

HUGO LETICHE

Where Have All the Bodies Gone?

ABSTRACT

Feminist / postmodern theoreticians of the re-erotization of the organization have attempted to force organizational studies to take the body into account. They oppose the sort of 'agency' assumed in '(New) Managerialism' which divides practice into 'minds' that rule and bodies that are ruled. However obvious it is that without bodies there would be no labor or division of labor and thus no organization; organizational research has largely ignored physical existence. Of late some theorists have focused on extremes (brothels, sadomasochism, female ejaculation, sexual violence) in physicality in an effort to (re-)introduce the body. I have studied the 'managing' of prostitution to see (i) what such work means for the managerial practitioner and (ii) what such studies reveal about management thought. But I conclude that extremes of physicality lead more to an organizational discourse of essentialist 'embodiment', than to one of inter-relationship and Othering. And Othering, or an understanding of complex physical/personal as well as body/anOther interaction, is what would welcome the body (back) into organizational studies.

Key words: *embodiment, organizational theory, management, prostitution*

ORGANS/BODIES(IZATION)?

The meanings of 'managerialism' have shifted several times during the last decades. Early twentieth century 'managerialism' equated administrative skill, determination and mastery – that is, rational control – with the social equivalent of natural science. (Stever, 1998) This 'managerialism' argued that in an industrialized, urbanized technological society, it is almost impossible to act rationally – organization is needed to shore up the individual inability to deal sys-

HUGO LETICHE, Professor, University for Humanist Studies Utrecht, the Netherlands.

• E-mail: h.letiche@uvh.nl

tematically and logically with social complexity. (Mayo, 1945) 'Anti-managerialism' countered that organizations reward mediocrity and conformity, while punishing courage and creativity. (Whyte, 1956) 'New Managerialism' (1980's to date) is anti-statist, anti-bureaucratic and pro-'enterprise culture'. It champions hard-paced competitive striving, extremely dominating leadership and celebrates highly energetic 'can-do types' for 'tough' decisive management. (Christopher, 1992) 'New Managerialism' – like any hegemony – displays some gaps, fissures or ruptures. 'Anti-New Managerialism' has tried to make 'new managerialism' look ridiculous, for instance by applying it to matters that its supporters would consider totally inappropriate, such as gay culture, drug dealing and the sex business. What's more inimical to the glorification of the individual work ethic and support for performance based rewards, than prostitution?

Judging from the papers and articles extolling attention for sadomasochism, 'female ejaculation' and (aspects of) prostitution, the attack on male ascendancy in organizational studies seems to becoming more and more extreme (see in bibliography Joanna Brewis, Gibson Burrell, Christopher Grey, Heather Hopfl, Hugo Letiche, Stephen Linstead, Lucie van Mens & John Sinclair). The prioritization of control, reason and dominance, in definitions of managerial 'agency', seems to have banned intimacy, mutual relationship and 'being-together'. Admittedly in much organizational literature, the body has been totally absent and a repressive, often very aggressive, sort of rationality has been championed. An anti-emotive denial of physical being has made mind/body 'holism' impossible. Perception has been emptied of feeling, relationship (often) of passion, and work of tactile immediacy. Thus in the study of organizations, there is almost no reference to physical existence. It is as if work and management, organization and the economy, all existed in a world without bodies. How can one capture this absence – that is acknowledge physical being and escape the ravages of mind/body dualism? (Knights, 1997) Creativity, emergence and *jouissance* (pleasure) demand a 'holistic' relationship between the physical and the mental. But will a strategy of exaggerated anti-dualism, embracing extreme 'pleasures', be productive? The attempt to break down the mentalist predilection, has led some to study the sex business and to lionize the anti-control, anti-strategy and anti-managerialist position. Obviously, the management of prostitution cannot ignore the body. It has to acknowledge physicality and bodily being. (O'Neill, 1994; Scambler & Scambler, 1997) Thus, via the management of prostitution one can see what happens to management when physical bodily existence cannot be put into the 'object'. Anti-dualist / anti-managerial thinkers have tried to put the 'body' before the ratio, and the 'object' before the 'normal'. My experiment with this logic has indicated that an anti-managerialist research strategy unfortunately does not bring the body into the management discussion in any meaningful holistic sense, but keeps it out by formalizing, routinizing and rationalizing physicality and by being limited to a perspective driven by market needs.

The study reported on here concerns the (professional) management of prostitution. In most societies prostitution is left in a gray area more to the outside than to the inside of the divide between what 'is' and what 'is not' acknowledged. Prostitution is relegated to the 'abject' – that is to regions of denied experience which cannot be fully suppressed. (Linstead, 1997a). In the Netherlands, the dominant regime of hyper-bureaucratized 'new managerialism' meets its match when it sets out to manage prostitution. Prostitution in Holland is 'in-between' – neither accepted nor rejected, neither a 'business like any other' nor entirely illegal.¹ (Pheterson, 1986, van Mens, 1992) An effect of prostitution's semi-legalization has been that research bureaus, health and information agencies, advice and consulting auspices have all grown up around 'the business'. This infrastructure is often government subsidized and is always professionally 'managed'. My research of such managers has explored managing outside standard rational, dualistic managerial 'agency'. In this article I report on two professional managers, studied via observation and depth interviews, whose managing is in the 'abject' of prostitution. A conundrum of fascination and horror, matter-of-factness and bewilderment, managerial clarity and human confusion is reported on. (McKeganey & Barnard, 1996; Barry, 1995)

THE IRON CAGE OF 'AGENCY', AND THE BODY

In organizational studies one can find power and volition, mastery and passivity, cooperation and competition, success and failure, but there are no bodies. There is power and leadership, decision and action, but no physical being. Common sense dictates that organizations cannot exist without bodies – orders are given to be realized in physical human activities. Organizational 'vision' 'mission' or 'strategy' is secondary to employees' physical presence and actions. 'Meaning' in organizations is realized when people look at one another, touch each other, physically react to one another. But oddly, situated concrete bodily existence is lacking from the organizational studies literature. Managerial 'agency' doesn't seem to include the body. Even the movement towards *re-erotization* has merely 'welcomed back feminization', that is attitudes, values and feelings, without actual concern for bodies. (Brewis & Grey, 1994) As Linstead has pointed out, in *re-erotization* the 'erotic' is identified with the 'feminine' (caring openness, emotionality) that is distinguished from the 'masculine' (rational, linear, competitive) and "we seem here to have little more than an inversion which reproduces the conceptual binary divide that accompanies gender dimorphism." (Linstead, 1997a) A reversal of the pri-

¹ It is too early to comment on the effects (if any), which the full-fledged 'legalization' of prostitution currently underway in Holland, will have on 'the business'.

macy of logos over Eros does not change the polar logic of the physical versus the mental, of the subjective versus the objective, of the passive versus the active.

