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A tragic paper in two parts, of somewhat unequal length, in which the protagonists resolve to exercise currently accepted academic conventions of writing but who discover, too late, the seductions of digression and all that TAT resulting in a deleterious situation in which they end up at the beginning-writing florid prefaces in deference to Borges, Lem, Calvino, Pynchon, Eco et al., in the hope of novel ‘theory’.
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Part 1: From Motivation to Motorvation: An Introduction to TAT

In sickness and health Buchanan and Huczynski seem forever wedded to Organizational Behaviour - to its future and past, presumably till death do them part. Welcome to the world of hucbuc. It has become a multi-media phenomena that extends its estate, at the latest count, to a fourth edition, although the time is perhaps not that far off when it will make little sense to talk in terms of ‘editions’ and the definitive, bounded volume. We may well ask if the teaching of “hucbuc Organizational Behaviour” is fated to become a continuous broadcast channel, a seamless background hum whose peaks and troughs of activity are perfectly calibrated to accommodate the financial rhythms and attention span of the undergraduate student? Now published by the global media empire Pearson Education, outreach, growth, market penetration, and crossover tie-in sales, can all certainly be expected to increase. Whilst the authors names have yet to equal the font size of their subject, unlike Gidden’s standard blockbuster introductory text in Sociology, Buchanan and Huczynski are becoming synonymous with Organizational Behaviour. Despite the asymmetry between their name and its object, however, everyone knows where they stand in relation to this text; signifier and signified are instantaneously reconciled in that ritualised speech act heard at the beginning of the academic term, ‘So, will you be using Buchanan and Huczynski’?

Colleagues who have little or no reading in Organizational Behaviour will undoubtedly be able to cite this text, and modules designed for non-specialists, or courses offered on post-experiential and post-graduate generalised management degrees, the MBA - for example, are more often than not built around the structure and material of hucbuc. Indeed, there are those who find it almost impossible to teach up to 340 first year undergraduate students without the assistance of the Buchanan and Huczynski. The solid 500 grams of its quarto gloss, sealed in its regal Rotolito Lombarda binding, together with the Herculean 916 pages of text, offers security and reassurance, a Winnicottian ‘transitional object’ between the classroom and the research site, or the library and the blank screen of the writers anxiety. Its coverage of the discipline is extraordinarily comprehensive and exhaustive in range, providing an impressive dictionary and standard reference to the ‘monumentalised’ history of Organizational Behaviour, a his-story which these authors, it may be argued, conspire to maintain and reproduce (see Nietzsche, 1874). Yet, in this paper chase here, we will have become increasingly confused about the space and time of hucbuc, the definition and boundary of its play, as we become motorvated by the germinal flux of its migratory délire that works to disturb the supervision of organization. It may be that we will need to learn to thank them for this service to the margins.

Whilst apparently speaking about Huczynski and Buchanan, we are writing on behalf of motorvation, and for this we must collectively risk the
Chrysology. The peculiar ‘logic’ of crisis, or the critical as the *krisis* (of a) turning (point). For Derrida, Plato attempts to keep open this space of/for the critical in his writings, which stage, or *play* at taking play seriously, which always, necessarily, risks getting out of hand. One must *court* the paradoxical or the aporetic in that risk which maintains critique, which reserves the possibility of bringing forth the new.

Stop and Criticize

experiment of ‘chrysology’ out of which this parasitical paper is produced. A strange doubling-becoming of hucbuc will be seen to overtake this paper (O’Doherty, 2002). Here, logic has a tendency to run away with itself, to spiral out of control, and *in extremis* producing what are apparently mutant strains of being and sense. It is seductive and elusive, and yet we can never be entirely sure of that logic in which we are enrolled, nor where it might lead. Yet, what kind of logic, or motivation, does it take to sit down and carefully read over 900 pages of a student textbook whilst ostensibly studying the question of the pleasure of periphery and/or the malady of marginality?

In part 1 of this paper we endeavour to trace out the motivation and conditions of possibility for these political questions as we explore the study of TAT. The ‘thematic apperception test’ is generally understood to have been designed to extract elements of personality in order to provide management with information that will help them make more informed and effective decisions about the selection, deployment, and use of labour in organization. However, we rapidly arrive at the reef of an ‘archive fever’ which propels or *projects* us back to our point of departure - Huczynski and Buchanan – providing a *certain* orientation in which it becomes possible to raise the question and consider the authority and reliability of their introduction to Organization Behaviour. This return evokes and allows us to ask the question about centrality, and that *work of centering*, performed, and achieved by hucbuc. At the same time, this return to conditions of possibility inaugurates conditions of impossibility. In circling back to their text we begin to suspect the duplicity of centres and margins as the material and ‘content’ of its organization begins to lose position, regularity, and order. It becomes another form of ‘tat’. We find hucbuc becomes an auto-generative, disseminating machine, discharging the elements of organization into a shower of *tattered* fragments and shards as we, too, find ourselves in danger of becoming elemental and disaggregated. We begin to fear that there is no escape from hucbuc, that it is observing and measuring us, a system of silent surveillance, that we have not ‘returned’, or maybe there was nothing we left so that there is nothing to return to. Have we become hucbuc? Are we becoming-tat? Here we are becoming *motorvated* as all around us tat begins to (de)form – and this is only an introduction – yet, as part 2 goes on to elaborate in greater detail, perhaps here lies a different chance to engage the complex dynamics of centre-ing/de-centering, and the space to review and challenge inclusion/exclusion.

Motivating Political Questions: In Search of TAT, April 2002

Sufficiently motivated, as we were that day, we sat down to read *Organization Behaviour*, only to discover a whole series of exclusions, defacements, and oversights; but, as we will go on to elaborate, this discovery is impossible without a certain risk, and, moreover, cost to one’s health. In part because motivation is always-already poised on the edge of a *motorvation*. For those who are prepared to *come after* organization studies (cf.: Jones and Surman, 2002), and perhaps more so for those *tympanising*
inside-outside organizational analysis, it will be found that we owe our discoveries to the conjunction of a mirror and an encyclopaedia, a **conjunction** that coincided with the **split and dispersal** of the knowing-subject. Like the narrator of ‘Tlon, Uqbar, Orbis Tertius’ (Borges, 1970), this mirror ‘troubled the depths’ of a corridor doubling as an academic office in the School of Management on East Booth Street in Manchester, UK, mirrors which led us astray down academic labyrinths equivalent to the infamous library of Babel (cf.: Case, 1999). These mirrors open up the ruptural strife that invites us to *think* the complicity and even asymmetrical volatility of a simultaneous conjunction and disjunction of centre and margin, a space rather like those ‘phantasms’ of thought which Deleuze explores, and which, moreover, *defy* thinking and cognitive settlement.

*Here*, the text falls open on page 163 of Huczynski and Buchanan. *There*, we came across David Clarence McClelland and Henry Alexander Murray, authors and progenitors of **TAT**. *Here-there, here-now, now-here* (nowhere): this is what we mean by tympanising space(ing), an agitation tripped off by accidents and chance, random juxtapositions, or the seemingly fortuitous encounter of incongruous phenomena, setting in train something like a penumbral and resonant standing-wave that benumbs and fascinates those who come too close to **TAT**, **those who come after organization**. Charged up by motorvation the mundane fabric of organization begins to unravel and irradiate out in fragments, splinters and shards, an irruption that recalls Deleuze and Guattari’s (1984:46) *becoming-molecular*, becoming that yields access to what they call the ‘non-personal hylé’. Organization becomes **TAT** in ways that suspend the possibility of definition. We enter a region where we are no longer able to distinguish the significant from the insignificant, the profound from the banal, the sacred from profane. ‘Here’ we are given chance to explore a ‘superior-empiricism’, to research subterranean and occluded relations, micromovements, dynamics, associations, interactions, and interference patterns, that work and **unwork** organization and its reproduction.

As so-called ‘specialists’ in organization studies, we were initially humbled and embarrassed by our lack of any knowledge pertaining to the research and practice of **TAT** and feared that this might be, to some degree, the product of our own resistance and repressions. To work within the tympanum demands a preparedness to unearth and excavate what Klossowski calls in his remarkable 1969 study of Nietzsche, the *valetudinary states* that mark a line of flight that opens up by way of ‘*assimilating other consciousness to himself so as to flee the destruction of his own*’ (Klossowski, 1997:121; emphasis in original). We felt compelled then, driven or motorvated, to push the boundaries of our own **unknowing** with the sense that this might yield to the possibility of critical and creative-organization-insights. We had both taught from Huczynski and Buchanan, so how come **TAT** seemed new to us? Oversight? Ignorance? A certain degree of blindness? Moreover, as time progressed **TAT** seemed to exercise an uncanny, yet significant, if oblique, influence on the development of our understanding and writing on orthodox motivation theory (Herzberg, 1968; Lawler *et al*., 1998; Ritchie and Martin, 1999).
Intrigued by these possibilities, and still motivated by our inaugural question concerning exclusions and centring, we first noted how rapidly and easily, in our quest to understand TAT, we began to transgress the normative and highly typical chapter boundaries reproduced in *Organizational Behaviour*. The ordering of material into chapters resembles the exercise of boundary making which acts through economy and abbreviation to order phenomena which is always-already in danger of becoming mobile, mutable, and intractable (cf.: Heidegger, 1977). It is in this sense that Huczynski and Buchanan might be said to reproduce the conventional order and divisions in the teaching and research of organizational behaviour. TAT is assigned to chapter 5, which outlines the contribution of studies in personality to an understanding of organization, whereas motivation theory is installed in its own chapter, namely chapter 8. Convinced that we were beginning to open up established thinking in motivation theory, in potentially critical and innovative ways, we took off from Huczynski and Buchanan and pressed on with our endeavours to excavate the archives and histories of TAT. Determined to fill the gaps in our understanding of the thematic apperception test we began to trace its exclusions and hidden histories, the forgotten and marginalised that have been casualties in the construction and representation of the subject. We sought the discipline of systematic, scholarly and archival research, but found that chance and the play of serendipity became greater allies in our quest.

