

## **PART II. BEING FESTIVE WITHIN SPECTACLE ORGANIZATION**

### **Chapter 7**

#### **Spectacle Concepts and Metaphors**

The chapter moves from concentrated/diffuse spectacles to Steven Pepper's four world hypothesis metaphors. The theme of the chapter is how are various spectacle concepts and metaphor-based models written into organization theory. The metaphors are mechanistic, organic, contextualistic, and formistic. Mechanistic and organic metaphors appear together, each claiming supremacy over the other. With contingency, the context claimed its domination over them both. And, the formists are ready to construct a typology comparing the similarities and differences of the other three. Each of the four metaphors presents its own moral compass as the most appropriate one to construct and navigate organizations. Each metaphor treats the others as fictive accounts while asserting their own as the universal truth.

Each metaphor presents a pragmatic contradiction. "A pragmatic contradiction can be defined as a discourse that claims one thing and does another" (Currie, 1998: 73). Spectacle claims one thing while masking another. When we read different metaphor images simultaneously we get some idea of the discontinuity, nonlinearity, fragmentation, and irony permeating organization theory. The hands of power become more visible as authors of spectacle-fictions about the techno-progress, teleological evolution, and historical determinism of organizations. Postmodernists and poststructuralists vehemently deny such teleologies by tracing their ideological underpinnings. I contend that metaphors are not islands of organization theory; they inter-reference and interpenetrate one another while claiming walls between them. They are not a division of knowledge, vantagepoints, but in their crisscrossing, they are rhizomatic. Rhizomatic can be defined as the interaction of the discourses. The chapter concludes with ways of being festive in spectacles of production and consumption. Festive becomes another root metaphor, another hypothesis

about organizational life. Festivalism coexists in spectacle time and space. It is no more neutral in its depiction of the world than Pepper's four king metaphors.

In proposing a fifth world hypothesis and metaphor, I do not think that it is somehow without its own ideology. Existing in the spaces between metaphors, and in the gaps within metaphors, festivalism is not immune to ideology. Yet, festivalism is also not completely mimetic of the metaphors it references, the other four world hypotheses. There is something unique and different about festivalism that gives it a logic and ideology that is not possessed by the spectacle metaphors of formism, contextualism, organicism, and mechanism. Festival is more self-aware that it can begin in the middle, chose its beginnings and its endings, or never leave the unfolding middle. Festivalism can choose its ideological packaging and still sustain nonlinearity and non-closure. Festivalism is a situation of anti-spectacle. It is anti-matter. If festivalism is one more metafiction, organizing open-ended experience into its own moral imperative, the it is easily appropriated into the spectacle of production and consumption. It is only through self-reflexivity that festival players remind themselves to not surrender to spectacle. Festivalism is a creative show and tell theater that knows it is artificial. Festivalism is self-aware of its characterizations, plot element choices, and narrative performance. Spectacle believes its own storytelling is authentic and authorial. Festivalism knows it is "subjective invention" (Currie, 1998: 67). Festival knows that its show and tell is theatrics. Spectacle enhances its realism by active involvement of spectators, making them actors on the stage.

Spectacle is under attack from the postmodernists, poststructuralists, and critical theorists. Critical theorists critique the managerialist viewpoint of the mechanistic metaphors. Yet, critical theorists seek reform of the machine system by giving workers more democratic control of their sociotechnical existence. Poststructuralists deconstruct the mechanistic metaphor, tracing its intertextual referentiality to the female rationality the phallic discourse of mechanism seeks to dominate and silence. The postmodernists juxtapose organic and theatric metaphors to spectacle enactments. Together postmodernists, poststructuralists, and critical theorists do not buy into the telos of progress, renewal, and utopian

promise of spectacle. Spectacle designers find it hard to hide the ideology of their productions from these disciplines. Spectacle is narrated and theatrically performed in so much of the everyday life of workers, managers, and consumers it constructs our identities. Spectacle is the narrative and theatrics of production and consumption, but festival is an anti-narration and anti-theatrics that can occupy the very same stage. Within the addictive organization and the addictive society (Schaefer and Fassel, 1977), there are those who do not become addicted. My quest is how to create more spaces and situations where the addictions of capitalism do not colonize everything and every action of every person. I want to be festive and see festival aspects of capitalism.

To construct post-spectacle situations, or what I am calling “festivals,” we must understand how the spectator’s psychological dependency is scripted by spectacle in ways that subverts self-reflection. Spectacles enroll the spectator to identify with the hero inscribed its theatrics and narrative. Hero-worshippers are recruited to distract them from festive choices of their life situations; self-reflection and critical reflection is discouraged; this leaves situation-construction to system engineers, directors, managers and leaders. The passive onlookers are part of the spectacle’s audience, and even become habituated bit players acting their scripted role, complicit in the spectacle journey, rather than living constructors and co-designers (Knabb, 1981: 43). The spectacle is assumed to be natural, thus masking the ideological underpinning. I am applying Alvesson’s (1987: 147) definitions of ideology in this chapter to look at what he terms “objectification mistakes:”

- A form of consciousness is ideological if it contains ‘an objectification mistake,’ i.e. if a social produced phenomena is assumed to be a natural one. This means that the products of a particular society or a group of individuals which potentially could be controlled and changed by the participants, are seen as natural phenomena, governed by processes outside their control.
- If a form of consciousness falsely assumes that the particular interest of the group as a whole it can be referred to as ideological.
- The glorification of social conditions as harmonious when they are, in fact, conflict-ridden and the denial or transmutation of contradictions might be seen as ideological forms of thought.

Spectacles, then with ideological awareness, could be controlled and changed by participants. Debord and Alvesson both pick up on Marx's concept of false consciousness. The spectacle sets out a false consciousness that in ways that is psychologically dependent. You do not see the interests of the group that benefit from the spectacle that renders real as harmonious and fiction as real.

These ideologies are central to what Guy Debord terms, the "concentrated" and "diffuse" spectacle. I want to explore Guy Debord's typology of spectacle, the concentrated and the diffuse spectacle. "The spectacle" says Debord, "exists in a *concentrated* or a *diffuse* form depending on the necessities of the particular stage of misery which it denies and supports" (#63). In both, ideology is used to masquerade much misery and rationalize what can not be masked. Both forms inhibit festive situation construction. Debord's theory of concentrated/diffuse spectacle, expands the theory to other spectacles, and concludes by looking at spectacle interplay and pockets within and beyond for festival. I would like to develop more festive alternatives to spectacles by exploring how concentrated and diffuse spectacles limit festive situation construction. But to do so requires more explanation of ideology.

