

En-Fleshed Practicing in Organizations: Flesh as Elemental Carnality and Formative Medium for Organizing Sustainability Development

Wendelin Küpers, PhD

Karlshochschule International University, Germany

Email: wkuepers@karlshochschule.de

Abstract

Based on phenomenology, this paper outlines possibilities for organizational practices towards sustainability development. To elucidate these practices, the paper outlines Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of the body, as well as his ontology of 'Flesh' as elemental 'carnality' and formative medium. Furthermore, Flesh will be interpreted as processed through sensual and reflexive doubling as a reversibility and chiasm of the sentient and the sensible. This understanding opens for the path to a post-dualistic, transformative approach towards processes of 'wild being' and 'be(com)ing' in organizations and sustainability. Finally, some practical and political, as well as research implications and perspectives are offered.

Keywords: Flesh, body, embodiment, Merleau-Ponty, practice, sustainability

Introduction

What would it mean to take the living body and enfleshed embodiment as a medium of and for organizational life-worlds? What would such an understanding of 'Flesh' as medium mean and imply in relation to unsustainable development and more sustainable ways of practicing in and through organizations? The latter becomes even more necessary as the so-called Anthropocene (Küpers, 2021), or 'life on Earth', faces widespread and increasing ecological threats. This includes various known problems, like mass species extinction, pervasive habitat destruction, rampant pollution, and global warming, all affecting the 'planetary body'.

In turn, the question arises: how can an enfleshed, reversible 'bodiment'—a body that simultaneously senses and is sensible, receives and acts in and through experiences—support developing a more situated and sustainable organizational practices and societal life in praxis? To respond to this question, this paper uses the polyvalent, variegated open-ended concept and metaphor of Flesh as developed by Merleau-Ponty (1964a; 1964b; 1995; 2003; 2012) to explore possibilities for embodied, expressive, and more sustainable practices in organizations.

Highlighting the inter-twining and reversibility of pre-personal, personal, inter- and trans-personal dimensions, Merleau-Ponty's ontology of Flesh allows a more relational and integral

understanding of embodied organizations/organizing (Küpers, 2015) and leadership (Ladkin, 2010, pp. 71–73; pp. 182–183) that enables more sustainable practices processually. Accordingly, Flesh is interpreted processually as an event (Bannon, 2012; Bannon, 2014) that inter-relates the natural, cultural, physical (material) and mental (immaterial); as well as non-human and human beings. These dimensions are seen in a matrix-like continuum as co-belonging and co-creating organizational life-worlds. From this perspective, different enfleshed elements that are relevant for organizing sustainably are mutually crossing into one another as ongoing movements and interrelationships.

Understanding Flesh as the original intertwining of perceiver/perceiving and perceived, sensing and being sensible, via an inter-involving reciprocity and kinship, allows a critique of alienating, unsustainable practices, based on anthropocentrism and irresponsible non-integrative orientation. Unsustainable practices can thereby be understood as being less-than-fully-adequately participating in—and lacking an openness to—engagement with a more-than-human ‘fleshy’ world (Hailwood, 2014).

Moreover, Flesh can serve the aim of developing and enacting more sustainable practices in organizations and praxis in relation to their various stakeholders, like environmental activist groups and society. Developing and enacting embodied, enfleshed ways of practicing in and beyond organizational life-worlds, carries potential not only for utopian movements (Johnson, 2003); it can also make it possible to understand, mediate and realize the incarnation and unfoldment of ‘alter-native’, that is, ‘other-birthly’ approaches. A critique of unsustainability in favour of developing alternative practices towards a more sustainable world based on Flesh can be connected to or be driven by a nexus of material, social and cultural dimensions, and its dynamics (Küpers, 2016a) and thereby be associated with economic, societal political, and ethical ‘inter-ests’.

To elucidate en-fleshed practices, Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology of the body and perception and his ontology of Flesh will be introduced below. Flesh is interpreted as elemental ‘carnality’ and formative medium. As such, it is processed through sensual and reflexive doubling as reversibility and chiasm of the sentient and the sensible. This understanding sets the stage for a post-dualistic, transformative approach towards processes of a ‘wild being’ and ‘be(com)ing’ in organizations (Küpers, 2014). These concepts of Flesh are then related to affect and imagination as well as organization and sustainability. Finally, some practical and political as well as research implications are offered along with some closing perspectives on possible enfleshed inter-practices of sustainability.