**TAT: Archive Fever**

The thematic apperception test is consistently defined in the literature as a projective personality test. At least this much we can be certain. In addition, most authorities agree that in the execution and performance of TAT the subject of the experiment is first told that they are going to take a test for creative writing (McClelland et al, 1976; see also Janda, 1998). They are then shown a series of pictures or photographs for which they must write a story. What were these pictures and what is their significance for understanding the development of TAT and the role it comes to play in organization behaviour? We delved deeper into the archives.

Amongst the archive of pictures used in TAT, one finds a drawing of Yehudi Menuhin as a young child staring at what appears to be his violin; in another a little boy is sitting on the doorstep of an old mountain cabin. In what is archived as ‘picture C’, we find an image of a young woman looking feint and holding onto a section of a wall with her right arm stood outside the door of what might be a bedroom, through which we see a young man slumped, fully clothed, on the bed. The caption of the original illustration by Pruett Carter, which appeared in the September 1931 issue of *Woman’s Home Companion*, reads “Why did I marry him?” she said, dazed. “Why?”

This was erased from Christina Morgan’s pen and ink rendering, ironic since she herself has been deleted from the official history of the invention of TAT - as reproduced in Huczynski and Buchanan, where we read that TAT was invented by Henry Murray (cf.: McClelland, 1961; Morgan,
The significance and contribution of these pictures to the evolution and operation of TAT remains shrouded in obscurity and reach us now much like the hieroglyphs and cave-drawings must have done for scholars of times past. What we have to confess is that we do not know the precise role or function of these pictures nor the methodological procedure to be applied when administering them. Equally unclear is the interpretative technique one should adopt in reading candidates’ narratives written in response to the images.

It slowly dawned on us that we would be in danger of losing all manageable boundaries and research definition if we were to extend our research and open up the debate about the reliability and predictive accuracy of the test itself in an attempt to find justification for its apparent exclusion. The possibility of any horizontal limit would be cast into serious doubt here; perhaps it would be rendered permanently damaged, to become eternally elusive, forever condemned to a fugitive career. However, and in brief, let us say, at least for now, that these pictures seem to be reproductions designed to assess something called ‘personality’, specifically, to measure the extent to which the examinee harbours a high ‘need for achievement’. The stories and descriptions produced by the subject are supposed to disclose the dominant drives, sentiments, emotions, conflicts and complexes of ‘their’ ‘personality’. It must be remarked, however, that there is even confusion about what this test is actually meant to elicit or demonstrate. For Huczynski and Buchanan (2001:163), TAT is designed to gain ‘access to the content of someone’s mind’; yet Schatz (1999) tells us that it is meant to ‘elicit fantasy material from patients in psychoanalysis’. Others argue that TAT is designed to measure all motivational needs, but as time passes the archives begin to resemble labyrinths, replete with inconsistency, contradiction, false trails and incompletion. The more we unearthed the addenda, the postscripts and footnotes, the more we uncovered a history of elision and exclusion, a cauldron of ‘my-stories’ and biographies bubbling just below the surface of textbook history. Mystery, then, instead of history. Increasingly, we begin to suspect that we only know that we do not know.

We began to fear that what we do know becomes indistinguishable from what we do not know, where the malady of marginality and the pleasure of the periphery is the centre, or the space(ing) of the becoming centre/margin.

One such story of exclusion is that of the role of Christina Morgan in the invention of TAT. Morgan (1999), apparently no relation, in her archival research, finds more than a hint of suspicion that Christina Morgan was of greater centrality to the development of TAT than orthodox histories of the subject reveal. This promised a narrative of the excluded other, the ‘other’ being that doyen of revisionist history, the marginalisation of women and the feminine. Possibilities began to appear: the over-valorisation of the conscious, the rational and intellect - at the expense of the body, the unconscious, the fluid and uncontrollable (Dale and Burrell, 2000; Linstead, 2000). It would also provide us with a target for critique – men and the persistent masculine hegemony in academic scholarship. That would undoubtedly secure popularity and support amongst the ‘critters’ of critical
management studies and contemporary innovators in organization theory. Yet, that research which debates the genealogy of TAT cannot agree about authorship and patronage. Moreover, one finds that these debates become ever more convoluted and arcane as they extend across a number of journals and publications including The TAT Newsletter, the Henry A. Murray papers housed in the Harvard University Archives, the Journal of Personality Assessment, the American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, the Smithsonian, and the American Psychologist.

There is a lively debate in the literature, for example, about the identity of one of the young boys in the TAT illustrations. Murray (1971) reproduces a photograph by Nancy Post Wright with the title ‘Mr. Abe Lincoln, Jr.’. However, Morgan (1995) enters into an extended dialogue with Hurley (1989), and Neace (1989), in a remarkable effort to identify the boy, which leads her to consult over 17,000 Farm Security Administration photographs and open correspondence with a Mrs Wolcott and a number of school teachers who were also photographed during the same assignment. In addition, Morgan interviews a number of residents of Jackson, Kentucky (where the ‘original’ photograph of “Mr. Abe Lincoln, Jr.” was taken) in her research about the origins and history of the Thematic Apperception Test. Whilst the identity of the young boy remains in some doubt, Morgan does confirm that the photographer was in fact not Nancy Post Wright but the American photographer Marion Post. However, Marion was known to use her married name, Marion Post Wolcott, which might have been the cause of some confusion.

We have not even begun to consider the thousands of web pages that are increasing by the day, adding further confusion and doubt about the authenticity of certain accounts and interventions. The status of reported fact, and indeed knowledge itself, is thrown into serious crisis as truth comes closer to fabulation and invention and as an ever-greater number of researchers pore over the literature and archives of scholarship. Indeed, when ‘truth’ surpasses fiction for incredulity and astonishment we begin to lose all distinction and division between fact and fiction (Bok, 2002).

Setting out from Huczynski and Buchanan’s Organization Behaviour we were now entering a most strange, disorientating world, a realm of apparent Disorganizing Misbehaviour. At first we thought we had departed from a reliable centre and had somehow been cast adrift into the margins of organization. Anxious, we wanted to relocate our centre. Increasingly lost, perhaps we needed to return home and take another look at our point of departure: Huczynski and Buchanan. Yet, why did we assume its authority and centrality? How had their text come to assume such veracity and legitimacy? How come it had opened up such an infinite regress of archival fever? Were we just unlucky? Let’s retrace our steps and try to start again.

Organizational Behaviour: An Introductory Text, January 2003

In thinking through the question of marginality in contemporary organization studies one is immediately struck by the apparent
contradiction between its multiplicity of diverse theoretical developments and the distending mass-market homogenisation of its product for the purposes of teaching and research summary. Reading through the textbooks and journals one might be excused, however, for reflecting that *plus ca change, plus ca la même chose*. Following the collapse of the liberal and marxist grand-narratives, accompanied by increasing suspicion about the value of abstract empiricism and positivist science, more and more specialist journals have emerged to cater for a dehiscence of epistemological and ontological diversity, more and more of it in organizational analysis self-consciously playful and experimental. In retrospect, Burrell and Morgan’s 1979 paradigm framework might be seen as a last gasp effort to provide some organization and order for a discipline that has become far from disciplinary (cf.: Grant and Oswick, 1996). In the wake of this proliferating fragmentation, coupled with the expansion of student numbers in higher education, it is little wonder that there is a demand for the compendium volume that can survey, overview (supervise), and summarise.

It is in the context of these conditions that the rolling conflux of editions of the Buchanan and Huczynski textbook, *Organizational Behaviour: An Introductory Text* have enrolled and flourished. No doubt the text is not simply a beneficiary of these emergent conditions but rather is an interested and active participant in its prosperity and reproduction. Without fear of exaggeration we can say that since the first publication in 1985, Huczynski and Buchanan has become a near-legend and occupies perhaps not only the most central institutional site in the discipline of organization behaviour, an obligatory point of passage for teaching and research, but also, as we shall see, makes possible “the margins”, marks out the peripheries, and calls out for the excluded in a number of politically complex and interesting ways.

Could one go so far as to suggest that hucbuc offers an *emancipatory challenge* to organization? Given that this year (2003) the text attains its majority, we might be excused for enquiring about its political status and its role in emerging power/knowledge regimes (Thrift, 1999) in which the university serves as a node in an extended global network of knowledge producers, state agencies, private business, management and work organization. What is the political status of hucbuc, and what are the political possibilities opened up by what is generally regarded to be a quite conservative text? Can the text be deemed politically responsible? If organization studies are inescapably and inextricably political, what are the politics of this text?

**The Complicity of Centre/Periphery: Tit for TAT**

Huczynski and Buchanan’s introduction to Organizational Behaviour is routinely accused of reproducing an extremely orthodox distribution and representation of the material of organization. For most working within and out of the ‘radical change’ dimensions of Burrell and Morgan (1979), it is precisely the perceived lack of an explicit critical political agenda and its apparent conservative tone that has consigned Huczynski and Buchanan to the disparaging category of ‘mainstream’, or ‘orthodoxy’. That is, in other words, the place where all that which is superficial and vacuous resides: one
may recall that the imperial centre always remains an odd mix of aggression, philistinism, complacency, and decadence. As an accomplice to the McDonaldisation of higher education (Jary and Parker, 1997), texts such as these are perhaps at best benign and irrelevant, or, worst, insidious and dangerous. And let us not forget that where a text is ignored or summarily dismissed, there is a process of marginalisation taking place.