There are several ideological components. Taylorism (Scientific Management), for example, contains both a managerialist (seeing the world through the manager's eyes) and a technocratic (progress through technology brings health and prosperity to all) ideology that remains popular to this day. The diffuse and concentrated spectacles are able to mask capital accumulation in the face of misery through ideology narratives and theatrics.

**Managerialism Ideology** – The viewpoint and voice of management is privileged above all other perspectives. The management function "is looked upon as clearly differentiated from organization work in general and is expressed as equally important or more important than the organization in its entirety, i.e. the work carried out by 95-99% of the personnel who do not belong to the management" (Alvesson, 1987: 160). In concentrated spectacle power wears a mask that makes managerialism seem the natural common sense view of how organizations are to be run. In diffuse spectacles, such as globalization, the

narrative of free market economies demands a lesser role for national control. Managers of transnational and multinational corporations define what is or is not appropriate labor and ecological policy. In both cases, the managers' voice drowns out other voices.

**Elitist Ideology** – The good boss, good leader, and the good executives work hard, are competent, and exhibit situated qualities necessary to succeed. In both concentrated and diffuse spectacle, the elite view is that the elite were born to power, and those out of power are where they belong. The executive (boss, leader) elite are segmented from people in general by their special education, training, and psychological nature. “Business leaders possess special personal qualities which make them more ‘holistic’ in their thinking, strength of will, capable of bringing out ‘the best’ in their subordinates or quite simply more ‘charismatic’ than people who do not reach higher management positions in their careers, all according to the elitist ideology” (Alvesson, 1987: 161). The elitist ideology underplays the executives’ ruthless, thirst for power, and finely honed ability to dominate and exploit others.

**Technocratic Ideology** – Technological developments determine the imperatives that management must follow. The mechanistic factory needs its concentrated spectacle to legitimate its form as most suitable to particular environments. The global Internet technology is the march of progress in the diffuse spectacle. Both are instances of techno-determinism: technology is always seen as progress, without accounting for consequences, access, social or ecological costs. “Technological rationality aims at the maximum exploitation of Nature” and “advanced technology is regarded as a good thing in itself” (Alvesson, 1987: 158). With each act of exploitation there is a need for a good ideological script to overcome potential and actual resistance to spectacles of techno production and consumption. This is not to say that all technology is evil or disastrous. It means that there are choices to be made.

**Harmony Ideology** Harmony is the idea that a complete integration between management and employee psychology is possible. Again, we see this in concentrated spectacles of job enrichment and empowerment programs of the

formal organization and in the new cosmology of the global spectacle where labor is now set free from paternalism, to seek independence from full time employment (as the story goes). We only have to find the right balance of “democratic leadership, personnel and group-oriented management, intrinsic motivation, involvement, personal development, self-realization, etc” (Alvesson, 1987: 161). Alienation and the need for emancipation disappear because the good manager is able to harmonize or socially engineer the correct balance points. Conflicts that do occur are part of the constructive negotiation of a harmonious whole. The manager manages conflicts so there is neither too little nor too much conflict. Harmony is supported, says Alvesson, by an ideology of optimism about the future and a denigration of the past. Development and change equals improvement and the past equals primitive, outdated passé approaches. “The principles of modern business management are always wiser, more rational, advanced, psychologically correct or in some other way praiseworthy than methods previously practiced: (p. 162). Instead of Taylorism and bureaucracy we have post-Taylorism and post-bureaucratic management and organizational practices. All practices are temporary, waiting to be replaced by future practices that will achieve harmony.

**Late Capitalist Ideology** – The late capitalistic or post industrialism ideology of the diffuse spectacle points to the advantages of capitalism, free enterprise, and self-organizing markets. Here diffuse spectacle opposes concentrated spectacle, but it is still spectacularly ideological theater. The ideology is used to oppose all forms of state control and to celebrate private ownership (Alvesson, 1986: 158-9). It is the market that “determines, “legitimizes,” and “rationalizes” lay-offs, downsizing, merger, acquisitions, plant relocations, and temporary employment. The laws of the market are thought to be determinate, thus masking the spectacle of socially determined conditions. What is good for the market is what is good for society and for the world or “What is good for General Motors is good for the USA” and “What is good for Microsoft is good for the world.” There is an instrumental relationship here that legitimates

market liberalism over approaches that would conserve natural resources or invest in human quality of life.

The ideological elements of managerialism, techno-determinism, and market liberalism (late capitalistic) combine to legitimate corporate power in both concentrated and diffuse spectacle. By learning to read the ideological scripts we may be able to regain choice points that make festival enactment possible. I turn now to a more detailed explanation of concentrated and diffuse spectacle, followed by a look at four metaphors that dominate organization design: formism, mechanism, organicism, and contextualism.

**Concentrated Spectacle** amasses and centralizes bureaucratic power. The concentrated spectacle organization is where both production and consumption are constructed in a totalizing self-portrait of power that masks its fragmentation. By masking fragmentation, the whole is seen as more unified. Spectacle is not a metaphor, not something fundamentally spectacularist, it is materially spectacle, it is reality constructing, and “the spectacle is real” (Debord, 1967: #8). Indeed, the postmodernists contend that the spectacle is made to appear more real than reality itself. This makes it difficult to read ideology, since reality is not read for its ideology-authors.

The concentrated situation becomes a unitary assemblage in time and space. We lose site of its fragmented and transitory composition or the situations they reproduce. The spectacle explains the choices away as destiny, evolution, science, or blind market forces. In this way we lose agency, surrendering control in spectacular passivity. Festival reclaims the choices from teleology by highlighting their material roots. In the festival, people explore their “precise desires for *ambiances in order to realize them.*” Each person must seek what he loves, what attracts him” or her (Knabb, 1981: 43). I have some ideas on how to reclaim festival from spectacle.

<p>First, we search for the material conditions of production and consumption spectacles. Second, we understand our own choice making. Third, we construct situations that attend the material roots of production and consumption in festive ways.</p>
---

1. **What are the material conditions?** Once you find out the human and biotic conditions under which gold, diamonds, coffee, sugar, fur garments, and sneakers are manufactured, you never look at spectacle in the same way. The facts make ideological claims more difficult to sustain. Once you find out the ecological costs of beef production in terms of methane production, rainforest loss, you do not look at unsustainable production and consumption in the same way. The spectacle masks the labor conditions and environmental costs of concentrated and diffuse production as well as the idealized life style of the over-consumer.

