Iris Rittenhofer

Centered societies. Business Leadership in Denmark and West Germany, 1960–1989.

1 Introduction

1.1 Keywords

The 22. April in 1960, the theologian and personnel-social consultant, *Dr. Dirk Cattepoel,* contributes to the lecture series of the *Deutsches Industriein-stitut* at the spring meeting of the association *Wirtschaftsring e. V.*[1] He gave a talk outlining developments in West-German post war society and their expected consequences for both, future leadership styles and future organization of businesses and industrial enterprises.[2] Those future developments are framed by the keywords *"Bildungs-"* and *"Ausbildungsgesellschaft"*. Both terms – the society of the educated and the society of the trained – proved to be constitutive for perceptions of industrial leadership.[3] They are constitutive for the published debates on leadership of the three decades to follow. Also *Cattepoel's* outline of developments explicitly characterizes a future German society, similar trends are to be found in other European countries, as is the case in Denmark. Cattepoel performs this new society by defining it. Thus, this is not a description, but a future, which is achieved, a version of society, which proves to be hegemonic until the early nineteen-eighties, when the educated and trained managers in employment turn from succesful career men into dependants and social clients.

1.2 Directing the future

For the decades to come, the categories of nation, gender and time give direction to the formation of this society, structure them and offer orientations within them. Moreover, they legitimate what I am going to name 'the social changes of no change' – differing perceptions of career and leadership imag-

---

[1] Dirk Cattepoel, Auf dem Weg zu einem neuen Führungsstil im Unternehmen. Vortragsreihe des Deutschen Industrieinstituts, Nr. 28, 12/07 (1960).

[2] Unless explicitly differentiated, the term leader and leadership will in the following cover both, entrepreneurs, business as well as industrial leaders.

[3] For an extensive discussion on the source materials, please see: Iris Rittenhofer, Diskurs und Konstruktion. Die dänischen und deutschen Medienpräsentationen der Führungsdebatten 1960–1990. Eine vergleichende geschlechterhistorische Analyse, Ph.D.-thesis, Aalborg University 1998.

ine social change. Nationed, gendered and timed interpretations of leader- and career concepts do move. Progress is created by timed (difference between decades or years), nationed (difference in terms of the imagined communities named nations) or gendered (difference of men's and women's career) difference. This has important consequences for the conduct of a historical comparison: By looking at how leadership careers are narrated in different spatial and temporary dimensions, with different genders and in different national publications, it is possible to gather a various aspects of what constitutes our cultural knowledge, and how meanings differ.

1.3 Cultural knowledge, creata and presentation

The term 'cultural knowledge' defines what comes forward in my sources, that is words 'put at the service of the visible', words situated and positioned put at the service of what can be seen within the discursive framework which is our culture.[4] Thus, sources do not bring forward new knowledge. Rather, they make statements on what we already know, what we take for granted. Sources are about what we want to explain, what we want to produce knowledge about. The statements in the sources reveal a system of ideas, concepts and ways of thought and behavior which are shapes within a specific context. This is true, whether I look at the sources within their own time, or as a historian using them years after they came into being. In this sense, my approach to comparison is that of a 'cultural comparison'. This approach to comparison is informed by deconstruction.

The cultural comparison I want to offer will not result into the reproduction of two different nations or genders, nor draw borderlines between different decades. It is an analysis of mediated leadership in the Danish and German material, looked at not as separated by nation, but as two sides of the same coin: the promises incorporated in the modern. I read the sources from the point of view of cultural analysis, which means across national divides and decades, and across gender. Similar trends in both, Denmark and Germany, are not mediated in the same way. Therefore, the categories of my interest obtain differing meanings in the context of varying perceptions both within Denmark and Germany, and across the two nations.

I created my sources out of printed media, published debates on business and industrial leadership. Media as collective and multi-voiced deeds are achieving leaderships and gender. Like all other actions, they are informed by their culture. What is interesting to me is to study media in order to understand, with what lenses societies were looked at a certain time period,

---

[4]   Joan W. Scott, The Evidence of Experience, in: Critical Inquiry no. 17 (1991), pp. 774-797.

how they organized perceptions of leadership, and which perceptions were hegemonic at the time? To which extend was gender a paradigm, influencing and supporting those views? My sources do not constitute a sample of data. The sources, collected and sampled by me and with outset in my own interests, are "creata".[5] *Creata* embody both engendered and not engendered material on leadership issues from Germany and Denmark for the time period of 1960–1989. *Creata* are treated as 'presentations'.[6] *Presentation* is an analytical concept ensuring the awareness that language use does not reflect or mirror – as suggested by the widely used term *'re*present' – text-external realities. Instead, language use creates a reality of itself, mediating and at the same time constituting the categories at play. The sources were read as texts of cultural memory and remembered culture, that is as discourses constituting in language what seemingly is discovered and brought forward as news. They reveal collective patterns of thought to be brought forward and independent of the boundaries of two European countries. Also my approach might remind of a conception of gender as performativity, as suggested by Judith Butler (1993), it differs in several points. Two of them are crucial: One, I decentralize gender, yet keep my analytic interest in gender; two, gender is not unique, but a nexus, embodying the same discursive relations as do contextual conceptions of leadership.

1.4 Content

The major themes constitutive for Danish and German industrial leadership are presented in *Self-made Societies*. A comparative aspect is an integrated part of all paragraphs. In *Continuity – denied, invisible, appreciated* I discuss competing leadership concepts in relation to the discourses at play. In *Cultural versus historical comparison* I outline my approach, were I combine methods of cultural analysis and historical comparison. The meanings constituted by the achievements of gender in the sources are discussed in the last

---

[5] Wendy Stainton-Rogers, Unpublished paper, in: Eva Bendix/Dorthe Staunæs (eds.), Overskridende Metoder [Transgressing methods], in: Kvinder, Køn & Forskning vol. 9, no. 4 (2000) 4, Copenhagen, pp. 3-16.

[6] Rittenhofer, Diskurs und Konstruktion (note 3). This chapter is based on the rethinking and reinterpretations of the results of my Ph.D.-thesis, in the illuminating light of two more recent projects. I refer here especially to the concept of 'parallel category' in: Iris Rittenhofer, Aftermath. A scientist's tales on self and present. Forum: Qualitative Social Research [On-line Journal], vol. 3, no. 3(2003). Access: http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs.htm (ISSN 1438-5627). Special issue: Subjectivity and Reflections on the Self in the Qualitative Research Process, and: Iris Rittenhofer, Voices past? The twitching and twisting bodies of gender, in: NORA. Nordic Journal of Women's Studies, vol. 9 no. 3 (2000), pp. 182-191.

paragraph *Engender – indicator of change and origin*. I conclude this chapter by *Comparative remarks*.