Amongst an emerging generation of what Burrell (1993:72) might call the ‘untenured lecturer with her more radical and youthful stance’ or the chest-beating ‘angry young men’ (see Parker, 1995; Jackson, 1995) of contemporary organization studies (see also Brigham, 2002; Jones and Surman, 2002), Huczynski and Buchanan occupies a peculiar Bête-noire position. Sneered at, mocked and derided, one’s apprenticeship would remain incomplete in the absence of a tit for tat ritualised degradation of this introductory text. Some might point to the fact that they have made a mistake with the date of F.W. Taylor’s birth, or that Mary Parker Follett has been relegated to footnotes, despite her obvious centrality and the importance of her writing, unacknowledged in a further round of exclusions, for the later work of Peters and Waterman.

Others will highlight the reductive and secondary commentaries on the work of Maslow, Eric Miller, A K Rice, or George Herbert Mead, and the absence of important writers such as Wilfred Bion and Bruno Latour from the text, which might look odd for a book with aspirations to survey the twentieth century development of the field of organization. Such critique, however, founded upon the legacy of a totalising impulse, serves only to provide grounds for that perennial academic game of ancestry and citation, the endless search for origins, and the competitive claims for mastery of one’s field. These omissions and oversights aside, there are even some aesthetes, with more contumelious barb, who choose to ignore it, whilst others, more precious and refined still, develop highly sophisticated if disingenuous strategies by claiming to be ignorant of the existence of hucbuc. Where this space of such rarefied and effete atmosphere might be found, however, remains a jealously guarded secret. There are many who have still yet to pass by way of motivation. For most of us, so long as it continues to constitute and occupy the centre ground, we can be reassured that there are ‘cutting edge’ margins of struggle and exclusion, an equal and opposite reaction to the centrifugal tendencies towards the lowest common denominator. Huczynski and Buchanan provide, therefore, a valuable standard against which to measure what is critical or radical and their institutional norm permits an assessment of the degree to which one has been able to develop imaginative and critically innovative teaching and research. Implicitly or explicitly their text operates to organize the centre and its margins, and for those who wish to ally themselves with a critical agenda, to speak on behalf of the excluded and disenfranchised, one could do no worse than navigate by-way of their introductory text. If Buchanan and Huczynski didn’t exist, we would have to invent them. Not simply central, hucbuc also acts then as guarantor and spokesperson for the margins.
HucBuc

There is considerable debate as to when or how this term first made its way into the discourse of organizational analysis. Some date it to 1985, but this argument seems to rest on the assumption that Huczynski and Buchanan really meant to use this term in the first edition of their text, or that this is what they were talking about even if they did not use ‘hucbuc’. In fact, nowhere does the word ‘hucbuc’ appear in the first edition, nor indeed in any edition of their introduction. In general it seems hucbuc refers to an organizational ‘condition’ somewhere between the psychic interior of an individual or group, it/its consciousness and ‘objective’ organization existing somewhere in the world out-there.

In sum their text provides a resource for researchers seeking to position themselves outside the mainstream. As Foucault illustrates in his genealogical cartographies of the prison and the asylum, we cannot have margins without a centre. The centre remains complicit with its margins and the margins seek out their centres. The dominant co-operates with the dominated, and power is co-implicated with resistance. This might explain why so many writers and theorists of radical organization studies and critical management studies are so (secretly) enamoured of Huczynski and Buchanan.

Hucbuc: Something for Everyone (Centre and Margin)

Centre and margin, there is something for everyone in their text. Hucbuc cannot really be accused of being simply mainstream and central, for it includes extended sections on material usually excluded from the orthodox teaching in business school organization behaviour, and if there is a politics, it will be discovered in a form with which we are not familiar. Whilst their writing incorporates and subsumes the standard genealogy of organization studies – via Weber, and the Pareto Circle, to Roethlisberger and Dickson, Elton Mayo, and Pugh and Hickson, it also includes recent and innovative developments that draw on poststructuralism and postmodernism. Here they reference and discuss various studies by Burrell, Clegg, Hassard, and Morgan. What might be considered in some quarters the avant-garde fringe of organization theory, represented by the work of Czarniawska-Joerges and de Monthoux (1994), Knights and Willmott (1999), and Burrell’s (1997) Pandemonium, equally fails to disturb their ambition for clarity, transparency, the summary, and bullet-point. Likewise, Michel Foucault, considered by many to be a writer of some of the most obscure and arcane of ‘poststructural’ writing (Thompson, 1993), offers no resistance, and is similarly unpacked and dispatched, ironically enough, by the orthogonal distributions of the mathesis and taxonomy (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001: pp. 646, 806, 812-14, 815, 816, 831).

For those coming at the subject from a labour process perspective Huczynski and Buchanan provide extended sections treating the work of Taylor and Ford (pp.413-32) (see also pp.792-7), together with a résumé of Braverman’s deskilling thesis and a summary of Ritzer’s more recent critique of the process of McDonaldization (Ritzer, 1993). On page 3 of their prologue the authors explicitly distinguish their position from the more ‘managerialist’ textbooks in the field, and here they mention Mullins (1999). For Huczynski and Buchanan, what is distinctive about their textbook is the recurrent analytical emphasis on multi-perspectivism, power, control, and inequality. Indeed, chapter 24 works towards what is quite a sophisticated, at least insofar as this is a textbook, poststructural understanding of power in organization, drawing on the work of Foucault and his writings on disciplinary power. A reasonable defence could be made
that their introduction to organizational behaviour remains, within
conventional understandings of the term, the most politicised introduction,
particularly when it is recalled that their readership is often first year
undergraduates and students following programmes of study which take a
predominantly abstract and technical, functional and utilitarian approach to
management. They make the claim that their definition of the subject area is
broader and more inclusive than managerialist delimitations. ‘A
managerialist perspective focuses on a narrow range of issues of perceived
importance to managers’ they write, which has the effect of pushing ‘a
range of other topics off the agenda, such as theoretical analyses that have
limited practical application’ (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001:3). They put
their cards on the table early on and declare that their understanding of
organizational behaviour is informed by a critical and pluralist sensibility.
We read that ‘Management is only one social group with a stake in the
behaviour of organizations’ and readers are encouraged to ‘take a critical
perspective, on research, theory and applications’ (ibid.). In addition their
opening chapter includes essays on the weakness of positivism in
organizational analysis and the unwarranted pretension to science
entertained by so much of its research, preoccupied as it is with objectivity,
prediction, order, and control.

They also offer a ‘postmodern justification’ (xviii) of their pedagogic
strategy, their understanding of which encourages them to make extended
use of films, literature, and novels, an approach which has been developed
with critical respectability in the recent work of Knights and Willmott
(1999). At least this is what they formally declare to be doing in their
introduction to organizational behaviour; as we shall see there is something
far more subtle and sophisticated going on in their text. What is immediately
evident is that Huczynski and Buchanan draw their readers attention to
writing that might be considered amongst the most demanding of the radical
avant-garde including Kafka, William Gibson, Bret Easton Ellis, and
Aldous Huxley’s *The Doors of Perception*. They can also do alternative
but populist in their recommended home viewing sections that, inter alia,
references films such as *The Matrix*, *eXistenZ*, *American Beauty*, and *A
Clockwork Orange*. We have already mentioned the use they make of
Foucault, but a close reading of their writing reveals a further series of
surprising theoretical and conceptual inclusions: Machiavelli (pp.824-5);
phenomenology (pp.15ff.); deconstruction (p.58); and the virtual
organization (pp.545-8). They may not make much use of queer theory, the
female ejaculation (Linstead, 2000), or ‘fucking management’ (Parker,
2001), but this is, after all, an introduction of organizational behaviour to the
mainstream. It would be unfair to dismiss this text as simply mainstream.
Hucbuc is far from being a mainstream introduction to mainstream
organization behaviour, but, rather, works more like an innovative
postmodern performance, which teaches as much through its ‘style’ as it
does by the elaboration of what we habitually look for and recognise as
‘content’ (see Ulmer, 1985, 1989).
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Postmodern Cyclorama: Panic and Paranoia, (no date)

A first reading of hucbuc usually recoils at the extravagant gloss of its appearance and its supplementary excess (cf.: Derrida, 1976:269-316). It is difficult to take flight from the seductions and attractions, the audacious provision and ambitious range of its alimentary hyper-marché. With its multi-coloured textual format, images, photographs, figures, diagrams, graphics, and newspaper style layout, the writing is attractive and easily digested, vari-formed and even, perhaps, post-form. It is not simply pictorial but rather more like an advertising billboard, the stills of a movie rush, or better, a movie production studio for a ticket that has exploded (Burroughs, 1968). Custom cannot stale its infinite variety, and if truth be a woman, as Nietzsche suggests, we have a veritable bon vivant Cleopatra.

Yet surely this is the point. Established distinctions between content and packaging, substance and style, are inverted and swept aside in their exercise of postmodern pedagogy. How the pages of text are presented, the adornment and decoration that garnish and embellish the linear restrictions of the academic sentence, the errata and curio, the epaulettes of anecdote, the clippings and memorabilia, are as important in teaching us about organization as any substantive exposition of theory and model. Hucbuc performs a veritable coup de théâtre that educates its reader to re-think the significance of the trimmings, those Kantian ‘free beauties’ - the ‘delineations à la grecque’ or the ‘lattice-work for borders or wallpapers’ (Kant, 1983:229; cited in Weber, 1996:21).

