

# Challenging Organisations and Society

reflective hybrids\*

## Different Cultures, Different Rhythms

---

Karin Lackner

**Editorial**

**Different Cultures, Different Rhythms**

page 442

---

Karin Lackner

**Cross Culture Pace**

**The Interplay of Cultural Dimensions  
in Global Organizations**

page 446

---

Ewald E. Krainz & Tina Rabl

**Here and Beyond**

**Management as a “Borderline  
Syndrome”**

page 459

---

Ulrich Krainz

**The Sacred and the Secular**

**Notes on a Neglected Dimension of  
a Cultural Difference**

page 473

---

---

Eva-Maria Lauckner

**Hospitality and the Perils of Culture  
Essay**

page 487

---

Hüseyin Özdemir & Mannie Sher

**Group Relations Work in China –  
Challenges, Risks and Impact for  
Organizational Development**

page 502

---

Christian Heinrich

**Telephone-Based Management  
Coaching**

**Advantages and Limitations**

page 516

---

**Journal “Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids® (COS)”**

COS is the first journal to be dedicated to the rapidly growing requirements of reflective hybrids in our complex 21st-century organisations and society. Its international and multidisciplinary approaches balance theory and practice and show a wide range of perspectives in and between organisations and society. Being global and diverse in thinking and acting outside the box are the targets for its authors and readers in management, consulting and science.

**Editor-in-Chief:** Maria Spindler (AT)  
email: m.spindler@cos-journal.com

**Deputy Editors-in-Chief:** Gary Wagenheim (CA), Tonnie van der Zouwen (NL)

**Editorial Board:** Ann Feyerherm (US), Karin Lackner (DE), Ilse Schrittester (AT), Maria Spindler (AT), Chris Sary (AT), Gary Wagenheim (CA), Nancy Wallis (US), Tonnie van der Zouwen (NL)

**Reviewers:** François Breuer, Silvia Ettl Huber, Jeff Haldeman, Ann Feyerherm, Russell Kerkhoven, Larissa Krainer, Karin Lackner, Marlies Lenglachner, Ruth Lerchster, Barbara Lesjak, Richard Pircher, Ilse Schrittester, Maria Spindler, Christian Sary, Martin Steger, Gary Wagenheim, Nancy Wallis, Tonnie van der Zouwen

**Proofreading:** Deborah Starkey

**Layout:** www.kronsteiner-lohmer.at

**Manuscript Submission:** Manuscripts original in style and content (not under review, accepted or published elsewhere) are welcome.

**Terms of Publication:** Before publication authors are requested to assign copyright to COS. At least one year after initial publication in “Challenging Organisations and Society . reflective hybrids®” the authors can retain their right to reuse the paper in other publications. Authors are responsible for obtaining permissions from copyright holders for reproducing any illustrations, figures, tables, etc. previously published elsewhere. Each author will receive an emailed proof of his article and a copy of the journal.

**Disclaimer:** The authors, editors, and publisher will not take any legal responsibility for errors or omissions that may be made in this issue. The publisher makes no warranty, expressed or implied, regarding the material contained herein.