If we posit that hierarchy opposes the manager to the worker, thought to action, the social to the technical; then organization polarizes 'agency' and body. (Wood, 1998) Organization exists to create positions from which action can be undertaken. It engenders a playing field suitable for its key agent(s), who are empowered to act. 'Agency', in organization, enacts logocentricism. (Cooper, 1989) Managers remain external to the things that happen to them; they are situated at a distance from what takes place 'outside their bodies'. Managers are 'in control' of events – their identity is grounded in acts of separation: planning versus production, control versus work, leader versus led. Managers hoard 'agency'. Their performative practices – that is their ways of speaking, their artifacts, the uses they make of others, are meant to produce secure boundaries that divide 'agency' from 'acted upon'. Managers operate in a 'disembodied' universe – their spreadsheets and 'bottom-line' are not embodied in direct relationships to concrete 'Others'. Their world of institutional boundaries avoids messy border situations between 'self' and 'other'. Managerial thought simply assumes that the managerial 'subject' is the site of 'agency'. Organizational 'agency', in turn, is identified with managerial 'agents'. Managers ascribe key ascendant attributes to themselves, such as: 'I am a visionary'; 'I communicate well'; 'I give leadership'; 'I am entrepreneurial'. The dominance of the 'I' epitomizes the ideology of managerial 'agency'.² (Wood, 1998, Burrell, 1997) But the manager's 'I' is not all that unique or individual. Managers function via generalizable practices and pre-conceived strategies that are meant to keep individuality and exceptions under control.

As John Seely Brown has made clear, managers almost desperately try to create and maintain 'boundary objects'. (Brown, 1998) That is: (1) to define what is supposed to happen and what is not supposed to happen; (2) to establish what 'identity' will and will not be encouraged; and (3) to affirm individual and collective prerogatives while forbidding their infringement. Managers are constantly struggling to impose order, rules and limits. Managers transform organization into an on-going definitional process, dedicated to the imposition of interdicts. The behavior and artifacts managers favor, are supposed to make labor productive, to steer actions effectively and to allow management to critically judge results. The imposition of formal organization – such as business units, departments, functional teams and quality groups – banishes the 'in-between'. Indeterminate, unstructured and 'messy' interaction is rejected. But managers' 'boundary objects' really are quite weak; they are temporary and are contested. Managerial 'agency' is constantly breaking down and having to be shorn up – that is why so much managerial time is dedicated to 'fire-fighting'. It is no wonder, thus, that anti-dualist and

² This is a conceptual 'I' found in the management literature --- the 'I' of individual managers is much more varied.

anti-managerialist efforts to deny managerial 'agency' are not welcome. The introduction of the body into organizational studies, functions as just such an attack.

The body's boundaries are inexact – where the skin ends and the surroundings start, is never totally specific. Furthermore, the warmth and odor of the body always extend beyond the skin. The boundaries to the body's erotic influence are very indefinite. The inexact limits to human anatomy, and the impossibility to control them, are an affront to an organizational universe that is out to impose 'agency' order and exactitude. Thus in 'managerialism', 'agency' is opposed to the 'body'. 'Agency' is the principle of rational control that subsumes individual desire to organizational goals. It is the repression of *jouissance* for profit. The 'body' stands for unmediated lived-existence, specific embedded occurrence, and the local or immediate.

Postmodernism is an intellectual movement that has chosen for the 'body' by embracing the principles of 'local truth' and direct experience. (Lyotard, 1998) Postmodernism grounds narrative in immediate perception – in what the body reveals. The modernist/postmodernist debate can be framed as a struggle between abstract rational 'truth' and direct 'bodily' truth. (Tyler, 1987) Postmodern criticism of managerialism points to major dilemmas in the managerial 'I'. It announces the 'demise of the episteme of representation', arguing that the social (organizational) world is 'self-referential' and unable to provide a vantage point from which managers could really determine their actions, define their strategies or give leadership. (Benhabib, 1992) In postmodernism, managers are *seen when they see* and are *influenced as they influence*. Managers are made to seem, as much part of the organizational culture, as is anyone else. Feminist postmodernism, in particular, has disparaged managerial 'agency', claiming that it reproduces "a heterosexist (management) culture where women and homosexual men are excluded in the name of rationality, efficiency and the holy profit!" (Höök, 1998) Managerial 'agency' has made "it possible for men to reproduce their power in an all-male, homosocial and potentially homoerotic setting" that excludes women. (Höök, 1998) Feminism sees, in the standard epistemological dualism(s) of the manager versus the managed – assumptions that are based on: (1) the actor versus the acted upon, (2) the subject versus the object, (3) the strategy (text) versus reality – just another scarcely concealed desire for stable and secure male identity to dominate. (Butler, 1990) The hierarchical assumptions render: (1) consumption (women as shoppers), (2) the absence of self (woman as lacking ego boundaries), (3) the surface as all there is (woman as appearance, fashion-oriented, outer-directed), (4) the particularistic (woman as operating with particularistic criteria of family), (5) the critique of logocentrism and attitude to reflexivity (woman as subjective), (6) the celebration of fragments (woman as a face, a breast, a womb) and (7) the denial of cultural hierarchy (woman as noncompetitive, not interested in power); inferior to the masculine principles of production, sharp distinctions, depth models, universal standards, wholeness and hierarchy. (Lutz, 1993)

But talk about the 'body', is not self-evidently a victory for generative immediacy above repressive 'agency'. Some feminists have claimed that when, despite everything, the 'body' has been smuggled into the study of organization; it has been as a 'man dressed in a woman's clothes'. Postmodern (feminist) criticism has been critiqued as a narrative strategy that expounds female values only to repress them. Feminist postmodernism has asserted the death of linear progress – that is the end of the primacy of 'more is better' and 'bigger is superior' – but has paradoxically "claim(ed) that the [pomo] views represent substantial progress over previous views." (Lutz, 1993) Postmodernism may have championed the death of the subject and thereby the end of 'agency' but may obscure who needs to speak-up, and thereby keep women and people of color mute. It has been asserted that postmodern feminism exploits the strong link between mass culture and the feminine, in order to define itself as peripheralized and as oppositional.³ The claim to contradict enlightenment science and to be an oppositional form of practice, may merely be 'trendy' and 'fashionable'. (Huysen, 1986) Such an intellectual strategy would be very 'masculine' and amount to the heroic pursuit of marginality and authenticity. (Burrell, 1997) 'Agency' then reappears as the right to 'label' or the power to determine identity and is strenuously restricted to the power bearers. The question for feminist postmodernism is: *Has the grip of 'agency', on the social construction of identity, (really) changed?*