However, let us not think that their text simply consumes and incorporates like some ravenous bibliophiliac anthology or almanac of organization. As they perhaps warn us with their playful mise-en-abyme citation to an edition of the New York Times magazine, which makes reference to the Pirandellian prison, hucbuc also gives out through a series of tentacular and prosthetic-like extensions. In addition to the by now familiar retinue of teacher’s manual, instructor’s handbook, and overhead projector acetates, students and lecturers are now provided with a web-site (www.booksites.net/hucbuc) that includes downloadable PowerPoint slides, extra FT articles, class exercise debriefs, something resembling an avatar like syllabus manager, ‘that will build and host your very own course web page’ (ibid.:xvi), and a user’s club chatroom. The fourth edition of hucbuc, from which we are reading, is simply a further punctuated, interruption in the hucbuc-flow, an unfolding, dehiscent flow characterised by dissonance and schismatic metamorphoses. Consider the ‘ORBIT’ newsletter which circulates by e-mail to academics and students to regularly update the user on the latest findings and developments in the world of hucbuc, which, incidentally, like the perennial problem of unsolicited business mail shots, proves almost impossible to avoid or return to sender. In this respect, their reference to Kafka’s The Castle is masterful. There seems to be no stone left unturned in this encyclopaedia of organizational behaviour; it might even be suggested that there is no outside of their text, no escape from this deus ex-machina of automobility and motorvation, a
The virtual Syllabus Manager became a feature of mass-market academic publications in the pre-subsided calendrical years of the early 1990s. It is supposed to allow the ‘real’ lecturer to build and ‘host’ their own course web page. Research in this area is at an early stage but speculation is rife as to what they do, or what they might be able to do.

perpetual orbit whose effects continuously expand like the irradiating circles of a pebble dropped in a pond. That there might be no escape seems to be confirmed by what the authors themselves say themselves about the text:

‘Eating a pizza in a restaurant, joining a queue at a theme park, returning a faulty product to a store, arguing with a colleague at work, taking a holiday job in a factory, watching a movie or reading a novel – are all experiences that can be related to the material in this book’ (xix).

In fact, so comprehensive is their broadcast and capture one might be excused for the occasional panic that with seemingly no way out, no way to go, there can be no future research agenda since it has all been anticipated and thoroughly exhausted by the hubuc machine. This paranoia is only amplified by the panoply of accompanying ‘resources’, the web-site, the ‘full Instructor’s Manual’, the circulating virtual ‘newsletter’ - from which it seems impossible to escape or return to earth, user profiling, the extensive network of Pearson representatives, the virtual surveillance deployed by cookies injected into your hard-drive, and the rather shadowy and sinister activities of this ‘syllabus manager’. ORBIT? Are we being forewarned of the completion of a perfect, mathematical circle or of an immanent outerspace. Might this be another oblique, cabalistic-like reference secreted into the text? Is the message suggesting that we might be being sent around in circles, an eternal return of the same? By whom? The field of organization behaviour? Huczynski and Buchanan? And if you travel round in circles (cf.: Burrell, 1997) for too long, or too rapidly, you are likely to become nauseous and even faint, particularly with all this pizza, the colours, lights and sounds of the hubuc fairground ride. Can anyone perhaps hear a melodious background jingle, a health warning, akin to “A ring-a-ring o’roses, a pocket full of posies”? We might be prompted to ask if it is any wonder that universities resemble factories, textbooks, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons?

Yet this panic and paranoia might only be an instinctive or impulsive response to the sense of vertigo opened up by a text which may be creating a new and radically expansive pedagogic space out of the habitual organization and delimitations of organization studies. Texts which have found distinction and voice, a ‘message’ or a programme, a model, theory, or ideology, tend to be rather more closed and predictable. Centre and margins are more fixed and stable and the room for movement, disruption and surprise, for affective and textual becoming, inhibiting and restrictive. With hubuc are we reading a text beyond the modern inhibitions of the linear and phonetic as it occupies and colonizes space beyond, or before, centre and margin? We have noted how the multiple resources of image and text seem to be effortlessly combined and resolved to generate a shifting, protean postmodern cyclorama, drawing in, whilst sublating, the possible tensions between the ‘high’ form of scholarship and research, and the ‘low’ modes of media and cultural production. Indeed, Organizational Behaviour: An Introductory Text might be said to transcend a whole series of possible divisions, tensions, and oppositions.
Centre and margin, we might be forgiven for thinking that the text must occupy a most aberrant and eccentric position. In fact we will see that Huczynski and Buchanan really occupy no position at all. Both centre and margin, we will see how their text is literally place-less. On further inspection its atopia can be seen to give way to what we call an undecidable ‘motorvation’, a nervous and restless, giddy-state that remains poised, directionless, headless, or acéphalic (see Bataille, 1985; Hollier, 1989), an experience which in turn opens up a des-œuvre of confusion and loss. Motivation has become motorvation. Whilst we might think we know where we stand with this text this paper will move forward to explore the spectacle of Organizational Behaviour as a motorvational exercise, one that opens out into what might appear a mutant, unfolding baroque of part-objects (Deleuze and Guattari, 1984; cf.: Klein, 1946, Bion, 1962). Yet this dissemination of tattered bits and pieces of organization helps adumbrate occluded dimensions of subjectivity and social relations at work, dimensions through which normalization and mundane order is routinized and reproduced. With its training and discipline, exercises and springboards, supported by the periodic recitation of the coach’s interpellation ‘It’s your call’ and ‘stop and criticize’, hucbuc sets the reader to task as they are inveigled to perform a complex gymnastics that becomes increasingly contorted and grotesque. On top of all the dressage, video home viewing and entertainment, the kaleidoscopic flicker of graphics and imagery, the interruptions and cartoon comic strips, the popcorn and fast-food (Lilley, 1997), the reader is in danger of becoming sick. We have seen how all manner of fragment and desiderata form a palimpsest of half-remembered quotations, aphorisms, and definitions, culled, at times with a seeming promiscuous abandon, from the annals of organized history. Hucbuc animates a malady of the margins, or a torpedo of trimmings. Our language does indeed begin to sound strange. Permit me reader this indulgence: you are becoming impatient with this verbosity? Yes, motorvation is infectious. There is no other way of coming to terms with the displacement and space(ing) of centre/margin produced by hucbuc.

We seem to have travelled a long way from TAT, or maybe we have just come full circle, an open ended, twisted spiral, perhaps, looping back on itself like a figure of 8 (drawn in the sand?). We set out under the ‘instruction’ yielded by the chance encounter of a mirror and encyclopaedia motivated by the question of exclusions, marginality and the periphery of organization. We lost our way in the distending, rhizomatic scrawl of the research archives, the publications, and journal footnotes debating the history and status of TAT. Somewhere amidst the 17,000 farm security photographs, the missing persons, and lost identities we found our way back to our introductory text in Organizational Behaviour, only to discover here accusations of incompletion, omissions, and errors. We then experienced the vertigo of a disorientation on the cusp of a new pedagogic space accompanied by a sense of paranoia, fear and loathing. Motivation had slipped into motorvation as the ontology of ‘paramount reality’ (Berger and Luckmann, 1967) began to decay and dissolve. We were left in bits and
pieces, confronted with improbable juxtaposition and the portent of mutant strains of organizational becoming.

Hucbuc serves to mark the becoming-kitsch and the becoming-scrap of organization and reminds us of the strange mutations in organization and its study. What is merely TAT and what is significant or profound becomes ever more unclear the further one tries to make headway with hucbuc. Indeed, the subject may find they need to vomit from an intoxication brought on by this over-indulgence and incoherence. This paper discovers that this ejection threatens to propel us out of the orbit of organizational behaviour towards, who knows, maybe Solaris (Lem, 1991), where the stars may once more be given chance to dance upon the penumbra of our vision. Spaced-out, seeing stars, we can no longer be sure if we are centre or margin, included or excluded, understood or misunderstood, significant or insignificant.

Recap

Out of this place-less spacing anything might happen next. As tergiversating centre and margin, the text displays and produces strange, aberrant movements, somewhere between the centrifugal and the centripetal, such that we might have to call this deviating, inventive, Brownian-like movement(s), devientation - for it also, perhaps, raises anew the question of the divine. These strange transitions and rhythms can be understood by a consideration of its motoring tendencies and the dynamics of its complex intermedia translation – a complex which we will discover, reserves an aporetic structure and a volatile potentia of schizophrenic délire (Lecercle, 1985). It is centre, margin, and something other, or rather it gives chance to something other … that is, to the extent that we are prepared to join Huczynski and Buchanan in the risk of becoming something other.

Part 2: Decentred Margins and the Délire of Hucbuc/Pending Title

‘Things have found a way of avoiding a dialectics of meaning that was beginning to bore them: by proliferating indefinitely, increasing their potential, outbidding themselves in an ascension to the limit, an obscenity that henceforth becomes their immanent finality and senseless reason’

Baudrillard, Fatal Strategies, p.7

There can be little doubt that, in the UK at least, the Huczynski and Buchanan machine has achieved a pre-eminent, near hegemonic status in the foundational teaching of Organizational Behaviour. Foundation pillar and a
comprehensive summation of the field, the introductory text is both base and pyramidal head-stone, the beginning and end of organizational behaviour. Indeed, a summary reading here might stimulate the reflection that this paper itself can be accused of an unhealthy complicity in this elevation, normalising its institutional sovereignty. It has been said before, but the art of reading is in danger of becoming an historical curiosity! Scholarship within the fields of Critical Management Studies, Radical Organizational Analysis, and Studies of Culture and Organizational Symbolism, seem to understand critique and resistance in such narrow and restrictive ways that not only is the implicit overlooked but the explicit is no longer read at face value. What chance is there then for writing and authorial ‘strategies’ that seek to work on that oblique movement which opens up in the margin between or outside the implicit and explicit, or somewhere tympanising inside-outside? ‘Here’, we will learn to call this the chrysology of organization, the beginning of the end, a ‘time’ that is still yet to come in what we have learned to call radical organization theory.

We are not seeking resistance nor a subversive, satiric, or ironic reading of Huczynski and Buchanan, and if it were said, or if it could be said that this paper is a theatre of cruelty, which draws on the work of deconstruction, Jarryesque pataphysics (Jarry, 1965; Bok, 2002), or Borgesian inspiration, it would fail on this count and then be unable to produce its effects and affects. There are moments of irony and satire, but these are periods of weakness, remnants of an unhealthy and human all-too-human, egotistical ambition. If organization is the reassurance given against the possibility of madness, at the closest proximity to madness (cf.: Derrida, 1978:59), then its therapeutic value can only be defined to the extent to which we acknowledge and gamble dis-ease, that dis-ease of the ego, and the dis-ease of motorvation.