2. **How does spectacle mask its choice making?** Spectacle, for example, “is the existing order’s uninterrupted discourse about itself, its laudatory monologue. It is the self-portrait of power” (#24)<sup>i</sup>. And, in the self-portrait of power, there are no visible blemishes. And, those that are, are made visible by media or activist exposure are explained away by circumstance, not by choice. Yet, once the self-portrait is juxtaposed with the human and ecological materiality of production, the illusion dissipates. The choice-making structure becomes visible. Systems are, after all, perfectly designed by choices made to attain their performance. Or as Debord (1967: #6) puts it “The spectacle grasped in its totality is both the result and the project of the existing mode of production.”

2. A. Choice making is also masked in cosmology. Spectacle involves shrouding production and consumption origins and consequences in a cosmology apologetic for materiality and utilitarian relationships. “In all its specific forms, as information or propaganda, as advertisement or direct entertainment consumption, the spectacle is the present model of socially dominant life” (Debord, 1967: #6). Perhaps the most pervasive cosmology of the concentrated spectacle contends that happiness is equated with our materiality.

2. B. - Making the fragment appear to be the totality masks choice making. Spectacle “presents itself as an *instrument of unification*” of the fragments, and is itself a fragment of unilateral communication pretending to be the totality (#3). Part of the totality is convincing producers, consumers, and investors that life circumstances are improving for the masses, and those not improving are

victimizing their own progress. In this way resistance is lowered, and people do not think to make festive choices.

2. C. Finally, the gaze of the concentrated spectacle is fixed on cultural heroes. The concentrated organization spectacle is a self-portrait of unilateral power that “concentrates all gazing and all consciousness” (#3). The gaze is concentrated onto the spectacle role models, those surrogate spectators constructed to channel our identification. This can be human-celebrities like Madonna, Spike Lee, or Bill Clinton, or corporate-celebrities like McDonalds, GM, and Microsoft. “The concentrated spectacle” says Debord, “belongs essentially to bureaucratic capitalism” (#64). And it is through the heroic image that a sense making cosmology is constructed and distributed for mass consumption.

In fact, bureaucratic property itself is concentrated in such a way that the individual bureaucrat relates to the ownership of the global economy only through an intermediary, the bureaucratic community, and only as a member of this community. Moreover, the production of commodities, less developed in bureaucratic capitalism, also takes on a concentrated form: the commodity the bureaucracy holds on to is the totality of social labor, and what it sells back to society is wholesale survival ... The imposed image of the good envelops in its spectacle the totality of what officially exists, and is usually concentrated in one man, who is the guarantee of totalitarian cohesion. Everyone must magically identify with this absolute celebrity or disappear. This celebrity is master of non-consumption, and the heroic image which gives an acceptable meaning to the absolute exploitation that primitive accumulation accelerated by terror really is” (#64).

2. C. Who is the one hero who models spectacle’s totalitarian cohesion? In the management and organization text it is the CEO, the accumulator of capital for self and investors, who achieves and lives the American Dream. The American Dream is constructed with the CEO as hero, such that we can gaze and learn how to feel and behave towards others. Spectacle is critical to the legitimacy of bureaucratic administration. Of course, since the word “bureaucracy” it is out of fashion, it is replaced with “managing on the edge of chaos” between bureaucratic order and anarchy, or with the “organic,” “servant,” or “transformational” leader of the new “learning or knowledge organization.”

Spectacle puts the old bureaucrats in new rhetorical clothing, the old departments in self-managed team rhetoric, and even appropriates the language of play, self-design, and spontaneity from festival.

In the concentrated form of the bureaucratic spectacle, what is good for society is what is officially and bureaucratically good for corporate power. This was the essence of my work with Disney (1995), where the official history of Walt and the Magic Kingdom is different from accounts of laboring artists. The concentrated spectacle coheres around the saga of the heroic CEO on a conquest of accumulation to better society-at-large. Walt is the paradigm of the American Dream, from rags to riches, bringing joy and happiness to millions. “The concentration of ‘communication’ is thus an accumulation, in the hands of the existing system’s administration, of the means which allow it to carry on this particular administration” (#24). Without the synergy of the Disney story, the legitimacy of the corporate enterprises ceases to grasp its consuming audiences.

2. D. Part of concentrated spectacle is to keep one from seeing how activities A, B, and C are connected to X, Y, and Z. As workers are separated through division of labor from viewing the totality of “the concentration of the production process ... unity and communication become the exclusive attribute of the system’s management” (#26). This is Bauman’s point in the scientific and bureaucratic management of the Holocaust. “Wherever the concentrated spectacle rules, so does the police” (#64). The police enforce bureaucratic property rights and guarantee totalitarian cohesion, and communication control, under the rule of the bureaucrat. Choices outside the concentrated spectacle and outside the mediation of the bureaucratic community are disciplined and punished.

In sum, the concentrated spectacle masks the material conditions of production and consumption. In this way our own festive options to construct situations is circumvented. By understanding the ways in which spectacle masks its material roots, we can begin to make festive situational choices. We can work to live in more simplicity, with less biotic destruction, and seek more

spontaneous, playful, and humane situations of production and consumption. However, the spectacle also presents a more diffuse faciality.

**Diffuse Spectacle** – The diffuse spectacle is one of fragmentation and specialization in the global economy, global marketplace, and global division of labor. It is as if concentrated spectacle reverses to background and all the messiness is foreground. The “diffuse spectacle” says Debord, “accompanies the abundance of commodities, the undisturbed development of modern capitalism” as it reaches into every nook and cranny (#64). Late modern capitalism combines the massification of concentrated spectacle markets and production with the diffuse spectacle of fragmentation to penetrate and colonize differentiated tastes and life styles. McDonalds is sold everywhere, but the burger itself is modified, even allowed in India to be vegetarian, in order to reach every fragmented life space on the planet. And it is this diffuse spectacle that takes center stage in late global capitalism.

Firat and Dholakia (1998) speak of this diffuse political economy as our global theaters of consumption. We live in fragmented “life mode communities” constructed into “enclaves” that keep us physically separate from each other (p. 160). In the postmodern condition people are navigating between and experimenting with multiple life mode communities. Some are weekend warriors, Harley riders in heavy leather, others are gender bending with alternative persona in chat rooms, and some are dancing ballroom in disguise in the clubs in Japan. “Construction of life mode communities will multiply the cultures of tastes, values, and realities” (p. 160). People are redesigning their body to look like Elvis, Barbie, or other celebrities. And the capitalist system is responding by allowing formerly passive spectator-consumers to now make designer-choices about life modes. Advertising is fragmenting to reach people experimenting in and sampling more or less temporary and transient life mode communities. In this way consumers are reclaiming the stage, taking on less passive forms of Spectacle Theater. It is as if spectacle, knowing there is the uncolonized festive space, is seeking to make spectacle into less passive forms of consumer participation.