Managerial identity may be acknowledged, by some, to be an emergent process wherein logocentrism and dualism need to be rejected, but that doesn't mean that most managers have really become any less over-powering. A possible reaction to Postmodern questioning, is to focus on managers' own stories and to see how they try to order their own world and attempt to secure their 'self'. (Knights & Willmott, 1999) Such a focus reveals a crisis in identity formation that is positively valued by feminist and post-structuralist thinkers. (Knights, 1997) Decentering and deconstructing 'agency' can open the way to alternative identity-securing strategies, wherein polyphony, complexity and displacement reign. (Haraway, 1991) Instead of ordering the world into, a 'this' and a 'that' – i.e. the subjective and objective, male and female, self and other, manager and managed; the manifold could be embraced and celebrated. The denial of 'logocentrism' ought to refuse to prioritize reason, order and rationality. 'Closure of meaning' should be denied – no stable 'agency' or 'identity' ought to be posited. The 'heroic masculine mastery of the world' should be disavowed – strategies of action that impose order and security ought to be thwarted. (Clough, 1992) A postmodern feminist attitude – centering on the fragmentary, provisional and uncertain – could then result. The refusal to "constitute orderly worlds and sustain secure identities" would then be championed. (Keerfoot & Knights,

³ It will be clear in the text that I do not think that this critique applies to Luce Irigaray or Judith Butler (or Hélène Cixous), but the theme of strategies of criticism tripping all over themselves and becoming hopelessly paradoxical, is a key issue in this paper.

1996) What would be the effect of all of this, on management studies? Could *différence* and multiplicity really undermine the authority of managerial discourse? Is 'agency' really becoming participative or polyvalent?

There is no automatism leading from Postmodernism to situational physicality. Postmodern managers could embrace *performativity* and throw the demand for *différence* to the winds. Would a hyper-active Postmodern narcissist do better justice to the 'Other' than a self-assured rationalist? Will postmodern feminism focus on managerial 'agency' in a liberatory manner? Critical attention to managerial identity can try to be relativating and particularizing. But, can it bring us closer to the 'Other' or to the 'body'? Could emphasis on managerial complexity produce a more inclusive concept of 'agency'? Postmodern 'performativity' might not focus on the 'this' (the manager's 'agency') of organization, but on the 'that' (doing business, money making). This line of reasoning follows Baudrillard. (Baudrillard, 1983) To state the choice in a very dualist manner: traditional theories of managerial 'agency' do not accept multiplicity or ambiguity – in effect managing as a *concrete human social activity* is made unthinkable. In rationalist dualism there is an (1) external reality that can be (2) understood, modeled and manipulated and about which (3) meaningful generalizations can be made that lead to (4) accurate predictions. Contrastingly, postmodernism can be seen to assert that meaning is: (1) fragmented (theories only possess limited explanatory value – even 'time and space' cannot hold events stable 'in their place'), (2) hyper-real (nothing and no-one is 'authentic', the 'real' is indefinable), (3) subject to de-differentiation (no hierarchy determines that one 'truth' or 'voice' is pre-eminent) and characterized by (4) différence (an inexhaustible diversity of possible interpretations, juxtapositions, alternatives). Both the 'dualist' perspective on managerial 'agency' and the 'alternative' postmodern version of 'agency', assume self/other, action/acted upon, mind/body, strategy/production dualities. Baudrillard has merely reversed the causality, letting the 'world' dominate. As long as causality assumes a dualist structure of 'agency' with an 'actor' and an 'acted upon', the body will remain in the 'abject'. 'Agency' perpetuates the opposition of 'rationality' or human 'will', to the *hylē* or materiality of the concrete world. Banning of the body, is inherent to the logic of managerial 'agency' – that is, to positing a manager who is in 'control' and who makes things happen.⁴ Inclusion of the body in organizational studies, implies a very radical sort of anti-managerialism. (Willmott, 1994) But is inclusion of sexuality and physicality in the study of organization, an effective way to evoke the 'Other' and the 'body'? Should the 'body' be identified with the 'Other'; with sweating laborers, physical attraction and/or sex workers? Critics of managerial 'agency', oppose the nitty-

⁴ 'Management' is treated here as a category, in the confrontation of rationality and control versus body and immediacy.

gritty of the 'body' to the logic of the organization. The 'body' is identified with the immediate, personal and concrete. Paradoxically, the 'body' functions in such a critical discourse, as an abstraction – as a principle of postmodern criticism, but not as direct concrete experience. Prostitution, sadomasochism and sexual attraction are evoked as if they were the antithesis to managerial 'agency'. The intellectualized 'body' opposes 'managerialism', without ever becoming lived-experience. A logocentric 'body' can only appear to oppose logocentrism. Lived interaction – that is tangible relationship(s) to the 'Other' – would forge new relationship(s) between 'managing' and the 'body'. I do not want to focus on the 'body' as an oppositional conceptualization, but on the 'body' as an experiential given. Since the 'body' in the post-modern criticism of 'managerialism', is often identified with the extremes of eroticization, I have tried to find a matching concrete empirical situation. Studying project managers, working on aspects of prostitution, fit the bill. The function was 'managerial', the subjects were at hand and the 'body' was crucial to their experience of organizing.

(ANTI-) MANAGING AND THE PROSTITUTION BUSINESS

What happens, when instead of evoking the anti-rationalist non-dualist logic of the 'body', actual experiences of the body are explored? Instead of manipulating prostitution as an icon of opposition, I studied project managers who work in the prostitution business. These managers are employed by government and privately financed agencies that exist to supervise the working conditions and the public health aspects of prostitution. Such project managers are in the ambivalent position of being professionals whose task it is to make the prostitution business work better. They manage teams of (semi-)professionals, who work directly with brothel owners, local government and the prostitutes to 'better' organize 'the business'. Sometimes, the managers (or their staff) work with the 'clients'. The managers are in constant contact with the target group, as well as with their own staff. Mostly their role is: (i) to generate support needed to make projects viable, (ii) to give expert advice, and (iii) to evaluate project results. All the work revolves around prostitution – its social conflicts, health risks, psychological effects. Their job, is to 'know prostitution' – that is, to be able on demand to provide 'expert' opinions about it.

My interest was in the implications that managing prostitution had for (anti-)managerialism. My involvement was in response to the lack of attention to emotion, the body and sexuality I'd encountered in organizational theory. The issues, of course, have been foreshadowed in literature on phenomenology and embodiment. (Hochschild, 1983) (Hearn et.al. 1992) (Fine-
man, 1993) (Collison & Hearn, 1996) (Merleau-Ponty, 1962) Many business concepts – client centredness, emergent strategy, globalization, value chain, organizational culture – look very

different when applied to brothels instead of to multinationals. The generalizability of business concepts is problematized when they are applied to prostitution. Hidden norms are made evident. The prioritization of the management perspective (the pimp's), the celebration of the client (trick), and the motivation of the workforce (whores), seems strangely inappropriate when looking to the brothel. Prostitution tests managerialism by examining it in a 'deviant' context.