Our language sounds strange speaking out of this space. It may sound odd, but the work performed by this paper, its experiment, seeks precisely to promote Huczynski and Buchanan’s introductory text in Organizational Behaviour, to take the helm, Phaethon like, and ride on the back of its wild becoming-délire so that we might, at least in the first instance, advance the question of centre and margin by working the experiential in ways that open up a mode of ‘space(ing)’ that permits a political re-thinking of centre-margin (cf.: Lacoue-Labarthe, 1999). Alternatively, it may be seen as a projective personality test; but this would be a textual mask. So, if ‘everything profound loves the mask’, as Nietzsche writes (1990:69), we must perhaps learn to think against ourselves, certainly if we are to give chance to the unthought, the new, that which is yet to be spoken. Perhaps this announces a necessary exclusion or marginalisation, at least if we wish to go on being at all, but through the motorvation opened up by this paper it will be seen how we begin to threaten the possibility of ‘being’.

For all the theories on motivation they offer up as tools for the prospective manager (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001: pp.236-71) part one has sketched how their text really begins to work by opening up the possibility of this motorvation, which, perhaps inadvertently, divines or duplicates wider
dynamics at play in contemporary organization. This is perhaps amongst one of the greatest and most subtle achievements realised by their text. However, subjects charged up by this motivation are also volatile and unpredictable, nervous and edgy, quick to temper, overtaken by sudden inspiration and feverish activity, prone to panic and hysteria as witnessed in those mysterious cults which surround the outbreak of the St. Vitus dance (see Brown, 1997). In part two we begin to see how this engineers and deflects strange forces in hucbuc, generating a surprising, volatile, deceptive, and paradoxical world. It is always one step ahead, and just out of reach, somewhat like Pascal’s ‘fearful’ circle whose centre is everywhere and circumference nowhere. Neither simply a textual or theoretical ideal, nor the brute workings of an apriori ontological materiality that organizational analysts have so far failed to contact, but the processual flux of an always organizing-becoming-text-becoming-organized. Never what you think, a chameleon-like trickster, showing first one face and then another, hucbuc becomes an unmasterable dissemination machine that spreads and infiltrates the body-politic of organization and organization studies with its textual shards, its bullet-points, and barbed cornucopia of theorems, concepts, and ideas. The text does this as the reader is inspired into a similar distracted state reminding us once more of the spectre and play of strange contagious doublings, mirroring, and mimesis.

Whereas the curatorial move which Burrell (1997) makes into pandemonium, a world resembling the streets of Pratchett’s Ankh-Morpork, is designed as a carnival of marginalised curiosity in organization, an organized collection and display of daemons, cabalists, visionary seers, witches, and satyrs, hucbuc intrudes to bewitch authorial and ‘readerly’ control. These intrusions offer no ontological or epistemological reassurance, no alternative discworld with its own rules and directions (Burrell, 1997:33), but rather plants tindersticks of volatile mass into what we will maybe learn to call the surface of organization (O’Doherty, 2003). Hucbuc gives chance to centres and margins at the same time that it renders them unstable and calls into question their possibility. If we were to read Pandemonium as providing a catalogue of the excluded and marginalised, it would only have provided an additional contribution to the project of organization, comprehension, and control. We might, therefore, accuse Burrell of simply opening up another field for exploration and exploitation over which he continues to exercise editorial supervision and control.

Intimations of the Surreal: Devilry and all that TAT (March 4th 2003)

Huczynski and Buchanan, by contrast, have no such pretensions. Their text unfolds and migrates, collapses into contradiction and absurdity, insinuates itself into other texts as their mistakes get reproduced, theory becomes practice, fact blurs into fiction, and fantasy bleeds into reality. And who could have believed it? Hucbuc organization is populated by such a strange and suspicious cast of characters and features: Blacky-the-dog, Vesuvian Scotland, the Clan Buchanan, job sculpting and staff retention, banana time, and “Phillip Zimbardo” - for Christ’s sake! (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001: 471). What about those passport size photographs purporting to be the
Alternative Organizational Behaviour Texts
There have been a number of texts in the study of organizations and behaviour at work that are widely considered to be stylistically and intellectually innovative. David Sims, Stephan Fineman, and Yiannis Gabriel, published Organizing and Organizations in 1993, and ask the reader to ‘think of this book as a wheel’. They develop their approach to organizations based upon prioritising the lived experience, emphasising ‘tales from the field’ and drawing on employee narratives of work organization.

leading figures in the field? Who would credit the reproduction offered of Derek Pugh? And where is Stewart Clegg, Hugh Willmott, Paul Thompson, or Hal Incandenza? The insouciance and panache with which these omissions are executed, the sheer arrogance exercised as ‘tough love’, is truly remarkable. And then we have the class tests. Oh! - the utter devilry. What rogues! The time allocations alone are hopelessly inadequate. One can only imagine the confusion and disarray that descends the classroom as some new university lecturer attempts to arrange the students into ‘syndicates with three to five members each’ to ‘design a practical, realistic behaviour modification programme’ (p.139). Behaviour modification! Such irony, and performed with an apparent, effortless grace. Not only must the lecturer ensure that the students are prepared, have read the ‘Making modifications’ brief, and are familiar with the ‘behaviour modification’ approach – and note that hucbuc offers no measurement tool or guidance so that the tutor might be in a position to make these assessments – but must also assume responsibility for the normal pressures and strains of classroom management: what to do about absentees, late arrivals, those who have to leave early, special needs students who must have 25% additional time, those students who don’t have the text, etc. Here we see another example of motivation starting up. We are becoming, perhaps, slightly delirious.

For an increasing number of students and readers, Huczynski and Buchanan is a truly subversive work of art, all the more effective precisely because of its apparent disguise, the suspicion that the authors seem to know that they are also not in control of this behemoth, that they too have sacrificed themselves for the work of hucbuc. A genuine situationist performance. We begin to wonder if hucbuc is simply an unusual state of consciousness; or a marginal version of reality that has somehow found its way into the centre of the business school and management education; a simulacrum; an undiscovered dimension of contemporary work organization; a plane of immanence; or a phantasm hinged somewhere in delicate suspense between paranoia and psychosis, productive of paranoia and psychosis - evident in the becoming délire of anyone who comes too near. For the student of management, there could be no better introduction to organization today.

This encounter at the very heart of organization and control undermines its derogated status as the ‘sanitized orthodoxy’ of organization behaviour (Hassard and Holliday, 1998). Hucbuc remains subversive in the extreme - or rather surface ‘perverse’ (Deleuze, 1990:199; cf.: O’Doherty, 2003) (it speaks from no ironic Platonic heights nor the Dionysian depths of Nietzsche) - harbouring the equivalent of terrorist sleeper cells, booby traps, and serial killer codes; in the work it performs it generates a series of veritable time-bombs that tick away barely concealed within the surface of sentence and paragraph. There are others, albeit with more self-conscious acumen, who might also reasonably insist that they too have explored questions of exclusion and marginality in organization behaviour in the form of subversive, alternative introductory textbooks that experiment with stylistic innovation. One thinks here of Sims, Fineman and Gabriel (1993),
but also Ackroyd and Thompson (1999), and Jackson and Carter (2000). Yet, these texts announce their alternative credentials and display their support for the margins in ways that are too obvious, often shackled with the weight of a cumbersome and monolithic, theoretical armature, such that they make themselves too readily available for co-option and the pigeon-hole. The margins are fixed and the lines of demarcation and confrontation too mechanistic and crudely delineated. They are not generative of the kind of organizational space(ing) and poised volatility we find in hucbuc. Moreover, whilst Burrell (1997:31) might (ironically) claim, in his feted avant-garde riposte to the kind of organizational behaviour deemed to have been developed and presented by Huczynski and Buchanan, that the streets of pandemonium are so dark that you cannot even see the signs which read ‘Beneath the pavement, the beach’, hucbuc prepares a far more subtle but disturbing and deeper journey through the black-magic of contemporary organization.

Here there are no obvious roadmaps or warning signs in hucbuc, or rather there is a surfeit – a palimpsestic délire - of signs, maps, codes, and signals, a dissematology that sinks into disorientation and panic. The structure, order, and organization of material - the chapter titles, for example - appear more like a perfidious disguise, designed to seduce but undoubtedly mislead the student of organization and management. They may turn to chapters with titles familiar to an instrumental and utilitarian agenda – communication, motivation, teamworking, leadership, and decision making – but what is found is a paper trail of material and content that lead outside and elsewhere. The chapter on decision making, for example, eventually arrives at the question of space travel, aliens, visitations, extraterrestrial life, and UFO’s (p.765). Truly spaced-out! In this respect Huczynski and Buchanan may justifiably claim the mantle of genuine, renegade radicals, working beyond the paradigm gridlock and the increasingly sterile dichotomies of centre and margin, mainstream and critical, or modern and postmodern. If, as might reasonably be expected, the authors deny this strategy or intent, would this not simply prompt the suspicion that Huczynski and Buchanan have offered up the author as sacrifice to the textual free-play of the surface glissement, the risk of acceleration and the infinite speed of délire?

