Kenneth Mølbjerg JØRGENSEN
Aalborg University, Denmark
Department of Education, Learning and Philosophy

CORRUPTION AND GENEALOGICAL ANALYSIS

Summary. In modern societies we need a complex understanding of relations of power in terms of understanding the subtleties of these phenomena at work in everyday life. This is no less true for corruption. Since it is difficult to precisely define corruption, I suggest taking another approach to corruption; that it is always a possibility and potential threat to democracy. For this reason I suggest Foucault's critical analysis of power, the genealogy as a means of exploring organizational and societal relations. Genealogy is relevant because it is systematically suspicious and critical towards the truth and morality claims of any statement. It is a critical writing of history characterized by seeking a democratization of voices in terms of representing the marginalized and suppressed voices on a more equal footing with dominating ones. Since relations of power, whether based on corruption or not, seek to harness language, this critical inquiry is necessary in terms of developing democracy and protecting us from corruption.

Keywords: corruption, foucault, relations of power, genealogical analysis

KORUPCJA A ANALIZA GENEALOGICZNA

Streszczenie. We współczesnych społeczeństwach istnieje konieczność złożonego rozumienia relacji władzy w kontekście rozumienia subtelności tych zjawisk w codziennym środowisku pracy. To samo można powiedzieć o korupcji. Ponieważ trudno jest precyzyjnie zdefiniować korupcję, zasugerowano przyjęcie innego podejścia do korupcji, jako zjawiska, które stanowi zawsze możliwość i potencjalne zagrożenie dla demokracji. Z tego powodu autor sugeruje krytyczną analizę władzy Foucaulta, genealogię, jako środka, który służy do badania relacji organizacyjnych i społecznych. Genealogia wydaje się być odpowiednim podejściem, ponieważ jest systematycznie podejrzliwa i krytyczna wobec deklarowanej prawdy i moralności. Krytyczne pisanie historii charakteryzuje się demokratyzacją, w kontekście reprezentowania zmarginalizowanych i tłumionych głosów na równi z głosami

dominującymi. Ponieważ relacje władzy, które oparte są albo na korupcji albo nie, starają się wykorzystać język, zatem niniejszy wgląd krytyczny jest niezbędny dla rozwoju demokracji i chronienia nas przed korupcją.

Słowa kluczowe: korupcja, Foucault, relacje władzy, analiza genealogiczna

1. Introduction

The paper is grounded on the presumption that the usual definition of corruption as the dysfunction of a political system or institution in which government officials, political officials or employees seek illegitimate personal gain through actions such as **bribery, extortion, cronyism, nepotism, patronage, graft,** and **embezzlement** is not very useful in complex modern democratic societies.

I suggest that corruption – or whatever we call corruption – works in much more subtle and almost invisible ways behind the scenes and, among others, seeks to harness the language of the world. The problem in the traditional definition of corruption is that it resembles traditional perspectives of power too much and thus that they have a rather narrow and simplified perspective on power and subsequently also on corruption.

I propose a more complex understanding. This understanding should be seen in the context of MacDonald's argument that Western societies rest on the idea of the sovereign ego oriented towards the rational meaning of being, and where human relations are governed by a refusal of any expenditure without return.[1] This idea also governs networks of power and is embedded in the mutuality, trust, expectations, norms and standards which work to favor particular actors, groups, institutions and viewpoints.

It follows that modern societies to a high degree actually work from the idea of mutual benefit and this tendency has actually been increasing over the past two to three decades. We have increasingly moved towards a postmodern condition characterized by strong relationships between political life, social life, business life and even scientific life, where scientific knowledge is increasingly commercialized.[2]

We would ordinarily not characterize all such relationships as "corruption" because this would basically mean that corruption is everywhere in modern societies. But there is a rather thin line between what is considered legitimate mutual relationships and alliances and what is considered corruption. Further, where the line is drawn varies from context to context.

---

[1] MacDonald M.J.: Losing Spirit: Hegel, Levinas, and the Limits of Narrative. Narrative 2005, no 13(2), p. 184.
[2] Lyotard J.F.: The Postmodern Condition - A Report on Knowledge. Manchester University Press, Manchester 1984.

This means that I will not try to draw the line between what is corruption and what is not corruption. I suggest taking another approach to corruption; namely that it is always a possibility and a potential threat to the development of democracy.

