# Socialization and the business school

Stefano HARNEY
*Singapore Management University*, sharney@smu.edu.sg
**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.1177/1350507607075772

# Stefano Harney
*Queen Mary University of London, UK*

## Socialization and the Business School

**Abstract**    *There is a new phase in the generalization of management capacities, but contrary to the assumptions of critical management educators, the investment in the business school has not been to socialize more students into this generalized management, but to seek the principle of generalization in these students themselves as part of a struggle between capital and labour. Using the insights of autonomist feminist theorists, this article attempts to analyse why critical management education has been unable to find a new object appropriate to this new generalization of management, and speculates on what the critical and political benefits might be of escaping older notions of the business school as a site of socialization for a social category of managers.* **Key Words:** *socialization; autonomist feminism; management education*

### Socialization in the Business School

Business schools across the developed world have seen rises in student numbers, staff allocation, and budget resources in the last 20 years that dwarf those of many other departments and faculties. One can accept national, regional, and institutional variations in this story without losing this basic point. Indeed the rise of the business school is just part of a well-rehearsed story in which it has become commonplace to say that managerialism has become ubiquitous in today's audit society; that the project of the subject is today self-management; or even to say that the international prevalence of governance discourse is a neo-colonial manifestation of these trends (Power, 1999; Grey, 1994; Osaghae, 2005).

Yet despite this popular narrative, something seems to be holding back Critical Management Education (CME) scholarship from fully exploring the implications of this generalization of management for its own project of a critical pedagogy. Indeed CME scholars seem wed to an older model of understanding their role in the university. In particular, it appears that CME scholars embrace an older model of the university by continuing to believe they are specifically teaching people who will become managers, and that the business school is *a site of socialization* for those managers. For all the awareness of this latest generalization, the institutional site of the business school continues to draw CME scholars back toward the tendency to equate management with managers, and thus to constitute the manager as the object of critique.

This is not to suggest of course that CME scholars are happy with the social effects of the manager. One of the founding scholars of CME, Christopher Grey, as far back as 1999, expressed this discontent with the spread of managers throughout the institutions of society, threatening 'the colonization of all human activities by casting them in terms of management' (Grey, 1999: 578). He cautioned against seeing the latest generalization of management technique and discourse as a sign of the democratization of management, and he used the occasion to call for an end to management thinking and the instrumentality it spread. However, rather than taking the generalization of management as an occasion to question the *sociological* category of manager, much CME scholarship continues to worry about the business school as a site of socialization for a class of people called managers.[1]

Today such scholarship consequently tends to confine itself to critiques of the business school as an institution of socialization, and the business school curriculum as a series of techniques for that socialization. These critiques suggest that this socialization process is masculinist, positivist, objectivist, and harmful to both students and teachers who think more critically. However, all of these critical tendencies, I contend, share certain limitations not necessarily internal to their possibilities, but rather imposed by their object of investigation.

In particular CME seems to divide into three such critical tendencies. There is a privileged critical position that derives from a reading of the Frankfurt School challenging instrumental, positivist, and neutralist approaches in the curriculum, and of which Grey's critique is an example. There is a feminist critique based on unmasking the social construction of gender and valorizing the subject position of the woman as teacher as in the work of Michael Reynolds and Linda Perriton (Perriton and Reynolds, 2004),[2] and there is a radical pedagogy position inspired by Paolo Freire and concerned with problems of class and power in the classroom, as for instance in Russ Vince's contribution to the volume *Rethinking Management Education* (Vince, 1996). All of these approaches are well set out in a recent contribution by Perriton and Reynolds, an article that also notes the interplay of these critiques, but the limits of these critiques are equally distinguishable.

In brief, the feminist critique remains stuck in gender analysis and assumptions about the category of woman that no longer stand after the emergence of queer, postcolonial, and bodily critiques. The use of Freire takes him out of historical context, and appears to forget that the latter half of his great book is devoted to the relationship of leaders to peoples in actual and proposed socialist revolutions. The Frankfurt critique also retains both the anti-Marxism of its popularizers and the distinction of labour and communication, thought and action, and public and private that is its price (and which today with the rise of immaterial labour and the post-structuralist attention to the materialism of language appears more untenable than ever). I will return in more detail at the conclusion of this article to these limits and how they might be addressed.