From Phenomenology of Perception to Ontology of Flesh

The underlying basis for Merleau-Ponty’s ontological understanding of Flesh is his phenomenology of the living body and dynamic embodiment (Merleau-Ponty, 2012). Departing from orthodox Husserlian concepts about the purpose and scope of phenomenology, Merleau-Ponty offered a post-Cartesian, post-dualistic, and post-representational turn towards situated bodies and embodiments as a dynamic and disclosing nexus of meaning. Rejecting the traditional representationalism and dualisms, with its separation of matter, and mind, body, and spirit, Merleau-Ponty developed an understanding of interplaying incarnation, of ‘being-in’ and ‘towards-the-world’, in which the interwoven self, other selves, and things come into being as an

experiencing, entangled system. For him, the body and embodiment and related phenomena, are always already lived, meaningful, relational, intentional, and responsive; so, intentionality works as a kinesthetic and e-motional action-oriented projection. His notion that bodily experiences and embodiment are not material ‘objects’ or subjective ‘representations’, but constitutive and open media, led him to an anti-foundationalist, anti-essentialist, and non-dualistic position, and to a philosophy of irresolvable ambiguities and of Flesh. The living ‘reflexive’ body functions as a medium of crossing, where mind and matter, culture and nature, self, and world, as well as meaning and force, meet and unfold. The embodied ‘subject’ and its likewise embodied inter-subjective and ‘inter-objective’ life-world are an extensive continuum, in which both are embedded and actively co-creative, while taking part in a passive mode. Therefore, no one dimension (subjective, intersubjective, or objective) can be isolated from the dynamic process of embodied being. Mediated by the body and embodiment, human beings and ‘being’ are all interrelated realities of becoming in an ongoing process of transition and always-unfolding meaning.

As affective, unpredictable, and unmanageable realities, the body and embodiment are decentering. Neither is centered or ‘mastering’, but disrupting, undermining, and escaping purposive and boundary-drawing orders. Accordingly, bodily, and embodied forces, underlie the processual, dynamic, and unfinished nature of any perceiving, feeling, thinking, intending, responding, and acting, as well as its material, bio-socio-cultural world spheres. These components are intricately intertwined and mutually ‘engaged’ within an ever-present relational sphere, which Merleau-Ponty (1964c) calls the “chair du monde” (p. 114) or Flesh of the world.

What Flesh is Not! Beyond Subject and Object

In Merleau-Ponty’s last, and unfinished book, *The Visible and the Invisible* (1995; original, *Le visible et l’invisible*, 1964c) he discusses the ontological notion of Flesh as part of a negative philosophy determining what it is not. Even though the term ‘chair’ translates in English to ‘Flesh’, Merleau-Ponty does not mean to refer to the soft tissue of the body of a vertebrate, covering the bones and consisting mainly of skeletal muscle and fat, or the surface or skin of the human body. Rather, for him it is neither body, nor mind; neither perceiving subject, nor material object. This negation felt all-encompassing, in that it was also neither immanence, nor transcendence, neither essence, nor existence, neither consciousness nor matter, and neither being-in-itself nor being-for-itself, nor any another *philosopheme* (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, pp. 157–58; p. 167; p. 224).

Dismantling or decentering “the objectivist ontology of the Cartesians” (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 183), for him, Flesh is ‘a-subjective’ and ‘non-objective’. That is, it is neither something that is ‘subjectively’ constructed, nor something ‘objectively’ instituted, but some-thing *between* them; a relational texture or inter-fabric all things and non-things are woven into (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 227).

Flesh as Element and Formative Medium

For Merleau-Ponty, “[t]he Flesh is not matter, is not mind, is not substance. To designate it, we need to look back to the ancient concept of ‘element’ in the sense it was used to speak of water, air, earth, and fire, that is, in the sense of a general thing, midway between the spatio-temporal

individual and the idea, a sort of incarnate principle” (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 139). Thus, the being of Flesh is an element in the pre-Socratic sense of having elemental qualities through which all entities move, or are existing in. As such, it is moving on a midway between spatio-temporal states on the one hand and conceptual ideas or reflections on the other hand. Being neither localizable, factual matter (i.e., material substance), a collection of facts, nor merely a mental representation, the texture of Flesh is more a “concrete emblem of a general manner of being” (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 147).