**Copyright:** COS . reflective hybrids®, Vienna 2014

## Content

*Karin Lackner*

### Editorial

**Different Cultures, Different Rhythms . . . . . 442**

*Karin Lackner*

### Cross Culture Pace

**The Interplay of Cultural Dimensions in Global Organizations . . . . 446**

Abstract . . . . . 446

1. Introduction . . . . . 446

2. Different aspects of culture within one organization . . . . . 448

3. Teams in global organization environments . . . . . 451

4. Cultural interplay . . . . . 456

*Ewald E. Krainz & Tina Rabl*

### Here and Beyond

#### Management as a “Borderline Syndrome”

**System Features and their Latent Anthropologic Dimension . . . . 459**

Abstract . . . . . 459

1. In search of the essence of the activity we call management . . . . 459

2. The perspective of cultural anthropology. . . . . 463

3. A conspicuous parallelism of roles. . . . . 465

4. Shamanist implications for management . . . . . 469

*Ulrich Krainz*

### The Sacred and the Secular

**Notes on a Neglected Dimension of a Cultural Difference . . . . . 473**

Abstract . . . . . 473

1. Introduction . . . . . 473

2. Religion as a Cultural System . . . . . 475

3. On the Political Dimension of Religion. . . . . 477

4. Secularization and Individualization . . . . . 480

5. Summary and Conclusion . . . . . 483

*Eva-Maria Lauckner*

**Hospitality and the Perils of Culture**

**Essay . . . . . 487**  
Abstract . . . . . 487  
1. Hospitality and the Perils of Culture . . . . . 487  
2. Being Intercultural . . . . . 488  
3. Accompanying Partners . . . . . 489  
4. Hospitality . . . . . 492  
5. The National Dimension . . . . . 493  
6. To Conclude . . . . . 498

*Hüseyin Özdemir & Mannie Sher*

**Group Relations Work in China – Challenges, Risks and Impact for  
Organizational Development . . . . . 502**

Abstract . . . . . 502  
The environment . . . . . 502  
The intercultural challenge: Making the acquaintance of the  
Chinese culture. . . . . 503  
Research background and principles. . . . . 504  
Establishing a structure to reflect . . . . . 506  
The consulting approach. . . . . 506  
The outcomes. . . . . 508  
Conclusion . . . . . 511

---

*Christian Heinrich*

**Telephone-Based Management Coaching**

<b>Advantages and Limitations . . . . .</b>	<b>.516</b>
Abstract . . . . .	.516
1. Introduction . . . . .	.517
2. Organizations in Need . . . . .	.517
3. Telecoaching Characteristics . . . . .	.519
4. The Survey . . . . .	.521
5. Research Results . . . . .	.522
6. Discussion of Telephone-Based Management Coaching . . . . .	.527
7. Future of Telephone-Based Management Coaching . . . . .	.532
<b>About the Authors . . . . .</b>	<b>.534</b>

*Ewald E. Krainz & Tina Rabl*

## **Here and Beyond Management as a “Borderline Syndrome” System Features and their Latent Anthropologic Dimension**

### **Abstract**

In all the discourses on management one thing seems to be clear, although not focused specifically: Management always is management of borderlines, be it in the shape of “here and there”, of “today and tomorrow”, of “inside and outside”, etc. The article takes a side step away from the beaten tracks of management literature, focuses on the inherent anthropological dimension of borderlines and how they are “managed” by trans-culturally occurring prominent roles. The interpretation of cultural differences is especially challenging when delving into societies where the sacred and the profane are inseparably connected. The excursion into cultural anthropology attempts to cast a light on the fascination “spirituality” currently seems to enjoy.

Keywords: anthropology, management, religion, spirituality, shamanism

### **1. In search of the essence of the activity we call management**

Management is a type of activity that is essential in all “organizational societies”. No organization survives without being managed. As a profession, management is a child of the 19th century in the wake of industrialization. The management sciences take their “objet trouvé” widely as given, which narrows down their perspective very much. They are fascinated by the undoubtedly incredible dimensions of development and progress which make up the wealth of the capitalist nations today. But to take this as an overall success story one has to neglect the multi-dimensional collateral damages of this developmental process. Initially – and since the early days for a long time – managing was limited to business enterprises. But more and more also

nonprofit organizations of all kinds are infected by the “management bacillus”, very often copying practices and procedures that already have a dubious reputation in the commercial world.

The nature of management is to constantly look for improvement, in quality, costs, technology, efficiency, etc. In doing so, managers always demand a better performance than the one that is currently going on. They are never satisfied and can never be, no matter how hard employees might try. Even if they perform well the managers demand better performance for the next planning period. To refrain from that would mean standstill. This chronic orientation of what is not good enough and can be improved places them in a fundamental opposition towards those whom they manage (Baecker 2011), as a “natural enemy” so to speak. Even though the effects of managing are sometimes spectacular and within a given frame “successful”, in a sense managing as an activity is largely tedious, fatiguing and exhausting. And it eats up trust, which is why managers in general need to be replaced after a certain period of time.