Nonetheless I would suggest at the outset that these limits do not derive from the critiques themselves, much less from the scholars. Instead they adhere in the sociological object. What I am interested in is the way these critiques are cleaved to a socialization process in the business school that involves the standard triadic relationship of, as Ann Cunliffe puts it, 'managers, educators, and learners' (Cunliffe, 2002: 57). Constantly constructing this triadic position is, I believe, holding back critique in management education, and preventing the emergence of an object worthy

of such critical energies. Perhaps a more fulsome understanding of socialization, derived with the help of scholars in the movement of autonomist feminism, can point to some new directions available when the categories of both manager and management are left behind in history, where I would argue with Grey, if for material rather than normative reasons, they belong. An autonomist feminist perspective on socialization might help us to dispense with this CME triad and might allow critique to confront a new object, business, understood as *the restraint on wealth-making capacities of a society of associated labour.*

## CME's Triad

That CME anchors itself in Cunliffe's admittedly unstable triad is evident in even a brief survey of its literature. The manager as a role to be produced and a status to be evaluated is commonplace here. Christopher Grey's work is typical in this respect. He concludes his intervention in the Academy of Management Learning and Education journal with, 'CME points to the need for managers to connect to a wider set of public duties than that of corporate performance' (Grey, 2004: 185) This insistence on the category of managers is accompanied by an implicit understanding of the business school as a site of socialization for both managers and educators, as for instance when he writes that 'if management education were to change so too would the future generation of management educators' (Grey, 2004: 184). Clearly the business school produces both educators and student-managers on this reckoning and the question of how managers, educators, and students manage the socialization to which they are subject becomes central.

This focus on the manager as object at the site of socialization echoes the introduction to the book *Rethinking Management Education*, edited by Robert French and Chris Grey, who identify two approaches to change in thinking about management, both of which have managers as the object of that thinking—either managers can or cannot be taught useful skills. They then pose a third position questioning the functionalist assumptions of both, appearing even to question the object and its socialization girding this functionalism when they write that rethinking business education might mean that 'students of management would not necessarily be or become managers themselves' (French and Grey, 1996: 6). However, this promising move leads only to a call for critiques of management practice directed at those who remain as managers and who continue to be socialized at the business school by French and Grey's 'managerialist' colleagues. Neither the object nor the process producing it has been fundamentally challenged here, much less a new object of critique proposed.

Similarly in this journal, authors using influences as diverse as Antonio Gramsci and Jürgen Habermas to situate their critical pedagogy commonly constitute this triad and identify the manager as object of inquiry. 'What managers do is also of fundamental interest to critical researchers' writes Carole Elliott in her Gramscian exploration of the role of critical educators in business schools (Elliott, 2003: 418). In this article Elliott states quite directly that her concern is with 'the current relationship between managers and educators in the business school' (Elliott, 2003: 414). Writing in a Habermasian vein, Delvir Samra-Fredericks also foregrounds the manager as object of investigation, advocating that 'the first step must be to access

and place centre stage managers' everyday lived accomplishments' (Samra-Fredericks, 2003: 295) Throughout, the author speaks of students, practitioners, and educators as the critically relevant roles and functions. In both of these essays, like so many others in CME, teaching is understood primarily as the struggle against a certain socialization of students into French and Grey's 'managerialist' managers. These three actors, student–manager–educator, appear again and again in their roles in this tense plot of socialization.

Thus Barbara Czarniawska initiates a special debate in this same journal on 'forbidden knowledge' and reconstitutes this triad, by asking if 'students, managers, and organization researchers are interested in the same kind of topics?' (Czarniawska, 2003: 253). In Martin Parker's article the socialization process of becoming a manager is portrayed as a monstrous transformation of the werewolf, simultaneously calling this socialization into question through the hybridized image and relying on the common sense notion of socialization in the business school for effect (Parker, 2004). David Knights and Graeme Currie opine in another article on teaching critically, that they refuse 'to treat managers as disembodied and depoliticized subjects' (Currie and Knights, 2003: 44). However, perhaps it might be a useful experiment to do exactly that, because it may be that the tension of this triad is not the best way to understand the business school today. Letting go of managers might be the first step toward re-conceiving the struggle in the business school.

## Lost in Sociology?

There is of course a lot of circumstantial evidence that the business school does not sit easily as a site of socialization for a social category called 'manager'. Most obviously, and this has not gone un-remarked in the literature, one encounters this contradiction in the case of the students now populating these schools. If one thing is evident in the massification of business education, it is that most of the students in the seats are not managers, and will not be managers—including those in the seats who already call themselves managers. Students of mass business education will be managed in several ways. Most students will leave for jobs where they manage no one but themselves. Most students will leave for jobs where they are themselves managed. Those students who do manage others will also be managed, not just by others, but also by the present condition of capitalist work which demands ever-greater loyalty to insecurity. This is evidently a different social phenomenon than the traditional object of the business school, which comes into being with the first industrialization of the mind under Frederick Taylor and Henri Fayol, is stabilized by the welfare state, and produces a manager who must be explained sociologically whether through elite theory (Domhoff, 1967), labour process theory (Baldoz et al., 2001), or by counting classes (Wright, 1997). However explained, the broad social phenomenon of a social class with a steady and abiding connection to power, control, and ideology in capitalism—the white-collar manager of the post-War era—seems more difficult to isolate today.