The new marketing challenge is to accommodate temporary players, who want to experience, but not permanently inhabit a life mode. “The multiplicity of life mode cultures will, however, produce many alternative theaters of consumption that are indeed multidimensional ... shaped based on many diverse interests and considerations rather than solely on the reasons of economy or any other single purpose” (p. 158). This multidimensionality includes ecology, gender, economic, and fun. Go on an eco-tour to the rainforests with young singles if you can afford it.

The diffuse spectacle is colonizing the alternative life mode communities, privatizing every time and space, including mainstream and non-mainstream alternatives. This means that the diffuse spectacle is no less hegemonic than the concentrated apparatus of power, and perhaps more so. Festival is in retreat from both. What is different is that in diffuse spectacle, consumers are able to flow as temporary players and more engaged spectators in the fragmented and multidimensional theaters of consumption.

Festival remains one of the final frontiers of resistance to diffuse spectacle colonization of “free” spaces. As festive players seek to reclaim the stage from passive spectators and from celebrated corporate heroes, spectacle-producers counter by making its theaters more diffuse. While the concentrated spectacle rationalizes, centralizes, and standardizes consumption, the diffuse spectacle partitions the stage, opens up consumer participation, and allows for active experimentation. The life mode consumer gets to go back stage to be part of a wedding, go on stage to solve a mystery, or is free to sit in the audience with the other passive spectators. Everyone is a spectator and a player in the new theaters of fragmented life mode consumption and accumulation. But, as the diffuse spectacle engages in more flexible productions of theater, it also produces new life modes, disaggregating its former concentrated spectacles, into new modes. The World Wrestling Federation wrestlers are adopting the names of rappers and techno-DJs to attract young spectators.

New modes of consumption are being produced with more dynamic consumer involvement. Reconstructing life mode communities, and leaving

spaces for dynamic spectator engagement is the postmodern form of production and consumption. And it is in this way that diffuse spectacle colonizes festival, moving from universal massification strategies to tactics of co-design, until any line between producer and consumer choice is a blur. Yet even beneath the façade of diffuse spectacle, there are material roots and the usual suspects are assembled in remote lands to seat out the production. And the spectators, with the most dynamic involvement in self-designed role-playing, are an elite consumer, far removed from the mass of passive spectators.

As we fragment into multidimensional life modes, materialist spectacles fragment into eco-tourism, consumer-activism, spiritualism, and simplicity consultation. Within the diffuse spectacle, consumers are free to choose the veggie Mac in India or the Royale in London. Choosing the Ahimsa values of non-interference in the evolution of other species becomes just another fragmented market for organic foods, non-silk, and non-leather garments. In the diffusion, the biotech life mode communities are constructed by new species of plant, animal, insect, and human life (Rifkin, 1998). Altruistic corporations like the Body Shop, Ben and Jerry's and Tom's of Maine are also among the diffuse spectacles, marketing to fragmented consumer tastes.

The diffuse spectacle becomes the driving force of other evolutions and accommodations. In its development "irreconcilable claims crowd" the global stage as various products simultaneously evoke spectacle as an apologetic for their respective life mode projects, each claiming their product will make the individual, society, and planet happy. Ahimsa and violent forms of production and consumption merge into one another. "The spectacle of automobiles demands a perfect transport network which destroys old cities, while the spectacle of the city itself requires museum-areas" (#65).

In the diffusion of life mode spectacles, the claims to happiness cancel each other out. Fragmentation is closely associated with the diffuse spectacle, since the consumer experiences "only a succession of fragments of this commodity happiness, fragments in which the quality attributed to the whole is obviously missing every time" (#65). As in the concentrated spectacle, even the

consumer participating in producing his or her own product design, does not see the entire process, the roots of material production.

The Internet is one way to make consumers and producers of diffuse spectacles more aware of the material condition. The same systems of global communication (i.e. Internet, Cell phones, fax) can be used to make consumers and investors aware of how goods are made, who makes them, and the human and environmental consequences of diffuse spectacles. The Internet is replete with activists exposing multinational corporation exploits and multinational sites responding to questions being raised. There is oftentimes a good deal of disinformation on both fronts, making it difficult for consumers and investors to discern whose counter-evidence to believe. Each leaves out parts of the story.

Both the diffuse and the concentrated spectacle forms sell us “the image of the society happily unified by consumption” but the object made celebrity in the spectacle “becomes vulgar as soon as it is taken home by its consumer” (#69, 70). A self-designer, life mode constructor treks from situation to situation in search of happy consumption. In its image diffusion, the spectacle of production and consumption, “pseudo-histories are constructed at every level of consumption of life” (#200). Official history substitutes for the unified misery of human existence. In diffuse spectacles, we morph our history with corporate-produced history. Activists seek to fill in the blanks with the darker side of corporate history. And history itself takes the spotlight off the hero and lets each wealthy consumer be a star performer.

What lies beneath both the concentrated and the diffuse spectacle? Lift up the boards on the stage and there is a slaughterhouse. The factory methods of animal slaughter and sweatshop misery are spectacles beneath the stage.

Most commercial egg-laying hens in the United States are crowded in battery cages. In this system, four to five birds are packed into wire cages the size of a folded newspaper. The birds are unable to walk or even stretch their wings, and they are commonly confined for one to two years.

A spokesperson for Compassion in World Farming, an organization which has campaigned against battery cages for 30 years, stated, "Battery cages are the oldest and perhaps the cruelest of all the

factory farm systems... We are delighted that the European Parliament has voted against this system and we now look to the EU Agricultural Ministers to ensure this system is consigned to the Scrap-heap of history."<sup>1</sup>

Between the factories migrating to cheaper labor, the factory farms, and the consuming public is spectacle. Consumers see the food as it appears in the advertising and in its presentation at the Mall and supermarket. Consumers accumulate the designer choice options scripted into the commodified performance. The factory farmer and sweatshop owner looks to the price structures of the global marketplace. Between the factories and consumers, there are material conditions to which few people are sensitive or aware. This is kept back stage while the advertisers present quite a different image. And it is here where spectacle has yet to colonize, to make slaughterhouse one of the theme park attractions. It would be difficult to sustain animal-factory farming once consumers saw the graphic conditions of animal production next to the spectacle representations. To undermine factory farming, consumers need to become aware of and to openly question the necessity of violent methods of production. It would be difficult to sustain many forms of violence if people saw it up close and personal. The new war films seek to display the tragic rather than the romantic aspects. Life is beautiful, on the other hands, provides a comedic tale within the tragic spectacle of the Holocaust.