The main error of management, though, is a certain one-sided- and short-sightedness. For organizations, “meaning” can never only come from within, it has to be defined as a relation between the organization and the outside. In the difference between inside- and outside-orientation the outside is normally seen as narrowly defined business-opportunities, as a market, not as society, as if the purpose were to reduce unmanageable complexity. Servicing the greed of shareholders is but a (more or less well paid) “occupational therapy” in a money machine and a possible societal responsibility is way beyond concern.

It seems that many – also in management circles – have an uneasy feeling about these circumstances. Only recently the term “responsible leadership” has been coined. But responsible for what? Obviously this is neither an easy thing to define, nor to realize. As if in search for Adam Smith’s “invisible hand” the question is raised how management and the understanding of “the purpose of it all” can go together. The “code word” for this more philosophical type of reasoning seems to be “spirituality”. The diagnosable feelings of a

lack of meaning, of a lack of deeper significance, the permanently frustrated "sense of coherence" (Antonovsky 1979) also lie on an existential and/or – as it is often said – "spiritual" level.

Where does this "spirituality" come from and what does it mean? The search for answers has to be put in a perspective of historical development and cultural comparison. Especially the difference between "the West and the rest" (Niall Ferguson) has to be understood and the role religion plays in the different societies. Admittedly there are "huge" topics related with such an attempt to understand, too huge to be elaborated in this article in detail (for the "long version" see Krainz & Lackner 2014), but a few may be named:

- Historically, the credibility of the Christian churches is at its lowest level, which is unique amongst the religions. "Heretical" ideas like "freedom of thought" are characteristic for the development of religiousness from the European age of Enlightenment onward, but to a certain extent an "indirect atheism" can be traced back to the very words of Jesus. The authority to define what religion should mean is placed into (more or less random) communities and their inner dynamics (Matthew 18:20). An assembled community of attuned believers is the creator of what they might call "god".
- Through the rise and development of the natural sciences a borderline between "knowing" and "believing" was introduced and the former sphere of the miraculous more and more became the realm of superstition. Weber characterized this new era as "disenchantment of the world".
- Since "believing" is a psychological operation based in the individual everybody believes what they want (after Kant believing is no longer an obligatory must of subordinates).
- We live in a secularized society, an often misunderstood phenomenon. Secularization does not imply widespread atheism but rather a "privatization" of religious beliefs, a very individual type of religiosity, something arbitrary and to some extent random, even something hybrid, a characterless puzzle

of pieces taken from different religions. We live in an era of a new type of bottom-up polytheism – and the collective term for this is “spirituality”.

- Psychologically, the “spiritual turn” is ambivalent. It is not the completion of the program of Enlightenment, although it inaugurates the individual as the instance to decide on matters of religious beliefs for themselves. And unmistakably it is the silent expression of social (and ideological) criticism.
- The impression, though, that this “spiritual turn” is not only progressive in the sense aforementioned but also a sign of collective regression, a fall-back into pre-modern times, a “de-rationalization”, brings up the question how the distinction between modernity and pre-modernity can be defined.
- Connected with this is the question how different societies can be distinguished on a developmental scale. Attempts like these have a bad press, even though there are impeccable sources of information already from the early beginning of such considerations (Wundt 1915). Meanwhile there are countless observations made by anthropologists that in “primitive” societies in certain respects also adults behave like our children or – the other way around – that our children in some respects behave like members from “primitive” societies.
- Nevertheless a systematic research on those parallels has started only relatively recently in the frame of a cross culture psychology (Hallpike 1979). On the basis of such considerations Oesterdieckhoff (2013) formulates a structure-genetic sociology, assumes a big leap in cultural development from pre-modern to modern times and notes the “childlike anthropological nature of pre-modern humankind” (Oesterdieckhoff 2011, p. 9).

What is our observation point? The empirical basis of our considerations is rooted in a number of study trips, many of them with the direct focus on original religious beliefs and practices, especially the shamanism in Central and East Asia. It is obvious that the religious beliefs form the core of what really moves people. In this sense we are working on a map of belief-systems, looking for specific differences as well as for the underlying principles that

can be generalized. This project is not free of sentiment. It looks bad for the indigenous cultures, all over the planet. Either they silently die out or they succumb to a pressure to assimilate so that everything is lost whatever once constituted their specific authenticity. Levi-Strauss' "Tristes Tropiques" can be taken as a metaphor that is also valid here. Yet, as long as the ethnic cultures still exist and are not extinguished by the Leviathan state they are worth visiting and studying.