In the management of prostitution, the relationship between physical (bodily) existence and meaning (strategies, rules, governance) gets shaken up. Prostitution confronts us with the epistemological crisis that has uniquely been explored (philosophically) by Artaud. (Artaud, 1976) Prostitution is about pure gut bodily experience, which transcends logic and re-directs perception to an originary bodily level.⁵ Artaud argued that this leaves us with the "howl" of "cruelty" because this is the only direct physical expression that can seamlessly weld together thought and body. Artaud tried to transcend traditional body/idea and subject/object dichotomies, but it was at the price of making ordered expression and thought impossible. Artaud's way of not prioritizing rationality and control, led to the 'end-of-sanity'. Is this what radical anti-managerialism leads to? Can a logic exist of managerial 'agency' that does justice to human (mind/body) holism? Or does managerial logic always reduce meaning to conformity and overwhelm individuality with clichés that drown identity? Can management do anything but destroy individuality and life itself? For Artaud rational organization is an escape from life – a way to not feel experience, and to not have to see. Managing deadens consciousness, so it can escape undergoing circumstance. Safe formulas and approved solutions inure the mind from confronting complexity, mystery or physicality. Management retreats into conventions, as a way of not having to meet existence head-on.

Prostitution is not easily tamed. It spurns rationalist stereotypes. It refuses to become 'progress', to be beneficial, to appear justified, or to act disciplinedly. Management can try to create routinized functionalist reality, wherein everything is ordered, purposeful and meaningful; but prostitution breaks the mould. One cannot make 'prostitution' mean 'order', 'structure' or 'intention' without doing something rather monstrous. Thus if one's job is to 'manage' prostitution, what does one do? What significance does one give to managing in such a context? What does managing end up meaning? The managers I observed knew: (1) the women who prostitute themselves, (2) the principle stakeholders in 'the business', and (3) how the 'governance' – via public health, the law, government policy – is organized. They had several options, namely to

⁵ Artaud's reflection limits itself to the cultural-psychological plane; he does not take-up the issue(s) of economic rationality. Likewise, in this article I 'bracket' the financial side to the transaction --- what I have to say is about organization and the body. It is not my intention to deny in any way the significance of the market structure to prostitution.

try to deal with prostitution as if (1) it was an abstract issue – but it is too emotive for that; as if (2) prostitution is a business just like any other – but it ‘really’ is ‘different’ or as if it was (3) an ‘objectified’ issue outside themselves – but it makes too strong an impression for that. Their belonging to prostitution was a problem they had to account for – as in “writing an account” but also as in “accountability”. (Munro & Mouritsen, 1996) Prostitution may be fascinating, but it is also ‘horror’ and ‘ugliness.’ None of the managers wanted to be identified with it. They all feared the questions ‘Who are you that you manage prostitution?’ And: ‘What is prostitution in you?’

THE TWO MANAGERS

A word on the methodology

Though I met, interviewed and had discussions with several managers and (semi-)professionals whose work is in effect ‘in the (prostitution) business’ only two had the sort of managerial responsibility that made their ‘cases’ revealing when juxtaposed with (anti-)managerialism. Those two I observed and interviewed (in Dutch) at length. What I present below is a condensed version of what they said. Though they have verified the text’s appropriateness and authenticity, I remain responsible for transcribing, analyzing, editing and translating. I have tried to provide the reader with the ‘voice’ of the managers telling their own story. My narrativization of the research material posed methodological dilemmas. What sort of ‘subjects’ am I creating? Do the ‘managers’ speak and write, or are they spoken for and written about? Is the attempt to create an illusion of auto-ethnography successful and/or appropriate? (O’Connell Davidson, 1998; Visweswaran, 1994) In order to avoid narrativising a disembodied unified and rational subject, I have attempted to create subjects that are textual contradictory and in-process. (Williams & Bendelow, 1998; Ahmed, 1998) But hereby I risk over-emphasizing individuation and re-creating the (textual) fetish of the ‘self’. The ‘self’ presented here is implicated in relations to ‘Others’, and the ‘text’ is at once an auto-biography of ‘self’ and an ethnography of ‘Other’. The balance between ‘self’ and ‘Other’ remains precarious. At once the text tries to resemble the ‘managers’ talking about themselves (‘self’), and to explore theoretical themes (‘Other’). In an article about boundaries between embodiment and organization, one has to be careful about the relationship(s) between ‘self’ and ‘Other’, because the logic of the one relationship parallels the logic of the other. If I present my ‘data’ structured around theoretical themes, a dominant logocentric authorial ‘self’ will take precedence; and if I privilege the managers’ ‘voice’, I will create a messy text that the reader has to actively (re-)interpret. My choice is for the second option.

(1)

Background: Frits Ploeg is a lawyer, his entire career he's worked with prostitution. He is now director of a private foundation dedicated to the improvement of prostitutes' working conditions. Originally the foundation was motivated by a Christian will to "save" prostitutes by prying them out of their 'lives of sin'. But the consensus has changed on what one ought to do to "help" prostitutes. Nowadays the hot items are: (1) the legalization of prostitution, (2) improving health facilities, (3) pensions and taxation, (4) female "slavery" and (5) illegal immigration.

Ploeg has worked twenty years on issues of the sex business. His relationship to prostitution is, at best, problematic. Prostitution, in his eyes, is a criminal sector and not exactly a place where one can find honest people. His role is to translate the sex business into what the society wants to know. Sometimes the brothel owners ask him to help them in their relationship to the 'official society.' The owners know that tax inspectors, police officers, zoning officials, will listen to Ploeg and not to them. But Ploeg knows that he will lose his credibility in the normal society, if he gets too close to 'the business'. As prostitute or as brothel confidant, you are always mistrusted and looked down upon by the normal society. Ploeg is as an interface between 'the business' and the government.

He never accepts money from the brothel owners because when they pay, they call the shots. The brothel owners have access to the best law firms and accountants, but none of these professionals want the stigma of being dubbed the lawyer or accountant of the sex business. Brothel money 'stinks' – the owners can buy expertise, but cannot really trust what they have bought. Of course some professionals have aligned themselves with the 'business,' but they are no longer accepted in their professional communities. 'The business' is never really on sure footing with the professional world. Ploeg is an inside-outsider – someone whose job it is to know 'the business' but who is not paid by it. There are many professionals – Md.'s, police, government, realtors, lawyers, bankers – swarming around the core of whores pimps and tricks, whose income (more or less) depends on their contact(s) with the prostitutes and brothel owners. Sometimes the professionals want to get directly involved – for instance to improve health and work standards, or to reduce the tension between the sex business and local neighborhoods, or to fight Aids. But the official world of government and police, deals mainly at arm's length with prostitution. Government may want to have an effect, but often does not want to be seen to be directly involved. Officialdom uses go-betweens, like Ploeg, as their middlemen. To be effective Ploeg has to have the trust of both the whores and the proprietors. 'The business' is very isolated – the various players are all shut off from the rest of society and doomed to one another's company. On the one hand, no one in the sex business (really) wants to be committed to any solidarity to anyone else – everyone is in it for himself or herself. And

on the other, it is a very insular closed world of people, who work intensely together. While Ploeg retains some direct contact with 'the business', most of the time he relates to it via his project staff. But when conflicts arise between the project staff and people in 'the business', he has to solve them. Mostly he writes project proposals and helps to present the project results.

