “just what jobs do we have in the post-industrial economy? ... If this is the age of information, how come Johnnie can’t read, why is Jill on drugs, and how come the high-tech companies, the computer companies, the electronic industry in general are on the run? ... Can people who are uneducated and illiterate become hi-tech entrepreneurs? ... Will the work force continue to be de-skilled? ... Will most large firms be a few privileged people at the core and a lot of temporary help and sub-contractors?”

At the close of every chapter, Boje and Dennehy (1993) provide a skeptical critique of the downside of postmodern organization, including post-industrialism, de-skilling, and the global market (which is why they are included, just barely, the middle ground between affirmative and skeptical. Hatch (1997) is quite clear in her critiques of the discourse domination of technical rationality from a feminist perspective. Clegg (1990) has a critique of administrative narratives of progress and technology.

In addition to being too affirmative as opposed to skeptical, on Rosenau’s (1991) dimension, Boje and Dennehy (1993) are panned of mingling late modernism in their postmodern organization text (Schwartz, 1995; Parker, 1997). They view all organizations as a mixture of pre-modern, modern, and postmodern discourses. Bergquist (1993: 177-180) also says it is “hybrid organization,” a mixture of premodern sweatshops (some would say systemic modern), a veneer of modern, and postmodern Senge-learning organization, Toffler-adhocracy, and Boulding-Intersect organization). The postmodern organization is as Thompson (1993) argues just label switching. The good news is that Bergquist (1993) anticipates the intermingle of chaos and postmodern theory, but unfortunately without seeing the potential for organizational sustainability that Best and Kellner (1997) write about. Cilliers (1997) book on Complexity and Postmodernism also walks this line.

Boje and Dennehy, in contrast to Bergquist, leans more toward the postmodern organization as more enlightened and progressive in its labor process, participative governance, and ecological stance. The modernist

organization is constructed as panoptic, hierarchic, and unsustainable without differentiating between Cooper and Burrell's (1988) systemic and critical modernisms. We can say that Clegg (1990), Bergquist (1993), Boje and Dennehy (1994), Hirshhorn (1997), and Hatch (1997) are more episodic than work by the Burrell and Cooper articles in *Organization Studies*.

What is the negative dimension of postmodern OT? Hassard and Parker's (1993) book is critical of the postmodern organization embedded, as it is, in late multinational capitalism. Hassard and Parker's (1993) collection of essays are also critical of any Affirmative postmodern OT that does not advance a critical assessment of global capitalism and can not look upon the dark side of postmodern organization. They describe several downsides to postmodern organization, which we shall now briefly review.

Thompson also argues that Jameson gives cultural trends but does not provide details about how a new stage of multinational or late capitalism will be sustained. Bureaucracy, mass production and mass consumption "are far from dead" (Thompson, 1993:190). Bureaucracies may be leaner, more decentralized, and train managers to use words like "empowerment," build core values, but they are still bureaucracies. The answer to Thompson is in the work of Firat and Dholakia (1998). First, in late capitalism, standardized production allows flexible production of differentiated products to reach ever-fragmenting markets. Second the balance between production and consumption shifts. In what Firat and Dholakia call the "Theaters of Consumption," consumers are no long just spectators. The consumer participates in the production process, taking on a role as producer. For example, a consumer can decide that they want to play an adventure role in a white water rafting weekend, get married on horse back, or take a role in a murder mystery retreat.

Thompson's most devastating challenge to postmodern theory: "the idea that there is nothing beneath the surface of representation is absurd and dangerous" (p. 196). He critiques postmodern organization writers such as Gergen (1992), Morgan (1990), Burrell (1988), Clegg (1989) and Townley (1990) for buying into this Baudrillard postmodern theory of representation that levitates

the sign from material conditions of wealth, privilege, and power. I would counter that Clegg and Townley and Burrell in his more recent writing observes and theorizes the material condition of labor and peasantariat exploitation. Burrell (1997: 12) adds “what conventional organization theory has done is to suppress whole categories of human beings and force them to keep their heads down.” He is referring to the half of the world that lives the condition of the peasantariat, the unemployed or under-employed people. In addition, other Affirmative writers, as observing and theorizing the material conditions of ecological degradation.