But, spectacle is also able to engage in the pedagogy of violence that makes gore and perversity a consumable. The new postmodern institutions are brutal forms of domination and the postmodern spectacular is enticed into modes of consumption that have the face of death. McClaren (1995) calls this "predatory culture," where celebrating violence has economic value. "Predatory culture is the great deceiver" (1995: 2). The postmodern spectacle of production and consumption makes the "bizarre appear normal." "Jeffrey Dahmer T-shirts are big sellers at heavy metal concerts..." We can give battered women says McLaren (p. 5) "empowering makeovers" or be empowered by Gacy voice recordings on a 900 number, up to the moment of his execution. We are

---

<sup>1</sup> Jain Meditation International email, April 7, 1999

reassured by our politicians, media, and Nintendo and Sony games that it is Ok to enjoy violence and find pleasure in human suffering. The paradox, therefore, is in the diffuse spectacle of disorganized capitalism, its ability to promote counterfeit desires.

As Baudrillard theorizes, the spectacle becomes the measure of authentic reality. “American television viewers are accepting a distorted picture of the real world ‘more readily than reality itself’” (McLaren, 1995: 9). In TV land people are trained to accept their own victimization. “Schools in predatory culture keep youth stupid” (p. 2). There are metal detectors in the schools, and the students are pulled into the surveillance mechanism. “Students are given rewards of \$50 if they turn in fellow classmates who bring guns to school” in Memphis (McLaren, 1995: 8). Giroux (1995: 29) says “critical educational theorists, are ... united in their attempts to empower the powerless and to transform social inequalities and injustices.” McLaren (1995: 23) puts it this way “we need to resituate the challenge of teaching as a task of empowering the powerless from states of dependency and passivity as both an informed movement for revolutionary social and economic transformation and as means of achieving what Brian Fay calls a ‘state of reflective clarity.’” The concentrated spectacle was easier to deconstruct than a diffuse spectacle that invites us to participate in predatory consumption.

And in the diffuse spectacle, we are told that we are empowered with more consumption choices, and more life mode construction choices. I see a need to balance the appreciation of co-design and co-production with an appreciation for an “empowering response to those historical conditions which have produced us as subjects, and to the ways we are inserted on a daily basis into the frontier of popular culture and existing structures of power” (McLaren, 1995: 21). Festival is the material form of empowerment; spectacle-empowerment makes us complicit in predatory culture.

What are festive choices in a spectacle world? The spectacle counters exposés by convincing consumers that the prices will rise and those alternatives to meat, milk, and egg products are not life sustaining. The spectacle says “the body demands its meat, its pound of flesh each day” and the “glamorous drink a

glass of milk each day.” Meat-vendors and vegetarians marshal their scientists and nutritionists to sway the public one way or the other. Vegetarians argue there is too much meat protein in the average diet; meat vendors’ claim that there is never enough and, that meat protein is superior to vegetable proteins. Yet “the surest way to avoid helping factory farming is to stop consuming its products” (Mason & Singer, 1980:132).

You can start by refusing to eat “milk-fed” veal offered in fancy restaurants, and gain-fed beef. Chance are the pork, poultry, eggs, and milk sold in your supermarket come from factory farms, so you should look for them elsewhere. If you feel that you must have these products, cut down on your intake and get them from an “organic,” “health,” or “natural” food sotry, or try one of the food co-ops in your area (Mason & Singer, 1980:132).

In Europe, in particular the Netherlands, consume demand for non-factory farmed products has grown to the point where imports to factory farm products are restricted, and local farmers are reverting to non-factory farm methods of production.

Another alternative to factory farm production is to turn vegetarian. I began by trying some vegetarian dishes each week, and then making the full turn, when I met the beautiful Grace Ann. Vegetarianism is a life style that moves our economy away from its dependency upon factory farming. A meatless diet contributes to making our global economy less dependent upon cattle production, which lessens the need to deplete the rainforests for feedlots. Try a veggie burger, it looks like meat, and if needed, you can pretend.

Debord posed one solution to the concentrated power of bureaucratic spectacle. He favored the concentration of economic power in “workers’ Councils which concentrate in themselves all the functions of decision and execution, and federate with each other by means of delegates responsible to the base and revocable at any moment” (#116). As Debord points out cooperative worker-governance was “quickly opposed and defeated by various defensive farces of class society” and workers’ Councils do pose their own special problems (#16). Like Marx, Debord held out the possibility of a worker revolution where power would be moved from the bureaucratic community to the

worker community. Mary Parker Follett had similar views on the transformative nature of worker's Cooperatives and industrial democracy. Yet, the history of labor managed firms is avoided in organization studies. It is time to reconstruct OB, OT, and OD and their images of organization and environment in accordance with worker-democracy and natured ecology. A democratic, labor managed firm, is a revolutionary organization in a landscape dominated by capital managed firms. An organization without division of labor is a realization of worker power over capital power, a triumph of workers' councils over managerial hierarchy. Yet, even worker power is insufficient to decolonize the everyday life of spectacles of predatory culture. What we know of labor managed firms (Luhman, 1999) is that democratic governance quickly turns into an imitation of the bureaucratic models of capital managed firms. And eco-capitalism reverts quickly to predatory capitalism. The revolutionary project of Marx did not happen. Worker democracy became worker participation and the wageworker was still without property.

In the concluding section we look at the relation of diffuse and concentrated spectacle to four dominant metaphor-models and images of organization.

**The Fifth World Hypothesis is Festivalism.** The question is how can we move beyond the concentrated and diffuse images of spectacle in organization theory to a situation of festival? Or, until then, how can we accentuate the festive gaps in an otherwise spectacle organization? Table One presents the four types of metaphors that have been used, most often, as spectacle images in organization theory. Understanding their spectacle nature is a prerequisite to identifying gaps and holes, and inner and outer situations of spectacle. Mechanistic, formistic, organistic, and contextualistic are the root metaphors of Stephen C. Pepper's (1942) four world hypotheses that I seen in spectacle relief.

Machine and formist (ideal type typologies centered on bureaucracy) images of organization have been the icons of the concentrated spectacle in formal organization theory. The organic and contextualist images are the representational icons of the more diffuse spectacle. I have added festival as a

fifth world hypothesis, or root-metaphor to seek situations outside these metaphors. The first four root metaphors have dominated the study and “images of organizations” since the mechanical apparatus of Hobbes’ Leviathan and Newton’s mechanistic science in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The world, society, human body, and mind were seen as machines within machines that could be controlled and scripted by human knowledge. Before and from time to time after the 17<sup>th</sup> century, people, nature, and techno systems were viewed in more organic terms. The universe for example was seen as a living organism, the organization also an organism, adapting and evolving to its habitat. Formism and contextualism are more difficult to explain, and we will unfold these in due course. But, my main point will be that each root metaphor is an ideological way of seeing the world (ontology) and a way of knowing (epistemology). And for Pepper certain metaphors were more adequate than others for constructing scientific hypotheses and truth claims about ontology and epistemology.