Male, project manager and sex business – in his own voice:

The whole sex business is a game. It's a sort of role-play that is constantly put on by the one for the other. It's as fake as could be. The whores and pimps pretend to be a counter culture and free – but they are really locked up inside their own sub-culture, from which they cannot escape. Prostitution is play-acting – the contact with the client is a performance. The women are as unreal as could be and that is what is fascinating. What's sold is so un-real; it has so little substance. The whores sell 'hot air'. I've worked behind the bar in a brothel to 'get to know the world.' When there are no clients, the prostitutes chat with one another and it is very friendly. When the bell goes, they all put on other personalities and begin 'the show.' Once the client has chosen and left with his choice; everything returns to 'as it was'. It's all an 'act'. The women 'play' being 'sexy' – it's all a performance – for those 'on the in,' it can be very funny. The client wants to be 'fopped' – he's the sucker.

Both the women and the brothel owners, of course, know that what they are doing is socially unacceptable. They are socially isolated. Only the 'trick' is free – he buys the wares and leaves. But 'the business' is one up on the trick, because he gets no 'real' sex or attention, but only 'play acting,' But the 'trick' is one up on 'the business,' because he is really free to come and go, as he pleases.

Over the years, I've been involved with very many aspects of the sex business: quality, labor law, medical matters, taxation, emigration. But I don't really like 'prostitution' as a theme. I have to admit that 'the business' does have a lot of different sides to it. And the illegal aspect has a 'kick' to it. At least in Holland, you can work on policy issues – in more hypocritical societies, nothing can be legislated because the politicians refuse to admit that the problem(s) exist. The worst thing possible, is when people believe prostitutes have to be saved from them selves and 'treated' (locked-up) 24 hours per day – i.e. 'terror' is accepted as 'policy'. Probably the situation of the prostitutes, is everywhere horrible – most do not earn that much; almost none save anything. The psychic and physical damage is enormous. But it would not be effective for me to mount the barricades. Only if prostitutes fight for themselves, can it make a difference. What I can do is catalyze some cooperation between the women, the brothel owners and the rest of society. Obviously we ought to get the clients involved – we did set up 'client talk groups' which were quite successful for a while. But traditionally, the clients do not like to be identified as a group. I have tried to get the prosti-

tutes, brothel proprietors and clients talking to one another. But more often than not, they do not feel that they have much of anything to talk about. Their relations are determined more by money than anything else.

Attitudes towards prostitution, in the official society, are subject to a mad pendulum-like movement. At first prostitution is dirty and nothing can be discussed. Then prostitution is a profession like any other and has to be legalized. Now there seems to be uproar about pedophilia, female slavery and psychic exploitation. 'The business' has reacted by retreating back into an ever-deeper illegality.

Am I impassioned – I don't know; the women have to take responsibility for them self – only they can change their situation. If you're a whore, you are very isolated. You cannot tell the neighbor woman you had a good day – three tricks and no problems. And if you want to do something else, you cannot apply for a job and tell your new boss how good you were as a whore. The women, who do get out, keep feeling the pain of prostitution – they're deeply damaged. I'm also, in a way, trapped in 'the business.' If you are a professional, who lives from the sex business, you're 'damaged'. You cannot go to Shell and say "I'm a broadly oriented manager who has solved in the 'sex business' a great variety of problems." No you're branded. I went to a bankers' association meeting – all men in blue striped suits and told them they ought to give loans to the 'sex business' on the same basis as they did to all other businesses. Their current practices really resemble usury! You should have seen them look at me – looks of: "How dare you talk to respectable businessmen like that."

A young bloke got a key policy job for prostitution in the Ministry of Health. They told him to keep quiet about what was in his portefeuille or he'd be dubbed the "whore Madame." But he was active and did good work. They replaced him within six months because 'prostitution was becoming too visible.' Very few in Holland really want a repressive police approach to prostitution, but no one really wants to get too close to the prostitution 'problem'.

For my family it is a predicament. I have four young children. Research into prostitution with an emphasis on health care advocacy, is my career choice – not theirs'. I've told the kids that I do policy research, but not a word about prostitution. And when someone has to present our results on TV, I always let a colleague do it. When people hear that you have something to do with the sex business, they want to hear sensational stories. They can be very persistent – really quite a nuisance.

As for the business itself – of course I know its 'ins and outs.' In the sex business, everything revolves around money. If you can help with taxes, loans, licenses – i.e. with business; you are welcome everywhere. Via prostitution the underworld whitewashes money from smuggling, gunrunning and drugs. You don't discuss these things with the proprietors, but you let it be understood that you know the score. What I know, might be dangerous for me if I was in

the DAs office and decided to do something about it. But as it is, there's no real danger to me. And the government finds it handy to have people like me who 'are in the know.' It makes it easier for them to keep track of things. Of course the list what needs to be changed is long. But only if the women organize themselves in some sort of union, will anything happen. If you legalize the whole business, then labor laws will have to be applied; normal working rules established, health and safety regulations implemented. Government's role will be much more transparent. It is the same story as with gambling, once gambling was legalized the wild-west sphere was gone and fairly normal business conditions took over. Legalized prostitution wouldn't be interesting as a cover for other illegal activities. Things would change. Normal managers would take over – but it is not for me! When I see what is sold in a brothel, I'd rather run a millinery store.

(2)

Background: Karine van Pelt has an MBA. She is involved in the public health aspects of 'the business'. Most women professionals involved with prostitution deal solely with the women – van Pelt tries to understand the relationship(s) between the proprietors, clients and the prostitutes. She manages several large projects per year and advises several others. She is an expert on the relationship between Aids and prostitution. She focuses on prostitute awareness, and the schooling of government professionals to react more adequately to the health and social problems of prostitution. Recently, she has managed a series of project evaluations and participated in several international projects.

Just after completing her MBA, she received a research grant to investigate: *Does the prostitution branch adapt itself to changing client demands and if so, how?* This research experience played a formative role in her career. Later, she analyzed how others had reacted to her as a researcher. In the beginning, she wasn't aware of how the research establishment was reacting. She was focused on getting data and worried that clients wouldn't be willing to be interviewed.

Woman, project coordinator and 'story' too often stifled – in her own voice:

I didn't want to work in a bar or to walk the streets to find 'S's' {Subjects}. That was much too 'sticky' and maybe even dangerous. So I put an advertisement in the newspaper. There was an offer for three want ads, to be placed in a single week for the price of one – a real bargain and my budget was very restricted. I thought I might get a couple of responses, but there were hundreds. I ended up running from here to there, from appointment to appointment. I did four to five interviews per day. There was no time for reflection.

