IDEOLOGY AND ORGANIZATION

Yvon PESQUEUX

Abstract

If, to speak about organization, we accept the postulate that there are " good reasons " to speak about it, it is then necessary to investigate the universe of ideology and the way by which models plunge their roots in ideology as well as they create a coherent world. Ideology, as justification, produces representations. What is in question here, is the kind of deformation carried by representations. They produce a structure of the world, the validation of which may be an object of science seen as the construction of a truth in a project of "knowledge" of this world. The concept of ideology is particularly difficult. It benefits and suffers from two major influences in its foundations: that of a political perspective with Marx and Engels and that of the sociological reaction (from Max Weber to Raymond Boudon and Pierre Bourdieu). Ideology as an " attractor " raises the question of " ultimate references ".

Key words

Ideology, Model, Truth, Organization, Reality

We shall here investigate the postulate that, at a given moment, there are "good reasons" for speaking about an organization in a "certain way". It is then necessary to investigate the universe of ideology and the fact that it shapes a "certain way" of speaking and that it tends to " create " a world which is coherent with the world which is carried by its discurse. The ideology is taken here as a producer of representations and of justifications. What is in question here, is the deformation, the status of the proof relevant for representations in an ideological context. The representations are related with an internal structure of the world the validation of which is object of science as well as the construction of the truth in a project of "knowledge" in relation with this world. Ideology is close to the concept of culture because it raises the problem of the contingency of the representation in a system of values. As for cultural life, it is a question of "managing" connections between elements of representations. The concept of system of values indicates that ideology, as well as culture, is a process of evaluation. Ideology and culture have something to do with a process of identification and are both the support of a project of life.

Before continuing more on the status of the concept of ideology, it is necessary to clarify the content of two related notions: the notion of value and that of rule because ideology is a process of construction and legitimization of shared values which give sense to the rules.

The notion of value

P. Foulquié[1] quotes the fact that a value is related to
> "all which would realize the appropriate nature of the moral agent (ideal values), or this realization itself ".

Kant and Mencius are writing about the transcendence of the values as it is quoted by François Jullien[2]:
> " What makes that a human being is ready to sacrifice his life, rather than to break his duty, says us Kant, is that it is conscious then of "maintaining" and "honoring" in his person the dignity of humanity. Because there are two sorts of "dignity" said Mencius: the natural dignities, "conferred by the sky" (the humanity, the sense of duty, the loyalty ...) and the social dignities "conferred by the man" (prince, minister, prefect ...). If the human being can suffer to seem in his mind despicable to live, pursues Kant, it is that he can give up completely the "value of his condition" (material and social), but not in the value of his person. Also, says Mencius (...) The "desire of what has value" is shared by all the human beings; but these human beings have also some distance with elements such as the honors given by the prince; they have no "authentic value". It is "in themselves", indeed, that all the human beings "have value" but indeed little realize it. What, "for them", transcends the moral values is the universality ".

There are several domains of application for the notion of value: economics, Ethics, aesthetic, politics, social life. In a relative understanding, the notion of value finds its foundations in economics in relation with utility. We have the same conception in the charming aspect of a character: intelligence is desirable, useful and then possesses a value but this meaning is connected with the idea of social value. In front of this conception, there is the meaning of an absolute value, as in the field of Ethics where this concept holds an essential place for morality. The concept of value raises also the question of the goal (to follow such value) which can belong to aesthetical, ethical, ideological, political or religious order. The actor adjusts his behaviour with the end he forces himself. The rational action in value is ordered by the followed values and is the keypoint of the morality of conviction for Max Weber (*Gesinnungsethik*) which is charaterised by its irrationality compared to the rational activity in end (*Zweckrational*).

The notion of rule

The idea of rule sends back to that of the consciousness because a rule is only a conscious rule. It is necessary to distinguish the rule from the habit because it is necessary to know and to recognize rules to conform to them. The rule indicates the prescripted behavior in precise circumstances and has no universal value. There is no

---

[1] P. Foulquié, *Dictionnaire de la langue philosophique*, P.U.F. Paris, 1995, p. 750
[2] François Jullien, *Fonder la morale*, Grasset, Paris, 1995, p. 141

main rule in a strict sense. For example, the moral law indicates the right rule in Ethics. The rule is then applied within the limits of a situation whose circumstances have to be relatively stable. On the hedge of circumstances coming to justify the existence of a rule, is the agreement. The rule is then going to oscillate between the agreement in its purely formal foundations and the reference to concrete social situations. It possesses at the same moment the arbitrary function of a " rule of the game " and that of rationality in relation with a goal. The concept of rule contains also the idea of the justifiable or inviolable imitation. There will be aesthetic rules (to be an artist would then be doing things as they have to be done, in the style of ...) as well as rules are connected with ideology (it then is a question of shared values). The rule is then taken as a justifiable reference to the state of the art recognized as a foundamental.