In summarizing, their book (Hassard & Parker, 1993), Parker (1993: 206) says “ ‘Postmodernity and Organizations’ indicates a fair degree of skepticism about claims that flexibility, decentralization, cultural control and so on indicate the rise of a postbureaucratic organizational form.” But, then so do those Affirmatives being dismissed. “Perhaps the ‘postmodern organization’ is nothing more than a new phrase to capture the imagination of the jaded reader because it seems to add little else that is new” (Parker, 1993: 206). I would agree with this as a label for Bergquist (1993) and even of my own work (Boje & Dennehy, 1993) but beyond that the generalization does not apply as a blanket dismissive of all Affirmatives.

What Thompson describes is a move common to modern OT writers, especially textbook authors. Daft’s (1998) scale of modern to postmodern paradigm echoes other dualities, mechanistic versus organic, bureaucracy versus adhocracy, closed versus open systems, market versus clan, patriarchal versus egalitarian. Parker rejects periodizing ontologies without looking at differences. To amplify this last point, postmodernists are said by Harvey (1989) and then Thompson (1993) to wallow in ephemerality, fragmentation, discontinuity and chaotic currents of change, without posing solutions. But, if they propose solutions, they are labeled “Affirmative” and dismissed. I would also reply that Marx, as the inventor of critical theory, was attempting to analyze the ways in which capitalism is an historically-situated project, not the product of Social Darwinism, not Natural, or God’s law. As an historical project, Marx

contended that choices were possible, that the course of history could be altered, and as Nietzsche observed, is being altered all the time in the will to power.

The other general charge of reviews is that the affirmative postmodernists do not look at the dark side of the postmodern organization or epistemology they espouse. But, this is not true of Clegg (1990) nor Boje, Gephart, and Thatchenkery (1996). Clegg (1990), and Mills and Simmons (1995) describe the downside of postmodern organization. Mills and Simmons (1995) cite Thompson's earlier (1991) critique that postmodernists underestimate the role of power holders (individuals in groups) in organizations, the fragmentary self does not come to terms with the fact that we have but one life to world, and finally Harvey's (1989) critique that postmodernist do not encourage radical change. Boje, Gephart, and Thatchenkery (1996) includes a chapter by Binzagr and Manning (1996) that argues that Boje and Dennehy (1993) can be extended by Hassard's epistemological approach, a chapter by Montuori and Purser (1993) critiquing Lyotard's reading of systems theory, as well as a chapter by Gergen and Whitney (1996) in which they seem aware that postmodern polyphonic organizations survive in a global economy of power and discipline.

In late capitalism, consumers say Firat and Dholakia (1998) are being given more options to design their consumption, to interact freely with what is produced for their consumption. This result is a change from industrial to Late Capitalism, in which mass production and mass consumption becomes flexible production for fragmented groups of consumers who want, localized design and more control over design. The postmodern consumer wants to be the character in the raft ride, be the bride and groom in the Elizabethan wedding ceremony, be part of an interactive experience. They do not want to be the idle, massive, spectator, sitting in a great audience, watching some celebrity do the performance. They want to become a player, become an interactive part of the performance of the spectacle. This is why, to me, spectacle involves theatrics, storytelling, self-design, and institutional control.

Table Two: Festivalism among the Spectacles

<p>Capitalism Spectacle There is a spectacle of production and consumption that defines itself as technology progress and salvation for less-developed nations.</p>		<p>Spiritualism Spectacle There is a spiritual spectacle that transcends religiosity, taking lines of flight through the material condition of late capitalism.</p>
	<p>Festivalism A line of flights, a place and time that is anti-spectacle or where festival reterritorializes spectacles of production and consumption (See Chapter 13)</p>	
<p>Marxism Spectacle The political economy is a religious and class spectacle that masks our understanding of the material conditions of exploitation and domination in the global division of labor.</p>		<p>Postmodernism Spectacle The spectacle is more authentic than the fragmented and diverse “real.” There are no solutions to offer that are not reconditioned by genetic-engineering choices of Biotech capitalism.</p>

I want to define festival as lines of flight intersecting postmodernism, spiritualism, capitalism, and Marxism. Spiritualism and Marxism are opposed, as are Capitalism and Postmodernism. Marxism seeks to reform and transcend the violence of capitalism and capitalism sees itself as a competitor and successor to (state) Marxism. Postmodernism has some new age spiritualists, critical postmodernists seeking political economy critique, and some Affirmatives attempting to live within capitalism.