2 Self-made Societies

The future German society, *Cattepoel* claims in 1960, was not continuing to be a '*Bildungsgesellschaft*', a literate society of the educated. Rather, *Cattepoel* argued, the future society was going to be an *Ausbildungsgesellschaft*, a society of the trained. This would put new demands to society in terms of the need for a decrease in not specialized work and an increase of jobs demanding specific training. In the nineteen-sixties, education was perceived as a class privilege. Like luxury and wealth – as related to tradition and upperclass – it had a bad reputation. Opposed to that, training was thought to be the means that would unite a split post-war Germany. As a trained society, Germany would be an *Einheitsgesellschaft der Mitte*, a society neither divided by classes nor privileges. Instead, it would be a society organized around a new center, which yet was to be built: a growing group of trained employees was to be in the middle of this society. Training and participatory employment are the unifying aspects and thus the heart of this society. It mediates a space between classes, careers, employers and employees. Training was conceived as a mediator between classes, employers and employees, capitalists and workers. It is training, which as the common lowest denominator was embodied in the widely used term 'the middle class'. This class of the trained employees incorporates the level of the blue and white collar worker as well as various degrees of leader positions.

The 'employed leader', as opposed to the 'borne leader', constituted the new middle within industrial organizations; the Anglo-Saxon term 'manager' was not used until the nineteen-eighties. Thus, by turning it into paid work and employment, leadership was purified of politically illegitimate associations like (old) elite, (family) tradition, authority, patriarchy, and inheritance, the links back to an unwanted past. Accordingly not inheritance, but training is put at the center of as the precondition of a successful leader career. The will to accomplish counts now as a prior means of success. The ideology of a career into the middle of societal and organizational power structures constitutes mediocrity as the new society's predominant characteristic. An image of an unitary society was actually accomplished by centering exclusive attention on those key themes like training for every body and employed leadership on every level, making elites and unskilled labor invisible.

In the material of the nineteen-sixties a pictures emerges: that of old elites and lower class people having vanished from post war Germany. A picture of post-war Germany is constituted, which gained the meaning of a factual

representation of this center as a predominant social structure at the core of power relations. In the nineteen-sixties, the educated and employed leader – manager – was explicitly marked off against the entrepreneur characterized by inheritance both, of capital, enterprise and a powerful corporate position. While employed leader and entrepreneur in the nineteen-sixties mediate a bipolar and hierarchical opposition, in the nineteen-eighties they merge. In the nineteen-eighties, the meanings of the manager were expanded and transferred on the emerging educated entrepreneurs successfully starting their own self-employment by founding an expanding enterprise.

Cattepoel had predicted, that this forthcoming united society would lead to the withering of the class-conscious blue-collar worker's Marxist ideology, since untrained blue- collar workers would be elevated into executive type of trained positions. In order to obtain this, Cattepoel pointed out that the thus elevated blue-collar worker would have to be as close to the grandeurs of the executive employee as possible, especially as it comes to giving titles of employed leadership to various degrees of training, experience and responsibilities. Thus, employed leadership-titles embraced both, foremen of minor working units, and managers in huge corporations, and everything in between. In Denmark, this theme is only marginally surfacing the media, and exclusively narrated as woman, when for example, housewives and 'office girls' are presented as woman who made a career or even as 'leaders'.

For the purpose of my argument, however, it is important to retain that the image of this society, centered around educational training and career, is a meaning constituted by the merging of blue-collar workers with white-collar workers – training being the binding agent filling the gap of the in-between. Blue-collar work on the one hand and leadership on the grounds of inheritance on the other hand vanish from the published centered images. At the same time, a differentiation, which extends a multitude of positions categorized as white-collar work, is gaining increasing importance. Cattepoel had explicated this development when stressing the importance of matching these developments by assigning titles and honors to blue collar worker positions formerly restricted to the designation of those of white-collar workers, thus changing the meaning of their jobs and positions and increasing their symbolic social status.

Educational training is established as means to break away from descent, either in terms of class, in terms of family or of feudal traditions. Equal chances qua educational training become one of the central themes of the nineteen-sixties and nineteen-seventies, centering training as a core meaning of democratization. Equal changes qua educational training, which materialized the will to accomplish, is a post-war fairy-tale built on the narrative of

modernity: the promise given to the individual subject to be able constantly to create her-/himself. The self-made-society is a society in permanent transition, and a transitional society between feudalism and modern marked economy.

The play of gender in the constitution of transitions in German and Danish postwar societies is one of the concerns of this paper. The comparative analysis of the engendering of transitions points at that gender itself is a transitional and thus a temporary category. The term 'to engender' is used here as an analytical concept and means 'to mediate with gender'. Inscribing key-transition points on gender achieves the effect of those points being the temporary entity or 'the being' of gender. This concept implicates an analytical decentralization of gender, leading to the question: If it does, when and where does gender emerge, and how does it mediate the patterns of leadership thoughts at play? Mediating with gender and as gender will be an integrated argumentation in this contribution.

Mediated leadership is a social practice embedded in the images of changing or transitional societies. Apart from gender, the categories of time and nation are further mediators. They all create a distance, which makes the simultaneity of coexisting conditions for success other than trained accomplishment invisible. Heredity and wealth are not only decentered, but no longer talked about in terms of successful career. Dichotomies like past/present or woman/man mediate the distance to traditions, which is crucial to the making of a German transition and a Danish continuity. Both images are centered around an intermediate class, but in their own ways. While the image of a modern Germany is centered around the middle by making elites/owners and under class/workers invisible, the focused image of Denmark is centered around community, seemingly embracing all classes and backgrounds without difference. In the Danish material, tradition continues to be a crucial, though secondary merit in the making of a meritocracy and therefore egalitarian Danish top elite.

2.1 A modern narrative

The modern narrative on social equality through educational training is known in both countries at the time. Educational training was the crucial tool and major device for social upwards mobility. The role, however, educational training did play for the continuity of the very top of industrial organizations and therefore in society, was positioned in a de-center and invisible in published discussions. Until the early nineteen-eighties, educational training in itself counted as an accomplishment in Germany. In the course of the nineteen-eighties, this meaning changed; it now was no longer a success-

guaranteeing device in itself, but turned into a mere precondition for getting access to the opportunity or the chance to get a successful career. In Denmark, training in terms of higher education was approached differently; it did not mean an accomplishment, but rather denoted a merit. This merit put achieved equal means to social elevation at the focus of attention. With regard to the reproduction of the top in industry and society, the merit of educational training only had a secondary and therefore minor impact. It is secondary to the merit of personal relations, like family ties or networks. Both, accomplishment in Germany, and merit in Denmark, legitimate leaders.

Those patterns continue into the nineteen-eighties. Here, changing chances on the labor market entail the necessity to keep up the modern narrative on entirely self-made careers and legitimating the limits of career possibilities. Until then, this major narrative on equal opportunity through education was held up by two main focuses. One of these focuses is a pattern already to be found in Cattepoel's speech; everything mediated as improvements of the future society was related to non upper-class people. In effect, transition was created and centered. The other major focus lies on employed leadership, meaning both, doing leadership (as opposed to being a borne leader in terms of either family descent or of personality), and leadership legitimated on the grounds of accomplishments like educational training (as opposed to heredity and ownership). Questions of capital ownership in enterprises and privileged family descent are not brought up when discussing these leaders as unbound and entirely self-made successful new career men. In Denmark, apart from a single piece in the style of a critique of capitalism, questions of capital ownership as connected to leadership do not surface at all.