I propose Foucault's critical analysis of power, the genealogy, as one of the guardians of democracy. This is because genealogy is based on the meticulous exploration of how relations of power work and is systematically suspicious of any statement. Since corruption - like other relations of power - seeks to harness, influence and frame language, this kind of analysis is critically important in terms of exposing the relations of power behind the statement.

Genealogy thus seeks to construct a high degree of transparency in terms of how social life works. The key point is that this transparency gives us the possibility to assess, evaluate and judge whether particular relations are legitimate or not by providing us with a more nuanced and varied understanding of the ways in which organizational and institutional decisions are made and implemented.

The paper is organized in three steps. Firstly, I describe Foucault's conception of power and how it can be used in relation to corruption. Secondly, I describe main ideas of genealogical analysis as a means of power analysis. Thirdly, I refer to a number of case studies on power in organizations and describe key principles of genealogy. Finally, I draw the conclusions of the paper.

2. Networks of power

Foucault's conception of power has emerged as a new powerful paradigm for the study of power in organizations.[3] It offers a new complex understanding of power, which makes it distinct from other perspectives on power. Hardy and Leiba-O'Sullyvan[4] identify four points where Foucault's conception of power is different.

First, it challenges the presumption that power is something that individuals or groups of individuals have or possess. This is the presumption behind the other dimensions of power identified in Lukes' (1974) seminal work. Power is rather a network of relations which captures the advantaged as well as the disadvantaged in its web.

Secondly, the assumption of a single autonomous individual is abandoned. Instead, Foucault draws attention to how individuals are socially produced by the power relations

---

[3] Hardy C., Clegg S.R.: Some Dare Call It Power, [in:] Clegg S.R., Hardy C., Nord W.R. (eds.): Handbook of Organization Studies, Sage, London 1996, p. 622-641.

[4] Hardy C., Leiba-O'Sullyvan S.: The Power Behind Empowerment: Implications for Research and Practice. Human Relations 1998, no 51(4), p. 458-460.

surrounding them. In this respect, the individual is a socially constructed category of analysis with multiple fragmented identities.

Thirdly, the status of the researcher is challenged. Instead of viewing researchers as all knowing and objective, they too are subjected to specific power relations. Finally, power produces identity and values thus enabling individuals with a sense of what it is to be worthy and competent. Power penetrates what individuals are passionate about, what they intend to do, what they wish, what they like and dislike.

One of the unique aspects of Foucault's conception of power is its social constructionist orientation. This means that moral conceptions of what is true and just cannot be defined once and for all. Such conceptions are socially produced categories and cannot thereby be separated from actors, interests and intentions.

As such, Foucault's conception of power has expanded the field of power analysis. The term is no longer only applicable in terms of describing power as a negative imposing force, where some people get some other people to do what they would otherwise not have done.[5] This is just the ultimate form that power takes.[6] Rather, "Power produces; it produces reality, it produces domains and objects and rituals of truth".[7] In this sense, power is positive.[8]

This means that Foucault attempts to capture the creative and productive sense of power rather then merely the repressive sense. Further, power is not primarily an external force outside of our language, traditions and identities: "Power is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere".[9]

Power emerges from the struggles between many different force relations at work immanently in economic and productive processes to the relations in the smallest elements in society – the family, the school room, the group, the organization etc. We are both the target and instrument of power. Power is inscribed in "…social institutions, in economic inequalities, in language, in the bodies themselves of each and everyone of us".[10]

Power is in other words culturally embedded and embodied. It is largely unquestioned and unreflected. It is in every act, in every perception, in every feeling. It is embedded and embodied in contextual rules-of-the-game by which we do and say whatever we do and say.[11]

---

[5] Clegg S.R.: Frameworks of Power. Sage, London 1989.

[6] Foucault M.: Excerpts from The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction, [in:] Natoli J., Hutcheon L. (eds.): A postmodern reader. State University of New York Press, New York 1993, p. 333.

[7] Foucault M.: Discipline and Punish - the Birth of the Prison. Penguin, Harmondsworth 1979, p. 194.

[8] Haugaard M.: The Constitution of Power. A Theoretical Analysis of Power, Knowledge and Structure. Manchester University Press, Manchester 1997; Elden S.: Mapping the Present: Heidegger, Foucault and the Project of Spatial History. Continuum, London 2001, p. 106.