Not only does the white-collar manager appear an increasingly incoherent sociological category, but its site of socialization, the business school, is similarly difficult to isolate using the old categories. Is it still identifiable as ideological state apparatus for producing a profession? Can it be understood as an institution for the normal-

ization of this professional knowledge? Again, the evidence suggests otherwise. The academic discipline of management studies has known its own attempt at the sociology of professions, and the question of whether management is a profession has been much rehearsed. However, the business school has not made the pursuit of such a category very easy, outside the field of accountancy which operates largely within a framework of credentialism. Today, this is even more the case in the Anglo-American business school. The business school is characterized in Britain, for instance, precisely by its indiscriminate admission policies, drive for expansion, and its mercenary links to university income in a way no law faculty or medical faculty would countenance. In contrast to business schools, these professional faculties rarely trade in distance learning education, and their associated professional bodies enact a labour-regulating function, again with the exception of accounting and some few specific instances in financial analysis. The situation is no more restrictive in the United States, the home of mass education, where lecture halls may hold a thousand business students. It is certainly possible to bring back the national differences argument here for other countries, but harder to deny that the Anglo-American model of massified business education is proving evermore attractive across the globe to universities seeking more income, and to students seeking a degree to match the insecurity of work-life.

Still more evidence for both the failure of a sociology of professions and the need for new forms of analysis comes with the emergence of the generalization of management in popular culture and language, what I have elsewhere called the demotics of management, where endless titles on management, leadership, and financial self-help fill the shelves of bookstores (Harney, 2005). The proliferation of this literature defies old definitions of professionalism. Self-help is available in medicine and law too, but it is also severely delimited in a way the promiscuity of the business title is not. One cannot practice law by reading books on it (although one can still take appropriate exams as an auto-didact and become certified as a lawyer in a dwindling number of states in the United States). Nor can one operate medically on another by reading books, but one can of course read a book on re-engineering, and with the proper economic power bestowed by the market, sack half of one's staff. If that makes one a manager, it also suggests that such a professional identity is based on a very different social agreement from other professions. It also suggests that older sociological categories may not work in understanding what is happening to students, or in understanding the business school as a social form in what Gilles Deleuze (1994) called the societies of control. Indeed if the sociological category of the professions is undermined today, and indeed never really worked for the business school, so too is its partner term, socialization.

## The Socialization of Sociology

Socialization in CME has been understood only sociologically. This may seem an odd formulation, but there are other ways to think socialization. Sociology has traditionally understood socialization as a process through which groups maintain and reproduce themselves by passing on social norms and skills to new generations. It is something that involves the transfer of know-how from the group to the new member. Persistently critiqued for its functionalist emphasis on a normatively static

and cohesive wholeness, this sociological conception of socialization is nonetheless operative in CME. Management is understood as a role, as a status, and as an identity. Students come to the business school to become managers, to inhabit the role and gain the status. The manager is thus presumed to exist, and moreover the business school is presumed to be the privileged site of the socialization process for this role. Managerialism may be everywhere, but managers are still made in the business school. Thus to critique this socialization process is then only to say that a class of workers called managers exploit employees, exploit themselves, exploit the environment, and exploit divisions in the social order. The effects of the role are critiqued, and the appropriateness of status is questioned. The identity is unmasked, but it is this sociological understanding of the manager, and his or her socialization in the business school that dominates in CME, that is its object of critique.

Sociological socialization theses are self-evidently incapable of explaining societal change. Indeed even in the work of Michel Foucault, the notions of normalization and disciplinary society have been taken to task primarily for the way they cannot account for their own existence, as for instance in the postcolonial critiques of Foucault, ignored in critical management studies, but important in positing causation for the disciplinary society and the abnormal.[3] The question of how one sociological category comes to be replaced by another is ironically a question that has too often been external to sociology itself, as for instance in the defunct field of deviance to give just one example (Sumner, 1994). Today, CME as a kind of sociology of management is another example. However, CME will not come to grips with societal change unless it can step outside this sociology. This is so because the generalization of capitalist work behind the generalization of management that produces the good fortunes of the business school may be said to come precisely at the price of the manager in two ways, ways from which it may not recover as a sociological category. First, strategies for accumulation have involved a concentration of capital designed to escape labour and its management, making capital less reliant on a stable production regime of management and labour. Second, the strategies for what Harry Cleaver called the imposition of commodity work as a means to societal control have had to violate the sociological divisions and consistencies of labour and its management, especially by resorting to work for work's sake, beyond the 'meaningful' wage and those who manage it (Cleaver, 1979). For example, programs pushing women who work in their homes raising children back into labour markets that have no place for them in already crowded low-pay service sectors appear to see work as a social good in itself, regardless of either its meaning or productivity. Similarly what have been called the new enclosures in the Fourth World operate by dispossessing subsistence farmers and forcing them into wage work, with no clear developmental goals (Midnight Notes Collective, 1990). When work is thus separate from productivity and purpose, management's reason is also called into question.