These main focuses eclipse that education and training not only legitimate the new post-war leaders of not privileged descent; also not outspokenly, they also legitimate the access and the leadership of any manager in general, and this includes those of privileged descent and/or capital owners. While this is made explicit in the Danish material, where a tradition of influential and privileged family ties counted as a merit and even a primary one, it is totally excluded in the German material. Here, the exclusive focus on both, educational training as the access giving accomplishment or as a merit, and on leaders employment, creates a transitory society and delimitation to an illegitimate past. In Germany, this past is characterized by both ongoing capital and business ownership, the inheritance of leader positions, and by the continuity of feudal elites. This becomes quite literal when the fusion of business owner and leader in the same person means authoritarian 'lord of the manner' leadership styles of patriarchs, associated with feudal luxuries.

Accomplishment in terms of training, combined with employment, mediates the 'new leaders'. The relationship between both, inherited and employed leaders, not legitimate and legitimate leadership, authoritarian leadership and democratic co-work is organized by the systems of difference. Those bipolar hierarchical oppositions create clear boundaries and, by focusing on the positive poles, their exclusiveness. They organize an ambivalent relationship to a past and make continuities in the post- and cold war society unthinkable. Constitutive for the image of the society of the middle, the effects of these bi-polarizations are strengthened in the mediation with gender. As part of the centering of accomplishments, business owner- and leadership vanishes in the nineteen-sixties from the material, for then to re-emerge in the nineteen-eighties, however, with a slight change of focus. Focus shifts from business heirs towards educated business founders, legitimating the until then silenced unification of owner- and leadership. The new society is also created by another major focus, namely a focus on the career opportunities of those explicitly not being of privileged descent. Accomplishments like educational training became signs of successfully overcome backgrounds and thus signs of the meaninglessness of descent for the achievement of positions of power. This is repeated in the exclusion of every leader's social background from published debates. Combined with focus on achievements, the meaninglessness of family and class-descent for the assignment of positions of power is established. Powerful positions in industry emerge as independent of traditions, that is of any kind of historical continuity. This is an essential part of the general discourses on the successful transition and democratization of German post-war society.

In Denmark, those elements are not split up in heredity and accomplishment, but peacefully coexist as various kinds of merit. Continuity in terms of family lines or family traditions for the occupation of leader positions is not marginalized, but even merits its representative. Top leaders are double merited, when old family ties are combined with the modern merit of accomplishments, like training. Continuity in the shape of family lines of tradition is something worthy. Educational training, meaning social elevator both, in terms of society, and in terms of individual top leadership, unites both models for legitimate top careers. Highlighted in the media, it creates the image of a homogeneous and modern society of equals. Trained blue-collar workers gained new meanings when disappearing into depictions of white-collar employees and managing executives of various kinds. Broader access to higher education added to the forming of a center, when it became the sign of a legitimate, broad and inclusive elite, resembling both, the people and the elite, and expanding the elitist touch of university in the stories on the

masses transformed into elites with the help of enlightening university education. This center replaces the notion of elites as old and exclusive, elites primarily by the virtue of descent alone, in the oblivion of invisibility and forgetfulness.

In the Danish sources, not employed leaders, but employees are centered, employees including leaders at various levels. In the nineteen-seventies, employed leaders, directors included, are being enunciated co-workers and wage- earners. However, focus does not shift away from the old elites. Rather, they are integrated into collective categories. Privileged family descent means an inherited family tradition of serving society well. As such, it is a primary and exclusive merit, not obtainable for everyone, differentiating the collectives like the merit of education. Educational training doubles the merit of these descendants from family traditions; they are exclusively inscribed on man. Thus, a continuity of elite signified as patriarchy is told as a national or organizational unity of equal wage earning, educated or trained people. Set up as binaries, employment explicitly combined with either double merit or simple accomplishment, legitimates (top-)leaders in respectively Denmark and Germany. What makes the difference is the centering and decentering of family ties as either primary merit, or illegitimate continuity for positions of social power, illegitimate because of connecting society to an unwanted past.

2.2 The demarcation with gender

The demarcation with gender, however, goes along slightly different lines. In the German sources there is an explicit distinction made between leaders, their co-workers and a mass of the people. Though they all have in common that accomplishment legitimates their positions and their living standards, they are distinguished by the degree of their risks and responsibilities. Personal fortunes of individuals in positions of power are hardly mentioned in either country; the presentation as salaried employees is an uniting aspect, which, however, is of minor importance in the German sources. In the years to come, in Denmark the image of a merited communitarian society of wage earners was created. Wage earning, set up as common denominator, became the symbol of egalitarian equality. This makes it hard to point at the lack of equal pay for equal work. In Germany, the image of the accomplished and centered society mediated unity; the effect is the achievement of equality by uplifting everyone into elite and luxury. In the German sources, unity is mediated by loosing sight of the differing preconditions for accomplishments and among trained and educated employed leaders. In Denmark, this effect is obtained by making favorable conditions prior to education and employ-

ment a sign of a special merit. In the Danish material, merit explicitly legitimates and thus confirms the continuity if old elites in a egalitarian language of collective categories.

In Germany of the nineteen-sixties, the entrepreneur especially of family enterprises turns into the modeling image of an unwanted past without legitimacy for continuing existence in post war Germany. Uniting the owner- and leadership of an enterprise in one person, the entrepreneur of typically small and medium scale enterprises becomes the symbol of both, elite positions by virtue of birth, authoritarian leadership styles, and the leader type of the absolutist patriarch: all signs of outmoded and illegitimate leadership. Family thus signals continuity from a past, tight ties, bonds and therefore an unwanted and illegitimate continuity. Family owned enterprises, that is often small or medium seized enterprises, became the modeling image of all that which was to be left behind. Vanishing from the material from the middle of the nineteen-sixties, they are re-centered when they continue to be mediated as woman-specific ways of accomplishing a career and doing leadership at the top of an enterprise.

The negative meanings of family as a symbol for unwanted continuity became quite literal when family turned into explicit barriers for the career mobility of young men promising to enter the ranks of the successful new self-made-man. They are mediated in stories on young men who have not yet reached the potential top of their careers, putting their career opportunities at risk by an early marriage. Early means before they have reached the top of their career. Embodied in man, family and top career become mutually exclusive before this family-owned leadership was exclusively embodied in woman. Actually, being stationary is a negative trait in a society defined by transition and change. Being settled even presents a matriarchal trait exclusively handed down from grandmother to mother and to daughter. But family ties as opposed to the new successful self-made-man is nothing but an image of a society divided between continuity and the independence of its history. Thus, woman symbolizes the embodied endangerment of the new society, wife the embodied endangerment of the new man. The purchase of homesteads early in their career lives is another barrier. Mobility places transition, independence and the overcoming of connections to the past in terms of descent in geography and physical space. Its opposite, embodied in an immobile homestead inhabited by a woman, literally turns into chains when related to the new man. These themes are not to be found in the Danish material of the nineteen-sixties.