To clarify the connections which can be established between representations and the represented "object", in particular because of the necessity of discussing the deformations which occurs in the process of representation, we shall now analyze the concept of ideology. After an introduction dedicated to the question of the deformation inherent to the representation because of the interference with ideology, we shall analyze successively the concept of ideology in the light offered by the sociological perspective, essentially taken from Raymond Boudon before quoting the political perspective, essentially taken from Jean Baechler. It is finally with the conclusion that the empathetic aspect of ideology will be underlined from what is qualified of "sociologization" as well as " politicization " of the concept, traditional since Karl Marx. It will then be briefly made a reference to the project of conformity of the behavior through the concept of imitation to draw the outlines of ideology seen as an "attractor".

About ideology

The concept is particularly difficult. It benefits and suffers at the same time of two major influences in its foundations: that of a political perspective with Marx and Engels and that of the sociological reaction (from Max Weber to Raymond Boudon and Pierre Bourdieu, for example).

In a strict sense, as any concept built like that, ideology is the science of ideas. The suffix *logos* indicates two things: it is a question of proposing a "logic of " and a "speech on", the "logic of" being understandable by the "speech on". Ideology is correlative, during the XVIIIth century, with the encyclopaedic project conducted by Diderot and d'Alembert as far as it is there in question to classify ideas were techniques are themselves seen as ideas. The concepts of ideology and technology (in its primary sense) were then built.

In a " normal " meaning today, ideology is seen as a
> "theoretical thinking which believes to develop abstractly on its own data, but which is really the expression of social facts "[3].

This meaning shows two aspects of the concept: its " politicization " and its "sociologization". It is why it is impossible to " escape " from ones ideology. Ideology represents the false idea, the justification of interests, passions. The definition of ideology is stuck between a neutral concept representing a dogm (the ideology of a society, a party, a social class) and a pejorative meaning used to downgrade the presuppositions of the others. The neutral meaning tends to attribute it some characteristics of an epistemological order. The dogmatic meaning allows to deal with dominant opinions (in a social group) or rules seen as a project formulated by a category in front of the others. The pejorative meaning emphasizes the aspect of false idea, justification of interests and passions.

In both cases, the ideological "system" possesses its appropriate logic to found representations (models, images, myths ...). As underlined it Louis Althusser[4], ideology has to be distinguished from the science seen as system of representations because of the pratico-social function of ideological representations instead of the theoretical function of scientific representations. The ideological interpretations are not the

---

[3] André Lalande, *Dictionnaire technique et critique de la philosophie*, P.U.F., Paris, 1991, p. 458
[4] Louis Althusser, *Pour Marx*, La Découverte, collection Poche Essais, Paris, 1996

product of concrete experiences but a distorted knowledge coming to force the individual to mask the elements of real situation. Ideology is conservative as far as its aim is to stabilize a given state. Ideology is not a vision of the world (which refers to the historic frame in which it is built); it operates by degradation of the critical sense because of its objective of identification in a group (important topic in organized action). The privilege granted to the present life is filled with scientific virtues and authorizes to question the past according to the opinions which dominate today. For what concerns us here, there would have been always companies, organizations ...

A scientifical theory can play the role of an ideological justification. It is the case of the concept of equilibrium within a society or an organization that should be then fatally a stable system (to justify any opposition to change or the unambiguous change promoted by one of its categories). The use of this concept of equilibrium allows the discurse of change. It is that misuse of the concept of equilibrium which establishes, for example, the current "sociologization" of ideology with the aspect of changes "necessary" for the preservation of the social stability. The theories of equilibrium are particularly affected by the ideological diversion. This diversion intervenes by "sursaturation" of causal clauses with the dichotomisation between "friendly" factors and "enemy" factors. The sociological origin of a theory does not imply *a priori* to suspect its scientific validity. It is the " ideologization " of the scientific and sociological theories that raises problems. The mobilization of Anthony Giddens's interactionnist perspective[5] allows the idea not of an ideology which is imperative in itself but of an ideology which is divided into a triadic logic: ideology - representations - behavior.

Always to support the thesis of the " ideologization " of sociology, a reference can be made to two other authors of this field (Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot[6]) and the way by which their thesis and the model which is connected to it, is empathetic. The general subject of their work concerns the relations between agreement and discord. The authors are going to build a frame allowing to analyze by means of theoretical instruments the various logics of action (in reference to trade, civil, industrial "worlds", etc ...). In a project of overtaking of the cleavage between sociology and economics which is their essential contribution, the authors are going to build six different "worlds" which establish sorts of cities corresponding to forms of majorities of opinions. The hypothesis they defend is that the identification of these worlds is a necessary phase to build agreements among the agents by the recognition of a real "imperative" in the process of judtification. The authors are going to present the various worlds from the analysis of textbooks and guides aiming at teaching the way to behave in situations governed by each of the forms of very common situations related with these "worlds". These two authors propose us a decoding method for ideological biais. But the use of these concepts by other authors to argue their own thesis may be very ideological. For example, it is the case in the use of the concept of "the city of trading" to express the project of what would be operating today for public utilities.