Rosenau (1992: 15) distinguishes between affirmative and skeptical postmodern positions: “Although the affirmative post-modernists, also referred to as simply the affirmatives, agree with the skeptical post-modernists’ critique of modernity; they have a more hopeful, optimistic view of the post-modern age.” Horthat Americans gravitate to the affirmative position while the Europeans, particularly the British take a more skeptical position. Some affirmatives adopt a New Age spiritualism worldviews (ranging from Transcendentalism, native spiritualism linked to ecology, to Eastern philosophy, including Ahimsa), while others work within the Information Age and its focus on the metaphors of chaos

and complexity. Skeptical postmodernists oppose the optimism in spiritual, democratic, ecological, and transcendent solutions. Skeptics focus instead on the hegemonic and material conditions of power and domination including issues of class, race, gender, and socioeconomic position within the political economy. Some New Age Affirmatives reject both 1st World and Third World solutions, seeking to recover an “organic” and “enchanted” understanding of the “living planet.”

The affirmative post-modernists encompass a more optimistic spirit than the skeptics, and they support a range of new political movements organized around everything from peace, ecology/environment, feminism, green politics, nationalism, populism, and anarchism to “spiritual fitness disciplines,” parapsychology, psychokinesis, and New Age movements. They encompass “communities of resistance,” poor people’s movements, and therapy groups.

Since this book is focused in Ahimsa, critical theory, and postmodernism, the relation of the Affirmatives and Skeptics is important to explore. I will argue that the Skeptics can make room in their ranks for Affirmatives’ focus on practice, and Affirmatives can tune into the Skeptics’ focus on the material condition. Separately Affirmatives veer into mysticism while Skeptics flirt with nihilism, which Rosenau (1991: 132) defines as “a denial of the possibility of any affirmation ... and the rejection of the very prospect of knowledge altogether.” My own preference will be for a critical postmodern position that relates an affirmation of plurality to the material condition. I was raised blue collar and I am a grassroots activist in my politics. I prefer self-governance to representative democracy, and I live in a State this is not “really” democratic. As Rosenau puts it, I move from deconstruction of the political economy, including its ecological and human circumstance, to its reconstruction. I seek a society without poverty or pollution. I prefer decentered, local, and fragmented organizations to centered, global-colonizing, and organized-systems ones. Skeptics question the effectiveness of nonviolent and disorganized activism of the Affirmatives.

Rather than a binary polemic between Skeptics and Affirmatives, I prefer Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) rhizomatics. Applying rhizomatics, the main

movements or flows are between the disciplines: critical postmodernism, new age postmodernism, spiritual capitalism, democratic capitalism, and between Affirmatives and Skeptics. The work of Adam Smith in *Moral Sentiments* was an attempt to give a spiritual perspective to capitalism. But capitalism has its own religiosity. To Skeptics and/or Marxists, Affirmative spiritualism is too easily appropriated into the worst aspects of capitalism, sending capitalism on lines of flight to missionize the Third World. And the Third World is in the Southern Hemisphere, but it is also within each of the First Worlds (inner cities, homeless, the farm, hotel, and restaurant workers).³ Capitalism attempts to appropriate each of the other cells in Table Two into spectacle forms of production and consumption. There is marketing to the fragmented postmodernists, sales of technology to the Marxists, and space for prayer breakfasts and chat meetings for spiritualists. Spectacle is also constantly reappropriating festival to garnish and camouflage spectacle.

The festival is, for me, a middle ground, at the center of capitalism, Marxism, spiritualism, and postmodernism. It is my attempt to open the flow of non-violent practices of production and consumption that can co-exist with other capitalisms, post-Marxists, spiritualities, and postmodernisms. The critical postmodern and Marxist approaches allow a critique of capitalist spectacle and Pollyanna or capitalist spiritualism in order to find where festival is sustainable. A critique of techno-determinism, linear progress, and evolutionism in capitalism is necessary. As is a critique of the technocratic and teleology of Marxism. And a critique of the history of violence in spiritualism and the lack of agenda in postmodernism are also prerequisites to the “life capitalism” of festival. Without the critique the festival quickly reverts to spectacle. Looking to writing about the postmodern condition in organization theory (OT), we find sharp disagreements.