The fifth root metaphor category is festivalism, and includes postmodern storytelling, narrative, and theatrics that resists and coexists with the global spectacle of late capitalism in the other four representations. Pepper, I think would disagree with me, restricting festivalism to an act of metaphysics, unfit to be called legitimate science. I will now review Pepper’s four root metaphors and argue that festivalism is not only a fifth, it is essential to envisioning a post-spectacle theory of organizations. I rely on Lyotard’s (1984) juxtaposition of scientific and narrative knowing, to argue that a narratology of festival is yet another, to me, adequate way of doing social science.

**Table One: Root Metaphors**

<p><b>MECHANISTIC</b> – Hobbes Leviathan - Lawfully ordered configuration of parts.  Radios, stereos, televisions, video cameras, VCRs as metaphors of human organization.  Telephones, cellular phones, and computers as metaphors of organizations.  Carriages, trains, automobiles, trucks, ships, spaceships, moon-walkers, and robot metaphors.  Abacus, slide rules, calculators, computers (hardware, software, performance programs)  Army – land machines (catapults, cannons, tanks, rockets)  Air Force – flying machines (jets, air transport, missiles)  Navy – floating machines (battleships, submarines, aircraft carriers, missiles)  Marines – Carry machines and get carried by machines (swords, rifles, machine guns)  Factory – assembly (automobile, guns) and disassembly lines (slaughterhouse)  Office – scissors, stapler, pencil, calendar, notepad, file cabinet, desk, fan, air conditioner</p>
<p><b>ORGANISTIC</b> – Henri Fayol corporate body with divisions representing the branches of the growing tree.  Body fragments results in nexus and organic wholes  Body corporate – manage nerve centers, manager is brain, worker is hand and foot, organs are functions, divisions are branches of the tree. Cells of body corporate are men and women, management is the nerve center, the chief executive is the head, the thinking organ. The whole organization is a living tree, a living animal, the body corporate.</p>
<p><b>FORMISTIC</b> – Max Weber’s ideal types of bureaucracy, feudalism, and charismatic organization.  Classification and blueprint growth, from entrepreneurial seed to blossoming corporation and from entrepreneur to feudal, charismatic, or Weber’s preference, the bureaucratic form.  Taxonomies: Weberian ideal types (bureaucracy, feudalism, and charisma).  Embedded forms (corporation, prison, school, hospital, dorm-hotel-barracks, and workhouse-sweatshop) stacked inside one another like Chinese boxes.  Blueprint: the acorn will grow into an Oak tree; the life cycle has its stages; forms grow into other types of forms (entrepreneur-partnership-cooperative-corporation-virtual knowledge organization)</p>
<p><b>CONTEXTUALISTIC</b> – Systems – open and closed, fixed and permeable boundaries, macro and micro systems, molecular and molar systems, and systems of systems. Other forms like organic and mechanistic seen in a defining context.  Quality (spread, change and fusion of action); Texture (strands, contexts, referents of action)  Quality: process flows, action networks, changes in course, fused action.  Texture –trace strands of action sequences, follow chains of events, embedded contexts of action, if there is a block move around it, till another block is encountered  History – unfolds into the present, can follow it as it unfolds around us.  Embedded – body embedded in team, team in organization, organization in local milieu, niche in environmental system, environmental system in global system, global in cosmos.</p>
<p><b>FESTIVALISTIC</b> - Decolonize macro-political, economic, social (race, gender) and ideological contexts blurred in spectacle. Spectacles have ideological footprints, which can be traced and uprooted in festival. Festival co-exists with and interpenetrates spectacles of production and consumption.</p>

I think Pepper’s project exiled festival and any other narrative ways of knowing (the last strata above) as unfit for the normal science ways of knowing. I seek to amend his dismissive and dogmatic rejection. . I shall argue here that festivalism is different from contextualism and the other root-metaphors of Pepper’s (1942) model, as summarized in Table Two.

**Table Two: Pepper's Four World Hypotheses**

Dimensions	Analytical Theories	Synthetic Theories
Dispersive Theories	<p><u>Formism</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Root Metaphor: Similarity</li> <li>2. Explanation: order and function are real; disorder and dysfunction unreal or exceptions.</li> <li>3. Exemplars: Plato, Aristotle</li> <li>4. Categories:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Immanent Formism - Theories of ideal types and classifications</li> <li>• Transcendent Formism - Blueprint growth models; ideal plans.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Truth Theory: Correspondence - Mirror theory from metaphor to reality.</li> </ol>	<p><u>Contextualism</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Root Metaphor: Historic Event in the present.</li> <li>2. Explanation: Only horizontal theory; focus on change and novelty in the unfolding immediate event.</li> <li>3. Exemplars: Pragmatists like Pierce, James, Bergson, Dewey &amp; Mead</li> <li>4. Categories:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality (spread, change, &amp; fusion)</li> <li>• Texture( strands, contexts, referents)</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Truth Theory: Operationalism - verifiable hypotheses and working theories.</li> </ol>
Integrative Theories	<p><u>Mechanism</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Root Metaphor: Machine</li> <li>2. Explanation: Elements are parts in a mechanistic, spacio-temporal framework.</li> <li>3. Exemplars: Descartes, Galileo, Hobbes, Locke, Hume, Berkeley &amp; Reichenbach.</li> <li>4. Categories:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Configuration of parts</li> <li>• Lawfully ordered</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Truth Theory: Causal Adjustment - Abstract general terms and formulae.</li> </ol>	<p><u>Organicism</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Root Metaphor: Integration</li> <li>2. Explanation: Historic events are steps in organic process toward ideal progress (thesis-antithesis-synthesis of Hegel).</li> <li>3. Exemplars: Hegel, Schelling, Green, Bradley, Bosanquet &amp; Royce.</li> <li>4. Categories: Fragments result in nexuses, leading to contradictions, and an organic whole</li> <li>5. Truth Theory: Coherence - each level of integration resolves contradictions of the levels below.</li> </ol>

**Mechanistic** is the root metaphor of the machine and the essential image of the concentrated spectacle. With the invention of various technologies, planetary citizens developed new cosmologies where that technology was the essential lens. Mechanistic spectacle is easy to observe. When industrial revolution took off, the Modern Times factory became the dark side of this spectacle while the utopias wrought by robotic manufacture continue to pose the light side of this force. When the computer was invented for the World War II war machine, it became the lens on systems of organization. Now that the World Wide Web is invented, it is the new worldview, the new mechanic's utopia. With

Biotech inventions, animals and plants became engineered machines of production. There will be yet another technology, and it will be the new mechanistic lens, with its dark and light sides. Mechanism is usually found in realism with organicism.