Representation and ideology raise the problem of reporting the " reality " because of the deformation of that reality carried by representations: this deformation is inherent to the process of representation in itself. Does it build an ideology or is ideology the cause of that deformation? Is it possible to escape of it or not? In fact, the process representation establishes the represented by the intermediation of a speech. Ideology belongs also to the order of the discurse. The ideological use of a model is going then, in an ideological perspective, to create "scientifically" an understanding of the social order, a reality becoming, in a sense, as socially validated reality in the terms of a shared ideology.

The difficulty of investigation of the concept of ideology grows when it is necessary to quote that scientific theories can become integrated into ideological understandings. The ideological context can favor the release of a scientific method as far as the status of the proof - as that of the error - possesses a specific "location" in human sciences and then in management sciences (if we accept their existence) because the proof

---

[5] Anthony Giddens, *La constitution de la société*, P.U.F., Paris, 1987
[6] Luc Boltanski & Laurent Thévenot, *De la justification - les économies de la grandeur*, Gallimard, NRF, Paris, 1991

arises from a triangulation model - literature - environment of one (or of some) observation (s). By offering an interpretation more empathetic or still by strengthening the dominant speech, the ideology brings to reduce the choice between parallel scientific conceptions by privileging the usage of some of them rather than the others.

It is partially by that project that Raymond Boudon was interested and that is why we shall consider him in the universe of what was qualified higher of "sociologization" of the concept of ideology.

The analysis of ideology made by Raymond Boudon[7]

In a work now considered as a classic, the author recognizes indeed that the models developed by social sciences establish simplifications of the reality and infer strategies of justification

> ("The ideologies are a natural ingredient of the social life. The ideologies appear not although the human being is rational but because he is rational"[8]).

The social actor is "always situated".

He will articulate his demonstration by referring at first to four authors:
- Marx with a conception of ideology as "falsifying" (ideology is a set of false ideas formulated for "arguing in force"),
- Raymond Aron where ideology is a composition of judgments of facts and of values,
- Shils where ideology is a kind of system of positive and normative goals,
- Geertz where ideology is simplification.

He will propose a synthesis of the definitions of ideology in relation with truth and the existence of a Marxist tradition or not[9].

Types of traditions	In reference with the criterion of true or false	Without reference to the criterion of true or false
Marxist tradition	MARX : Ideology as false science THEORISTS OF CONCIOUSNESS	LÉNINE : Ideology as a weapon in class struggle ALTHUSSER : Ideology as a necessary atmosphere in social " breathing "

[7] Raymond Boudon, *L'idéologie*, Seuil, Collection Points, n° 241
[8] Raymond Boudon, *op. cit.*, p. 22
[9] Raymond Boudon, *op. cit.*, p. 37

Non marxist tradition	ARON : Ideology not directly related (but indirectly) with truth or false PARSONS : Ideology as a deviation with scientific objectivity	GEERTZ : Ideology as symbolic action SHILS : Ideology as a particular case` in systems of beliefs

Raymond Boudon organizes the appreciation of the definitions of ideology around the criterion of truth. The meaning of a word related with the accepted representations is well expressed by the notion of ideal - type (simplifying and something that one never meets so but so empathetic!). Ideology is related with acceptable truth by leaning on doctrines of scientific type and by establishing a link between symbolic acts (with the use of metaphors) and realities by arguing in a scientific type.

"Today the company should change" has to be accepted without possible discussion (and nevertheless of what change it is in question). It has in fact to refer to a " darwinian " or a " lamarckian " universe. For which interests is it formulated? And more simply, what is a company which changes? How is it possible to perceive this change from the observation of the facts?

Raymond Boudon will then refer to Mannheim's argumentation where ideology is seen as putting idols into life because the deformation is connected to the "preferences" existing " at the beginning ". It is what will allow him to elaborate a restricted theory of ideology from the following proposition:

> "Contrary to a successful idea, the successful ideas entering the composition of the ideologies, far from being always the fact of the blindness or the dark forces escaping the control of the subject, can, on the contrary, appear normally in its spirit"[10].

It is how appears a "sociologization" of ideology which conducts social sciences to conceive ideology as the "normal product of a normal science". These theories may focuse the attention on the importance of the situation of the agent by taking into account effects of position and effects of arrangement because these two aspects have an impact on the intention of the actor. The position implies the subject and the arrangement closes the field of the possibilities. It is the validation of a diffuse knowledge stemming from its own culture.

The sociological agent is rational. He interiorized the "capacities" from the positive or negative effects of the representation through the consequences of an action. It is the same thing with the effects of distance regarding a problem. The representations arise from an ambiguous glance made by the agents.

> "He does not know that he does not know, but he believes to know "[11]

what are the different associable understandings of a given event. But the mobilization of the elements of proof will be so different in relation the presuppositions!