## **2. The perspective of cultural anthropology**

The comparative approach to cultures allows distinctions as well as generalizations, oscillating between relativism and universalism (the former is easy to have, the latter is more ambitious, albeit more error-prone). In non-Western societies one can immediately see how much any religion depends on "social events". The social function has often been referred to, religion binds the believers together and in order to make this possible they heavily depend on continuous rituals. Systems of belief, whether "cultural" or "religious" in character, create "webs of significance" (Geertz 1973). As such they have a stabilizing, orienting and prescriptive effect on all individuals sharing those beliefs, which constitutes them as a social group. What Geertz implicitly insinuates is that anthropologically seen human beings crave for "significance". So we can say that in general the world is divided into two spheres: the sphere of the phenomena and the sphere of their significance. This automatically creates a certain "beyondness" in itself that keeps the mind busy.

In the sphere of the phenomena some are directly connected with the human existence itself, opposing forces, entities, forms of being, existential contradictions – life and death, where we come from and where we go to, the riddle of the two (or three?) sexes, the difference between young and old, between health and sickness, between humans and animate and inanimate nature, and the like. Such phenomena have a strong impact on human minds and subsequently on cultures. They provide a stimulus, so strong that human beings cannot help but construct "explanations" and do something about it. Gehlen

(1956) finds here the source and reason why human beings build institutions, following an impulse he calls “undetermined commitment” (orig. “unbestimmte Verpflichtung”). If we take for instance the presumably most striking of the mentioned phenomena, the encounter of death of fellow humans, we can see that the phenomenon itself leaves the survivors not only with a huge interpretation problem but also makes them create customs and habits to deal with death and the dead, thus building an institution. The stronger the impulse, the more compulsively the people adhere to their customs and are intolerant of disrespect.

According to Bataille (1957) human existence is characterized by a state (or fate) that he calls “discontinuity”. Existentially, we as human beings drop out of some kind of an overall cosmic connectedness and are isolated in our “individual discontinuity”. This is more than irritating, it is a source of (existential) suffering, as a result of which human beings individually, but more important: collectively, undertake attempts to create the feeling of connectedness, a dissolution of the boundaries of individuality, at least temporarily. The basic idea is very much in accordance with fundamental insights of psychoanalysis, especially with the concept of symbiosis and regression. Having uncovered a syndrome – the craving for meaning is but an extension of the discontinuity-problem in the sense of Bataille – we are now getting a clue how to decipher religious rage, cruelty and violence, all of which are evidently “irrational”.

Sacrifications e.g. – basic operations in any religion (Heinsohn 1997) – are seldom a bloodless venture. Amongst them human sacrifice is outstanding (Green 2002). There is no ritual resort to violence, mutilation, self-mutilation or killing on this planet that is not somehow related to religion (Girard 1972). Much of the “process of civilization” consists of nothing but a replacement of the original drama through substitutes. The sacrifice of “criminals” instead of – as was originally the custom – community members with a high status, even kings (Frazer 1915), is an obvious substitution, as well as the replacement of human sacrifice through animal sacrifice. Finally (in a process of sublimation in the sense of psychoanalysis) the use of symbols that only indicate what was once immediately “understandable” makes the rituals less

blood-drenched. The behavioral patterns are formed by the way cultures organize their survival. So a culture based on crop growing differs from a society of hunters or herders. The excessive sacrificers were the agrarian cultures of sedentary settlers (Henaff 2002), not the hunter-gatherers. This is important to note, because on a large scale the settlers have won against the nomads.

Trans-culturally, one thing they all have in common: the importance of the ancestors. From small tribal communities to the largest imaginable kingdoms, the ancestors are not gone. They are so present that they control the life of the living. They demand to be taken care of; sometimes they are serviced more than is customary amongst the living. They are a greedy bunch and have to be fed and nourished (Herbig1988). Not to constantly honor them, to neglect their importance and ignore their wishes would lead to all kinds of woes, bad weather, crop failure, lack of hunting success, diseases, sometimes even immediate death (Schmid 2010).