With each wave of techno device, its mechanical engineers are legitimated to socially engineer and reengineer the firm based upon the latest mechanistic science. Organization theory (OT) has spend the last fifty years trying to convince us that we should move from a mechanistic to an organic root metaphor. And presented it as if Burns and Stalker (1961, 1966, 1994) had evolved an organic rationality, when Fayol (1916) had invented and disseminated it decades before. Burns and Stalker's (1961) mechanistic-organic duality is the foundation, the very cornerstone of contingency theories that persist even now, by which managers choose between one or the other form depending upon environmental uncertainty/turbulence, technological complexity, size of the firm, and other "variables." Mechanistic fallacy, confusing human organization with machines and organic fallacy, confusing it with trees, remains epidemic in organization study. In recent formulations we look at mechanistic and organic as co-defining discourses, happening together, or sequentially, but we do not see them as spectacle.

**Formistic** models of organization can be seen in the ideal type forms of Max Weber and as a second concentrated spectacle. Not just bureaucracy, but the feudal and charismatic forms of authority concentrated control into a hierarchical elite. At the center of Weber's model is the capitalist entrepreneur, who decides between three ideal types: bureaucratic, feudal, and charismatic. And the charismatic, like the entrepreneur is an unstable form, most likely, says Weber, to become or to revert to feudal or bureaucratic. Weber prefers the rational aesthetics of bureaucratic forms to the unsettling antics of feudal nobles and charismatic religious leaders. For some odd reason, OT has elected to ignore the feudal and charismatic in order to treat bureaucracy as just another machine metaphor that can be juxtaposed against organic. For Pepper (1942) formistic also encompasses blueprint growth models, form succession from the

acorn to the tree. Life cycle and life stage models of organizations are based upon the fallacy of form succession, form evolution. Theorizing organizations as natural evolution, as life cycles and form transplants has led us to ignore spectacle, the creative invention of form and its coevolutionary agency. The spectacle showing and telling of the evolution-narrative sustains a telos of unfoldment. The taxonomies of so many similar and different forms, even this taxonomy, I now rewrite, presents a logic of logics, a rationality of rationalities.

**Organic Spectacle** The image of an organic enterprise (body corporate) began as a concentrated spectacle but has taken on more diffuse, networked, and variegated manifestations in late capitalism. Its concentrated rendition began when Henri Fayol (1916: 70) based his fourteen commandment-principles of management and his five basic managerial functions on an organic metaphor of the firm (the living tree), the spectacle of production morphed with the commandments of nature. He saw employees and managers as the “constituent elements of the body corporate” and visualized his division of labor principle as an element in organic evolution. Fayol reasoned that as organizations grew, organs appeared in the body corporate. He held the same is true of societies: “As society grows, so new organs develop destined to replace the single one performing all functions in the primitive state” (1916: 20). The principle, “unity of direction” meant “a body with two heads is in the social as in the animal sphere a monster, and has difficulty in surviving” (1916: 25). “Like division of work, centralization belongs to the natural order” (p. 33). Fayol repeatedly conflates nature and organization to leave OT with the organic legacy. He gives the example of planning based on “plant life” where “in the realm of growth there spring from the single trunk branches which spread out and grow leaves, and the sap brings life to all branches, even the slenderest twigs, just as higher authority transmits activity right down to the lowest and farther extremities and farthest extremities of the body corporate” (p. 58). His application of plant and animal metaphor is the basis of his text and the cornerstone for contemporary population ecology theory:

Man in the body corporate plays a role like that of the cell in the animal, single cell in the case of the one-man business, thousandth or millionth part of the body corporate in the large-scale enterprise” (1916: 58).

Men (and I assume women) to Fayol, were cells, departments were functional organs, and the organization was the organic whole, evolving, varying, selecting, and retaining progressively more perfected (progressive) forms. Organs included shareholders, boards of director, department managers, superintendents, foremen, and operatives. “The nervous system in particular bears close comparison with the managerial function” (p. 59). As organization became legitimated in a narrative of natural evolution, a crisis in OT has surfaced. What evolves is due to the agency of natural laws of selection and evolutionary progress and not to the agency of social production and consumption, by evolution, and not by the agency of spectacle design. Coevolution is a recent change in our thinking about evolution.

Biological theorists, Herbert Spencer in 1910 called the kind of theorizing I just revealed in Fayol, the “biological fallacy” (Hodgkinson, 1996: 41). But, Spencer would associate evolution of nature/humans to commerce in very violent ways. Spencer, as we shall see, not Darwin coined the term “survival of the fittest” and he was quite concerned that people did not interfere with the violent treatment of the poor or nature in the dawn of the Industrial Revolution. He thought anyone rich was fit to survive and anyone poor had to struggle and perish in order to enrich the quality of the human race.

Work by Best and Kellner (1999: 17) agrees with my position that OT continues to endorse biological fallacy, when now complexity, chaos and cybercapitalism theorists “wrongly dissolve the boundaries between natural and social systems.” Coevolution theory reasserts the boundaries and interrelationships between human, machine, nature and I think spectacle systems.

In OT the organic metaphor becomes a spectacle and gets in the way of seeing nature and power; we have been taught since Fayol that organizations evolve like trees, animals, and other living species; there is no need to look at

power, exploitation or hegemony. The analogy of organizations to just nature-evolution, survival of the fittest, is I think wholly misleading and needs to be deconstructed for what it is, a legitimating narrative for the status quo of power and domination of the rich against the poor. Organizations are not the fulfillment of natural laws of evolution; they are, to artificially contrived realities, not just living species, not just organic or natural systems, but coevolution. Nor, do I see technology as an evolving natural system (Kelly, 1998). This is also imploding the distinctions between human and techno systems. Organizations are agents, producing, organizing, and consuming spectacles for the spectators. To say otherwise is to invoke the fallacies of a pseudo-science and biological fantasy.

I view organizations as diffuse spectacles, not just evolutions of nature, not subjects of the laws of nature, but disrupters of nature. It is a matter of coevolution of spectacle with biotic nature, technology, and human beings. The metaphysical and ontological mistake in OT is to confuse a transition in spectacle fashion with the conditions of organizational evolution. This is not to say that spectacle are not composed, in part of species. Humans and plants are species, and no doubt they do coevolve, but this does not mean that an organization or even a population of organization evolves, in some kind of exclusively natural space. An organization can enact a spectacle that gets imitated by a population of organizations, but this does not make the mimicry natural evolution; it is fashion that changes how other systems coevolve. This book explores much fallacy inherent in the idea of organizational biology, the most basic assumption of organizational scholarship.