Independence became a characteristic trait of the new man. Until the early nineteen-eighties, every trained and educated body turned into self-

made-managers of their lives and in their jobs, holding the dignities of accomplished leadership and participating in corporate decision-making processes on various levels and degrees of responsibilities. The exclusive focus turned upon them strengthens the image of middle management as a successfully accomplished top career. Middle management thus placed at the center of success, the self-made-man's top career stands out as the very top of career, success and society. When the ceilings between class differences in success as well as between middle and top management enter the surface of explicitness in the nineteen-eighties, top leadership and the limitations of educational training become acknowledged. It is only then that middle manager positions eventually begin to mediate a corporate top career of woman.

In Germany, the educated generalist and top-leader of at the least large-scale enterprises vanished from the general picture from the mid nineteen-sixties and left the published space for the trained expert and specialist until the beginning of the nineteen-eighties. There, the regained visibility of the educated generalist has his revival, placing the trained managers on the middle level as explicit experts, dependants lacking a disposition for risk-taking, and subordinates. The generalist reemerges as the one at the very top. Once centered, employed middle managers now stand out as a glut of an affluent mass. The replacement of managers in the middle or at the margins of corporations is narrated as a lacking ability to compete. If engendered, this lack is inscribed on woman. Again, gender is placed successfully at the center for explanation. It legitimates the limitations of trained social mobility as well as the limitations of success – not to be able to make it to the very top of society – in 'being'. Accordingly, independence gained new meanings: autonomy from social security systems, bosses and dependant employment are now to be found in business foundations. Engendered, business foundation in the nineteen-eighties is narrated as women's opportunity for emancipation from patriarchal society, that is to gain independence and economic autonomy from men: bosses and husbands. The exemption from patriarchy, in the nineteen-sixties still a theme of national importance, is in the nineteen-eighties re-inscribed on woman and told as women's way into both, total independence and top management. In the Danish material, in the same period, an eye-catching number of 'women directors' emerge on the surface. The mere quantity mediates progress and successful emancipation of a gender into the powerful top of industry and society; all of them, however, turn out to be one-woman operations.

The processes of centering and de-centering denote not only categories of leadership, but also of gender. Engendering is a central means for the mediation of social progress and change. If engendered, the most valued career

paths and leader positions are in both countries always and exclusively embodied in man. Man signifies what at different times and within specific contexts is at the center of societal self-understanding and self-definition. The embodying of these changing focuses in man is a cultural activity, which in two movements establishes both, managers as valuable symbols for worthiness and therefore for legitimate social recognition, status and personal position, and man as their modeling image. Accordingly, the manager embodies legitimacy, democracy, independence, self-made etc., becoming the modeling image of the successful new man.

Strikingly, the successful self-made-man continues to be faceless, a non-person without a name. In Germany, this is also true for the generalists and for top leaders. Quite opposed to that, in Denmark, explicit focus is directed towards individual leaders merited by family traditions of serving society, by training and by results right from the beginning of the time period for this investigation. Already in 1961 there was an entire series in favor of the 'Men at the top'.[7] Continuity in terms of merit in the Danish material is both, an openly expressed barrier for the new man, and a cherished value at the center of society, while it in Germany is devalued, de-centered, silenced, inscribed on woman or mediated as non-existing until the nineteen-eighties. The central role given to industry and economy in the German material right from the nineteen-sixties is due to the illegitimacy of political leadership and a declared lack of key positions in post-war society. From this emerges a lack due to the de-centering of any historical continuity, and the constitution of industry and economic leadership as the legitimate key positions in society. One mode of narration is the story of a changing character of legitimate leadership within enterprises. The 'concrete ceiling' (Cattepoel) of inheritance forms in the early nineteen-sixties a metaphor for the barrier to the uprising trained and therefore legitimate self-made-leaders, that is heirs to the business and the respective leader positions at the top of the enterprise. What is claimed to be the achievements of the old leaderships – the reconstruction of German economy and enterprises after the war – is overcome by the centering on the accomplishment of educational training, legitimating business leadership. Thus, not only the modern discourses of enlightenment and the victory of a certain kind of scientific rationality are at play, but also the modern discourse on the individual's emancipation from gender, class or family background, mediated in the centering on successful self-made-man. Respectively, and following Adorno's attempt of outlining leader types, bossy lord of the manor leadership styles are considered to be out-timed by more democratic and co-operative styles adjusted to the centered society,

---

[7]   Series: Mænd i toppen. Vendsyssel Tidende, 1961.

which integrates economic leaders and the new key positions in post-war society.

The cultural practice of engendering, of inscribing leader on gender and gender on leader, contributes to the notion of break in the German material. So does the fact that political, military and intellectual elites are not part of the centered society, on the contrary. In Germany of the early nineteen-sixties, these traditional elites are explicitly said not to have any legitimacy left. Legitimated not by resurrection, but by the *Wirtschaftswunder* mediated as societal accomplishment, the industry not only mediates a new, democratic and legitimate leadership of society – the only legitimate leadership said to be left. They are also explicitly to fill in this vacuum of political leadership, which is to take on responsibility for the establishment of a free social market economy and thus the molding of a new society built on competing accomplishments. Industry, not politics is to be the most important sector responsible for society as a whole. Such needs and developments were not expressed in the Danish materials in the same way.

Here, politics and military experiences are not de-centered, the unification of public and industrial interests with heredity do not illegitimate, but merit leaders. This might serve as an explanation for why the one and only woman leader visible in the Danish material – Dagmar Andreasen – in the nineteen-sixties gets at the center of published interests, namely at the time when she is elected MP to the *Folketing*. This may be explained by the fact that the intertwining of politics and industry is not only not silenced, as is the case in the German material, but even signifies a special credit distinguishing top from other leaders. Moreover, the story on her success and expansion of an agrarian family enterprise into industry tells the story of the transition of Danish society from an agrarian to a manufacturing, but not an industrial society. She has no published attention when she transforms the family owned enterprise into an industrial corporation with a board. Though embodying the merit of family tradition in terms of both parents being successful entrepreneurs independently of each other, she is lacking the accomplishment of educational training. However, being a politician, too, she is double, yet traditionally merited, not embodying the ingredients of the modern self-made-leader, despite the fact that she expanded a small manufacture and enterprise into a huge industrialized company.

As in the German material, the categorization woman serves to create transition, either embodying what is de-centered and left behind, or what does not fit into the narrative on progressing societies. The lack of success (despite accomplishments) is centered in being, inscribed on woman as a sex and as a gender. Success, on the other hand, is centered in doing and engen-

dered with man. Thus, doing is inscribed on men as a sex and as a gender. Woman is an indicator for what is to be considered as left behind, of what is contextually de-centered and therefore either is non-existent, out-dated or illegitimate. In the German material, woman exists right from the beginning and throughout the period of my investigation. Until the nineteen-eighties, woman almost exclusively is perceived as related to the leadership of family owned enterprises, including the luxury of old and the wealth of new family fortunes. Heredity and exceptional wealth is inscribed on woman; the effect is that heredity counts as woman-specific and woman-only access to business leadership: first, exclusively as inheritance of business owner- and leadership, later on as well as the psychological or social inheritance of specific traits – both bequest from man.