### **3. A conspicuous parallelism of roles**

All activities related with such customs need "managing", "mediating", nothing happens without "special agents". The inevitability of rituals, how blood-thirsty or seemingly peaceful they may be, requires a specific role play and especially calls for one specific role. Depending on the culture, this role is taken by emperors, kings, shamans, medicine men and women, magicians, priests, etc. Indeed, in the course of history many such roles have been developed. They all attempt to bridge the gap between the one side and the other, between the given and the transcendent. Saying this, one has to admit that this is already a simplification because Bataille's idea of the discontinuity of the human condition includes a variety of gaps.

If there is any basic drive that can be attributed to human beings then it is the drive to overcome existential anxiety. One side is the urge to understand, hence the notorious and unquenchable question why things are as they are. On the other side humans have a strong ambition to bring themselves into

a position that allows to control – or at least to cope with – the threatening forces of the world in any given form.

The main sources of what makes life fearsome can be roughly grouped into three, so actually we can speak of three different “worlds”:

- There is the natural world, the world of the material things, the “elements”, land, water, air, fire, wood, weather, animals;
- then there is the social world, other people, familiar and unfamiliar ones, of the same kind or of a different kind (one cannot even be sure whether animals should not rather belong to this group);
- finally there is the immaterial world, the after-life, the realm of ancestors, spirits, demons, gods, where you never can be sure whether they are benevolent or rather dangerous.

Towards each of the three “worlds” mankind has developed specific agents (later: professions) who represent the ambition to understand as well as the ambition to control and make use of them in a practical sense. In order to do so they have to “manage” the borderline between what is given and visible to everybody and the transcendent, what is not (yet) visible, will be constructed (materially) or developed (socially, e.g. the resolution of a conflict). Thirdly they mediate the influence of immaterial spirits on the living in a way of a “positive” (or at least non-negative) outcome. The “manager” as the civilizational type we see today therefore stands in a line with other types and prototypes.

- Towards the natural world we are helped by “tricksters”, people with specific skills, alchemists, people who are able to transform matter from one form to another; in their modern shape they appear as technicians or engineers;
- as agents towards the social world we can find chiefs of all kinds, kings, rulers, despots, feudal lords, CEOs, bosses and managers;
- with regard to the immaterial world we have priests, shamans, sorcerers, etc.

What can be separated analytically is often found in combinations, e.g. that the spiritual leader and the political leader are functions exercised by the same person. Those who knew the technique how to process ore, gain metal out of it and forge it to e.g. swords were often considered to be magicians. Being the masters of fire they knew the secrets of metallurgic processes and how to make "more out of ore" (as a contemporary advertising slogan reads; Eliade 1980). The first highly skilled alchemists in history were probably Daoist monks. In the search for eternal life they not only laid the foundation for what we nowadays know as TCM (traditional Chinese medicine) but also accidentally invented gun powder (for later use in firecrackers, to chase away evil spirits).

In any culture the bridging of discontinuity (regardless in which respect or direction) is nothing for ordinary people. The designated bearers of functions act like delegates of a community, but they have an ambivalent image, they are helpful as well as to be feared. At least during the activities where they act out their skills they are shunned by ordinary people. So their "professional between-ness" often takes them out of the normal social life. Being able to get access to the "other side" they often not only deal with the transcendent but also are considered sacred, untouchable and taboo themselves, at least occasionally (Maccoby 1982). They stay away from "ordinary pleasures" (or the pleasures of the ordinary), lead an ascetic life, etc.

One of the most important and historically influential collective illusions is the one of the king's divinity (in a trans-cultural perspective: Roheim 1930, where kingdom is less a political function but rather an institution taking care of "spiritual" needs). Deeply rooted in mythical thinking of Daoist animism the emperors of China e.g. had a specific role to fulfil. In the collective belief the ruling emperor was considered to be the "son of heaven" (in Chinese mythical thinking "heaven" stands for a totality of a harmonious wholeness). This was less a title showing his universal superiority, it was rather a duty. Positioned on top of the hierarchy (the literal meaning of the word "hierarchy" is "sacred order") his function was to preserve the cosmic order and to keep away any disturbance. In an agrarian culture crop failure is the greatest threat.