That’s the Way the Wheel Turns: A Carnival of Decontextualisation

We have registered our admiration with the exhaustive and comprehensive broadcast of hucbuc, but this global coverage is matched by an equally extraordinary attention to detail and the fine print. Not only do we note that the muscular endowment of 34 reference pages are typed in small font, but included amongst its alumni one also finds a rich and surprising collection of marginalia, oddities, the esoteric, and eccentric: inter alia, Calvin and Hobbes cartoon strips; diagrams detailing the Hell’s Angles’ status structure; lyrics to a Leon Rosseleson song called ‘That’s the Way the Wheel turns’; and a grainy photograph purporting to represent ‘Seven men sat around a table supposedly to participate in a study on visual perception’, all juxtaposed and interspersed with the more respectable and institutional
Stop and Criticize

mainstream. We find that OECD job study publications rub shoulders with alternative science fiction, which is followed up with a citation to the New York Times Magazine retrieved from April 1973\textsuperscript{10} - and just in case the reader might be feeling insufficiently humbled by the scholarship of this brilliant heteroclite assemblage, consider the barely concealed titular message implicated in the reference to Not Clever Enough, sourced direct from page 105 of the 18\textsuperscript{th} May 1996 edition of The Economist. We had cause to remark earlier that the explicit is badly read in critical studies in management and organization.

Is there anything that escapes the attention of hucbuc, any micro-snippet of information which they have been unable to document, classify and archive? With an apparent casual indifference to the labour of compilation and citation, hucbuc seems to control and survey not only the official, historical archives of textual publication, but also that which is more discredited and marginalised, akin to those subjugated or naive knowledges of which Foucault (1980:82) speaks, ‘disqualified as inadequate to their task or insufficiently elaborated’. However, we are beginning to see how in the riot of decontextualisation and repositioning, texts and citations tend to lose their preceding genealogy and begin to acquire a new one, in what is, undoubtedly, fated to become simply an additional, temporary genealogical transfer, a swerve or displacement in the becoming-infinite histories of knowledge and its classifications. Confronted by such a dispersed series of surface dislocation and ruptural protuberance it becomes increasingly confusing for the reader to assess what is centralised, official majoritarian orthodoxy, and what is marginal, excluded minor knowledges (cf.: Deleuze and Guattari, 1987), what is part and what is whole, what is inside and what is outside.

These reversals and perversions are especially evident in those student essays developed out of a reading of hucbuc that cite Braverman as an advocate of deskilling. Doubtless we are all familiar with those summaries which are only slightly off kilter in their claims that Braverman believed in deskilling as the most effective form of managerial control or Braverman showed how managers could increase control over workers by deploying scientific management. These are examples of what we have called elsewhere the baroque unfolding of narrative, text, and understanding - which, of course, feeds back into and relays with practice as these students later assume managerial or consultancy positions\textsuperscript{11} - or simply, and more prosaically, a baroque unfolding that is manifest in the bizarre and mutant strains of evolution in organizational behaviour periodically thrown up by empirical research (see Massumi, 1993; Bryman, 1995; Lyon, 2000; Munro, 2000). Of course, in some ways, we might appreciate how Braverman (1974) could well be understood as an advocate of, or at least ambivalent about, deskilling. On the one hand it provides a simple moral vilification of management and reproduces a certain marxist narrative which is convinced that agents of capital retain omniscient control to subordinate workers and impede the proletariat revolution. On the other, the elegiacal, biographical tone of Labor and Monopoly Capital belies not only a romantic and
Labour and Monopoly Capital. Written by Harry Braverman and published in 1974. Widely considered to be one of the most important texts in the fields of management studies, organizational analysis, and the sociology of work. It has spawned a vast amount of secondary commentary, critique, and analysis.

Continues to inspire the UK based annual international labour process conference, which has been meeting since 1983 and regularly attracts over 150 delegates. Key themes associated with this body of work include the degradation of work; control; deskilling; Taylorisation; technology; the division of labour; and the ‘habitation’ of the worker to capitalist employment relations.

sentimental relation to history but also a possible unresolved affirmation and denial of the efficiency and ingenuity of technological development. We might be prompted to ask whether in fact Braverman was deskilled or reskilled during his own employment history? Was he then the victim of deskilling in the coppersmith trade, or was this the making of Braverman? Indeed, in the absence of his deskilling and redundancy it is unlikely that he would have found employment for the Monthly Review Press, nor written his account of the degradation of work in the twentieth century. Could there be, then, a flawed design and methodological bias at the heart of his writings? Moreover, it is worth recalling that Braverman was implicated, as an editor with executive operating responsibilities, in the design, implementation, and administration of computerised office systems, which had the effect of degrading and deskilling many traditional, craft printing skills (Braverman, 1974:7).

It is peculiar how student ‘mistakes’ might actually, in their unknowing, also reveal deeper and more subtle ‘truths’ about the history of organization and the development of thought in the discipline. Established academic readings of Braverman (Morgan, 1986; Watson, 1987; Thompson, 1989; Thompson and McHugh, 1995) might too quickly recoil from these unruly, delinquent interpretations and thereby lose the possibility of re-thinking convention and received wisdom. Over time, mistakes, the errata, and marginal may well accumulate and snowball, which combined with the dispersal of interpretation, evolution, development, and application in disparate, semi-autonomous fields of academic labour and empirical practice, suggests a mode of organizational-becoming that is highly fractious and inconsistent, without centralised authority or guidance. We have already seen in part 1 how a quest for the origins of TAT, in what is a relatively marginal field for Organizational Behaviour, or at least what we thought was on the periphery, rapidly descended into a maelstrom of confusion, uncertainty, and contradiction. Yet, that which is deviant is later established as the standard. Foucault (1971) tells us that history is constructed out of the normalisation of injustice and arbitrary, insignificant truths. It is better studied, therefore, through a patient genealogy of the descent of ‘accidents, the minute deviations – or conversely, the complete reversals – the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us’ (p.81). The mutant becomes rehabilitated as the norm in imperceptible and silent ways such that we can no be longer be certain whether the centre is really an illusion of chimerical proportions, itself strange and mutant. When we extend this argument to reflect that disciplinary ‘origins’ themselves are phantasmatic projections back in time, an arbitrary selection and delimitation of a more rhizomatic spread of knowledge, or perhaps a mutant delimitation of a mutant spread, we risk entering the spirals of an infinite regress. Does a mutant becoming of an ‘originary’ mutancy cancel itself out to become those “‘seen but unnoticed”, expected, background features of everyday scenes’ (Garfinkel, 1967: 36)? Indeed, where are we, and how can we even ask this question if we have lost all sight, or experience, of regulating polarities such as phylogeny and mutation, the norm and abnormal, truth and falsity, TAT from tat. That’s the way the wheel seems
délires. Non-sense; or, bordering on the non-sensical. Words becoming sounds. This can be thought of as an eruption of language and expression from the depths of the body where articulation runs away with itself to subordinate the speaker/writer whom we usually think of as its master. However, to understand and define the boundary of sense/ non-sense, or to create the new, indeed ‘sense’ itself, implies its on-going transgression and the play of non-sense at the heart or centre of sense. The division is arbitrary and always shifting such that one is always prey to the insight that what is commonly accepted as sense is perhaps nonsense (see Lecercle, 1985; Deleuze, 1990).

to turn these days. We are mapping here a most peculiar contemporary emergence of alien-nation.


As media and dissemination machine, hucbuc opens up what we have been calling the chrysology of organization, motortivating these speculations and strange becomings as it takes the reader – and organization - elsewhere and outside. The world of hucbuc is like a ‘chaodyssey’ (Deleuze, 1994; Guattari, 1995), through which it is very easy to lose one’s head as the foundation stone of Huczynski and Buchanan crumbles and gives way to yield what it has perhaps always been, only a slight, iridescent shiver in the infinite Library of Babel, that library which is our contemporary academic archive. Huczynski and Buchanan stage a mise-en-abyme of this iridescence at the very heart of hucbuc, in that moiré shimmer of the Buchanan clan colours, which for some reason the authors feel compelled to assert he doesn’t wear (p.164). Now what would Freud make of a denial in the absence of an accusation? Indeed, the chevron and cross-hatch is a popular and recurring symbolic motif in hucbuc, providing auspicious, synecdochical warning signs, at least for the geomantic trained scholar. ‘Hey, I ordered a cheeseburger!’ cries one of the characters (p.146), a ‘personality type’ according to Huczynski and Buchanan; but look again. He’s wearing what just might be a tartan kilt. The other three ‘personality types’ are also wearing intense, fine grained and closely rendered checks.

Once we begin to look at the text in this way, we begin to see the cross-hatch everywhere, used variously as background fill and shading (pp. 7, 32, 42, 55, 98, 116, and passim.), but also during intense concentration on the text itself, necessary when working through some of the strange and demanding concepts, causes the words and letters to explode into a maelstrom of something resembling the scattering of thumb-nail tacks, almost like stars, or migrating birds swarming across the sky. The repetition and proliferation of the lattice and moiré might represent the limit of orthogonal organization, the hyper-trophied efflorescence of modern European reason and rationality. Sent into a spin by the loss of lineage and patronage, by the accelerating dynamics and the ‘dyslexic dialectics’ of postmodernising, global capitalism (O’Doherty and Case, 2003), organizing ‘behaviour’ at work today might seem to resemble, ever more, only the folly of cranks and tenured professors.

These are perhaps intimations of ulterior motives, but the play of strange forces at work is more obvious in the reference to Bandler and Grinder’s The Structure of Magic and their Frogs Into Princes, writers apparently famous for establishing the importance of dissociation, ‘mirroring’, and ‘anchoring’, which, we are told, is especially useful for salespeople ‘trying to persuade customers to buy more of their product’ (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001:197). We are compelled once more to ask: is this all an elaborate, if exquisite hoax? One of the apparent unintended consequences of riding the saddle-point of this place-less lability, this space managing no-one, nowhere, we identified in part 1, seems to be the infectious spread
of a similar dissociation and oblique mirroring, experienced as *délire* by text, writer, and reader, categories that are becoming, as we have suggested above, increasingly indiscernible and probably irrelevant.