Ideology cannot be studied independently of communications problems and the cognitive and ethical resources of the theories. The mediation of the speech (and metaphors) is important here. The "metaphoric" reception of theories will induce the scientific and ideological status of the proof (and founds the references to the question of the truth "in legitimacy"). Ideology develops itself also in the heart of the scientific work. It operates a link between the truth " assigned by force " and the truth in legitimacy and strengthens the power of the adopted analysis. The "sociologization" of

---

[10] Raymond Boudon, *op. cit.*, p. 106
[11] Raymond Boudon, *op. cit.*, p. 156

the concept of ideology has different effects in comparison with those of the "forced passage" quoted by Marx.

It is also possible to say that paradigms concern ideologies. The validity "in legitimacy" of a paradigm is also related to its " fertility ". It is important to put some light on the ideological process in the way by which, after having speaking about organization in a certain manner, it tends to create the elements of reality related with this discurse. It is so necessary to distinguish between the validity of a configuration and interests (which are the main source of ideology). The seduction, the sympathy created by a model confers a " superior " value to a theory in comparison with others. It is why ideology is also available for a scientific theory. A particular mention should be so made for the ideological gliding appearances inherent to globalizing theories.

> "In other words, it is necessary to distinguish carefully between the social broadcasting of the successful ideas and ideologies, and their political use (…) By confusing these two aspects, one exposes himself to two risks: to confer on the successful ideas more power than they have in themselves; and to give to the received ideas an exclusively political origin, when, at our time especially, they have a scientific origin. Now, if one gives to the successful ideas and to the ideologies a purely political origin, it becomes difficult to explain their credibility"[12].

Raymond Boudon underlines also the importance of the return of tmodified ideologies (being able to be so perceived as new ideas). The explanation, rather of the domain of the science is more convenient than the prediction (rather of the domain of ideology) but the ideological aspect of the science is the prediction and the scientific side of ideology is the explanation.

> "The fact that effective ideologies contain mostly solid scientific aspects which can be treated as white boxes only by a fine elite is not so contradictory with their capacity to have a wide broadcasting. Simply, from step to step, the message changes its shape, because the broadcasting of ideologies is not a mechanical process. It is on the contrary the fact of actors and intermediaries who, naturally, adapt the translation of the message to their public like they perceive it. It is why the most rustic ideologies have also generally a scientific origin "[13].

As synthesis, it is possible to say that ideology is not not a state but a process where the ideological identification operates by simplification and repetition (incantation in a way).

By referring to Paul Ricœur[14] it is possible to discuss the concept of ideology. Paul Ricœur perceives it in relation with that of utopia, ideology and utopia being both the products of social and cultural imagination. Imagination uses as operator as far as, at the same moment, it deforms reality but it also structures our relation to the world. Deformation of realities constitutes its negative aspect and the structuration of the relation to the world the positive aspect. It is why we are not so far from the concepts of image, metaphor and shape as representations in their vocation to offer a understanding of what is organization, market, customer and of the situation where ideology serves clearly as a frame for social interactions.

Paul Ricoeur questions the association of ideology and utopia in relation with the concept of illusion by explaining how each of them are buildt around symbolic structures and, I would add also, the vocation of a justifiable ideology or utopia "to create" the reality as it was quoted higher. The ideology is related to the concept of representation, as a kind of invisible mask coming to found a representation which will strengthen it.

Habit and *socius* (Pierre Bourdieu)

Quite as other sociologists, Pierre Bourdieu[15] offers a frame in the same way that we have already qualified of "sociologization" of the concept of ideology. He speaks about

---

[12] Raymond Boudon, *op. cit.*, p. 279

[13] Raymond Boudon, *op. cit.*, p. 290

[14] Paul Ricœur, *L'idéologie et l'utopie* - Seuil, Collection la couleur des idées, Paris, 1997

[15] Les éléments de ce texte s'appuieront principalement sur Pierre Bourdieu, *Raisons pratiques – Sur la théorie de l'action*, Le Seuil, Paris, 1994

7

an universe where the agents are not seen at first as conscious subjects but as " active " agents and influenced by a professionalism, with an acquired system of preferences and capacities of perception. The behavior of these agents can be explained in reference to rationality even if there is no rational explicit and conscious calculation like with an *homo economicus*. At a given moment, there is a

> "relation between social positions (relational concept), the positions (or the habitus) and the choices with which social agents operate". In other words, "families are life bodies with of a sort of conatus in Spinoza's sense, that is a tendency to be social with all their powers and their privileges. It is what constitutes the principle of the strategies of reproduction".

The social connections are rather a symbolic equilibrium of powers but can or are able to be a physical equilibrium of powers. In social fields, there is a specific "legality".