## The Socialization of Capital

To glimpse these strategies and appreciate their threat to the category of manager as a socialized role in a system, two *other* notions of socialization will be useful. They will be useful not just to pose a new object of critique, but also to discover a new politics of socialization in which one might worry less about how students are socialized

and more about how students socialize. Yet again, this latter use of the term must be understood quite differently. We can find the first of these different notions of socialization in Books II and III of Karl Marx's *Capital*. In these books Marx is concerned with solving a problem he first raises in Book I, where he documents the ways in which capitalist society has historically been hostile to itself. Rather than sustaining itself, rather than reproducing itself, it should fall apart, such are the antagonisms of labour and capital, and such is the indifference of capital to the base of social cooperation and interdependency upon which it relies. Yet capitalism evidently does not collapse, and for Marx one major reason for its seeming ability to contain or at least postpone this contradiction lies in *the socialization of capital*. Through the joint stock company, capital socializes its risks, improves its circulation, and multiplies its powers, but in the process also collectivizes its interests. Marx writes,

> The capital, which in itself rests on a social mode of production and presupposes a social concentration of means of production and labour-power, is here directly endowed with the form of social capital (capital of directly associated individuals) as distinct from private capital, and its undertakings assume the form of social undertakings as distinct from private undertakings. It is the abolition of capital as private property within the framework of capitalist production itself. (K. Marx, Vol. III, Chapter 48)

Capital pursues here its own version of the interdependency it imposes on labour. All businesses come to want the stock market to do well. They come to care about the general conditions of production and even minimally social reproduction that are measured through the stock market. They calculate this new social interest besides, or even instead of, their private interest. This is their new 'social undertaking'. Marx cautions that this abolition of private interest occurs 'within the framework of capitalist production itself'. That means among other things within a framework where labour is made to feel isolated and private. Yet at the same time this socialization of capital ushers in new social arrangements of labour, setting it on the road to 'a new form of production'. Marx puts it this way,

> This is the abolition of the capitalist mode of production within the capitalist mode of production itself, and hence a self-dissolving contradiction, which *prima facie* represents a mere phase of transition to a new form of production. It manifests itself as such a contradiction in its effects. It establishes a monopoly in certain spheres and thereby requires state interference. It reproduces a new financial aristocracy, a new variety of parasites in the shape of promoters, speculators and simply nominal directors; a whole system of swindling and cheating by means of corporation promotion, stock issuance, and stock speculation. It is private production without the control of private property. (K. Marx, Vol. III, Chapter 48)

This movement toward a new form of production remains contradictory, and crisis-ridden, as we well know who live within it today. Marx considered the explosive quality of this contradiction. He noted in Book I that a capitalist has no regard for the reproduction of his labour, or only minimum regard for keeping him alive, and indeed even this regard ignores the unwaged work of mostly women who produce this male wage worker. However, what happens when *socialized* capital as a whole has no regard, or insufficient regard, for labour as a whole, and indeed is collectively blind both to its own reliance on this labour and to what it would actually take to reproduce that labour? This was the question Marx asked in the Grundrisse, his notebooks written in part to prepare Capital.

This tendency first for individual capitalists and then for socialized capital to desire a separation from human labour, by making labourers into machines, by introducing of machinery itself, and today through the fantasy of finance capital where money seems to make money with minimal human labour, was for Marx a dangerous tendency for capital that might, as he famously said in the Grundrisse, 'blow the foundations sky high'. Marx says this because he understands capital to be only dead labour without the movement of living labour that animates it from within. Nonetheless we see the persistence of this tendency of capital to flee labour today in what goes under the sign of globalization, of information technology, and of new financial products. Socially necessary labour time is being reduced by the speed and distance capital can travel through its circuits, giving the appearance that wealth is produced by this speed and distance rather than by the labour it rushes into circulation. What goes for labour also goes for its measurement and surveillance and here the bodily presence of the manager is often slower and less convertible than disembodied and reinscribable techniques, discourses, and affects—or in other words what appears as the generalization of management. This does not mean an end to managers or workers, only to their stability and consistency as categories of lived experience in the face of capital's increasingly frenzied attempts to separate itself from labour.