A Look into the Modern Abyss One fifth to one half of the world’s 6 billion people can be classified as peasants. “What conventional [management and] organization theory has done is to suppress whole categories of human beings

³ See Deleuze & Guattari, p. 468 for a discussion of four flows (matter-energy, population, food, and urban) between capitalism centers and (internal and external) Third Worlds.

and force them to keep their heads down” (Burrell, 1998: 12). The categories include women, races, and particularly the peasantry. An important, if not brilliant, recent critique of the neglect of premodern discourse in the management text is Gibson Burrell’s (1997) book, *Pandemonium*). He proposes a “retro-organization theory” that “seeks to reassert the role of the peasantry in contemporary life – across the globe” (Burrell, 1997: 57). This poorest 1/5th of our populations, Burrell (1998) calls the “peasantariat” (native people living off the land, nomadic people, homeless people, small farmers, small shopkeepers). And the peasant’s numbers are not declining. The peasantariat has resisted being absorbed into colonialism and capitalism. Peasants have always lived in a more sustainable relationship to the earth than the richest portion of the population. This circle is now broken.

Auschwitz was a modern extension of the factory system, what Heidegger called “the manufacture of corpses in gas chambers and extermination camps” (In Burrell, 1997: 137).

Zygmunt Bauman’s marvelous book on *modernity and the Holocaust* (1989) shows the importance of bureaucratic organization to the death camps; and how Reason itself comes to be used for insane purposes.... The bureaucratic and Cartesian nature of mechanized barbarism ... Bureaucratic systems when fused with rationality, of course, need not produce the death camps. But once put in the context of racial purity and the ideology of extermination, bureaucratic rationality found it relatively easy to produce a system of physical extermination carried out in a dull, routinized way (Burrell, 1997: 141).

Violence was authorized from above, there was a division of labor to keep people from seeing the whole “theater of cruelty” at a glance. (p. 142). “The task of baby-burning, which for any civilized people we fondly imagine would have been abhorrent, was split into minute, functionally separate tasks. No one person could be identified with responsibility for this set of activities. All were ‘cogs in a machine’” (p. 143).

At the turn of the century, managers managed the human carnage of the meat plants. There is a long history of slave plantation management. Just recently we have resurrected sweatshop practices, not just for Asia peasantry,

but in major cities for the youth of the inner city. In 1906, Sinclair's book The Jungle reported the river of blood in the Chicago stockyards. "McDonalds requires the profitable death of cattle and chickens in profusion" Burrell, 1997: 138).

Festival and Postmodern Conditions The history of spectacle and festive organization extends from feudal to present. As it will quickly become clear, festival and spectacle are intermingled genres. Postmodern and modern lifestyle choices are different from ancient times, but traditional festival theatrics and costuming have been carried forth from former times and remain a focal point of contemporary social and business life. It becomes difficult, at times to tell them apart. We will therefore expand upon our festival/spectacle distinctions to explore their interplay in contemporary times. Only in our retrospective reconstruction of history is it easy to ignore fragmentation and present a festival or spectacle that is coherent, orderly, linear, holism. Spectacle and festival are each ways to masque fragmentation. Fragmentation is the defining characteristic of postmodern (Bauman, 1995). Fragmentation is also very much a part of the premodern and modern.

In the first three chapters, I summarized the differences in spectacle approaches between Baudrillard and Debord. I have my disagreement with Baudrillard. I do not think we have arrived in mass into the postmodern epoch. Rather, there are multiple political economies: primitive accumulation, Industrial Capitalism, Cyber Capitalism, and the Postmodern World of production and consumption. These four political economies (first three from last chapter) combine in hybrid fashion to construct our social, economic, and political realities. I think only the more elite and the richer consumers are able to self-design their consumption. And, Industrial and Cyber capitalisms are moving into self-designed consumption offerings, while the working peasants (peasantariat) of the world work for (sub) poverty wages in toxic, and life-exhausting situations. Concealed beneath all these four there is the means of constructing a fifth capitalism, the festival form of life capitalism that has so little space to grow.

Festival can reterritorialize capitalism and state Marxism. Its power does not lie in the technological determinism of cyberspace or promises of a new chapter in political economy history. Festival is another line of flight.⁴ Just as state Marxism collapsed in on itself, capitalism is consuming planetary and human resources at such an accelerated rate; it too is collapsing from within. In its place a new geopolitics of ecological and human sustainability can reterritorialize the space left by both capitalism and Marxism. This is being helped along by the pluralistic perspective of postmodernism and the new sensibilities of spiritualism taking their own lines of flight from institutions of religious domination and repression.