It is indeed the position in the social fields that influences the vision of the world, the habits. This *habitus*, sort of structure " incorporated " into the agent, influences its choices and its strategies and consolidates its position in the "objective" structure of the institutions of a society. It will be for example the case of the school. So that, in numerous "social fields", the submission to the " general interest " is the best mean used to defend its own interest (for example the bureaucracy, the family ...). The relations of domination are then the support of a symbolic violence. For Pierre Bourdieu, sociology is an instrument of knowledge to question imaginary rights and allows to conquer the freedom by the knowledge of what constitutes the social determinism. The term of *doxa* often comes back in its work. It synthetizes the dominant position that imposes itself upon all as a universal point of view. If there were confrontations to create that point of view, they are taken away and buried in the unconscious. Indeed,

> "the thinkers leave to the " unthink " state the presuppositions of their thought, that is the social conditions of possibility from the scholastic point of view, which are acquired through a school experience or scholastic, often registered in the continuation of a native experience (as a member of the bourgeoisie) of distance to the world and on the urgencies of the necessity ".

To understand, it is necessary to criticize the theoretical point of view which neutralizes the interests and the practical stakes. The visible strategies of conformation recognize the rule. The *doxa* is here to grant what it is asked for the acceptance of the expected representation. And the group rewards this submission, real or fictitious, of the " self " in " we ". It is then possible to consider as an universal anthropological law the existence of "profits of universalization".

More than with other authors, it is possible to see here the slender border between legitimization and legitimacy. But it is already possible to put in motto a concept allowing the passage between these two aspects by referring to the imitation which belongs at the same time to the individual order and to the socio-political order. The mimetic behavior results from a choice slanted by the glance concerned things, slanted choice and contributing behavior both necessary in the construction of an ideology.

About Jean Baechler's "*What is ideology?*"[16]

It is by underlining how much writing on ideology is difficult because of the arbitrary in the definition that Jean Baechler helps us to indicate the outlines of the concept ideology. Jean Baechler will build his developments in parallel writing with the concept of freedom. Jean Baechler indicates us indeed that freedom is opposed to oppression, the oppression being the mark of a non-choice, or the submission to an outside necessity. But freedom is also opposed to pressure, and suggests that the meeting with another will develop without justifiable obedience. The freedom is finally opposed to the subjection which is the impossibility imposed to take part in the decisions which concern himself. These three aspects can be connected or dissociated but they show the subtle outlines for whom who wants to be interested by the question freedom and this of ideology.

---

[16] Jean Baechler, *Qu'est-ce que l'idéologie ?* - Gallimard, Paris 1976

The nature of ideology is, for him, that of a speech which tends to generate values which are used as references in the exercise of power in a society. It is a process of transformation of passions in values. The dimension he gives to ideology is fundamentally related with politics, and let us underline with him that

> "an ideology is neither true nor false, it can be only effective or ineffective, coherent or inconsistent "[17].

But it is also metaphysical because the author says us that ideology allows to transform passions into values. He also aks us the question to know what is an "individual value".

Ideology fills several functions:
- The reunification, the gratitude given to the actors of the same universe of thought,
- The justification of its faiths which allows to draw the outlines of the group of opponents and that of the partisans,
- The buckle of the interests, in particular those of the dominant class,
- The choices proposed to the partisans, what establishes, in the pluralistic political societies, the frame of a representation; as such, ideology does not only concern the values but also the purposes,
- The field of the perception by simplifying the data because it allows to manipulate "totalities" and to have a position on the future.

He will then analyse the ideological demand with the following categories:
- The global demand of ideology which depends of the degree of consensus which reigns in the society (the weaker this degree is, the higher the demand of ideology is), of the intensity of the political conflicts (the more numerous the choices are and the stronger the ideological demand is).
- The groups characteristics make Jean Baechler to propose criticisms of contingencies like the age (the demand of ideology would decrease with the age), the education level (which, increasing the doubts, increases the demand of ideology), the social positions (which ends on the interests of the dominant class, and to the contesting of this one by the "weakers"), the gender (where men, in western societies, are in position of domination in the public sphere).
- The individual demand depends on psychological characteristics.

After the demand, Jean Baechler invites us to examine the ideological supply:
- The ideological raw material is constituted by the myth, the religion, the habits, Ethics, the rational propositions which are advanced but ideology is (if we follow the metaphor proposed the author) the parasite who is nourishing and corrupting these elements.
- The product of the parasitage is of symbolic and discursive order.
- The producers are intellectuals whose influence depends on the more or less consistency of the society (in front of the State).

He underlines that ideology, produced by the intellectuals, consists of a rational speech being able to appear as scientific and motivated by passions. Passions and values are the beginning and the end of ideology and determine its main lines. Jean Baechler draws us a panorama of passions in their vocation to be made of ideology. It is here that we find the pursuit of freedom he quoted at the beginning of his book in the drift of its excessive forms.

> " The plurality of choices finds its limit in the anomy, the autonomy in the anarchy and the association in the formalism or the militancy "[18].

A non ideological expression is, for example, the technical expertise developed on the basis of efficiency but the ideological expression is the prometheism (project of the technical mastery of the world), the epimetheism (project of the criticism of the dangers and the limits of the technique), as well as the scientism and its reaction, the spiritualism.