One evening, I came home and there were dinner guests. I excused myself to go to take a shower. I didn't realize what was happening, but everyone looked very strangely at me. My partner queried: 'Why do you need to take a shower? You never shower at this hour.' I was displaying the symptoms of a rape victim! They stand hours under the shower, trying to wash off the 'stain'. All the stories had hit me much harder than I'd realized. I was opening this enormous cesspool; all the intimate stories from all sorts of men. Things they'd never told anyone, and they were telling them to me. It took at least a year before I was clean again, i.e. rid of the effect. It was 'heavy,' it 'stuck' to me. I started to see things others miss – looks or signs on the street. You pick up the signals and vibrations of the men. You know, who 'goes to the whores'. You feel people's secrets, which they don't really want you to know. The exaggerated rejection of the subject matter and the tensed-up responses are often giveaways. And sometimes, mere acquaintances or distant colleagues 'spill the beans' to you – afterwards they're afraid of what you might do with what they'd told you.

Of course I interviewed some weirdoes; but most of the men were pleasant and reasonably good-looking. You could have a good laugh with them. I kept telling myself, I didn't have any right to judge them; after all I was asking them to tell me about their visits to the brothel. I never asked why they went – my questions were marketing directed: 'What sort of women do you prefer?' 'What sort of establishment do you favor?' 'How often do you go?' 'What does it cost?' 'Do you often go back to the same woman?' 'When was your first visit?' etc. etc. I wouldn't ask about their wives and girl friends. But they would begin to talk about them – things like: 'I like blond and my wife is dark.' 'I like really big tits and my wife's are small.' 'I want a blow job and my wife doesn't want to do it.' Many men didn't actually want all their sexual desires to be met by their wives. There seems to be a barrier to asking for some things. Men seem to think that some things are 'dirty' and that their wives shouldn't do them. But most of them said: 'You're a man and you want these things.' I found that terribly easy. But when they started to talk about sexual techniques, I found it really very difficult – things like descriptions of SM and (especially in the army) sex with animals. At first I didn't believe it all, but the stories kept repeating themselves.

The talk about sex, creates sexual feelings. I was sitting each day with four or five men with hard pricks. A female brothel proprietor later said to me: 'Karine, how did you do it – sex with all the men, OK. But listening to all their stories, that's really hard work. That's the most difficult thing there is.'

After all my work, the funding agency refused to let me publish my results! The granting agency only wanted 'facts' and 'figures.' . No client quotes or descriptions of the trade were to be published. Only a censored text was permitted – the research had to be made 'pristine.' The reader wasn't allowed to know what was really going on. The only interesting thing I was

allowed to publish, had to do with how all the clubs in the major city where I had done most of my research, were coming into the hands of a few owners. The board that controlled the research grant, was interested in the concentration of ownership. But I was forbidden to write anything about the product. How can you understand a business, when information about the product is taboo?

I had wanted to deal with changing problem definitions. Such as: *How has what is problematic about prostitution changed? Who defines, and how, what is or is not, accepted?* For instance, brothels in Holland pay taxes; but prostitutes are not protected by the (labor, health, etc.) law(s). Most research into prostitution has been written from the man's point of view. It looks at the women and ignores the men. But without the clients there would be no prostitution. How do the clients determine what happens in prostitution? Prostitution isn't simply 'dirty', or a marginal woman problem. It is (in Holland) a more than five billion guilders per year business. We need to get rid of the simplistic 'Madonna / slut' dualism. Prostitutes are neither evil, nor innocent victims; most have chosen to be a whore. But it isn't a normal profession, like any other.

I didn't go undercover or anything like that, to do my research. I thought it was pretty normal to tell people what I was doing. But you get such strange reactions from other researchers. Men would suddenly dump all their sexual secrets and problems on me. People would stop talking to me, and would walk away when I approached them. I was at a national research conference, and the chairman introduced the lunch with 'We have researchers here working on everything from microbes in the Amazon River to conditions in Dutch brothels.' A senior Professor at my table reacted stunned: 'Who is going to the brothels?' When I revealed myself, he didn't speak for an hour; he just seemed to sit there in shock.

I still do some mainstream (social science) research, such as work on the developing economies in central Europe, or on organizational issues in the civil service. When I'm doing that research, I try to make sure that I get to see everyone involved before they know that I've worked on prostitution. Then the prostitution work is just a mere detail; otherwise it can be a major obstacle. I've had to fight stigmatization; to try to find a way not to be labeled and shunned. Especially conservative males, in positions of power, seem to brand one.

I used to wear short skirts, but I've stopped – there was a rumor that I'd been a whore. I started wearing my signature ring with my family herald on it; to prove that my connections and pedigree are as good as anyone else's. People seem to want to see me either as unique, special and brilliant; or as depraved, mentally handicapped and dangerous. Of course, the subject of prostitution has its kicks; I've been repeatedly asked to appear on TV. Prostitution is never dull and it touches so very many emotions. But you have to watch out that you aren't used to generate cheap kicks and mere sensationalism. People want to use you for their titillation.

Prostitution has a strange power to make everyone involved in it, whatever their role, very passive. The prostitutes like to see themselves as victims; they often speak as if there is no way out. Prostitution creates mental lethargy – you become ‘doomed to it’ – it sticks to you, it follows you. The brothel owners say they cannot earn a living in any other way; clients claim to be ‘addicted’ to it.

When I had my first research grant, I never had opportunities to discuss my work on an academically satisfactory level. It is a very difficult field – you have to jump from one theoretical frame of reference to another. Women’s studies wants one thing from you; psychology another; organizational studies differs from public policy, etc. etc. You get shunted from one discourse to another. Now I’m more arrogant – I’ve generated enough research money to have an impressive track record. But discussion about my work hasn’t gotten much better. At international conferences, there’s sometimes interesting discussion – but the feeling of being a pariah hasn’t changed. What I really wanted – that my data would be allowed to speak for itself; was denied me. I cannot say that things have gotten much better.