[9] Foucault M.: Excerpts…, op.cit., p. 334

[10] Foucault M.: Two lectures, [in:] Gordon C. (ed.): Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault. Pantheon Books, New York 1980, p. 90.

[11] Hardy C., Clegg S.R.: Some…, op.cit., p. 631-634.

In this sense, power is about the politics of everyday life.[12] It is about politics as exercised from within the social body.[13]

As such power is better understood simply as a *political game*. We are part of this political game; as individuals who are trained to talk and understand things in a particular manner, as individuals who are expected and obliged to speak and behave according to our positions in these games, and as individuals who – depending on our positions – have different possibilities for influencing the processes and outcomes of these games.

…. Power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with, it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society".[14]

Power must be understood as more or less loose and shifting networks and alliances,[15] which creates domains and rituals of truth and morality.[16] Power analysis in organization studies is to illuminate how these shifting networks and alliances are created, what kinds of truth and morality they proclaim, and on what grounds they proclaim these kinds of truth and morality.

There are many different ways in which power analysis can contribute to the analysis of corruption – or rather act as a guardian of democracy against corruption. First of all, Foucault's conception of power focus on how relations of power become embedded and embodied in statements, in concepts, in institutions, in structures, architectures, and systems. Power is everywhere in the network of relations and embraces everything.

The fact that power is so pervasive is a danger to all democratic societies because our social construction of reality relies on relations of power. Language and narratives are thus framed by relations of power and at the same time they try to legitimize these relations of power.[17] In other words, reality become framed in particular ways but these realities are the results of language, which favour particular groups, institutions and view points, while others are marginalized and displaced from the scene.

This way of working is also the case for relations of power in which corruption plays a more or less significant part. This means that corruption may pervade language to a considerable degree and that may pervade what we become to consider as evident, as truthful

---

[12] Clegg S.R.: op.cit., p. 149.
[13] Clegg S.R.: op.cit., p. 155.
[14] Foucault M.: Excerpts…, op.cit., p. 334.
[15] Clegg S.R.: op.cit., p. 154.
[16] Foucault M.: Two…, op.cit.
[17] Jørgensen K.M.: Power without Glory - A Genealogy of a Management Decision. Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen 2007.

and legitimate. This is obvious for example, when corruption pervades the media, archives, records and the ways in which stories and narratives are told. The analysis of corruption must take this possibility into consideration and this is viewd here as one of the strengths of Foucault's power analysis.

Secondly, Foucault's conception of power opens up for us a complex understanding of the subtle ways in which power works including the techniques of power, the many points in which power may work and the many faces of power. This is, in my view, one of the main advantages of Foucault's conception of power; that it is not linked to one perspective, to one group, to one particular way of power but instead recognizes that there are multiple ways in which power may work in complex societies.

Similarly, corruption may also work in multiple ways. Especially in complex Western democratic societies it is relatively rare to find corruption exercised in a direct visible sense. It is much more subtle, working in multiple ways at many points of interest – often on the boundaries of what we call corruption and what we simply label as alliances or networks. Sometimes this boundary is crossed, sometimes not.

But anyway there are multiple ways and multiple spaces in which corruption may show its face. Foucault's power analysis thus opens up for a much more nuanced and varied understanding of corruption but also opens up for the understanding of complexities and issues involved whenever we judge something as corruption or as being legitimate relationships.

This for me is what Foucault's power analysis can contribute to our understanding of corruption. In any case, it is difficult in societies in which economic gain plays such a major role to define a clear-cut boundary of what is corruption and what is not corruption. In theory, it may be clear-cut. In practice however, the distinction may be blurred and fuzzy. Corruption, like any other illegitimate use of power, is a threat to democracy in that it favours particular groups and particular voices in society and thus it suppresses and marginalizes other voices. And this is in my view the reason why we need Foucault's conception of power and Foucault's power analysis.

This aspect will become clearer when I describe the principles of power analysis, *the genealogy*, which is addressed in the following sections of the paper.

3. Genealogy

When doing power analysis, Foucault proposes genealogy or genealogical analysis. The practice of power analysis is thus a special kind of historical analysis where Foucault seeks to

construct an alternative memory that is different, more nuanced and varied than the memory embedded in present day narratives and language.