The greed is based on the legitimization of the power to possess which ends on the will to have possessions. The non ideological demonstrations are in economic

---

[17] Jean Baechler, *op. cit.*, p. 61
[18] Jean Baechler, *op. cit.*, p. 206

activities with the search for abundance or with the collector. But the ideological expression is the productivism the order of the consuming. And, as underlines it Jean Baechler,

> "beyond a very narrow physiological minimum, no need is natural (....) they are determined by rival desires, each wishing what the other one indicates as desirable. It follows that any ultimate satisfaction is excluded, because it is not the consumed good which arises by itself the desire, but the desire of the others "[19].

The consumption takes place in the infinity with desires which end on answers.

> "In brief, the productivism suggests the filling of the Danaïde' barrels in an increasing dissatisfaction "[20].

The ideological criticism of productivism is expressed in the term of "consumption society ". The vanity expresses itself as the tendency to have the respect of others by the assertion of a prestigious superiority. It indicates in itself in the establishment of hierarchies as structural or symbolic. Love makes the actor to perceive others as an absolute value, what makes the wish to be perceived like that by others. Pleasure can be seen, in a positive way, as resulting from the meeting of an object (material or not) considered as pleasant. The realizations are in the habits with social expressions like fests or in demonstrations as sport. The ideological expression is the ludism and its opposite, the denunciation of the corruption of the habits.

The ideological systems develops from a great number of passions and are the basis of questions:
- Fundamental question which, for Jean Baechler, is that of the Bad where he distinguishes the dualist position of liberalism (the individual is the place of the choice of the Good and the Bad), monistic positions (which are represented by socialism, nationalism and fascism).
- The phagocytoses which characterize the fact that ideologies tend to absorb the non ideological speeches, in particular the mythologies but also the habits.
- The ideological proliferation which is coming from a principle qualified as doctrinal development (ideological answers given to all possible questions) and from the principle of the heresy which consists in seizing an element of a doctrine and to develop it by being unaware of the context. The heresy means "difference of opinion". It threatens the unanimity which constitutes the body of the main doctrine. It is often qualified in the words with the suffix "ism": parliamentarism, regionalism, liberalism ...

He is also interested in the elements of genesis of the heresy with the crystallization, the organic passage and the seizure of power. The crystallization is characterized by a posture based by a leader and followed by others. The organic passage is characterized by the passage of a posture into the reality and the grip of the power results from the obtention of a "critical mass". The opposition to a doctrine is also a heresy and builds a new doctrinal source. The last source of diversification of ideologies is based on the necessity of not giving disadvantage to the facts by trying to keep its general value while revisiting modes of understanding.

Jean Baechler invites us then to examine the case of the ideological consumption. He indicates the difficulty in proposing general rules of validity appropriate to explain the consumption of ideology by such or such category. It can involve a "civilization", a society, a group or an individual. The choice "to consume" such or such ideology finds some existence in a plurality which is always guaranteed at the level of the civilization and of the society, but not necessarily at the level of the group or of the individual. The proposed choice can express a wide difference, in particular towards the choice of others (oppositions to relatives, leaders etc ...). Jean Baechler also quotes the possibility of expressing an ideological choice by retaining only a specific aspect.

> "Any ideology is liable to a hard or soft definition, with all the intermediaries "[21].

But the choices of societies and civilizations are wider if we quote two characteristic elements of ideology, the core, as a permanent vocation, developed around a sublimated passion and the developments around the core, the game of both

---

[19] Jean Baechler, *op. cit.*, pp. 219-220
[20] Jean Baechler, *op. cit.*, p. 220
[21] Jean Baechler, *op. cit.*, p. 315

10

develoments are conducting to multiply the concrete forms. Jean Baechler invites us at a look on the religious criterion (Catholics and Protestant for the western countries) with the weberian filiation which connects Protestantism, economic liberalism and secularization of the religious thought and disillusionment of the world.

Jean Baechler invites us also to think in terms of chances of ideologies in their vocation to be found as pleasant, which is coherent with his thesis built on passions. He underlines the relations between liberalism and legitimacy of the principle of pleasure. The efficiency of ideologies arises from the tripartition which is established between passions, interests and representations.

Ideology ends on a process of organization of " silly " thing (seen as the limitation of the capacity to seize the truth). In this sense, ideology is a gradual perversion of the knowledge.

More than the concept of culture, ideology seems valid to deal with the question of values because it is characterized by the double dimension of prescription and evaluation considered as coming from the same glance. In companies where agents, at the same moment, prescribe and estimate their employees as well as their customers, the ideological project very important.

Conclusion: Beyond the rationality : the beliefs and the irrational?

Ideology allows to include the beliefs and the irrational apparently in the most rational forms. According to Jürgen Habermas' theses[22], what is institutional exceeds the legality and legal shapes and contains also symbolic mediations which are important to be integrated in the analysis of representations.