This tendency to separation has been taken up in Italy by a much under-valued theoretical movement in Marxism known as 'autonomia', a movement only now beginning to attract attention under the English term 'autonomist Marxism'. First reading for the socialization of capital (Tronti, 1966) and then reading for the separation from labour (Negri, 1991) wrought by that socialization, theorists in this tradition are today gathering attention for their efforts to identify the contradiction of the resulting movement toward what Marx called a mere phase on the way to a new form of production (Virno, 2004; Lazzarato, 2004).

The notion today of 'immaterial labour' is emerging as a way to name this mere phase where language, culture, and general social intercourse form not just the always already abandoned conditions of capitalist production but are themselves directly productive and products. Immaterial labour names labour's ability to draw on what Marx called the General Intellect, that heritage of cooperative production marked in language, common feeling and enjoyment, and in science and technique, to invent evermore sophisticated forms of interdependence. However, if the means of production today are affective, linguistic, and cultural capacities, the question arises of how capital can control this means of production, and how, just as importantly as Nicos Poulantzas (1978) insisted, it can be the initiator of what is made and when. This question also raises the tantalizing prospect grasped by autonomist Marxism that labour might separate itself from an antagonism with capital and come to value itself without capital's intervention. Indeed in contradistinction to the older Left choices of the ballot or the bullet, the autonomist Left and its iterations in the 'no global' movement tend to try to enact separation from capital.

## Socialization of Labour

This is only one aspect of Marx's socialization thesis, however. For at the same time one of the most important theorists of this movement, Mario Tronti (1966) noted

that at the moment capital seemed most free of labour, as for instance in finance, it was in fact 'penetrated by this menace, this threat of labour'. Here another face of the generalization of management also emerges. Rather than detaching itself from labour through this generalization, rather than separating itself from the stable sociological regime of managers working to extract surplus in the workplace under the sign of the wage, capital finds itself drawn ever closer into associated labour. In particular it finds itself drawn into parts of life like social reproduction, language, culture, and affect that cannot easily be separated from the body of the labourer. These domains of the General Intellect are not coincidentally the domains of women under capitalist patriarchy. Nor is the rise of technoscience and the attempt to control the reproduction and direction of life itself coincidental as capital's response to these new difficulties in separation encountered in the domain of women (Clough, 2004).

An example of capital being drawn into the body of the labourer and its social capaciousness can be found in Randy Martin's study (2002a) of the financialization of daily life. In this study Martin explores the growth of personal credit worthiness, stock market participation, self-help on managing investments, advice on raising children profitably, and how mortgages, car loans, student loans, and credit cards are securitized such that one has to care not just about one's own promised future labour in all these products, but the also the labour of others. Martin writes, 'fetishized capital which is the social ownership of capital (the joint stock and today financialization) means caring about general conditions of reproduction'. Martin goes on to describe the ways in which finance is a force of subjectivation in contemporary society, one that occurs outside the workplace but not outside capital. The work of financialization is unwaged, and often takes place in what was the domain of social reproduction. At the same time socialized labour reaches this subjectivity through new levels of association in finance capital, and through finance capital labour experiences new potential for collective projects. What emerges in Martin's analysis against the separation tracked by the Italian autonomists is a new expertise of labour at the very heart of finance capital, or what Marx understood as *the socialization of labour*.

It is through the socialization of labour that Marx's socialization thesis has been most commonly apprehended, more so, except in the case of Martin's work, than through the socialization of capital. Classically the idea was that capital uprooted the isolated peasant and brought him into communication with others along the assembly line, leading both to a sense of the combinatory possibilities of labour and to a political articulation of the exploitation that held it back. Thus the imposition of the wage as the basis of the general equivalent in the economy created a kind of egalitarianism and fellow feeling that might turn a class-in-itself into a class-for-itself. Yet this threat to capital posed by the socialization of labour also enriched capital as this associated labour developed new combinations and interdependencies that capital could exploit.