Foucault's genealogy is here inspired by Nietzsche,[18] who developed genealogy as a way of going beyond our everyday conceptions of what is good, true, just, evil etc. In other words, genealogy was developed to question our moral conceptions embedded in everyday life and which has been taught to us as the right and appropriate way to conceive things (Nietzsche 1992)[19]

Writing history by means of genealogical analysis is Nietzsche's way of ridding ourselves of the chains – the power – of history. Nietzsche's aim is to perform a novel critique of morality. He wants to show that morality has a history, that there have been different types of moralities and thus that morality "needs to be understood as an invention of a particular human type".[20]

In other words, Nietzsche considered morality as a construction with a long history of accidents, reversals, discontinuities, etc. By writing the history of morality he wanted to create the conditions for a more reflexive relationship to what we have come to take for granted, and what we have been taught as right and just – hence the construction of an alternative memory. He calls this a *revaluation* of values on which culture is founded.[21]

Thus, when applied in organizational research, power analysis is conducted with the purpose of revaluating the values on which organizations, or phenomena or events in them, are founded.[22] Fairclough has noted that this kind of power analysis is the first step towards emancipation because it makes us more conscious of where our conceptions of truth and justice come from.

History is the weapon by which we can "free" ourselves from the power of the present. This should not be understood as freeing ourselves from the language of the present because we have no other language. It is freeing ourselves in the sense of being more reflexive of our language and thus our values of truth, morality and justice.

It is this radical writing of history which is also interesting in relation to corruption. This relies on the presumption that corruption, like any other dominating relations of power, will pervade language and thus how we come to interpret reality. In such cases, genealogy battles corruption by creating an alternative, more varied and critical memory of the present.

---

[18] Foucault M.: Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, [in:] Rabinow P. (ed.): The Foucault Reader. Pantheon, New York 1984.

[19] Nietzsche F.: On the Genealogy of Morals, [in:] Kaufmann W. (ed.): Basic Writings of Nietzsche. The Modern Library, New York 1992, p. 437-600.

[20] Ansell-Pearson K. (ed.): Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1994.

[21] Nietzsche F.: On…, op.cit., p. 456

[22] Jørgensen K.M.: op.cit.

Genealogy is cynical and seeks to bring forward the darker sides of history; that is those voices which were not heard, those who were left behind, suppressed and marginalized from the scene.

In this way, genealogy is systematically suspicious of any statement, of any argument, of any narrative because it looks at such actions as framed by relations of power at work in everyday organizational life. Genealogy is open for worst cases to occur[23] including cases of violence, fraud, tyranny, corruption etc. As such genealogy doesn't presume that people are necessarily polite, civilized, noble, pragmatic or reasonable. People can be evil, immoral, obnoxious, selfish and capable of doing whatever it takes to promote their own intentions or interests.

Genealogy would for example reveal that the concept of liberty is an invention of the ruling classes and not necessarily the basic condition of man.[24] It reveals that rationality was born in an altogether reasonable fashion – from chance.[25] Power should also be understood in a more mundane manner. Power does not derive from the king. The constitution of social life is, on the contrary, derived from "…a complex set of petty and ignoble power relations".[26]

To write a genealogy is to write what Foucault terms the history of the present.[27] Genealogy is not about the past, it is about the present. This includes why we think, act and interact in the ways that we think, act and interact. It is to try to see how history influences our daily practices because our ways of thinking, acting and judging are descended from history, but not a manifestation of history.

As Hardy and Clegg[28] put it, power is "…embedded in the fibre and fabric of everyday life". Power is as such strong, relevant and concrete in that genealogy always supposes that power is an indispensable part of historical development and change. This means that the interpretation of the historical text in a genealogical sense is not the uncovering of hidden meaning. Looked through the lens of the genealogist, there is nothing there to interpret – because underneath everything said and done there is already interpretation.[29] In other words, there is no hidden essence of truth in the text, because this text is only an interpretation of other texts, which are interpretations of other texts and so forth.