In sickness and health we are beginning to see how a whole series of confusions and ambiguities are spawned and proliferate as one sets off motivated in quest of TAT. A single word develops and balloons. You can trace its origin, pursue its passage and development, chase the translations, the migrations, permutations, the mutations and metamorphosis, through the labyrinth of catalogues and archives, the manuscripts, academic papers, and journal articles. Adequately equipped with motivation, one can track the footnotes, the revisions and elisions, the tiny countless oversights, the errors, mistakes, and the slips of the pen, or rather the nervous tremor of the finger on the keypad that manifests as the typo, the glyph, or the oblique careering of an ampersand. Motivation slips into motorvation at some point in this quest, switching on a stroboscope of tattered shards and fragments. Here frogs do turn into princes, inkblots spread through the publicity of Mental Measurement Yearbooks, Scottish tartan begins to pull at the warp and weft of organizational behaviour, and Henry A. Murray is recruited by the US Office of Strategic Services during the war to help select men for “James Bond-like tasks” (OSS, 1948). A sinister plot is hatched with dragons, hippogriffs, and other curious and fabulous creatures; meanwhile the ‘Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory’ is launched, whilst Murray is seen smoking before the hearth of Jung’s “Faustian retreat”. These fantastic spectres join the ghosts of Blacky the dog and his family and friends, the mysterious CAT 1949, and the house-tree people. They stalk in the margins and forgotten histories, in the ‘hauntologies’ (Derrida, 1994) of organization, where they continue to work social relations in silent but profound ways. Further research needs to be done to track down this enigmatic residual inventory of organization, to trace out the connections, its meaning and significance, and to establish its degree of centrality and marginality.

As many may have begun to suspect, time and space have come out of joint (here). We are no longer sure about the status or credibility of this material. What is its relevance or significance? Can we trust these authors? What is more fantastic or unbelievable: the existence and influence of some dog called ‘Blacky’ in the development of personality assessment (see Cramer, 1996; Gieser and Stein, 1999), or the practice of something called psychometric assessment in employee selection, or how about the employment of court jesters to sit in the executive boardroom of large, multinational corporations (Jackall, 1988; cf.: Cleverley, 1971)? Strange, incongruous juxtapositions and decontextualisations meet dreams which collide and miscegenate, morphing into what little of the real might still be left. Are we any more surprised with the masquerade of hucbuc, with its reversals, implosions, and metempsychoses, than we are with the antics of the ‘magic roundabout lads’ in Beynon’s *Working for Ford*, Donald Roy’s ‘banana time’, or those employees of Disney who never work but perform ‘on stage’ (Van Maanen, 1991; Bryman, 1995)? Hucbuc organization might appear surreal, pushed and pulled into a heterotopia by asynchronicity and
other antediluvian forces, but it may just be a concentration and exaggeration of forces and tendencies evident throughout modern organization. Hucbuc does seem to generalise and amplify paranoid-psychotic dynamics in organization producing greater psychic fragility and instability than was perhaps common in twentieth century work organization and it does begin to sound like a Thomas Pynchon plot. Some can be heard singing: that’s great it starts with an earthquake, birds and snakes and aeroplanes, Lenny Bruce is not afraid. It seems to build to a crescendo, or is it fading into the crackle and hiss of an abyssal white noise? Like that detective narrator trapped inside the periscope in ‘Foucault’s Pendulum’, we are confronted with a screen full of endless zeros, which is still only ‘a pale imitation of the multiplication of combinatorial universes, of the exploding swarm of all possible worlds’ (Eco, 1988:37). Motivation gives way once again to hucbuc, dispersal and confusion.

If Lacan (1977) warns us that the ‘I’ is merely that which I shall have been for what I am in the process of becoming, we might need to attend more carefully to that future anterior tense which seems to subtend the restrictive economy of Organizational Behaviour. Without doubt, there have been warning signs for the ‘I’ of the author/reader. Before we even have a chance to know where we are, we may have begun to mimic, to look and sound like Buchanan and Huczynski; maybe we are becoming hucbuc? Might we, therefore, be accused of clowning around or misbehaving (Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999)? Like those who endeavour to read the equivalent of a telephone directory or the Yellow Pages in their quest to ascend and gain organizational behaviour, one might be accused of being ‘sick’. Counting the number and cataloguing the series of photographs published in hucbuc; working through the class and chapter exercises; retrieving the obscure personal archives of Henry Alexander Murray to better understand hucbuc’s reading of personality and motivation; tracing out the connections which take you from epistemological issues in the study of OB to a meditation on the working components of theodolites used for the surveying of desert landscapes; chasing references that always, uncannily, seem to lead back to a military conspiracy, a techno-military industrial complex; and … and … and … the truth must be out there! Is this just another form of scholarship? Is it any wonder that universities resemble hospitals?

Here is someone who may be taken to be in need of professional intervention and help: nothing short of wholesale reengineering and reorganization may be required. So if there is a mirror stage here, it is a most peculiar arrangement, more like that hall of mirrors one finds at the circus generating ‘warped space’ (Vidler, 2001), or those mirrors in the pyrotechnic insanitarium of contemporary ‘culture on the brink’ (Dery, 1999). In our drive to study motivation theory we have been led across the perpendicular divisions and the two dimensional tabular co-ordination that organizes organizational behaviour to reach the space of a strange now/here. As the Cartesian and tabular-like projection of longitude and latitude begins to oscillate, the co-ordinates of centre and margin also begin to shimmer, setting off an unsettling moiré pattern that strangely resonates
with the bright red and yellow Scottish tartan of Buchanan (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001:164), a vortical gyration barely maintaining its cross hatch through which we might have begun to glimpse the resonance and force-fields of alternative organizational geographies (Short, 2000). Through this space(ing) a series of bizarre but suggestive conjunctions and correspondence begin to cast a complex series of associations and projections, aberrant, erratic vectors, and sinuous, kinked lines of flight. TAT has begun to proliferate and accumulate as shards and fragments, the detritus of that furniture and fittings which inhabit and maintain ‘paramount’, or mundane, organization. In our question of motivation, which has occasionally peeked through our main textual scene, we are being worked by way of an adumbration through the relatively de-limited field of TAT, and have begun to emerge, now, in the grip of motorvation, on the pivot of what Derrida (1981:157) has called ‘chrysology’.

Recap

So, we appear to have come to rest, adrift upon a beach in County Antrim, Ireland. If the figure of man has been drawn on this sand the incoming tide has washed it away. Splintered and decayed, bleached by the sun, there are a few wooden pillars that still stand up to stake out a boundary, a marker post, or is it a fragile causeway staked out to indicate a line of flight into or maybe out of the sea? Can we do without centres and margins? What would happen to struggle and resistance in the absence of an oppressive centre? Is it possible to have a radical or critical organization studies that remains supportive of the margins without a stigmatised other to serve as centre? Or rather, must we wager these stakes if we are to give chance once more to organization, that organization which is always-already about to arrive?

The stakes are clearly high. In sum, our paper has traced how motivation gets inflected into motorvation, which tarries with the dangers of an automotive where we-becoming-automobile find automation as délire - but also unpredictability and danger - at the 'limit' of a potential ec-stasis, in stupefaction and heightened sensitivity (and on the beginning of social enquiry there is always a ‘benumbing’ (cf. McHugh et al., 1974; Derrida, 1981: 63-171)). TAT seems to emerge as potentia, opening up the possibility of an alternative, oblique spacings, re-opening our relation to organization, where distinctions between ‘dream’ and the ‘real’, fact and fiction, centre and margin - as organizational (ontological) referents and methodological procedure (cf. Plato’s Timaeus), begin to collapse. This opens up the possibility (and impossibility) of affirming the ‘goodness’ or ‘badness’ of organization in a space(ing) and strange time both before and after the divisions of centre and margin. This is the infinite time of the Stoic Aion (Deleuze, 1994), the event-horizon where sense meets non-sense and subjects accelerate into the oblique orbit of motorvation. Organization and its artefactual forms gives way at the maximal point of this intensity to the
délire of fragmented bits and pieces, a strobe-light effect of angular, spasmodic shards of unformed and deformed ‘tat’, opening up the possibility of lines of flight emerging out of the suspense of its deviented tension of forces. It is the realm of hucbuc organization, now/here.

Notes

1 This paper is in part a report and reflection on some of the motorvations and theoretical underpinnings which inform our preparatory study for a forthcoming introductory text to Organizational Behaviour with the working title *Subversive Organization: A Beginner’s Guide*.

2 Of course, and in the absence of denial, there would be a suspicion that the researcher W.G. Morgan, by virtue of sharing the same patronym, would be biased in her historical revision of the role of Christina Morgan in TAT. However, that they are not related by genealogy does not disprove the possibility that W.G. Morgan is on some level motivated to rescue and monumentalise the name of Morgan. Show me an academic piece of work, and I will show you the biography, Nietzsche writes somewhere, and ‘every great philosophy has hitherto been’, he writes in *Beyond Good and Evil*, a ‘confession on the part of its author and a kind of involuntary and unconscious memoir’ (Nietzsche, 1990:37). Nick Royle (1995: pp. 85-123) shows how the corpus of writings published under the name Shakespeare is in fact an extended meditation and manipulation – inversions, condensations, displacements, spoonerisms etc. – of the name Shakespeare who spent his life shaking his spear, presumably because the pen is mightier than the sword in the will to power. Perhaps we should stop here for we may be in danger of slipping into this strange state of motorvation.

3 This is only a rough estimate by the authors and so can only be read here as pending more accurate scientific measurement.

4 It might be better thought of, therefore, as a form of post-linear *Writing*, one that resurrects elements of the hieroglyph, the picto-ideo-phonograph of ‘writing before the letter’ (Derrida, 1976; see Ulmer, 1985), or maybe that unravelled calligram that Foucault identifies in the work of Magritte, Klee, and Kadinsky, whose art abolishes the classical mutual embrace of discourse and figure to juxtapose ‘shapes and the syntax of lines in an uncertain, reversible, floating space’ (Foucault, 1983).