## Feminist Autonomism

This classical approach to Marx's socialization thesis was turned upside down by feminist autonomists. Not only did these scholars deepen our understanding of the

socialization of labour, but they also revealed the deeper domain of social wealth in labour that became both the source of profit for capital and its most consistent enemy. They began with an alternative reading of capital's origins. 'A democracy of unfreedom' is how Marx in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of the State* (1970) described the community of serfs. Each serf, man, woman, child, elder, was commonly devoted either to producing for the lord or to producing for the survival of family and community. There was a rough equality to this serfdom, a perverse democracy. Mariarosa Della Costa and Selma James pick up Marx's description in their groundbreaking analysis of capitalist housework produced in the 1970s and inaugurating feminist autonomist theory. They note that capitalism had to break this unity of unfreedom in order to impose its hegemony on the social relation of wage labour, male wage labour. 'The unfree patriarch was transformed into the 'free' wage earner, and upon the contradictory relations of the sexes and the generations was built a more profound estrangement and therefore a more subversive relation' (Della Costa and James, 1976). The scholars note that this more profound estrangement and more subversive relation was the result of women, children, and elders entering capitalism through the back door. What they produced, developed, and maintained for exchange was male labour power (regardless of whether women and children also entered the factory regime). Thus the family as a whole, and not just the wage earner, was freed, that is to say alienated, by capitalism. The early subsumption of the family under capitalism in this reading, and of the exploited wealth of social reproduction under capitalism, suggested that certain contradictory relations were in play from the earliest moments of wage labour. In particular, the socialization of wage work—extending the command of capital through the imposition of wage labour throughout societal relations—and the work of socialization—all that labour does without wage recompense to make this regime possible both in the workplace and the community—are present from an incipient moment in commodity labour.

This reading suggests a potential anti-capitalist politics in the household and in the realm of social reproduction that many in the Marxian tradition failed to see in the 'private sphere' until that sphere was challenged by its further conversion into waged work, and the further socialization accompanying this conversion, in the post-War period in developed nations. It is within the 'Copernican revolution', as George Caffentzis (2001) says of autonomist feminism, that one can begin to speak about the work of socialization as the broadest available conception of society as self-expanding not just self-reproducing.

## The Society of Producers

Marx called this second notion of socialization, this socialization of labour in the most ample sense, the society of producers. Taken together with the socialization of capital, we have access to Marx's socialization thesis. This thesis allows us to start not from the presumption a role whose status in a system must be investigated, but from a social relations whose abiding instability is only superficially steadied by appeal to sociological categories. Freed of these categories we might think about the phenomenon of the business school very differently, not as a site of socialization of a class of managers, but as the site of struggle between the society of producers and 'social

undertakings' of finance capital. Taking this struggle as an object, and studying the business school and its education as a symptom of this struggle may also allow us to expand our critiques in ways that avoid them mimicking the sociological categories of role, status, and systems.

## CME Beyond CME

In particular, if we return to the three tendencies we identified at the outset we can see now that the limits we recognized in them are connected to this risk of sociological mimicry. This is most clear in the feminist critique where the 'status of woman' is then correlated to 'the role of woman' and the system is then checked for inadequacies and biases. So long as socialization in the business school is understood as a process of producing a role for a system and critiquing its status as enacted through the triad, such tendencies are self-limiting. However, if as a teacher one is instead caught up in a struggle between capital's social undertakings and the emerging society of producers, then whether to insist on role, status, or system becomes a purely strategic issue, not a normative one. If capital needs a moment when role is fixed, the feminist position might be nomadic, escaping through the performance of unstable identity. If capital needs a moment when role is fluid, the feminist position might be that of sexual difference, finding strength in the feminine. This is precisely the work of prominent feminist Rosi Braidotti (1994) for instance, and work like hers opens up new fronts for the feminist critique in CME but working at the threshold of the struggle of socialization. These are fronts that must be explored. For to attempt a politics of construction while capital moves in spirals of destruction and reconstruction is not only to take a stand in the middle of a river but also to miss the labour that powers these spirals. Rather than gender identity and social construction, critical feminist tendencies today like the nomadic feminism of Rosi Braidotti challenge capital to catch labour's innovations in performance.

For example, Elaine Swan has hold of the possibilities of a nomadic feminist critique in a recent article, and she rightly notes the limits of CME feminist scholarship to date, exemplified in the work of Linda Perriton and Amanda Sinclair (Swan, 2005; Sinclair, 2003), but she also retains the triadic relationship, imagining she is teaching managers. As a result, the nomadic show us as a series of exceptions and caveats at the end of her article on race, class, and sexuality, rather than understanding these as central to her argument. For instance she cannot imagine transgressing race, class, and even sexuality in the classroom. Her masculinity never introduces an erotics between women for example, much less the homoerotics of male management. She remains in a duality of feminine and masculine that is quite conventional and must except race, class, and other kinds of sexuality. Indeed it is Judith Butler herself, cited but not used to much effect in Swan's article, whose famous 1994 article 'Against Proper Objects' raises the problematic relation between gender and sexuality and cautions against calling one into question without calling the other into question too (Butler, 1994). So long as the object of Swan's teaching is the male manager in the triad and the stakes are her relationship to this male manager, the range of her nomadism remains constrained.