THE STRATEGY OF EXTREMES FAILS

Prostitution in the managers’ texts is the unwarrantable Other – an impalpable given. Derrida has aptly captured prostitution’s ‘meaning’ by identifying it as the “unrepresentable ground of representation.” (Derrida, 1978) Prostitution comes as close as we can get to Artaud’s ‘theater of cruelty’ – that is to a process wherein direct bodily interaction is enacted without the mitigating intervention of rationality and order. In prostitution the distance between ‘meaning’ and ‘action’ is at a minimum. ‘Body’ and ‘significance’ come as close to one another as they can get. But prostitution is ‘false’ in the sense that it is not intimacy, affection or agape. It is a physical relationship of use – via the manipulation of genitals. Prostitution is stylized, routinized, formalized – it is representation and theater without affection or endearment. Prostitutes emphasize their rules: no kissing, sex only with condoms, no affective involvement and strict time management. (Brewis, Linstead & Sinclair, 1998) Prostitution ‘represents’ sex – it both is and is not, mere ‘representation’. Prostitution is epistemologically destabilizing – what and how does it signify? Prostitution is at once exactly what it is – that is, an activity leading to ejaculation; and it is not what it is – that is a ‘relationship’. Sexual arousal destroys rational self/other distance. Detailed descriptions of prostitution will be pornographic – the representation can not be sharply divided from the represented. In prostitution the conventional dualism of the represented and the representation is shattered. Prostitution can be thought of as a fetishised representation of sex, wherein the prostitute objectifies her client’s desires. Prostitutes sell men, male fantasies of sex. (Theweleit, 1987 a & b; Letiche & v Mens, 1998) The prosti-

tute is not the 'Other', in a complex relationship of *différence*, but the 'same' to an imagined (imaginary) need— i.e. *fetishized sex*. (Brewis, 1998) The man's 'self' in prostitution, is the idea he has of his desire. The prostitute's 'self' is the idea she has, of what she has to give the 'trick' to earn her money and to get rid of him, as efficiently as possible.

Radical opponents to mind/body dualism in organizational studies have tried to rediscover corporeal existence by championing extreme examples of *managing the physical*. The managers in this article refused in their accounts, to see anything liberatory about working in or around 'the business'. Interpreting prostitution 'essentialistically', as 'the body speaks', attacks body/mind dualism by prioritizing what is normally repressed. But the return of the repressed as 'organizational pornography', merely reverses the peck order without abrogating the hierarchy. (Mumby, 1998) The body reappears on the side of 'truth' as the 'dominant logic' and as the 'real' – supposedly over-coming the anti-physical phallogocentric position of the past. But the logic of dominance versus subservience is maintained. Instead of 'essentializing' order, control and organization, one now 'essentializes' physicality sexuality and the 'body'. The managers I studied rejected such reversals and chose for *Othering*. They 'narratized' *Others* as those who challenge and confront, fascinate and befriend, astound and bore. Relationship is a process of *Othering* wherein *différence* is experienced. (Irigaray, 1985; van den Ende, 1999) The managers maintained that in prostitution the quality of *Othering* was deeply unsound. There was no relationship – no dynamic interact between mind and body, self and other, the one and the many. In prostitution, flesh and sex are present without *Othering*. For the organizational theorist who is in search of human physical presence and not just the power effects of managerial 'agency', there isn't much of interest in managing the brothel. Embodiment in management and organization, I believe, will not be helped by engaging with the 'managing' of prostitution. The re-figuring of the body in organization and the abandonment of phallogocentrism in management, demand more attention for felt relationship and *Othering*. The critique in organizational studies of the not-represented body does not need to fall into the trap of an over-represented body. The movement away from the body via the repression of the physical is not effectively answered with a movement towards the body characterized by fixation or fetishism. The *in-between* of relationship preserves the *self* and the *Other*, as well as the body and the context. The (auto-)ethnography of extreme and violent forms of physical existence, will not open the study of organization to the living body. Something very different – namely studies of everyday relationship and intimacy, based on the *in-between* of interaction rather than on the power relations of managerial 'agency' – could succeed where the extreme strategy fails. ■

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- AHMED, SARA (1998) *Differences that Matter* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ARTAUD, ANTONIN (1976) *Selected Writings* New York: Farras, Straus & Giroux
- BARRY, KATHLEEN (1979) *Female Sexual Slavery* New York: NYU Press.
- (1995a) *The Prostitution of Sexuality* New York: NYU Press.
- (1995b) "Pimping: the world's oldest profession" *On the Issues*
- BAUDRILLARD, JEAN (1983) *Les stratégies fatales* Paris: Grasset.
- BENHABIB, S (1992) *Situating the subject* London: Sage.
- BREWIS, JOANNA and CHRIS GREY (1994) 'Re-eroticizing the organization' *Gender Work and Organization* vol 1 no 2 67–82.
- BREWIS, JOANNA and JOHN SINCLAIR (1996a) 'Intimacy and the sting of the postmodern – re-eroticization of the post-industrial workplace' paper presented at SCOS-8 UCLA, July.
- BREWIS, JOANNA and JOHN SINCLAIR (1996b) '(Dis)organizing the erotic: sadomasochism the body and pleasure' paper given at Body & organization Workshop Keele, September.
- BREWIS, JOANNA STEPHEN LINSTEAD and JOHN SINCLAIR (1997a) 'The Prostitute-Client Relationship: Examining inscriptions of an empty space' paper presented at SCOS-9 Warsaw, July
- BREWIS, JOANNA MARK HAMPTON & STEPHEN LINSTEAD (1997b) 'Unpacking Priscilla: subjectivity, identity and the organisation of gendered appearance' *Human Relations* vol 50 no 8 pp 1275–1304.
- BREWIS, JOANNA, STEPHEN LINSTEAD and JOHN SINCLAIR (1998) "The worst thing is the screwing, self-identity and sex work" paper presented at Gender Work & Organization Conference January, Manchester.
- BROWN, JOHN SEELY (1998) 'On boundary objects' talk given at Organizational Science Winter Conference Keystone Col. January.
- (1999) 'Bridging Epistemologies' *Organizational Science* vol 10 no 4 381–400.
- BROWN, REVA (1997) 'Emotion in Organizations' *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences* vol 33 no 2 pp 247–263.
- BURRELL, GIBSON (1992) 'The organisation of pleasure' in Mats Alvesson and Hugh Wilmott eds *Critical Management Studies* London: Sage 67–88.
- (1997) *Pandemonium* London: Sage.
- BUTLER, J (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism & the subversion of identity* London: Routledge.
- CHRISTOPH, JAMES (1992) 'Remaking of British Administrative Culture' *Administration & Society* vol 24 no 2 pp 163–82.
- CLOUGH, P T (1992) *The ends of ethnography* London: Sage.
- COLLISON, DAVID & JEFF HEARN (1996) *Men as Managers, Managers as Men* London: Sage.
- COOPER, ROBERT (1989) 'Modernism, Post Modernism & Organizational Analysis' *Organization Studies* vol 10 no 4 pp 479–501.
- DERRIDA, JACQUES (1978) *Writing & Différence* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (1986) and Paul Thevenin *Artaud Dessins et portraits* Paris: Gallimard.
- FINEMAN, STEPHEN (1993) *Emotion in Organizations* London: Sage.
- GREY, CHRISTOPHER (1996) 'Towards a critique of managerialism' *Journal of Management Studies* vol 33
- HARAWAY, DONNA (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs and Women* London: FAB
- HEARN, JEFF & WILLIAM PARKIN (1987) 'Sex' at 'Work' Brighton: Wheatsheaf.
- HEARN, JEFF et.al. eds. (1992) *The Sexuality of Organization* London: Sage.
- HESTER, RADFORD & KELLY (1996) *Researching Male Violence* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- HOCHSCHILD, ARLIE (1983) *The Managed Heart* London: University of California Press.
- HOIGARD, CECILIE & FINSTAD, LIV (1992) *Backstreets: Money Prostitution & Love* Cambridge: Polity Press.