In the line of flight there are ruptures, clean breaks, jail breaks, voyages where you do not ever return, an abandonment and a discovery of new territories, new frontiers. There is the crossing of a void, an absolute deterritorialization (like a divorce), and a crossing over to reterritorialize some space that is itself deterritorialized (land that invites frontiersmen). There is a positive line of flight, a get away, a breakthrough across the divide, a breaking through of the signifiers into the black hole of subjectivity. It is this breaking away that I see in festival, a reterritorialization of a void left after deterritorialization of the spectacles of production and consumption.

In our postmodern condition, those of us with choices are overwhelmed by our freedoms rather than by oppression. With the move to a shorter workweek, the option of reinventing ourselves in six or seven careers, a future in which we can clone or otherwise genetically-engineer our off spring --- we have more choice than ever before in defining "real." In affluent pockets of economies, we the affluent can design a story for our lives in which we design ourselves as the main character using a variety of scattered and disconnected elements and fragments. We can design our body, our career, our environment, and live a life of simulation, playing virtual and theatric games, and never touch real at all. Yet, as we design our freedoms, we also face the problem of control. The movie

⁴ Terms: reterritorialize and line of flight come from the work of Deleuze, Gilles & Felix Guattari (1987). A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia, Trans. By Brian Massumi.

Gaddica explored the hegemony and counter-hegemony of those genetically designed versus people trying to pass in a biogenetically engineered world. Few are able to resist the surveillance and sanctions of the genetically determined society.

The postmodern condition puts us into a new relation to socially-engineered “real” and a substitution of play and fantasy for this surrogate authenticity. Bauman (1997: 124) argues that in such a world “the artists of the life game – the novelist’s exposure of the immanent fragility and underdetermination of human fate comes hardly as a revelation and thus loses much of the emancipatory and redeeming power” ascribed to it. In the postmodern condition, the artist of the game of life takes center stage until the novelty wears off. As we redesign DNA in our body and our environment, life takes on a more and more fragile character, and what were unshakable laws of nature and history become designable in the postmodern world. The questions are do we make money with the new economies, do we redefine human and animal rights, do we mess with Mother Nature, and do we take this line of flight?

What is “authentic” in a world in which every aspect of spectacle is by designer choice, even consumer-designer choice, and where we live in total simulacra? For Jean Baudrillard, we live in the postmodern world of simulacra. For Guy Debord we live in the world of spectacles of production and consumption, which masks the level of exploitation and the ability to make festive choices. Debord seeks the anti-spectacle condition. The difference between Baudrillard and Debord, is just who is it that is controlling and designing our roles in the spectacle? Debord focuses on limitations of our abilities to design our own role since spectacle is designed and mass-produced for mass consumption. An essential limit is living in spectacles of delusion and fetish. My friend Ann Cunliffe had this parting example of the inauthentic spectacle condition:

I think you are so right about the simulated replacing the real. I think in the process of time/space compression we focus on the performance of the moment and lose the origin. Jameson's comment that we are 'condemned to seek history through our own

pop images' was made real to me when I was at Jamestown, VA a few Christmas's ago. The site is a reconstruction of 17th century life acted out by 20th century actors. Part of the site was closed due to the federal budget crisis... history closed for the day. However, I could ponder the survival of those first settlers while eating my burger in the cafeteria! Even though I missed the enactment, it struck me that history was being replaced by commodification (tour buses, McDonalds etc.) and aestheticization (colorful costumes, interesting dialogue). (From Ann Cunliffe, 1999 letter to me).

In the postmodern spectacle it is more and more difficult to find uncolonized and uncorporatized spaces of festive enactments. Our public spaces are becoming increasingly privatized and made spectacular. We are replacing human experience with commercial experience, and authentic experience with hucksterism. And it seems to me that the colonization of private and public space by corporate endeavor is spreading from the marketplace to the hospital, the university and into the home. The cultural logic of late postmodern capitalism is busily simulating, commercializing, and digitizing spectacle from the Super Bowl, to War game theater, to Clinton's impeachment hearings. In the next chapter we look at the spectacle of simulation and violence that saturates our movie images.