In its ‘elemental’ sense, Flesh can be conceived of as a surface of sensibility, a skin or fabric into which ‘en-Fleshed’ sensitivities—the sight of our eyes, the sound in our ears, the scent in our nose, the depth of taste on our tongues and languages, the touch on our skins—are indivisibly interwoven or enmeshed. But there is a coherence of these fleshly beings with the general Flesh of the sensible world. As body and world are inscribed in one another the ‘individual’ Flesh and that of the world are intertwined. The “world is an extension of the body’s Flesh, as the body is an extension of the world” (Low, 2000, p. 53). Thus, Flesh refers to a sensible, and bodily being, and a more general elemental commonality that all entities and the world share. This elemental commonality refers to a generative capacity of an understanding of being as becoming that enables the emergence of differences. But with its indeterminate qualities, the ontological concept and carnal metaphor of Flesh cannot be reduced to conventional notions of ‘subject’ or ‘object’. Rather, Flesh serves as the formative medium for a carnal emergentism that is preceding conceptual bifurcations into ‘subjective’ and ‘objective’, or other forms of dualistic categorizing.

With its intertwining of pre-personal, personal, inter- and trans- personal dimensions, Merleau-Ponty’s ontology of Flesh also contributes to a profound and relational understanding of phenomena as sustainable be(com)ing. Based on a profound critique of dualistic separations and by developing a post-dualistic orientation (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 250), the concept of Flesh mediates the rehabilitating a pre-reflective present or ‘tissue’ that underlies all subject–object relations, all explicit differentiations, and otherness as part of an extended approach towards sustain-ability. We can sense and make sense, hear, and be heard, speak, and be spoken to sustainably, as well as having an affective and/or imaginative relationship to sustainable phenomena, because we share the same basic condition that is sharing the same fleshy reality.

Flesh and things share thickness, worldly depth, weight, and surfaces; we come together in sensual contact, firm resistance, and mutual influence as we are—in these and other forms—counterparts or cohabitants of the same world. This involves a sense of empathy and even compassion; as an example, to feel pain entails a feeling of how others’ feel pain, to be affected by ‘unsustainability’ in relation to others who are suffering from it, as we are all enveloped in such Flesh (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 234). As an intermediating realm, this empathic relationship to Flesh inter-links the pre-reflexive sentient and sensible body, through which inside and outside, passivity and activity etc., mesh. In this way, Flesh refers to an original fabric and shared corporeality that precedes what then becomes bifurcated into all kinds of opposing categories like those mentioned before. Moreover, for Merleau-Ponty, the sensible world of the Flesh is the sustaining, nourishing, and mediating ‘groundwork’ not only for affective and empathic relationships, but also for thinking, abstraction and language, or expressions. This carnal ensemble of selves, other creatures and sensible things is central to what Merleau-Ponty means when he speaks of the Flesh of the world: a shared corporeality.

Overall, as a defining ontological principle, Flesh sustains Merleau-Ponty's attempt to overcome traditional metaphysical dualisms; to expand and ontologize his concept of the lived body as an ambiguous Being. This notion makes it possible to explore possibilities and paradoxes of expression (Landes, 2013) and creative style of being as a responsive in-forming of what is not yet formed, not yet specified, not yet shaped (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 139). The following section outlines how Flesh is processed through reversibility and chiasm, to elucidate this concept of Flesh further. These specifications then open a path to a post-dualistic ontology of 'wild being' and transformational becoming that we contend are particularly relevant for an integral understanding of sustainability.

Reversibility and In-ter-Between and Experiment

Flesh operates through a role-swapping reversibility. This reversibility refers to the reflexivity of sensible experiences wherein the sensing body itself is always within sensible fields. The entwined sentient and sensible aspects of the Flesh are mediating an emblematic experience of an 'originary connectedness' (Clarke, 2002). The experience is that of us being both, for instance, seen and being seen, or touched and being touched (or engaged in some other similar mode of active and passive sense-making). Merleau-Ponty sensitizes to the difficulty of attending to both subject and object at once.

The reader might experience this him or herself by doing the following experiment: Touch something with your right hand, for instance a surface, a pencil, a paper, or anything else. You may feel the texture, the resilience, the coolness, or warmth of the thing. But now, while still touching the thing with your right hand, use your left hand to touch your right hand. Again, you can feel those qualities of the thing touched, but something else is going on as well. What do you experience, how?