Writing a history of the present, involves this kind of historical spirit where everything said and done needs to judged and evaluated according to the context in which it is said and

---

[23] Flyvbjerg B.: Making Social Science Matter – Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001, p. 95
[24] Foucault M.: Discipline…, op.cit., p. 78-79.
[25] Foucault M.: Nietzsche…, op.cit., p. 78.
[26] Haugaard M. : The Constitution…, op.cit., p. 43.
[27] Foucault M.: Discipline…, op.cit., p. 31.
[28] Hardy C., Clegg S.R.: Some…, op.cit., p. 631.
[29] Rabinow P. (ed.): The Foucault Reader. Pantheon, New York 1982, p. 107.

done. An organization's history is not a straight line but the result of chains of utterances in which a plurality of different voices and circumstances have made their influence in unpredictable ways.[30]

The problem in traditional writing of history is that the multilayered and plural history is often represented in simple linear narratives with a clear, beginning, middle and end.[31] In this linearization, we lose the historical spirit; we lose the actors in the process. Genealogy seeks on the other hand to reconstruct historical development by bringing attention to who, where and when in a way which is aligned with marginalized voices.

Next I will refer to some studies which I consider as genealogical. This is followed by an identification of key principles of genealogical analysis.

4. Principles of genealogical analysis: descent and emergence

Genealogical analysis is based on the detailed and meticulous exploration of texts as well as their interrelations. As such Foucault follows Nietzsche in arguing that genealogy "… is gray, meticulous and patiently documentary".[32] In other words we need the source material which may provide rich accounts of the complex course of events that leads to the emergence of organizational decisions and actions.

These are accounts that ideally should make it possible to follow history as it progresses, develops and changes through interactions and negotiations among actors in different positions and with different intentions. In organization and management studies, I would include O'Connor's case study of the emergence of The Harvard Business School and The Human Relations School[33] as an instance of genealogical analysis.

Through the detailed exploration of historical texts, O'Connor describes the complex historical circumstances behind the emergence of these famous institutions in management thought. They were the results of an alliance behind powerful business men such as John D. Rockefeller and others, as a reaction to the prevailing fear of Marxism and the labor movement. This was a kind of a "new deal" in management thought, and it emerged in a series of small actions and decisions on the part of a variety of people under the influence of specific political circumstances. A new strategy of management though was born.

---

[30] Arendt H.: The Human Condition. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1998.
[31] Boje D.M., Durant R.A.: Free Stories! Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry 2006, no 5(3), p. 19-37; Jørgensen K.M., Boje D.M.: Genealogies of Becoming - Antenarrative Inquiry in Organizations. Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry 2009, no 8(1), p. 32-47.
[32] Foucault M.: Nietzsche…, op.cit., p. 76.
[33] O'Connor E.: The Politics of Management Thought: A Case Study of the Harvard Business School and the Human Relations School. Academy of Management Review 1999, no 24(1), p. 117-131.

In our language, this study is the deconstruction of a solid and unshakable truth in management thought as the sudden and surprising scientific discovery of the impact on human relations on worker behavior and productivity, which came out from the famous Hawthorne investigations. The point is that O'Connor through the exploration of historical texts tells a different story of the emergence of what has become a myth in management thought thereby questioning the foundations of this paradigm in management thought.

Flyvbjerg's case study of city planning in Aalborg[34] is another example in which the emergence of political decisions were subjected to historical scrutiny in order to analyze complex relationships between actors and how it influenced political decisions about traffic and public transportation infrastructure, architecture, environmental concerns and so forth. The story includes mayors, politicians, business life, planners, other interest groups and broader political and societal circumstances.

Among others, it tells the story of how seemingly rational decision making is twisted and corrupted in favor of particular actors and interests groups. It tells how major decisions are made before serious investigations of impact and alternatives have been carried out, and how these decisions are rationalized afterwards to make them appear legitimate in the public eye. Interestingly and ironically, the project that these controversial decision making processes were part of, received a price for "good and careful planning" for more than ten years in a row.[35]

Jørgensen's study of organizational change in a bank[36] explores the emergence of a particular management decision of implementing a new functional and geographical division of labor in its historical context in order to create an alternative memory of these actions and events that diverge from official and dominant narratives and accounts of the present. The story questions these narratives and accounts by revealing among others how controversial relationships among actors and past failures of managing change influenced the decision. Relationships and failures that were however not part of the organization's legitimate vocabulary and memory.

These examples are characteristic of genealogical analysis in that they scrutinize concrete historical events in terms of actors (and their interrelationships), chronology and context thus exposing dominant accounts to mockery and laugher. They are relevant for the analysis of corruption in the sense that they seek to dig in behind the scenes and visualize the complex political network of relationship at work in regard to major organizational decisions and events.