5 Unique, specially prepared versions of hucbuc are planned for the future in which individual lecturers can custom build their own text through splicing, grafts, deletions, and insertions of additional material in a process that is known in the trade as ‘shrink wrapping’. Pearson Education representatives tell us that if a lecturer wants to incorporate something that they themselves have written into hucbuc, an additional chapter on international organizational behaviour, for example, or a chapter from another publication, Pearson Education can ‘shrink wrap’ the supplementary material into the Huczynski and Buchanan text. Over time one imagines that Huczynski and Buchanan will have less and less input into the published material so that the status of “Huczynski and Buchanan” as names will soon be forgotten as their nomenclature assumes the role of signifier, a mark of approval, or quality kite, a bit like that “MTV Live” stamp that appeared on select records released during the 1980s and 1990s. In fact there are some who have suggested that this paper here might eventually find itself shrink-wrapped into a version of hucbuc.

6 Let it not be thought that the authors of this piece lacks shame or embarrassment at this cacoethes loquendi. And it is not as if we have not been forewarned. The writings of Artaud, Bataille, Schreber, Brisset, Roussel, and Wolfson, are evidence enough of the dangers of entering the space which is being opened up, in its latest incarnation, through the work of hucbuc. Before the organization of centre and margin, on the cusp of the unthought and new, language is made to groan and strain; or, rather, language makes us groan and strain.

7 There is an urgent need in organizational analysis to re-examine the relationship between writing, texts, publications etc. and managerial or organization practice, which holds open the question and precise nature of these polarities, if indeed they are best thought as polarities. Some studies in this area has already begun and some recent work, such as that by Cooper and Fox (1990), John Law (1994), Czarniawska-Joerges (1998), and Rhodes (2001), seems promising (see also Hassard and Holliday, 1998). In this respect it would be helpful if there was some consideration of the relevance of Giddens’ by now relatively well established idea of a ‘double hermeneutic’ (Giddens, 1976), and its distinctiveness in comparison to more recent work in reflexive social science (Ashmore, 1989; Woolgar, 1991), so called deconstructive organizational analysis.
Derrida works on the undecidable role of the fetish, which is better approached with the idea of a phantasm.

Note that the 4th edition of Huczynski and Buchanan runs to 918 pages with 26 pages of preface, acknowledgements, etc. Further investigative analysis also proves that Zimbardo turns out to be the author of the Pirandello prison article in the 8th April 1973 New York Times Magazine, which we have had cause to reference earlier. If hucbuc might resemble an elaborate hoax? Or, that hucbuc itself is an elaborate hoax, one which the authors are doing their best to warn us. Who amongst us is suffering from violence, rebellion, tyranny, or mental breakdown, condemned as we are to this prison environment. It seems all too perfect, an infinitely extending hall of mirrors, or a mise-en-abyme, a prison at the centre of a prison. There are some who might recall that Zimbardo was the psychologist architect who devised the infamous Stanford Prison experiments where individuals were selected to act out as guards and prisoners in a simulated prison environment. Even better, then, a simulacrum at the centre of a simulacrum. The Stanford experiment had to be abandoned after 6 days because of violence, prison rebellion, tyranny, and mental breakdown. There are others who might now doubt whether this picture is indeed Phillip Zimbardo. Are there any of us who might think that the ‘Stanford County Prison’ was an elaborate hoax? Or, that hucbuc itself is an elaborate hoax, one which the authors are doing their best to warn us. Who amongst us is suffering from violence, rebellion, tyranny, or mental breakdown, condemned as we are to this Pirandellian like Organization behaviour?

Who is prepared to vouch for the authenticity of this character? Zimbardo is found right at the very centre of hucbuc, page 471!. Note that the 4th edition of Huczynski and Buchanan runs to 918 pages with 26 pages of preface, acknowledgements, etc. Further investigative analysis also proves that Zimbardo turns out to be the author of the Pirandello prison article in the 8th April 1973 New York Times Magazine, which we have had cause to reference earlier. If hucbuc might resemble a silent psychic prison then this reminds us of the 602nd night in the 1001 Arabian nights, when Shahrazad tells the tale of King Shahryar, the tale of the tale … of the 1001 Arabian nights, in which the King Shahryar orders his wazir to bring every night a young and virgin girl whom he ravishes and then slays until the wazir’s daughter Shahrazad offers herself to the king and beguiles him with her tales of the 1001 Arabian nights, avoiding death for so long as the King wishes to hear the next instalment on the following night. It seems all too perfect, an infinitely extending hall of mirrors, or a mise-en-abyme, a prison at the centre of a prison. There are some who might recall that Zimbardo was the psychologist architect who devised the infamous Stanford Prison experiments where individuals were selected to act out as guards and prisoners in a simulated prison environment. Even better, then, a simulacrum at the centre of a simulacrum. The Stanford experiment had to be abandoned after 6 days because of violence, prison rebellion, tyranny, and mental breakdown. There are others who might now doubt whether this picture is indeed Phillip Zimbardo. Are there any of us who might think that the ‘Stanford County Prison’ was an elaborate hoax? Or, that hucbuc itself is an elaborate hoax, one which the authors are doing their best to warn us. Who amongst us is suffering from violence, rebellion, tyranny, or mental breakdown, condemned as we are to this Pirandellian like Organization behaviour?

See Case and O’Doherty (forthcoming) for further close textual readings of class tests and chapter exercises in Huczynski and Buchanan, exercises which at best seem to rely on the mobilisation of a complex and sophisticated background of knowledge, understanding, and organization; at worst, the exercises and activities are impossible to complete, collapsing into contradiction and inconsistency - in what might appear to be a deliberate design to bewilder and frustrate. One can almost see the sly smile of the authors as they sit back and contemplate the disruption and pandemonium caused in the classroom.

One might be reminded here of Lautréamont’s definition of beauty as ‘the unexpected meeting, on a dissection table, of a sewing machine and an umbrella’, routinely cited in surrealist writings as the quintessence of surrealist art. With its wild out-of-scale juxtapositions and disproportions, shimmering images, decontextualisations, and recovered memories, hucbuc becomes nauseous and dream-like in ways that resemble many features of surrealism, particularly, for the purposes of this paper, in its contagious hypnotic, trance-like affectivity. Breton writes in his 1927 text Le Surréalisme et la Peinture that the mind confronted with the surprising juxtaposition of two images, where outline and form gives way to movement and latency, is stimulated to wander into ‘fields of force’ beyond the ‘limiting consideration of the object’s known life’. We would call this state of becoming motorvation and in its space(ing) objects, entities, and relations are de-positioned in a process involving for Breton (1965:86) moments of diversion, de-contextualisation, dispersal, and reconstruction. Of the period of decontextualisation Breton writes that this illuminates ‘the very uncertainty of its previous assignment or the ambiguity resulting from its totally or partially internal conditioning, which gains dignity by discovery (found object) and leaves an appreciable margin in the case of the most active interpretation’ (ibid.; emphasis added). This paper can be read as an attempt to leave or invent margins by an active derangement of the senses, a becoming-(of-the)-phenomena. The encounter with hucbuc is dangerous and in this sense irreversible.

During an interview conducted by one of the authors, which formed part of a research project examining technological and organizational redesign in the financial services industry, the interviewee, a manager in the mid 40s, responded to one question with the words ‘Well, that’s Braverman’s territory isn’t. It’s not as if we don’t learn our lessons at school you know!’. Later, they went on to elaborate: ‘You see, we’ve been able to deskill these processing centres as far as possible and they are perfect for women, mid to late 30s, child care responsibilities, and looking for a bit of part time work for extra cash’ (see O’Doherty 1992, 1993). One might also recall the tale recounted in Clifford and Marcus (1986) of the ethnographer interviewing the chief of a tribe in a remote village community. When asked about the precise nature of the objects and rituals used in some tribal ceremony the chief, whose memory was not as good as it had been in such matters and affairs of his community, dispatched his valet to recover a book from the library. The book that was returned to the chief was in fact that of the ethnographer’s supervisor who had previously conducted a study of the tribe.

Here we draw on Derrida’s (1986) highly instructive reading of Freud’s theorisation of fetish and taboo in Glas where Derrida works on the undecidable role of the fetish, which is better approached with the idea of a phantasm.
Is there a possible narrative to be worked here? Braverman as a proto-Murdochian buster of union demarcation rules and custom and practice?

There are many consultants who offer their services as ‘clowns’ to organizational clients, or indeed who train management to become clowns. “Money for old rope”, some might say. The work of Vivian Gladwell and Sharon Usher, who describes herself as an ‘organizational consultant and clown’ ([www.treda.freeserve.co.uk/connections/index.html](http://www.treda.freeserve.co.uk/connections/index.html)), are perhaps the two most well known exponents in the field. Sven Werner has also written an as yet unpublished paper ‘The Role of the Court Jester in Modern Organizations’, which was delivered at the annual ‘meta-morphosis’ conference in Edinburgh, April 2001 ([www.connect.to/metamorphosis](http://www.connect.to/metamorphosis)). On a more subversive note, the San Francisco based ‘Cacophony Society’, led by Asswipe the klown (Adam Bregman) who dresses in a polyester clown suit topped with a large bright orange cowboy hat two and half feet in length, regularly crash corporate meetings and events, and entertain corporate executives with twisted and warped versions of ‘Happy Birthday’, which leaves their “clients” bewildered, and often upset (see Dery, 1999:83-4). In their newsletter, Tales from the Zone, the Cacophony Society describe the operation as “a loose network of humans devoted to the pursuit of experiences beyond the mainstream. We are the bug under the rug, the termites in society's crutches, the bad egg at the corporate picnic, the vital spirits of cultural fermentation. You may already be a member.” (see [http://losangeles.cacophony.org/lacaco.htm](http://losangeles.cacophony.org/lacaco.htm)). Anticipating the coming millennium, Dery (1999:69) writes that the ‘psycho-clown who takes his sociopathic slapstick outside the ring is moving stage centre in the pop unconscious’. We are perhaps already there in hubuc.

**Springboard**