This happening can best be explored now, without moving your hands, noticing that the right hand can also feel the left-hand touching. With the right hand, or indeed any part of your skin surface, you can perform this doubling up of being a perceiving/perceived medium. When I focus my attention on feeling the left hand touching the right hand, the left hand as feeler, rather than that which is felt, recedes. Reversing roles and adopting alternate positions never coincides the same way. Thus, this circular experience of switching points is characterized by a divergence or a gap, split, fission or fold in the Flesh.

In general, the experience of one of your hands touching another thing while being reciprocally touched by the other can be taken as a model for all perceiving also in relation to something or someone else. When you place one of your hands on the other, or when you shake hands with a friend, the crisscrossing tactile sensations arise as an intertwining of touching and being touched. To feel your hand touching warm beach sand is correspondingly to feel the sand touching your hand. At first as you reach out, you may feel your left hand from within. It has a sensibility for itself, as a system of reversibility where tactile Flesh coils back in its separateness as the sensuous context for my perception (e.g., of hardness or softness). But when the active left hand is suddenly touched by the fingers of its companion, your attention and perceptual consciousness cross over to the site of reversibility offered by the Flesh of your right hand or the hand of the friend (e.g., a handshake). What you experience is that of being both toucher and being touched. With astonishment, you begin to experience the change of your left hand from sensible for itself to an inert physical body located just beyond the tactile Flesh as exemplified in the five fingertips

of your right hand. But although you explore your left hand as the surface of an external thing, you can at any moment reactivate its system of tactile Flesh and the reversibilities latent within, simply by touching your right hand in return. What these experiments show is that we have not only to be seeable or touchable to see or to touch, but we do also experience reversibility, and the remaining gap, which separates within an inseparability. The meaning drawn from reversible experiences of holding and being held in this way are different and yet collaborate in contributing to our understanding. The reversible folding together of differences needs a kind of integration by which some form can hold, but also unfold, further differentiations and open possibilities. This dynamic integration can be interpreted with Merleau-Ponty's post-dichotomous account of 'identity-encompassing difference' (Dillon, 1988, p. 159). To think identities within differences disrupts the bifurcation of inside/outside, self/other, individual/collective, and other dualities, while it opens towards a non-dual in-between.

Describing "the inherence of the self in the world and of the world in the self, of the self in the other and the other in the self" (Merleau-Ponty, 2003, p. 306) can be interpreted as a kind of 'inter-involvement' or '*Ineinander*', meaning 'in one another' or 'one-in-another' (Merleau-Ponty, 2003, p. 306). Selves and world as well as culture and nature intertwine with each other in all perceptual and embodied relationships, which move through them. Importantly, as a lateral relationship of transgression or overcoming, this irreducible inter-entwinement does not abolish but on the contrary helps to conceive and cultivate a profound kinship (Merleau-Ponty, 2003, p. 268; p. 273). The '*Ineinander*' of this kinship reconceives the relationship between life and spirit as body and in the spirit and immersion of mind in corporeal situations as part of a primordial, enfleshed in-division. This 'one-in-another' catalyzes and happens through life, as its connective 'inter-subjective' and 'inter-objective' fabrics di- and converge along multiple spirals of unfoldment. Inspired by this enfleshed ecology of '*Ineinander*', such an interpretation enables a different kind of understanding of non-human and human beings as parts of a relational nexus in and through organizations.

For Merleau-Ponty's post-dualistic, proto-integral philosophy of '*Ineinander*', human and non-human beings are integrated as 'non- or other-than-+-human' composition of the physical (material) and the mental (immaterial), of the natural and the cultural that are mutually crossing into one another as ongoing and reversible movements. Accordingly, selves and worlds, as well as cultures and natures, as part of what is happening in organizations, intertwine with each other in all embodied relationships that unfold through them.

The transitional movement can be interpreted as a multidirectional metamorphosis. As such, it implies an open transformation, rather than a dialectical transcendence to a supposed 'higher' level or structural complexity. It is more a lateral movement that entails no fundamental ontological discontinuity, but ongoing circulations (Toadvine, 2009, pp. 91–92). However, various critical questions of this understanding in relation to the status of asymmetry, non-reciprocity and irreversibility have been raised along with discussion of extended possibilities for a corporeal plasticity (Sparrow, 2014). From this perspective, the co-Fleshing with others and the Flesh-of-the-world implies more radically heterogeneous cohesions of different senses, corporeal operations, and carnal densities that are also fissured, non-continuous, non-overlapping and irreversible.