---

[34] Flyvbjerg B.: og Magt - Et case-baseret studie af planlægning, politik og modernitet. Akademisk Forlag, København 1991.
[35] Flyvbjerg B.: Rationalitet…, op.cit., p. 23.
[36] Jørgensen K.M.: op.cit.

As such genealogical analysis seeks to tell a more varied and complex story of why particular decisions were made and implemented and why the legitimacy of these events was represented the way it was. In telling such stories, Foucault recommends two principles inspired by Nietzsche.; *"Herkunft"* (descent) and *"Entstehung"* (emergence).

The English word for Herkunft is *descent*. It emphasizes the historicity of words and actions. History influences, limits and makes possible. But it is not history, which repeats itself. Events are not reflections or manifestations of history. Instead, the analysis of descent is the analysis of "numberless beginnings ...(which)... permits the dissociation of the self".[37] The "self" – and the values linked to it – is in other words a historical construction, which has numberless beginnings. Thus, the self is not a unity but is fragmented, differentiated and shaped by accidents.

In genealogical analyses, descent is inscribed in the body, in nervous systems, temperament, systems of digestion and so on - "its task is to expose a body totally imprinted by history and process of history's destruction of the body".[38]

The English word for Entstehung is *emergence*. In the same way as descent is not to be considered as an undisturbed continuity, neither is emergence the final part of historical development. It is only an episode in a series of "subjugations".[39] The descriptions of emergence in many ways resemble Foucault's descriptions of power.

Genealogy, for example, "…seeks to re-establish the various systems of subjection: not the anticipatory power of meaning, but the hazardous play of dominations".[40] Emergence is also linked with *force*. The purpose of an analysis of emergence is to delineate the interaction between different forces. Emergence is the scene on which different forces meet face-to-face.[41]

While descent describes the character of the instinct and its inscription in the body, emergence is "…a place of confrontation".[42] Emergence is the result of a relation between forces. As a consequence, no one is responsible for emergence; "…no one can glory in it, since it always occurs in the interstice".[43]

To reiterate, emergence is always a relation between forces and no one is responsible for it. The actions of people have to be viewed in interaction with particular material circumstances and other actors. As a consequence, emergence is never finished or complete. It moves through new relations and new confrontations, which carry with them new objects

---

[37] Foucault M.: Nietzsche…, op.cit., p. 81.
[38] Ibidem, p. 82-83.
[39] Ibidem, p. 83.
[40] Ibidem, p. 83.
[41] Ibidem, p. 84.
[42] Ibidem, p. 84.
[43] Ibidem, p. 85.

and new ways of speaking. According to Foucault, this means that there is only one drama, namely "…the endlessly repeated play of dominations".[44]

This endless play of dominations is fixed, through history, in rituals, in procedures, in norms and rules, which prescribe truth and justice. To suggest that civilized societies are equal to the rejection of violence and war would be very naïve. Violence, war, and the bloody confrontations are rather installed in the rule- and norm systems, which go from dominance to dominance[45] and produce inequality and difference in the possibilities of constructing what is to be considered true and just.

The analysis of descent and emergence – and the relationship between them – have thus certain presumptions about the nature of power and thus also on relations of power in which corruption plays a significant part. First of all, it presumes that such relationships are deeply embedded in everyday life. Corruption as such may be inscribed in the body, in language and in the practices of life. Further, it will describe how such relationships become embedded in norms, rituals, rules, procedures and traditions which prescribe truth and justice.

The key problem here is that emergence is not the result of an interaction between equals. It is produced by *different* people with *different* intentions and with *different* opportunities to produce such emergence. In other words, when corruption pervades language, it also becomes embedded in the writing of history, the creation of history for the future and thus in the control and disciplining of what we come to think as true and just.

Genealogy is explicitly directed against this problem. Emergence produces inequality, difference, domination and control, which in turn produce emergence. The writing of history depends on relations of power. The winners write history. Contesting arguments, viewpoints, meanings and actions are lost and forgotten. The writing of history - whether it is in books, in stories, in narratives, in techniques, in procedures, in rules, in concepts, in sentences and so on contains a specific version of what is true and what is just.