Collingwood (1993), in his lectures 1926-1928, argued that history, even organizational history, is not evolution or biology. Evolution, he argues “abolishes one specific form to create another” (1993: 25). Organization is merely the fashion of present day spectacle, and past fashions played out on the global stage of the present moment. The confusion between evolution and coevolution stems from a false identification of organization and management with the natural processes of evolution instead of the dance of interplay among different systems. The spectacle is a different process; one by which organizations (collections of

people) create a script that constitutes material, ontological existence. The discourse in OT on organizational evolution keeps OT from penetrating the agency and mystery of spectacular organization.

**Contextualistic** The root-metaphor for contextualism is “historic event ... alive in the present” (Pepper, 1942: 232). Like organic, this is a more diffuse image of spectacle. This comes close to story, but is quite different. In contextualism, change, complexity, novelty, in more recent versions, even chaos unfold in the immediate present. Pragmatist philosophers, in particular James, Dewey, and Pierce focus upon the lived experience, in which change and novelty are a given (Pepper, 1942: 234-5). We are caught up in intrinsic complexity, interconnected networks of events with “continuously changing patterns” (p. 233). Each event has a structural (or semiotic) order to be explored and a network of diffuse strands to be traced. What are the textures and qualities that link the context of the organization to its current circumstance? What happens when a linear strand is blocked? If an instrumental strand (means) that extends to a terminal strand (ends) is blocked, it requiring some kind of instrumental action take place, in acts of non-linearity. One action-option is to investigate the block to see how it can be unblocked, to neutralize the block (switch and go around, under, or over), or incorporate the block into a more complicated instrumental strand. This represents the total texture of an event network. Pepper traces its strands to the hunter story. The hunter moves around obstacles, such as boulders in the stream, to trace the path of his quarry.

Contextualism models are represented in the systems theory approach of organization theory. Fred and Merrelyn Emery (1993), for example, adopt contextualism metaphors as fundamental to any knowledge of organizations and its interactions with an environment that is everywhere turbulent since the 1960s. Other theorists focus on complexity, transformation, and chaos theories. Contextualism is viewed by Fred and Marilyn Emery, as foundational to open systems and ecological adaptation theories (M. Emery, 1994: 2; 1997: 11). But, these are not theories of coevolution, rather the organization adapts to its “turbulent” environment. Russ Ackoff and Fred Emery (1972) attempted to

theorize a model of man that broke away from the “man-as-machine,” as well as the organic systems models (Emery F. 1977: 69). Working from a contextualist paradigm, they theorize the whole system as changing over time (toward turbulence), and this changling is considered knowable through an extended analysis of a series of historic events within the changing context of the whole system and environment. As M. Emery (1997: 11) puts it, with contextualism, there is “... the possibility of active adaptation. If all systems are open to their environment and if the people within them can directly extract meaningful information from, and learn about it, there is constant change and the possibility of purposeful designed change.”

Systems theory, along this lineage, to me, implodes differences between nature, machine, human, and spectacle systems. The implosion sees everything as just systems embedded in other systems. People are defined as purposeful systems “living and working within larger systems which function as task and learning environments” (M. Emery, 1994: 3). From here the learning or knowledge organization metaphor fits into a story of a transforming environment, rich in novelty, and just another embedded system.

Contextualism, as a diffuse spectacle, differs from concentrated spectacle in several ways. First, the conception of time is non-linear, but not relativistic. In diffuse spectacle, fragments of narrative and theatric are grasped together or emploted in ways that script organizational behavior back into linear time, camouflaging other time perspectives. While the respective scripts can posit linear ascension of an organization and project a linear pathway for its future, these are scripts of history. Second, the theory of space for the contextualist is a tourist journey, not a journey of festive-agency or coevolution.

The critiques of poststructuralists, postmodernists, and critical theorists disinvest organization theory of the biological metaphor by refusing to implode differences between system types. Third the theory of history in contextualism is seen as spectacle. In contextualism history is confused with natural organic-evolutionary-process.

History is defined as an agreed consensus among the most popular textbook writers. So much so, that Steve Robbins (1997) for example, the writer of the most widely selling management textbooks, has gone so far as to locate the historical review of organizations, the contribution founding fathers Fayol and Weber, and founding mother Mary Parker Follett into his appendix. Students, I surmise from Robbins, are more interested in spectacle-illusion than history. As Robbins (1997) explains "students' interest in history is minimal" (1997: xvii); "students want material they can apply on their jobs" (p. xvii); "Students want to know what works and what doesn't... They are not interested in the details of research, the historical evolution of our knowledge, or long discourses on competing ideas" (p. xvii). The word evolution when applied to knowledge is to me a signal of spectacle in action. In the main text, Robbins writes a more contemporary history, one that will appeal to our pragmatic, career students. As Robbins (1997) puts it: "The majority of workers have entered the contingent workforce" (p. 23) and are becoming knowledge workers in the knowledge organizations of our global knowledge community. In short the text celebrates spectacle uncritically.

The best selling organization theory textbook is by Richard Daft in its multiple editions. Daft's (1998) edition of his organization theory textbook starts with a chart summarizing a book I did with Robert Dennehy (1993), Managing in the Postmodern World. The chart he develops is Toffler's Second Wave of industrialism compared to the third Wave of Post-industrialism, with some postmodern elements thrown in. This is the most popular narrative of organizational history, from first, to second, and third wave, with the third wave cresting from service to knowledge organization. It is the celebration of the spectacle of production and consumption progress, like Robbins, an uninterrupted progressive evolution. Daft does not acknowledge it, but he is making a strange-connection between two very different ideas of history, a Narrative Metaphor (postmodern) and a Contextualist Metaphor (Transformation from wave to wave).

**Festivalistic Options** Festival decolonizes these four types of spectacle. Festival is a reversal of spectacles within the global community of organizations that transform life into fragmented and artificial appearances. Festivalism continues to coexist in the heart of spectacle forms, be they mechanistic, organistic, contextualistic, or formistic. Festivalism somehow celebrates life capitalism in this midst of predatory capitalism. In this way festivalism represents one hope that non-violent behaviors can permeate more violent spectacles of production and consumption. The simplicity and Ahimsa movements are examples where consumers are refusing to purchase products with predatory origins.

---

<sup>i</sup> Numbers refer to paragraph numbers in Guy Debord's La Société du Spectacle, first published in 1967 by Editions Buchet-Chastel (Paris); it was reprinted in 1971 by Champ Libre (Paris). The first English translation was published by Black & Red in 1970. It was revised in 1977, incorporating numerous improvements suggested by friends and critics of the first translation.