Chiasm χ

The reversible, dynamic inter-relationship and its in-between of Flesh is processed and described by Merleau-Ponty with the metaphor of a sensible-sentient chiasm. Derived from the Greek letter χ ('chi'), chiasm implies a crisscrossing structure, as is found at the point in the brain where the optic from the right visual field crosses to the left side and vice versa. The non-photosensitive, but perception-enabling nerves create hidden blind spots in the periphery of the field of vision through this process before the chiasm reversibly rejoins the two sides in one unified visibility.

Merleau-Ponty was inspired by a general understanding of chiasm as a dynamic diffraction or splitting dehiscence and mediating link between different sides of phenomena. Metaphorically, the reversible processes of the chiasm can be described as connecting lacuna of intersection in a give and take pattern, akin to movement of waves that rise and flow. The folding over and coiling waves are spiraling forward to encounter sand at the seashore before flowing back to the sea. Through a constantly reversible flow of elements, an interlaced circular movement arises in which each element advances to then recoils through divergence and overlap(ping). For Merleau-Ponty, this opening chiasm is a processual patterning process of Flesh that differentiates and 'unifies' without synthesis, while constituting all sensing, perceiving, and communicating (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 143). Sensibility, affection, perception, and other forms of relating and movement are possible, because the bodies, as sensing and sensed media, are already part of the fabric of the sensible Flesh. Experiences are affective because corporeally processed and expressed states are constituted and belong together in an in-corporeal inter-world of chiasmic mediality (Merleau-Ponty, 2012). Or to put it metaphorically differently: in the 'inter-world', sparks of sensing/sensible affection are lit and the fire starts to burn (Merleau-Ponty, 1964, pp. 163–168). Once ignited, amplifying tensions, resonances, metamorphoses, and ambiguities emerge.

To summarize, chiasmic enveloping, but diverging Flesh comprises both a sensibility as reversible capacity to feel and be felt, and an ontological mode or 'milieu' of moving corporeality and things as processes. The concept of Flesh offers a conceptual tool for a critique of idealist views of knowledge and world and for the critique of a mechanical view of the physical world as spatial extension or as a simple location. By contrast a living 'matter-Flesh' can be interpreted as a qualitative and dynamically active and endowed with an intrinsic capacity for a 'living' creation and differentiation (Simanke, 2016).

Understanding chiasm as the operational mode of inter-corporeal Flesh, and the intermediating link between different sides or positions, preserves and invites open possibilities for forming relational connections between different phenomena and 'entities'. Importantly, a chiasmic realization of Being exceeds the basic and visual forms of perception as it encompasses the full range of corporeal senses of bodies as they move, shift, and are deployed sensually with events in developing meaning (Morris 2010). The separating and uniting chiasm operates in all carnal beings and in the intercorporeality of the enfleshed world.

One advantage of such understanding of a dynamic chiasm is that it allows a relational pluralism regarding the nexus of various levels in organizing. This implies that any focal entity, whether a person, a team, or an entire organization derives or co-creates its meanings and possibilities of action from its chiasmic multiplex, heterogeneous, and overlapping relations with other entities and through the emergence of hybrid organizational forms.

Wild Being and Inter-Be(com)ing

The described processual, non-substantial ‘inter-worldly’ Flesh generates an affective power through its intensive, libidinal, decentered ‘wild being’, which refers to a primordial energy that empowers intertwined being and acting. Merleau-Ponty’s notion of wildness, and the corresponding pre-reflective quality of ‘wild meaning’, indicates that ‘subject’ and ‘object’ have not been tamed into separate categories, but are preceded and are presupposed by these or other dualities. For Merleau-Ponty, this fleshly wild being is a brute fabric of meaning that is interwoven through all levels and layers of experience and as such makes possible all particular horizons and accomplishments. It serves as an invisible ontological medium out of which self, others, and things arise through the previously described elemental, reversible relations and chiasmic ‘*Ineinander*’.