This is for example when phenomena, which we thought had a great history and the result of sacred figures, are exposed as something with a very controversial history of illegitimate relations of power; of systematic injustice against certain groups in society performed by our heroes, kings, business entrepreneurs etc. The whole spectrum of human characteristics is instead represented in genealogical analysis: Nobility, generosity, heroic deeds, reason and vision – but also war, massacres, blood, conflicts, violence, exploitation, corruption and so forth.

---

[44] Ibidem, p. 85.
[45] Ibidem, p. 85.

5. Conclusions

I have argued that instead of defining corruption, we should take another approach to corruption; namely that it is always a possibility and potential threat to the development of democracy. I have argued that power analysis can act as a guardian of democracy and to immunity of corruption by trying to make the work of organizations and institutions more transparent through the meticulous historical unravelling of organizational decisions in terms of who, where and when, and by which everyday conceptions in present day language are confronted with alternative stories of becoming.

Power analysis is highly relevant, since illegitimate relationships that influence decisions and outcomes often work in subtle and invisible ways behind the scenes and also seek to harness language and narratives. Foucault's conception of power and subsequently power analysis thus opens up for a complex understanding of the multiple ways in which corruption works but it also opens up for an understanding of the complexities and issues involved whenever we judge something as corruption or as legitimate relationships.

Bibliography

1. Arendt H.: The Human Condition. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1998.
2. Boje D.M.: Narrative Methods for Organizational and Communication Research. Sage, London 2001.
3. Boje D.M., Durant R.A.: Free Stories! Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry 2006, no 5(3).
4. Clegg S.R., Courpasson D., Phillips N.: Power and Organizations - Foundations for Organizational Science. Sage, London 2006.
5. Clegg S.R.: Frameworks of Power. Sage, London 1989.
6. Elden S.: Mapping the Present: Heidegger, Foucault and the Project of Spatial History. Continuum, London 2001.
7. Fairclough N.: Language and Power – Language in Social Life. Pearson ESL, London 2001.
8. Flyvbjerg B.: Making Social Science Matter – Why Social Inquiry Fails and How It Can Succeed Again. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2001.
9. Flyvbjerg B.: Rationalitet og Magt - Et case-baseret studie af planlægning, politik og modernitet. Akademisk Forlag, København 1991.

10. Foucault M.: Excerpts from The History of Sexuality: Volume 1: An Introduction, [in:] Natoli J., Hutcheon L. (eds.): A postmodern reader. State University of New York Press, New York 1993.

11. Foucault M.: Nietzsche, Genealogy, History, [in:] Rabinow P. (ed.): The Foucault Reader. Pantheon, New York 1984.

12. Foucault M.: Two lectures, [in:] Gordon C. (ed.): Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault. Pantheon Books, New York 1980.

13. Foucault M.: Discipline and Punish - the Birth of the Prison. Penguin, Harmondsworth 1979.

14. Hardy C., Leiba-O'Sullyvan S.: The Power Behind Empowerment: Implications for Research and Practice. Human Relations 1998, no 51(4).

15. Hardy C., Clegg S.R.: Some Dare Call It Power, [in:] Clegg S.R., Hardy C., Nord W.R. (eds.): Handbook of Organization Studies. Sage, London 1996.

16. Haugaard M.: The Constitution of Power. A Theoretical Analysis of Power, Knowledge and Structure. Manchester University Press, Manchester 1997.

17. Jørgensen K.M.: Power without Glory - A Genealogy of a Management Decision. Copenhagen Business School Press, Copenhagen 2007.

18. Jørgensen K.M., Boje D.M.: Genealogies of Becoming - Antenarrative Inquiry in Organizations. Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry 2009, no 8(1).

19. Lyotard J.F.: The Postmodern Condition - A Report on Knowledge. Manchester University Press, Manchester 1984.

20. MacDonald M.J.: Losing Spirit: Hegel, Levinas, and the Limits of Narrative. Narrative 2005, no 13(2).

21. Nietzsche F.: On the Genealogy of Morality, [in:] Ansell-Pearson K. (ed.): Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge1994.

22. Nietzsche F.: On the Genealogy of Morals, [in:] Kaufmann W (ed.): Basic Writings of Nietzsche. The Modern Library, New York 1992.

23. O'Connor E.: The Politics of Management Thought: A Case Study of the Harvard Business School and the Human Relations School. Academy of Management Review 1999, no 24(1).