- HOOD, CHRISTOPHER & MICHAEL JACKSON** (1994) 'Keys for locks in administrative argument' *Administration & Society* vol 25 no 4 pp 467–489.
- HÖÖK, PIA** (1998) "Management as Uncontrollable Sexuality" paper presented at *Gender Work & Organization* Conference January Manchester
- HÖPFL, HEATHER.** (1998) 'The Heroic Quest, The Chanson *de geste* and the Struggle of the Hero' paper SCOS Guaruja Brazil, July. (2000) 'On decadence and falling from Grace' paper *IABD* Las Vegas Nevada, March.
- HÖPFL, HEATHER** (1995) & John Sincalir 'Representations, technology and the pornographic gaze' paper SCOS Warsaw, July.
- HUBBARD, PHIL** (1998) "Sexuality, immorality & the city" in *Gender Place & Culture* vol 5 no 1
- HUYSEN, ANDREAS** (1986) "Mass culture as woman" in T Modleski ed. *Studies in Entertainment* Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- IRIGARAY, LUCE** (1985) *Speculum of the Other Woman* Ithica: Cornell University Press.
- KEMPADOO, KAMALA AND JO DOEZEMA** (eds) (1998) *Global Sex Workers* London: Routledge.
- KERFOOT, DEBORAH AND DAVID KNIGHTS** (1996) 'The best is yet to come; searching for embodiment' in D Collison & J Heran eds. *Masculinity & Management* London: Sage.
- KERFOOT, DEBORAH AND WHITEHEAD, STEPHEN** (1998) "Masculinity, New Managerial Discourses and the Problematics of Intimacy in Organization" paper presented at *Gender Work & Organization* Conference January Manchester
- KNIGHTS, DAVID** (1997) "Organization theory in the Age of deconstruction: Dualism, Gender & Postmodernism Revisited" *Organization Studies* vol 18 no1 pp 1–1.
- KNIGHTS, DAVID AND HUGH WILLMOTT** (1999) *Management Lives* London: Sage.
- KONDO, DORINNE** (1990) *Crafting Selves* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- LEHRER, KEITH** (1990) *Theory of Knowledge* New York: Westview.
- LETICHE, HUGO & LUCIE V MENS** (1997) "Prostitution and the Rupture of Representation" paper presented at SCOS July, Warsaw.
- (1998) "Fractals, Prostitution and the Representation of 'Manliness'" paper presented at *Gender Work & Organization* Conference January, Manchester.
- LINSTEAD, STEPHEN** (1995a) 'Averting the gaze, power and gender on the perfumed picket line' *Gender Work & Organization* vol 2 no 4 pp 192–206.
- (1995b) 'Organizations that suck and organizations that kick ass' paper *The Aesthetics of Organization Workshop*, Bolton, April.
 - (1996) 'One for the money: the female ejaculation and the organization-without-organs' paper presented SCOS UCLA, July
 - (1997a) 'Abjection and organization' *Human Relations* vol 50 no 9 pp 1115–1135.
 - (1997b) 'Unpacking Priscilla: subjectivity and identity in the organization of gendered appearance' *Human Relations* vol 50 no 10 1275–1297
 - (1997c) 'The control of fluidity and the fluidity of control' paper *The Body in Organizing Workshop* Keele September.
- LINSTEAD, STEPHEN JOANNA BREWIS & JOHN SINCLAIR** (1997a) 'Empty selves, empty lives: the management of identity in sex work' paper SCOS Warsaw July.
- (1997b) 'Any time, any place, any where; 24/7 and the organization of sex work' Workshop paper *Organization after dark* Bolton UK March.
- LUTZ, CATHERINE** (1993) "Social Contexts of Postmodern Cultural Analysis" in *Postmodern Contentions* J P Jones III, W Natter, T R Schatzki ed New York: Guilford Press.
- LYOTARD, JEAN FRANÇOIS** (1988) *The Differend* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MCKEGANEY, NEIL & MARINA BARNARD** (1996) *Sexwork on the streets* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- MAYO, E** (1945) *The Social problems of Industrial Civilization* Boston: Harvard University Press.
- MERLEAU-PONTY, MAURICE** (1962) *Phenomenology of Perception* London: Routledge.
- MUMBY, DENNIS** (1998) 'Organizing Men: Power, Discourse and the social construction of masculinity(s) in the workplace' *Communication Theory* vol 8 no 2 164–173

- MUNRO, ROLLAND & MOURITSEN JAN** (1996) *Accountability* London: ITP.
- O'CONNELL DAVIDSON, JULIA** (1998) *Prostitution, power and freedom* Cambridge: Polity
- O'NEILL, MAGGIE** (1994) "Ethnographic work with prostitutes" in Lupton & Gillespie
- PHETERSON, G** (1986) *The Whore Stigma* The Hague
- SCAMBLER, GRAHAM & ANNETTE SCAMBLED** eds (1997) *Rethinking Prostitution* London: Routledge.
- STEVER, JAMES** (1998) 'Organizational scepticism' *Journal of Management History* vol 4 no 4 pp 289–302.
- THEWELEIT, KLAUS** (1987a) *Male fantasies: Women, floods, bodies, history* St Paul: University of Minnesota Press.
- (1987b) *Male fantasies: Male Bodies* St Paul: University of Minnesota Press.
- TYLER, STEPHEN** (1987) *The Unspeakable: Discourse Dialogue and Rhetoric in the Postmodern World* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- van den ENDE, TONJA** (1999) *In levende lijven* Leende: Demon.
- van MENS, LUCIE** (1992) *Prostitutie in bedrijf* Rotterdam: Eburon.
- VISWESWARAN, KAMALA** (1994) *Fictions of Feminist Ethnography* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- WHYTE, WILLIAM H** (1956) *The Organization Man* New York: Simon & Schuster.
- WILLIAMS, SIMON and GILLIAN BENDELOW** (1998) *The Lived Body: Sociological themes, Embodied issues* London: Routledge.
- WILLMOTT, HUGH** (1994) "Bringing agency (back) into organizational analysis" in *Towards a new theory of organizations* John Hassard & Martin Parker ed. London: Routledge pp 87–130.
- WOOD, MARTIN** (1998) 'Agency and organization: toward a cyborg-consciousness' *Human Relations* vol 51 no 10 1209–1221.