With its reversibilities and chiasm the affected/affecting, animating Flesh of wild being refers to an openness of bodily matter to its own unstable, pre-individual capacities, relating to it in a non-linear and non-deterministic way. Thus, Flesh and enfleshed affective processing is to be understood in terms of potentiality, indeterminate emergence, and creative mutation. Accordingly, it appears as an ontologically real-virtual that remain implicated in embodied matter (Clough et al., 2007, p. 66) and en- and unfolds through placed space-times as relation-scapes for the sensing and rhythmic becoming-body (Manning 2009; 2013) or web of bodies-becomings (Manning, 2013, pp. 122–127) to be explored in organizational life-worlds (Küpers, 2014) and for sustainable development.

Overall, Merleau-Ponty’s key process-based philosophical concepts of living body and dynamic inter-corporeality as well as the reversible, chiasmic Flesh and wild being provide the foundation for what might be called an ethos of ‘inter-be(com)ing’ (Küpers, 2015) in which humans, organizations and the non- or more-than-human-world are enmeshed in a process of unfolding together. The outlined post-dualistic perspectives on ‘in(ter-)between’ offer a proto-integral philosophy of inter-be-coming of organizing bodies (Küpers 2015, pp. 27–91) that helps to develop and realize a proto-sustainable responsible orientation towards ecology and the environment (Cataldi, & Hamrick, 2007) and an affective eco-phenomenology (Brown & Toadvine, 2003). All of them are highly relevant for sustainable development and enactments and can be linked to responsible and artfully proto-wise practices in organizations (Küpers, 2016). Even beyond ‘local’ organizational bodies, such inter-be(com)ing rehabilitates and mediates planetary relationships that are sensing and make sense as part of entwined ‘Earth-bodies’ (Mazis, 2002). For developing an en-fleshed praxis, both practitioner and practices when linked to sustainable actions, need an ‘ecological’ account of bodies and embodiment, embedded in a materio-socio-cultural nexus. Considering carnal, physiological and phenomenal—thus environmental—sensitivities, guide and give shape to the corporeal structures and processes that thus inform the contours of perceptual and practical engagements.

Flesh and Sustainability

Building on the previous sections, Merleau-Ponty’s understanding of Flesh, the following relates the same to the concept and practices of sustainability. According to Brook (2005), the notions and interpretation of Flesh and ‘Earth’ in the ontology of Merleau-Ponty can help to transform more than just environmental thinking. In addition to dissolving the residual division in our thinking of the relationship of subject-object, it also offers possibilities for reconfiguring a sustainable relationship.

Complementing the acknowledgement of our own ‘thingness’, our own taking part in the Flesh of the world: Flesh articulates our style of engagement. It shows our constitutive involvement of the world there is to engage in when working with material substance, in contemplative wonder or in sensitive experimental investigations. “The reality of our situation is being environed, being engaged in an embrace, not as an optional extra - a lifestyle choice – but just how it is” (Brook, 2005, p. 361).

A Flesh account suggests a view of perceptual adequacy in terms of retaining a primordial awareness of our actual situation of inherence (primordial situatedness) within a wider, more-than-human world. This is because Flesh is the primordial intertwining of perceiver and perceived, a relation involving kinship and reciprocity. But this relationship, especially in the context of unsustainability, appears as an alienated one. If ‘nature’ entwined with culture is understood essentially as the ‘fleshy’ ‘perceptual world’, and its intertwining, then our estrangement from it is a manifestation of a disconnection (Ives et al., 2018) and an ‘inadequate participation’ praxis within the same. This detached connection, concerns ‘primordial’ perceptual relations due to a domineering instrumentalizing approach towards ‘nature’ (Hailwood, 2014).

A modernistic, singular, compartmentalized appropriation of ‘nature’ as a resource-providing system, is continuously working to separate itself and humans from the biophysical environment in favor of a conditional, instrumental link to the economic imperative, instead of there being a relational approach and understanding of enfleshed nature as developed by Merleau-Ponty (2003) (see, Faugstad, 2010; Bannon, 2012; 2014; 2016). In turn, for Hailwood (2014) an ‘adequate participation’ “is a praxis of relative openness to the kinship and reciprocity of the ‘more-than-human’ Flesh. And so...it is a praxis relatively ‘undistorted’ by egoism, instrumentalism, obsession with the virtual and abstract and by misrecognition of the more than human” (Hailwood, 2014, p. 78). Merleau-Ponty’s philosophy of non-dual, and non-anthropocentric Flesh as elemental, reversible chiasmic ‘*Ineinander*’, calls for an inclusive understanding of nature and culture that accommodates both human and ‘other-than-human’ components. This then may lead to an inclusivity of a ‘*natureculture*’ (Haraway, 2003; Küpers, 2016a) that avoids the dualistic split between biocentrism and anthropocentrism, or ego- and eco-centrism.