For Jürgen Habermas, to take into account connections of powers and constraints but also knowledges and faiths is important. The theory of the society should be at the same time objective and subjective. In that way, the social link is an integration in the system independently of any critical consciousness and sociality is seen as an integration of a set of representations of the world.

To understand sociality, it is necessary to confront us to a praxeology (theory of action) and an epistemology (theory of knowledge). For Jürgen Habermas, the " communicational acting " holds that place : praxeology then freed from the risks of the ideological drift and epistemology because it allows the developmentof a discussed knowledge. Jürgen Habermas proposes a founding of the performative (in the action) linked with universal appropriated principles "freed" from ideology. The capitalist system favoured, in that sense, a logic of cognitive action - instrumental - by the promotion of the success of companies. But the "techno-science", which is the instrument of this success, privileges the logic of the application under constraints of the technique instead of emphasizing a method which would consist in making conscious choices.

His theory of action is based on 4 modes:
- Teleology where the actor pursues an end defined in advance,
- Axiology where the behavior is governed by standards,
- Dramaturgy where it is in question otopropose a certain image,
- Communicational acting where the construction of a consensus results from a dialogue between agents.
In that last case, intersubjectivity is important because it establishes a posture where the formal pragmatic consists in doing the first step by developing an argumentation. Communicational acting constitutes then the base of social integration because it allows the construction of a world lived by social groups. The political consequence of its lack is the replacement of the discussion by the domination of a group by another one (idelogy). For him, the theoretical discurse also belongs to the communicational acting.

---

[22] Jürgen Habermas, *La technique et la science comme idéologie*, Gallimard, coll. Tel

In *The technique and the science as ideology*, both entities have to be perceived as inextricable. The technique and the science are presented as the only great adventure of the modern society. They sweep all the former metaphysical, religious, moral values and open the new era of ideologies seen as situations in which any truth goes out for the benefit of the violence. Jürgen Habermas questions the cumulative aspect of the scientific progress in the name of a social theory which takes into account the modifications brought by the science. It brought neither intellectual progress, nor moral progress. The technicisation of the science ended with a " scientifization " of life in an always wider social complexity with the intervention of the State bodies in a programmatic position coming to fix a frame. This induces Jürgen Habermas to propose a revision of the labor value to take into account the intellectual work and he analyses the power of the technocracy connected with science and technique as a domination. Max Weber[23] in *Economy and Society* invited us to a similar analysis when he advanced the notion of legal domination and its pure type, "the administrative and bureaucratic direction management ".

For his part, Jürgen Habermas puts in evidence both possible reactions: the "left" one or the " liberal " one with the myth of the golden age and the "right" one or the conservative one with man - machines systems where the machine has the upper hand. Both reactions build the generalization of a technocratic ideology in front of which Jürgen Habermas proposes alternate models as, on one hand, the decisionist model based on the weberian distinction scientist - politician where politicians keep the attributes of the decision, where the rationalization collides with the decision-making process, as a residual logic in a sense, and the procedural rationality with the pragmatic model based on mutual adaptation for the couple political decision - scientifico-technical reason. In this last case, politic is the place of mediation between the values of the tradition and the possibilities of the science. But the positive reason appeared and developed from the second half of the XIX ° century on the basis of a causalist and antidogmatic knowledge.

Criticisms of Jürgen Habermas's position and the return to Paul Ricoeur

With Jürgen Habermas, in any knowledge are interests and, among these, interest for control and manipulation, object of empirical sciences. But let us remind here Alain Caillé's comments on the current legitimacy of the utilitarian reason and the reference he made to Karl Otto Apel and to Jürgen Habermas[24].

> "A community is, they say us, a communicational ideal, governed by the only Ethics of the communication and not perturbed by the search for power. In such a community, within which each would be invited to clarify and to defend in front of every possible opponent, the principle of its action, would form and would demonstrate at the same moment the ultimate foundation of any rational comment and any moral comment. The proposed solution of the enigmae of the Reason leaves perplexed. It presupposes, indeed, that all the principles of action are reducible in the common denominator of the discursive Reason and that any thought becomes identified with this one. Now, we do not see too much what would have to say in the communicational community Guayakis or Nuets, mystic which chose the way of the silence, or, more simply, all those which were not at schools. There are strong chances that in the court of the Reason they would be sentenced in absentia. The condemnation would be still more merciless if the court should be that of the utilitarian Reason, which refuses in advance to hear any plea which would be based on another understanding than his one and which would believe that this plea would contain some dissimulation or ignorance ".