Similarly for the Frankfurt School critique still hoping for a place beyond the instrumentality of management, Marx's socialization thesis returns the optimism of

the will sometimes lost in the pessimism of the intellect by focusing on the priority and capaciousness of socialized labour as that which allows the general equivalent to be asserted, and thus as that which has the power to assert a different generality as a basis for society. More directly for our purposes, the feminist autonomist insights into the domain of social reproduction as historically the place of menace where subversion and estrangement indicate the presence of socialized labour help us to dispense with the notions of spheres, public and private, labour and communication, that capital uses to hide as a more profound social relation of the production of life itself. Thus the business school needs to be critiqued not for asserting the private at the expense of the public, or labour at the expense of ethics or communication, but for perpetuating such divisions as sociological categories hiding a struggle that knows no such boundaries except as camouflage. Perhaps this might lift our critique out of the divisions that come from focusing too narrowly on organizations and firms, such that the first order of such critique might be to ask what damage the recuperation out of these categories of 'critical' ideas like alternative organization, self-management, and non-instrumental community do within a struggle as encompassing as the one that produces the business school.

More than that, we can see that increasingly it is not the rationality of capital that dominates, but as Cleaver suggested rather the need to impose capitalist work even at the price of the rationality of the wage and the general equivalent. Here we come finally to the second way in which managers and management are materially disrupted and disintegrated today. Where capital cannot escape labour, and this perhaps is everywhere with financialization, it must control it through work. Yet, as we see in feminist autonomism, the domains of struggle resist rationality and calculation and indeed these are not capital's main weapons here. The Frankfurt Critique in critical management studies with its Weberian fear of bureaucratic mission creep and commodification of a sphere that men need to protect is of no use here. Work for work's sake in welfare reform, securocratic wars among the relative surplus population, and religious and racist nationalisms are deployed here against the threat of socialized labour for its own sake. Indeed a better interpretation of Giorgio Agamben's work is to be found in what lies beyond the control of capitalist work and brings bare life into a highly socialized form where the exception is very much among us in domains most intimate, secret, and common (Agamben, 1998). Against this command to produce and reproduce for capital or die, we can pose the question of what wealth labour holds that such measures should be necessary, measures that strike at the rationality not just of management and labour, but capital. It would seem that socialization has reversed itself here. Labour is left either to socialize itself, or to continue to socialize capital. This seems like a good reason to see what students might have rather than what they might be given.

Finally, what we are taught by feminist autonomist reading of history is that political leadership comes collectively from domains where it is most unrecognized until it bursts forth, whether from the Women Against Housework movement, the Welfare Rights movement or the Zapatistas (Federici, 2004). Each made a socialism of the socialization initially thrust upon them. Thus it may be worthwhile to rethink Paolo Freire such that the socialism, rather than the leadership, rather than the focus on the teacher–student relationship, comes to the fore. Freire himself may not have been able to foresee this, but the landless peasant movement in Brazil that is in part his legacy urges us to think less about ourselves and our power as teachers and leaders,

and more about how to support the self-organizing, self-expanding socialisms always being launched in this struggle of socializations, even among the not-managers, or what Marx called the real not-capital, that is labour, in our classrooms. Rather than capital socializing students into management, perhaps we should start thinking about how students socialize capital, and how with them we might start to socialize society differently.

## Notes

1. I use the term sociological to name a disciplinary approach that cedes other realms like economy, politics, and philosophy. Even a scholar as committed and exceptional as Michael Burawoy disciplined his Marxist trajectory when he was recently President of the American Sociological Association. In his presidential address he promoted the idea of a 'public sociology' in which sociologists would become involved in debates in civil society as economists were involved in debates about economy, and political scientists about politics.
2. This article is a good summary of CME and thus it is unfortunate that they choose Albert Memmi's notion of refusal to pick a way forward as this is based on a not very careful reading. In Memmi's book the 'left-wing colonizer' not only refuses to mix with other colonizers but is repelled by the sounds and smells of the colonized who would figure as the students in this approach. The point of Memmi's book is the impossibility of a coherent political position under these circumstances, a point that leads Memmi to the necessity not of refusal but revolt and Frantiz Fanon to envisage the need for an entirely new situation to make politics possible through revolution.
3. Such critiques of Foucault run from Gayatri Spivak's questioning of Foucault's own lack of reflection on his subject position to the work of Joy James on lynching and discipline to Giorgio Amgaben's critique of power without an outside.

## References

Agamben, G. (1998) *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Baldoz, R., Kroeber, C. and Kraft, P. (2001) *The Critical Study of Work: Labour, Technology, and Global Production.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Braidotti, R. (1994) *Nomadic Subjects: Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Butler, J. (1994) 'Against Proper Objects', *Differences: a Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 6(2–3): 1–26.