Enfleshed Organizing - Elemental, Reversible, and Chiasmic Flesh in Organization

Based on his post-dual ontology of ‘inter-being’, Merleau-Ponty suggests a radicalized relational understanding of organizing as an emerging event (Merleau-Ponty, 2003, p. 208) that can be related to sustainability. This happening and undertaking is constituted and processed through the described elemental, mediating, and reversible Flesh, through which organizing of sustainability is situated and processed.

An inter-relational enfleshed organizing of sustainable development or sustainability-oriented ‘organic-izations’ (Cecil, 2004) is happening for example in embodied in-between spaces and times (Bradbury & Lichtenstein, 2000), which include various interwoven processes and feedback-loops, as they emerge in practices (Calori, 2002).

Transformations in enfleshed organizational life-worlds towards sustainable practices are connected to spontaneous, dialogical, and expressive-responsive processes linked to moving bodies (Shotter, 2004). In contrast to an ‘aboutness-thinking’, such a responsive ‘witness-thinking’, co-creates an ‘action guiding’ sense from within lived and living experiences of shared circumstances (Shotter, 2006) towards sustainable practices. Flesh in organizing sustainably serves as a generative capacity and generous source (Diprose, 2002), of giving and being given and primordial participation for all beings. As such, it can enact a corporeal generosity of embodied mutual recognition of ‘sameness’ and difference of the other within organizational life-worlds (Hancock, 2008) and for a politics of difference and of resistance (Pullen & Rhodes 2014; Rhodes & Wray-Bliss, 2013) against unsustainable practices. Likewise, considering the elemental medium of a ‘Flesh of Leadership’ makes it possible to grasp co-created and reversible roles of leading and following (Ladkin, 2010, pp. 71–73; pp. 182–183), as both are constitutive through their mutual relationship.

Furthermore, the reversible and chiasmic ‘in-between’ of Flesh can be used for post-dichotomous interpretations and post-dualistic orientations in organizing, especially in relation to conflicts and transformations or dealing with ambiguities, dilemmas, and paradoxes (Küpers, 2015) as they appear regarding sustainability. Accordingly, an embodied chiasmic organizing of sustainability is balancing dynamically between, for example, control and autonomy or creativity and structure that are situated in inter-practices.

Embodied and Enfleshed Inter-Practices

The concept of embodied and enfleshed inter-practice in organization (Küpers, 2015) helps to reveal, interpret, and enact a proto-integral nexus. This nexus integrates being, feeling, knowing, doing, sharing, structuring, and the effectuation of sustainability through corporeal agency and action, both individually and collectively. Such inter-practice can be used for processes that make up a negotiating interplay regarding inherently entwined materialities, subjectivities, intersubjectivities, and objectivities as they are needed and occur in sustainability-enacting organizations. Understanding and realizing inter-practices allow a ‘body made Flesh’ as a medium of learning, while serving as a kind of ‘corporeal device’ (Evans et al., 2009) that intercede implicitly more sustainable actions.

What makes this account of embodied and enfleshed inter-practices significant for accomplishing sustainable forms of living is that it allows a holonic and synthesized way of affective, cognitive, and actionable relationships with Others as part of a ‘be(com)ing-in-and-towards-the-world’, rather than as separate physical and mental qualities that bear no relation to each other (Stolz, 2014). This integral, enfleshed inter-practice can contribute to enacting more creative and sustainable development in and through organizing, as a mode of be(com)ing.

Highlighting and recognizing that organizations and their members or stakeholders as well as economies, societies and the planet are all part of a living nexus of multiple enfleshed inter-connections, the concepts of so-called social corporate responsibility and sustainability, became reference-points in related debates (Küpers, 2012). Both concepts pose challenges to conventional ways and underline the urgent need to perceive and act or perform not only according to economic logics and imperatives.