The self-made-leadership of industry embodies the virtues of the *Leistungsgesellschaft,* the performance oriented society, directed towards achievement. Exclusively inscribed on man, man appears to be the gender at the center of the new society. Self-made-leader accordingly embodies the opposite to old elites, their fortunes and societal structures, literally pictured as feudal left-over. Danish patterns of thinking industrial leadership are characterized not only by continuity of merit. In Denmark, industrial leadership was hardly a subject of published critical discussions in the nineteen-sixties.[8] Moreover, neither the legitimacy of leaders and leadership, nor the continuity of old elites were problematic. As opposed to the German material, neither is the linkage between industrial and political or other forms for public leadership a problem in need for neither discussion nor legitimatization. Only one Danish source does mention at all the new self-made men. Different from Germany before the nineteen-eighties, the Danish published sources openly address these men's troubles with entering the old elites, not even in the late nineteen-sixties interrupting continuity of elite families in powerful positions. In the German material, the 'concrete-ceiling' is exclusively enunciated in relation to family owned enterprises, thus stressing the symbolic value of family as linkage, limitation and unwanted relation to the past. Thus, family owned enterprises become the symbol for being not modern. In 1987, this pattern is confirmed by a published analysis on the recruitment to powerful positions in Danish society.[9] In the German sources, the limitations of career prospects despite performed accomplishments and

---

[8]   Compared amount of published newspaper articles. Germany 1960–1972: 111/67 in the 1960s and 44 between 1970 and 1972. Denmark: 1960–1974: 61/34 between 1960 and 1969, 27 between 1970 and 1974.

[9]   Mogens Nygaard Christoffersen, Magtens mænd – om rekrutteringen til magtfulde poster, in: Samfundsøkonomen, no. 5 (1987), pp. 4-9.

the willingness to take on responsibilities outside family owned businesses was not explicitly acknowledged before the first half of the nineteen-eighties. A World-War II kind of past is neither existent in the German nor in the Danish sources. 'Past' is reduced to the First World War and the 'feudal' times before then.

3 Cultural versus Historical Comparison

Compared across decades, Cattepoel's implicit distinction between borne and designated leaders equals the distinction between *Bildung* (education) with its connotations of breeding, upbringing, ways of behaving, and *Ausbildung* (training). Training is less deep and enfolding, stays on the surface, and basically means education with a certain predefined purpose. Education, on the other hand, signals lines of tradition and a general direction. This distinction is parallel to the distinction between manager and leader or management and leadership. It is mediated in the difference between the generalist and the specialized expert. In the nineteen-eighties, it becomes apparent that this distinction is analogue to the middle manager and the top director. This difference surfaces in the German material in the nineteen-eighties.

Investigating across decades, nations and categories apparently very far apart from each other, the generalist and the specialist parallels the earlier distinctions between the borne leader and socialized leader behavior, between traits and training, between descent or family inheritance and accomplishment, between talent and education, between woman and man, between past and present, between continuity and a break with the past, between single and double merit. All those binaries are contextual metamorphoses of the basic modern dichotomy nature versus culture, body versus mind, constituted by the clash of discourses which becomes visible in the change of hegemonic perceptions of societal barriers: ceilings, in the nineteen-sixties made of concrete, in the nineteen-eighties made of glass. Metaphors for barriers towards action, they make the schism of modernity visible. Despite the ideologies of equality and education for every body, performance is not enough to overcome being – who and what every body is. The past lives in the presence of the material, that feminine leadership and woman leader – embody what is devalued and counts as outmoded. As a consequence, if the analysis is not organized along well-established divides like decades, it turns out that masculinities parallel femininities. This re-gendering suggests that there is original content neither may be designated to only one of the two genders, nor to the decades explored or the nations compared.

The goal of this comparison is neither to trace down empirical differences between the developments of nations, times or genders, nor to analyze the

causes for their differing origins. Origins being an effect, the goal of cultural comparison rather is to assemble what it is that has been split apart by categories organized as both, hierarchies and dichotomies. 'Discursive knowledge' does not know of spatial or temporary frontiers or various sites of knowledge production, like different media houses.[10] Comparisons on the level of cultural theories are always genuine comparisons. Nation and chronology are only analytical tools for organizing the source material and as such not causal, but secondary to the questions at stake. The crisscrossing search for parallelisms reveals a line of silenced continuity in the German material, which actually matches the outspokenly cherished continuities in the Danish one. This line of continuity is the one of unchangeable, social or biological, traits, either inscribed to gender, or to various categories of leader, in terms of heredity. The match of a double or additional nature, that is that of man and top leader, is an effect brought forward in discursive language use. The concepts of the top leader are either molded as the borne leader with traits prior to and therefore independent of accomplishments, or as merited family descent, or as 'being' in terms of vocation, the social and 'doing'-oriented version of which is the non-stop work for 24 hours a day. All three concepts signify and legitimate the chosen few; when hegemonic, they are embodied in man alone. The effect of a gendered nature establishes a line of legitimate continuity, which coexists in both countries, though it is of larger importance in Germany than in Denmark. This is due to difference in language use, that is collective versus polarized categories in respectively Denmark and Germany.

While the use of collective expressions creates hegemony and equality, polarized language use achieves major divides. The open discussions of leader specific traits vanished in the second half of the nineteen-sixties from the German material, they returned in the nineteen-eighties shaped as talent. The discourses of meritocracy, governing those of borne elites, clash at that time. The will to take risks now openly divides those educated and willing to achieve from those successfully entering top leadership. Thus, paid employment, highly trained employees metamorphosed into social dependant masses with no disposition for risk-taking. There lack of top success is therefore legitimized as a lack of being, of not being able to compete successfully. Risk-taking, however, has been a designated leader trait right since the upcoming of leader theories in the 19th century.