Winds can cause damage, storms might come, drought could be a problem, rain can fall either too much or too little, so invoking the forces of nature and praying for a good harvest is a serious matter.

Since the emperor is held accountable for the welfare of his people it is his task to ensure the next cycle of sowing, growing and harvesting. This sounds more “instrumental” than it is in traditional Chinese thinking. The emperor is an integral part of the cosmic order and the cosmic harmony is ensured and maintained through the performance of certain rituals, so we have a kind of “circular definition” in a non-causal connectedness, where logical categories like cause and effect do not necessarily exist or can be used very freely (Granet 1934). This free interpretation of causality was introduced into management discussions only recently (Jullien 1996). In Chinese thinking it is possible that something that happens later can influence something that already has happened. The chain of cause and effect is less important than the overall totality and connectedness. Much was at stake for the emperor. If in spite of all the rituals things went wrong, e.g. a bad crop had occurred or enemies had invaded the country, it was legitimate to remove him from his throne and replace him by a new emperor because it was obvious that he has lost the “mandate of heaven”.

From the 15th century on the “temple of heaven” in Beijing was the place where the rituals were performed; it perfectly mirrors the heaven-earth-connection and the ceremonial linking function of the emperor. Of course the rituals are older than this temple, as far as the written sources document they date back to the first dynasties. Nature worship is a very basic type of religious mind-set and what Daoism was for the religious thinking, correspondingly Confucianism later became for the political thinking. Already in times of the early dynasties the wise men and advisors of the emperors amalgamated the religious and the political function of these undertakings. This had two functions, firstly the unification of the empire (after a period of costly power struggle and warfare between small kingdoms), secondly the “ideological” legitimization of the emperor as the one and only ruler – at least as long as he was on good terms with the forces of nature. In their essence, such mind-sets

and practices servicing "spiritual needs" are shamanistic (Müller 1997, Vitebsky 2006).

#### **4. Shamanist implications for management**

Structurally the role of the emperor in imperial China is the same as the one any shaman has in the villages of e.g. the Amdo-Tibetan hinterland today. In agricultural societies the general intention is to create a connection to heaven-god-spirits and to ensure luck for the next sowing-growing-harvesting-cycle. The great dividing line to distinguish different types of shamanism is defined by – in the words of Marx – the process of production. In non-agrarian nomadic herding cultures like the ones of Siberia and Mongolia shamanism is the dominant form of "spirituality". The Mongolian spirits can be really nasty and to deal with them shamans need a lot of training (Schenk 2009). They always have to be careful and e.g. hide their face behind a curtain of strings when in trance.

What shamans do can be called "continuity-management", continuity in the sense of Bataille. For this they dispose of a spiritual power often referred to as "mana" (La Barre 1972). They arrange what can be accepted as a message from "the other side" and they also keep destructive forces out. They accompany and guide their clients through their transitions from one phase to the next, which is the basic idea of the "rites of passage" (van Gennep 1909). They mediate wherever two aspects of entities or system features have to be taken care of. They literally sit on the borderline. They are so to speak Janus-faced and can see both sides of the difference at issue. By use of rituals and ceremonies they attempt to integrate the differences to a wholeness that is permanently divided up through the process of life. Much of this seems irrational, awkward and spectacular. But this is the very tradition modern management stands in.

To manage transitions is shamanistic skill at its best, if for nothing else than for the coordination of different temporalities. The speed of organizational

planning is much higher than the speed in which people can adapt to new circumstances, which is chronically under-exposed in the relevant notions.

Emotions flow slowly and it takes time until the demands produced by constant change are overcome by the persons concerned. The task of managing change means to handle the borderline between a general duality of two forces, a driving, changing, differentiating one, and a conserving, integrating and stabilizing one. These two forces are hard to combine since they are contradictory tendencies. In the world of enterprises there is a distinct tendency for a change-orientation. Culture and religion on the other hand are strongholds for the preserving forces. Neither change nor preservation is a value in itself. Actually, depending on a situation both can be necessary – a “cultural revolution” where culture is repressive and unjustifiably limiting freedom, and a sense making integration where due to constant change the feelings of insecurity are overwhelming.