Caffentzis, G. (2001) *TPTG's Conversation with George Caffentzis,* http://www.wildcat-www.de/en/material/tptg_caf.htm.

Cleaver, H. (1979) *Reading Capital Politically.* Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Clough, P. (2004) 'Future Matters: Technoscience, Global Politics, and Cultural Criticism', *Social Text* 22(3): 1–23.

Cunliffe, A. (2002) 'Reflexive Dialogical Practice in Management Learning', *Management Learning* 33(1): 35–62.

Currie, G. and Knights, D. (2003) 'Reflecting on a Critical Pedagogy in MBA Education', *Management Learning* 34(1): 27–49.

Czarniawska, B. (2003) 'Forbidden Knowledge: Organizational Theory in Times of Transition', *Management Learning* 34(3): 353–65.

Deleuze, G. (1995) *Negotiations 1972–1990.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Della Costa, M. and James, S. (1975) *Women and the Subversion of Community.* Bristol: Falling Wall Press.

Domhoff, W. (1967) *Who Rules America?* New York: Prentice Hall.

Elliott, C. (2003) 'Representations of the Intellectual: Insights from Gramsci on Management Education', *Management Learning* 34(4): 411–27.

Federici, S. (2004) *Caliban and the Witch.* New York: Autonomedia.

French, R. and Grey, C. (1996) 'Rethinking Management Education: An Introduction', in R. French and C. Grey (eds) *Rethinking Management Education.* London: Sage.

Grey, C. (1994) 'Career as a Project of the Self and Labour Process Discipline', *Sociology* 28(2): 479–97.

Grey, C. (1999) 'We Are All Managers Now', *Journal of Management Studies* 36(5): 561–85.

Grey, C. (2004) 'Reinventing Business Schools: The Contribution of Critical Management Education', *Academy of Management Learning and Education* 3(2): 178–86.

Harney, S. (2005) 'Why Is Management a Cliché?', *Critical Perspectives on Accounting* 16: 579–91.

James, S. and Della Costa, M. (1980) 'The Power of Women and the Subversion of Community', in E. Malos (ed.) *The Politics of Housework*, pp. 160–87. London: Alison & Busby.

Lazzarato, M. (2004) 'From Capital-Labour to Capital-Life', *ephemera: theory & politics in organization* 4(1): www.ephemeranet.org.

Martin, R. (2002a) *The Financialization of Daily Life.* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Martin, R. (2002b) *On Your Marx: Relinking Socialism and the Left.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Marx, K. (1967) *Capital.* New York: International Publishers.

Marx, K. (1970) *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, K. (1976) *Grundrisse.* New York: Penguin.

Midnight Notes Collective (1990*) New Enclosures.* Somerville, MA: Midnight Notes Collective.

Negri, A. (1991*) Marx Beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse.* New York: Autonomedia.

Osaghae, E. A. (2005) 'The State of Africa's Second Liberation', *Interventions* 7(1): 1–20.

Parker, M. (2004) 'Becoming Manager, or the Werewolf Looks Anxiously in the Mirror, Checking for Unusual Facial Hair', *Management Learning* 35(1): 45–59.

Perriton, L. and Reynolds, M. (2004) 'Critical Management Education: From Pedagogy of Possibility to Pedagogy of Refusal', *Management Learning* 35(1): 61–77.

Poulantzas, N. (1978) *State, Power, Socialism.* London: Verso.

Power, M. (1999) *The Audit Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Samra-Fredericks, D. (2003) 'Proposal for Developing a Critical Pedagogy in Management from Researching Organizational Members' Everyday Practices', *Management Learning* 34(3): 291–312.

Sinclair, A. (2003) 'Teaching Managers about Masculinities: Are You Kidding?', *Management Learning* 31(1): 83–102.

Sumner, C. (1994) *The Sociology of Deviance: An Obituary.* New York: Continuum.

Swan, E. (2005) 'On Bodies, Rhinestones, and Pleasures: Women Teaching Managers', *Management Learning* 36(3): 317–33.

Tronti, M. (1966) *Operai e capitale.* Turin: Einaudi.

Vince, R. (1996) 'Experiential Management Education as the Practice of Change', in R. French and C. Grey (eds) *Rethinking Management Education.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Virno, P. (2004) *The Grammar of the Multitude.* New York: Semiotexte.

Wright, E. O. (1997) *Class Counts: Comparative Studies in Class Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Contact Address

**Stefano Harney** is at the School of Business and Management, Queen Mary, University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK.
[email s.harney@qmul.ac.uk]