In the nineteen-eighties, the center of society moved; employed leaders turn into dependent employees, dependency means social dependency in terms of a monthly salary, pension and unemployment benefits. As such,

---

[10] Rittenhofer, Aftermath (note 6).

they are opposed to a lack of autonomy, a willingness to take risks, and so-
cial and economic independence. The nineteen-eighties are the decade where
the image of the centered German society is disintegrated. The highly trained
signified as successful elites metamorphose into academic masses, symboliz-
ing a luxury surplus. Symbolizing luxury, the possibility emerges for criti-
cizing public higher education for not being a social benefit, thus not legiti-
mately being funded by a strained welfare system. The stories on limited
corporate success are not only told as woman, but are the general tone in the
nineteen-eighties, when higher education looses its status as a key to a suc-
cessful career and instead turns into a precondition to a career access posi-
tion. The trait of talent is explicitly reintroduced when highly educated peo-
ple gain the status of masses dependently employed; the heritable possession
and social position metamorphosed into the inheritable talent, legitimating
the top success of the few in a meritocracy despite the accomplishments of
the many. Closed elites openly emerge on the published scene once again,
this time not limited to family owned enterprises.[11] Unequal preconditions
due to descent in terms of family, class and gender reenter the stage; talent,
what people are, or the lack of the same divides the trained into those with
legitimately successful and unsuccessful careers. In the nineteen-eighties,
higher educational training turns into an outspoken career possibility for es-
pecially women at a point of time, when it no longer counts as neither suffi-
cient preconditions nor a guarantee for a successful career into a leadership
or top leader position. Higher education, in the nineteen-sixties still a means
to escape family descent and class ties, is in the nineteen-seventies and nine-
teen-eighties denunciated as mass education. In the nineteen-eighties, it sur-
faced as a newly discovered means for woman to overcome her gender and
to enter into a successful career. This new inscription on career woman is
made at a time when formal qualifications decrease from guarantee of a suc-
cessful career to the ticket for at best a career start position.

The trait 'talent' turns into the explicit legitimacy for the limits or possi-
bilities of a career despite of accomplishments and the will to achieve. This,
too, indicates that leader conceptions rooted in 19th century leader theories
still have influence in post war Europe. The basic concept is that there exist
certain traits, which distinguish a leader from the bulk of most other fellow
persons. This development is actually similar to the conceptions of sex or
gender, gender based on the limitations of sex, a fact usually overlooked
when research in gender and leadership is done. Besides mass, woman, too,
signifies the limitations of corporate careers of highly trained people. Since
hierarchies in society in the Danish material are incorporated into collective

---

[11]   Rittenhofer, Diskurs und Konstruktion (note 3).

categories like merit, the clear-cut polarizations between mass and elite are not in operation here. Merit, however, in terms of family line, transports the concept of exclusive and exclusionary traits. Gender is, with the exception of Dagmar Andreason at play from the late nineteen-seventies and increasingly throughout the nineteen-eighties. This is a change in the application of another system of difference. These phenomena are shifts in explicit published focus and such of cultural lenses, and as such indicators of changing social conditions demanding new legitimacies. As thus, they coexist in both set of materials and in the respective decades.

The general believes in the blessings of meritocracy, of every man willing to achieve also being able to make a career, were in the nineteen-eighties openly countered. Talent, as does woman, directs meanings towards unchangeable traits written into the body and creates limitations of success despite public education programs, gender equality laws and other means supporting an understanding of societies centered round thee belief in educational meritocracy of measurable qualifications. In Germany, talent reintroduces traits as legitimate limitations for degrees of success, openly differentiating the highly trained and not by name, but by virtue introducing a legitimating system on the surface of the Danish material throughout the period of investigation. They now legitimate the limitations of social change with regard to elite positions despite accomplishments. These beliefs may go on and may not be challenged, since aspects for social inequality and limited social change are rooted in the essences of those at question. This continuity or reminiscence of 'old times', said to be left behind in the dark ages of elitist class society, is blurred by metamorphoses of the systems of difference and changing meanings.

From the first half of the nineteen-eighties woman and talent, gender and leader forth drive a theme earlier openly discussed in the nineteen-sixties. That top-elites are out of published German focus for two decades is constitutive for that both, the new class performing the middle, and corporate middle management, may perform the new elite, creating the effect of a top. Middle management positions being the highest leader positions visible until the early nineteen-eighties, these positions became important as symbols for the achievement of the new man's top-career, for top-management, thus constituting the new and democratic elites and a totally new society. The refocusing on those on the very top in the first half of the nineteen-eighties causes the effect of an apparent replacement of the new man in changed career possibilities now openly acknowledged as limited. Thus, it is in the nineteen-eighties when woman in both countries visibly emerges on the published corporate scene; woman is a the metaphor or symbol for being gradu-

ally less, and for a gradually less (like talented) being. As such, the modern schism between doing and being appears in various forms or embodiments, among them those top-leader/manager, man/woman.

4 EnGender: Indicator of change and origin

When in both countries in the nineteen-eighties woman visibly emerge on the published corporate scene, they engender barriers known as the 'glass-ceiling'. The 'glass-ceiling' is today widely known as a problem specific for woman as a gender and located in her gendered being. However, as this analysis indicates, apparently gender specific findings are not exclusive for gender. Therefore, I suggest to define explicit 'gender' as a nexus. Those finding should not be referred to as a characteristic of neither woman nor man.

The reconfigurations of both, privileges, criteria for success, and of criteria for legitimate leadership in the nineteen-sixties and then again in the nineteen-eighties, are mediated by their re-engendering, and thus an achieved effect. In Germany, right from the beginning of the time period for my investigation, women in business or industrial leadership positions get published attention, though slightly differing from that of their male counterparts. While the new self-made man is a corporate man, corporate woman is not visible before the nineteen-eighties, where she embodies the lacks of competitiveness, success and independence of the by then devalued self-made-managers. Looking at gender as the nexus of patterns of thought, considering the variety of aspects constitutive for the leadership debates, the question is what it is that is embodied in narratives on woman.

What is it that is told as a woman's specific way of being or of doing career or leadership? It is remarkable that the heredity of positions of power, in the nineteen-sixties demonized as symbol of a not legitimate continuity of a past, is the only access to leadership visiblized as woman in that decade: the image of woman, heir, business owner and leader in one and the same person. One reason for that woman in leadership positions do enjoy published attention in Germany at that time is, that they in 1954 became the organized members of an international lobby organization for women entrepreneurs. Woman managers do not have a lobby in the nineteen-sixties. A further factor is the constitutionally guaranteed equality of woman and man in Germany, which is not achieved in Denmark until today. This explains why there is a vast amount of pieces on this group of leaders in Germany right

from the nineteen-sixties, but not how the theme of woman and leadership is dealt with or what kind of knowledge it is that is put forward that way.[12]

Social dependency, in the nineteen-sixties meaning heredity as opposed to meritocracy, is in the nineteen-eighties transferred to dependant employment. The ownership and leadership of businesses and enterprises, mainly as a result of family tradition and heredity, emerges as being the exclusive path for a woman successfully heading towards leadership positions during the nineteen-sixties and nineteen-seventies. It is not, however, woman's success, as opposed to men's success, but different nexuses of gender, which are at play. If we take a look at where woman and man surface exclusively, woman is the nexus of what is less valuable or prestigious, man is the other. Thus, there is a change from man to woman, achieving the effect that woman always is one step behind men, that gender destiny is reversed. This effect is repeated by not surfacing woman in respective most prestigious top positions. As such, gender functions as a boundary in exactly the same way as the differentiation of time into present and past.