Indeed, Jürgen Habermas connects an anthropological concept, the concept of interest, with an epistemological concept, the concept of knowledge and it is a connection made of both which allows to enlighten the concept of interest. And Jürgen Habermas to underline that the perception of labor is difficult when it is reduced, as Karl Marx did it, in an instrumental activity independent from the traditional and institutional context, that build standards and ideals allowing the communicational acting. Ideology plays here an essential role in the way it conditions the

---

[23] Max Weber, *Economie et Société*, Plon, Paris 1971
[24] Alain Caillé, *Critique de la raison utilitaire*, Agalma La Découverte, Paris, 1989

communicational activity and the instrumental activity and, with this position, Jürgen Habermas escapes partially Alain Caillé's criticism when he underlines how much the contemporary representation of the interest consists in reducing everything in a purely technical interest and in subjecting the interest of the communication to the technique of communication as the interest did it for the knowledge.

It is because of that reduction that Paul Ricœur introduced the utopia: the utopia of Jürgen Hamermas' communication would work as a representation allowing to avoid the exclusivism of the instrumental rationality. The instrumental reason cannot explain everything or offer sense. In other words, the criticism of ideology made by Jürgen Habermas is built on the utopia of a communication without constraint. Also, it is now for the organization the utopia of a customer and a company dedicated in the service of the customer that constitutes the ideology of a trading world as the utopia of a better world.

For Paul Ricoeur, utopia comes to offer the frame of judgment of an ideology:

> "It is always from the point of view of the rising utopia that it is possible to speak about a dying ideology. It is the conflict and the crossing of the ideology and the utopia that give to each of them all their sense "[25].

In both cases, he refers to Karl Mannheim who underlined that ideology and utopia have in common to be in discord with the reality but that ideology defends the established order (and contributes to consolidate its legitimacy) when utopia disputes it. It would always be in the name of an utopia that it would be possible to criticize an ideology. The utopia would allow to reveal what seems to be obvious in an ideology. It is because it expresses something strange who can moreover seem fanciful that it allows to have doubts on the representation congealed by an ideology. Karl Mannheim fights those who are delighted by the end of the utopias.

But it is so as difficult to escape ideology as utopia. Both reveal the importance of the imagination and its pathological power. In a double movement between ideology and utopia, the ideological representations allow to judge pathologies of the utopia and the positions of the utopia allow to reduce the rigidity of the ideology.

It is on such an epistemological position that it is possible to base postures which allow to speak about the company, the market or the organization and to base the principles of the justification of its political modes. It is not a question here of dedicating itself in a shortcut which would make of the company or the organization a new shape of totalitarianism. The situation is more subtle than it appears. We could formulate the organization as being a "totalitarianism with a human face", which means an universe of constraints and voluntary submission but in an ever fragile ideological universe.

The exit for understanding could be then found in the metaphor of "attractor", used to underline the empathetic aspect of the ideological perspective. Ideology can be seen as an "attractor" inheriting three constituents of ideology: the one that arises from the political reading of the concept where ideology is legitimization and passage in force, the one that arises from the sociological reading for which the ideology is legitimization and passage"in justice", the one that arises from the psychological reading where the ideology is conformity and passage in imitation.

Ideology as an attractor finally raises the question of the "ultimate references", reference at the same moment of social and cultural order so that ideology and culture together do "system". That is why we suggest here by trying to reach the "fundamentals", that these elements would allow us to explain how we think and to see how these fundamentals constitute permanent elements susceptible to offer a better understanding of the "managerial situations", which are essentially variable and escaping situations.

References

Louis Althusser, *Pour Marx*, La Découverte, collection Poche Essais, Paris, 1996
Jean Baechler, *Qu'est-ce que l'idéologie ?* - Gallimard, Paris 1976

---

[25] Paul Ricœur, *op cit.*

13

Luc Boltanski & Laurent Thévenot, *De la justification - les économies de la grandeur*, Gallimard, NRF, Paris, 1991
Raymond Boudon, *L'idéologie*, Seuil, Collection Points, n° 241
Pierre Bourdieu, *Raisons pratiques – Sur la théorie de l'action*, Le Seuil, Paris, 1994
Alain Caillé, *Critique de la raison utilitaire*, Agalma La Découverte, Paris, 1989
Pierre Foulquié, *Dictionnaire de la langue philosophique*, P.U.F. Paris, 1995
Anthony Giddens, *La constitution de la société*, P.U.F., Paris, 1987
Jürgen Habermas, *La technique et la science comme idéologie*, Gallimard, coll. Tel
François Jullien, *Fonder la morale*, Grasset, Paris, 1995
André Lalande, *Dictionnaire technique et critique de la philosophie*, P.U.F., Paris, 1991
Paul Ricœur, *L'idéologie et l'utopie* - Seuil, Collection la couleur des idées, Paris, 1997
Max Weber, *Economie et Société*, Plon, Paris 1971

Yvon PESQUEUX
CNAM
Professeur Titulaire de la Chaire
" Développement des Systèmes d'Organisation "
292, rue Saint-Martin
75141 PARIS Cédex 03
FRANCE
Tél   ++ 33 1 40 27 21 63
Fax   ++ 33 1 40 27 26 55
E-mail   pesqueux@cnam.fr
Site web   www.cnam.fr/depts/te/dso