On a large scale a lot of concepts need to be reconsidered. Even though economy is driven by figures and figures look very rational, everything that revolves around money is currently one of the most irrational and unexplained issues. One trail goes directly into the religious sphere (Schwarz 2012) and – since money is a product of the sedentary agrarian and surplus producing cultures – also to the logic of sacrifice (Braun 2012). It is a problem in itself to what extent such considerations can really be delegated to the upper management. Shifting the responsibility only to leaders is a risky thing, at least this we could have learned from history. On the other hand one has to admit that establishing participation in a frame that extends across an entire organization sounds good in theory, but is hard to achieve in reality, especially in the case of large organizations.

Modern management implicitly claims to be on the peak of the development towards societal rationality.

But matter-of-factly it practices a crude reductionism. Already the word “rationalization” is revealingly euphemistic and to lay off employees evidently stands in the tradition of human sacrifice. A reflection of the anthropologic

dimensions of tackling life on an existential level can show how embarrassingly narrow the perspective of modern management can be. Per definition, reductionism constitutes the one-sidedness that does not fulfill the principle task of appropriately handling the borderlines.

## References

- Antonovsky, A. (1997). *Salutogenese*. Tübingen: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Verhaltenstherapie Verlag.
- Baecker, D. (2011). *Organisation und Störung*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Bataille, G. (1957). *L' érotisme*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Braun, C.v. (2012). *Der Preis des Geldes*. Berlin: Aufbau.
- Eliade, M. (1980). *Schmiede und Alchemisten*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta.
- Frazer, J.G. (1890-1915). *The Golden Bough*. New York: Oxford University Press 1998.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gehlen, A. (1956). *Urmensch und Spätkultur*. Wiesbaden: Aula 1986.
- Gennep, A.v. (1909). *Übergangsriten*. Frankfurt: Campus 1986.
- Girard, R. (1972). *La violence et le sacré*. Paris: Bernard Grasset.
- Granet, M. (1934). *La pensée chinoise*. Paris: La Renaissance Du Livre.
- Green, M.A. (2002). *Dying for the Gods*. Stroud: Tempus.
- Hallpike, C.R. (1979). *The Foundations of Primitive Thought*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Heinsohn, G. (1997). *Die Erschaffung der Götter*. Reinbek b. Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Hénaff, M. (2002). *Le prix de la vérité*. Paris: Édition du Seuil.
- Herbig, J. (1988). *Nahrung für die Götter*. München: Hanser.
- Jullien, F. (1996). *Traité de l'efficacité*. Paris: Édition Grasset & Fasquelle.
- Krainz, E.E. & Lackner, K. (Hg.) (2014). *Betrifft: Organisation*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- La Barre, W. (1972). *The Ghost Dance*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Maccoby, H. (1982). *The Sacred Executioner*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Müller, K.E. (1997). Schamanismus. München: Beck.

Oesterdiekhoff, G. (2011). The Steps of Man Towards Civilization. Norderstedt: Print on demand.

Oesterdiekhoff, G.W. (2013). Die Entwicklung der Menschheit von der Kindheitsphase zur Erwachsenenreife. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Roheim, G. (1930). Animism, Magic and the Divine King. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, reprint by Kessinger.

Schenk, A. (2009). Herr des Schwarzen Himmels. Freiburg: Hans Nietsch.

Schmid, G.B. (2010). Tod durch Vorstellungskraft. Wien, New York: Springer.

Schwarz, G. (2012). Die Religion des Geldes. Wiesbaden: Springer Gabler.

Vitebsky, P. (2006). Schamanismus. Köln: Taschen.

Wundt, W. (1915). Elements of Folk Psychology. London: George Allen & Unwin, reprint.

---

The Journal “Challenging Organisations and Society, reflective hybrids® (COS)” is the first journal to be dedicated to the rapidly growing requirements of reflective hybrids in our complex 21st-century organisations and society. Its international and multidisciplinary approaches balance theory and practice and show a wide range of perspectives in and between organizations and society. Being global and diverse in thinking and acting outside the box are the targets for its authors and readers in management, consulting and science.