A surface different to the Danish material, reverse gender creates a boundary between education and socially privileged descent. A gender effect is the clear separation of both, political and economical positions of power, and of social privileges and accomplishments as means of a successful career. Woman not only appears to be lacking the virtues of industrial and democratic post-war societies, which highlights are modeled in the image of man. Woman becomes the symbol of forever being a back number, of always being one step behind. In the nineteen-nineties, this aspect has become a self-evident truth, as the still widely used term 'the glass-ceiling' does indicate. It's widely overlooked, that this terms has it's roots back in the nineteen-sixties, when dependency turned into a gender specific trait for success and the concrete ceilings of family succession into a gender specific protection against competition, at a time when leader traits or "being leader" versus "doing leader" and accomplishing a career stamp the published debates on leadership. Remains of this engendered tale are in the nineteen-eighties the need of a supporting husband in order to be able to accomplish a career, or the need of being a daughter in order to make it into successful leadership. Accomplishment, independence and the ability to make it to the top by them selves are inscribed on and embodied in man. The concrete ceiling of the nineteen-sixties and the glass ceiling of the nineteen-eighties illustrate the change in focus from relationships to educational training as access giving

---

[12] Compared amount of newspaper articles on women in leader positions. Germany: 1960–1970:67. Denmark: 1960–1970:46, the majority of them are written on Dagmar Andreasen. 1977–1989:188/31 between 1977–1979.

devices, the change in focus from society as a whole to woman in particular, solving the clash between discourses on equal opportunities qua education and those on personal relations privileging the chosen few by locating it in the achieved differences of two genders. It is this clash, which demarcates the publishable space in which leadership-careers and their genders are achieved.

Dependency as a parameter of woman's success into leadership is embodied in quite a number of features. In the nineteen-sixties, it is embodied in family heredity. In the nineteen-eighties, the social has won over the heritable when successful woman's dependency is seen as a social relation, that is in terms of special corporate or public measurements, meeting woman's published needs for support in order to be able – as a gender – to accomplish a career. Interestingly, the accomplishment of a career counts itself as major success, if it is related to woman. Therefore, the nineteen-eighties revival of the boss and business owner in the shape of a founder of small or medium scale enterprises also is mediated as a women-specific way of gaining autonomy from patriarchy, that is either from (male) bosses sabotaging their career success, or from economic dependency in terms of a patriarchal structured society. The enlightening tale is that of being your own boss, either in terms of independence from man, or in terms of social independence, of not being a client of social securities offered by employment.

In both countries, woman becomes the published modeling image of the educated and trained founders of small businesses, which do not expand. This is mediated in different ways in respectively the German and the Danish material. In the Danish material, stories on woman general directors emerge in the nineteen-eighties, suggesting progress as the equal opportunities scene expands into top leadership of private industry. However, while the woman top directors embody the leadership of one-woman businesses, the general managers of corporate enterprises are embodied in man. This is yet another example which illustrates that categories like general manager are collective categories in the Danish material, while it is an exclusive category in the German material. Thus, in the Danish material gender is used to establish and to legitimate collective differentiations and hierarchies within the same, while it serves in Germany to deepen and to legitimate polarizations and hierarchies.

Looking for patterns across decades, and differentiating between what is told with gender, that is the contextual multi-relations in the nexus woman or man, and what is told as gender, that is as gender-specific, a pattern emerges which brings forward a story different from the master narratives on realized emancipation or equal opportunities. With talents, traits are reintroduced in

order to explicitly legitimate what now is openly acknowledged, namely that not everybody who is highly trained also automatically has a successful top career. Said in other words, that despite educational training, the top leadership positions are always restricted to the chosen few. And the top leaders are reemerging, depriving the educated broad middle of managers there touch of top elitism. The re-entrance of an elite on the published scene is remitting them into masses, thus explicitly reintroducing the modern theme of the outstanding few silhouetting against a bulk. The top leaders are created as the providers of both, their employees and society. Thus, dependency equals the corporate employees and managers with the masses, transforming them from employed leaders into dependants not taking social risks. Patriarchy, then, is not about male power over women; before the New Women's Movement turned patriarchy into an inherent male characteristic, certain hierarchy structures in feudal societies and in enterprises and a certain authoritarian leadership style were discussed under this name. It too has its female counterpart, when for example the styles of woman entrepreneurs mediated as being authoritarian are discussed as "matriarchal" or motherly leadership of childlike co-workers.

In Denmark, the fiction of the enlightening truth is that of a successful collective equalization. A variety of degrees are embodied in gender, thus clearly held apart, legitimated and frozen. While the unsuccessful equalization of those of differently merited origins first was a theme embodied in class and man, equalization turns successful when narrated as the theme of gender, embodied in the story of woman top leader in the nineteen-eighties. Traits are reintroduced, too and legitimate the top leader, yet in a way different from the German material. They emerge in the shape of womanly and manly traits to be combined in the collective category of the holistic leader. The holistic leader is a concept made famous in a Danish context by the former SAS top leader Jan Carlzon in 1985. However, the holistic leader is embodied in man, making the so-called manly traits the primary and essential ones, the womanly ones secondary and supplemental. This pattern also emerges in the competing top leader, modeled by the general manager and embodied in man, cooperating with a team of directors. Team-members are inscribed on both genders. The team tasks embodied in woman match the so-called womanly traits, regarded as useful, but neither necessary nor sufficient for leading entire enterprises. In 1989, at the end of the period of my investigation, both models for top leadership were still competing.

Not family and class, but massed and sexed mediations offer in the nineteen-eighties the body once again as natural origin of unequal opportunities and reintroduces unequal preconditions for career and success. While the

"will to accomplish" was the mantra guaranteeing every body's success from the nineteen-sixties, by the nineteen-eighties unchangeable limits re-appeared in the guise of not trainable traits to individual subject's success when trying to climb the corporate ladders, despite the access-giving posses-sion of educational training. Silenced ambivalences were thus given a natural explanation. The reintroducing of the modern body by talent turns the highly educated, even if a minority in numbers, into a mass. This not only displaces education as means of social equality. It also has the effect of a pre-social barrier to social measurements, however, preferably told as woman. This is quite apparent in the emerging theme of family business leadership as eman-cipation of women from economy and patriarchal dependencies in the nine-teen-eighties is constitutive for both, the notion of the successful emancipa-tion from class differences through equal access to society's elites qua education, and the notion of the natural individual limitations for the access to those elites despite education. My readings not only suggest that despite all promises it is not educational training, which ever decided on the profes-sional successes of a life time. Rather, educational training appears to be a mere addition, a supplement, but not a necessity. In this regard, a cultural comparative history of leadership debates is a study of how this fact was given quite opposite meanings for almost two decades.

5 Comparative Remarks

Engendering as a cultural policy did not occur on the same scale in the Dan-ish and in the German debates. Apart for the reasons already mentioned one reason for that certainly is that the categories of equality characterizing the Danish mediations of leadership neatly fit the absence of expounding in depth the problems of elites in Danish societies, whether of economical or of intellectual elites.[13]

However, when interpreting these facts, three important observations have to be taken into account. First, the legitimacy of leadership, access to and the composition of the leader community, as well as the interweaving of politics and private industry is as compared to the German material neither in quality nor in quantity an important subject for published discussion in the Denmark of the nineteen-sixties at all. Quite the contrary, merited top lead-ers in the Danish material all have merit in some type of public, sometimes political office. That there is only one woman in a leader position visible in Denmark in the nineteen-sixties, has to be seen in relation to this – business

---

[13] I found similar patterns in the mediation of intellectual or economical elites in Den-mark between 1970–1990.

leaders in general do not appear on the published scene. This also explains that Dagmar Andreasen and her factory only got published attention at the time where she had became a member of the Danish Parliament and thus a figure of published attention. This comparison on the nominal and thematic phenomenology of gender also indicates that gendered interpretations do appear due to certain contexts; they are neither at play constantly, nor are they central to the mediation of all subjects of business leadership. The more extensive material on women and leadership in Germany has several causes. One of them is most certainly the constitutional guarantee of the equality of women and men, the other the Association of Women Entrepreneurs, founded in 1954, which launched public and published attention towards women in leadership positions. Third, while the legitimacy of leadership in general and of business owner leadership in particular is a subject of major discussion in Germany already in the nineteen-sixties, this is not the case in Denmark at all. Neither is the structure of and the access to the leadership group a subject in Denmark in the nineteen-sixties; there is but one single piece of text discussing the composition of Danish business and industrial elites. In other words, while these themes are widely discussed and extensively engendered in the German material right from the beginning of the period of my investigation, they are hardly discussed and hardly engendered in the Danish material before the late nineteen-seventies and early nineteen-eighties. In Denmark, gender emerges comparatively late on the published scene, since there has not been the need to create the enlightening fiction of a new society and therefore not the same need for symbolic boundaries.

Mediated leadership is part of a discursive formation designating the modern. The discourse of the modern subject, this ambivalent and ambiguous 'discourse of the modern human being', that is "the image of an individual who creates h/er/im self"[my translation], is inscribed on man and creates among others the 'independent new man' of the German sources.[14] This discourse competes against other understandings of humans and creates the published worlds with language. Gender is one nexus, pointing to the coexistence of symbolic demarcations of places in society, and a deterministic body. Leader is another nexus, as the coexistence of concepts of heredity and inheritance do show. In other words, the modern subject is in this context told as both, the fiction of the respective top leader, and the fiction of man. In this, a pre-modern way of designating orders of precedence is at play. It is the coexistence or combination with the modern 'two-sex model' of different

---

[14] The quote is from Magnus Berg "Ikke uden min datter". Analyse af populær-orientalisme i vestlige medier, in: Kvinder, Køn & Forskning, vol. 9, no. 3 (2000), p. 12.

natural bodies and sexes that leader is embodied in man and the hegemonic tales on business leadership are told as those of men. At various social occasions, these embodiments may be, if I here follow Judith Butler, 'inscribed on the surface of bodies', societies or organizations. But they are read as male being and in effect legitimating choices and orders. However, my readings suggest that this double feature or coexistence of modern and pre-modern understandings is neither specific nor limited to the double understanding of sex and gender; it also is to be found in other categories like for instance descent or social class, leader or manager.[15] In this, those categories serve as signifiers of the modern subject.

The self-made-career, on the other hand, either in terms of the employed leader employing democratic and co-working leadership styles, or in terms of the self-employed founder of a successfully expanding enterprise, is the image of the modern subject not hold back by, to follow Berg, either "traditions, God, class background", authoritarian bosses or other circumstances subjecting the individual despite its own will.[16] Gender is one means to split off aspects of society not recognizable in a respective context. And gender, as is 'the (born or talented) leader', is a way of re-introducing non-social limitations, the body. As Lyotard has pointed out, modernity and its values never really came true. The fiction of those modern societies investigated in this chapter centers round the space created by the conflicting modern and pre-modern elements, linked by nexuses like gender or the augmented concept of leader.

As social structures and the systems of modern organizations indicate, published discourses and publicly available discourses might differ in degree, but not in kind.[17] The open acknowledgement of bias in contemporary post war societies, here the Northern European Denmark and the Western European Germany, and their organizations, was no longer opportune. The clash of discourses in the 1980s once again added gender to the surface of organizational careers. As double metaphor, gender legitimately links both,

---

[15] I quote Magnus Berg, "Ikke uden min datter" (note 12), p. 13.

[16] Gareth Morgan makes a strong case for the idea that organization always has been class -based. Morgan suggests that the first types of formal organizations arose in hierarchical societies. Both formed "an intermediate class of people between the ruling class and the peasants or slaves involved in the actual production of goods. We find the same system reproduced in modern organization in terms of the distinctions between owners, managers, and workers." Gareth Morgan, Images of Organization, Thousand Oaks, Calif. 1997, pp. 308-309.

[17] Thomas Laqueur, Making Sex. Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud, Cambridge, Mass. 1990; Genevieve Lloyd, The Man of Reason. 'Male' and 'Female' in Western Philosophy, London 1984.

hierarchies and continuing pre-given biases in a European world clinging to the belief in unbiased new societies and equal opportunities.

List of References

Magnus Berg, "Ikke uden min datter". Analyse af populærorientalisme i vestlige medier, in: Kvinder, Køn & Forskning, vol. 9, no. 3 (2000), pp. 7-20.

Judith Butler, Bodies that Matter. On the Discursive Limits of Sex, London/New York 1993.

Thomas Laqueur, Making Sex. Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud, Cambridge, Mass. 1990.

Genevieve Lloyd, The Man of Reason. 'Male' and 'Female' in Western Philosophy, London 1984.

Gareth Morgan, Images of Organization, Thousand Oaks, Calif. 1997.

Iris Rittenhofer, Diskurs und Konstruktion. Die dänischen und deutschen Medienpräsentationen der Führungsdebatten 1960–1990. Eine vergleichende geschlechterhistorische Analyse, Ph.D.-thesis, Aalborg University 1998.

Iris Rittenhofer, Historicizing the glass ceiling. The engendering of difference in German and Danish media presentations of leadership debates 1960–1989. FREIA working paper no. 46, march 2000, Aalborg University 2000.

Iris Rittenhofer, Voices past? The twitching and twisting bodies of gender, in: NORA. Nordic Journal of Women's Studies, vol. 9 no. 3 (2000), pp. 182-191.

Iris Rittenhofer, Aftermath. A scientist's tales on self and present. Forum: Qualitative Social Research [On-line Journal], vol. 3, no. 3 (2003). Access: http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs.htm (ISSN 1438-5627). Special issue: Subjectivity and Reflections on the Self in the Qualitative Research Process.

Joan W. Scott, The Evidence of Experience, in: Critical Inquiry, no. 17 (1991), pp. 774-797.

Wendy Stainton-Rogers, Unpublished paper, in: Eva Bendix/Dorthe Staunæs (eds.), Overskridende Metoder [Transgressing methods], in: Kvinder, Køn & Forskning, vol. 9, no. 4 (2000), Copenhagen 2000, pp. 3-16.