These approaches call for individuals and collectives to go beyond an instrumental, rational bias and one-sided, socially constructed realities, and invite one to explore the inter-relatedness of individual, cultural, social, economic, political, and ecological processes in relation to sustainable development. Generally, debates about responsibility and sustainability mark responses to the current crisis of late modernity and capitalistic society and its organizations. But to make a genuine difference, these debates need to be systematically linked with sensorial experiences of inter-affection (Küpers, 2014) and interactions within the flux and fluidity of animated and material, natural, social, and cultural life-worlds. And for these worlds of life, Flesh serves as a medium of integration and transformation.

Not only are the Flesh of the body and Flesh of the world intertwined, enfleshed interpractices help reconfiguring the unsustainable relationship between selves, others, and worlds. Moreover, an enfleshed practice can also serve as an affective medium for sustainable living, through reconnecting with 'nature' and 'culture' by rehabilitating both, bodied senses and what allows us to make sense, differently. Flesh offers possibilities for a regained sensibility as reversible capacity to feel and be felt; that is, to sense and make sense even of nonsense of unsustainable and sustainable phenomena by members of an organization and its stakeholders.

Accordingly, human involvement with the biosphere as a more-than-human fleshed sphere in more sustainable ways, is not simply a mental one, but an engagement of body-in-mind and mind-in-body. Thus, "it is not enough to know sustainability. We must literally be able to feel it" (Carolan, 2014, p. 317) and affectively dwelling in the 'Flesh-sphere' bodily and resiliently, as part of ongoing interactivity of mind, body and environment through time (Cooke et al., 2016). The relational understanding of Flesh in sensu Merleau-Ponty outlined previously can be connected to issues of unsustainability and sustainability on different levels affectively and imaginatively. The former is related to experiences of being 'en-fleshedly' affected by unsustainable realities and problems, caused by anthropogenic, rational, logos-driven, instrumental regimes and corresponding economic modes of appropriating exploration and inappropriate exploitation. In turn, the 'en-fleshed' affects can serve to enact a passion for sustainability and engaged sustainable practices, including education (Shrivastava, 2010). The other level or modus of linking Flesh to sustainability refers to the potential of 'en-fleshed' imagination for co-constituting, triggering, and mediating and 'instituting', orientations and movements towards more sustainable and wiser ways of living in and through organizations. The role of 'enfleshed affects or inter-affection (Küpers, 2014) and 'caring imagination' (Hamington, 2008), 'ecological imaginaries' (Perey, 2016) and imaginary worlds of sustainability (Bendor et al., 2017) supports development of an ethical and sustainability stance based on or mediated by Flesh. Affection and imagination in Flesh, can not only facilitate an integrative re-membering and re-discovery of an elemental philosophy (Macauley, 2010), but also embodied 'planetary senses' and their role for a revived dancing of entwined 'Earth-bodies' (Mazis, 2002). A dance that is expressing a poetic interplay between perception and imagination, and between silence and solidarity of bodied and embodying being that are on a spiraling way un-folding in human-non-human matrix (Mazis, 1993; 2016). Affective and imaginative Earthlings in Flesh are dancing convivially with fluxes of matter and mind, body and soul, and nature and culture, that are opening specific implications.

Implications

Before concluding, the following discusses some practical, political and theoretical and methodological implications. An embodied and en fleshed orientation and inter-practice as outlined in this paper can be related to various practical, political as well as theoretical and methodological implications (Küpers, 2015).

Practical Implications

One form in which embodied organizational inter-practices are organized, experienced, processed and 'effective' includes those which involve 'bodies at work' (Wolkowitz, 2006, p. 183). These practices involve working bodies or bodily organizing work that are affected in particular on other bodies and modes of somatic work as well as affective, emotional and aesthetic labor involving engagements on appearing movements, placing, timings and rhythms, caring but also disciplined performances, tensions, stress, fatigue and suffering (Küpers, 2015). With its experiential and dynamic status, the described forms and transformational qualities of affect and senses, embodied inter-practices defy control and elude a straight manageability. Because they do not exist as given, stable, fixed entities or objects, they cannot be simply organized, managed, or manipulated. The reductionism of a short-sighted 'practicalism' as technocratic or managerial ideology, with its outcome-fixation and utilitarian course, collapses practical instrumentalism with practicality. As such, it loses access to emergent, indeterminable qualities and possible meanings of unfolding Flesh. Moreover, the preponderance of instrumentalist preoccupations can lead to a pre-conception of all phenomena as intrinsically meaningless resources, which impoverishes and undermines the creative engagement and the potential for ethical and aesthetic dimensions, relevant for sustainability. In the same vein, and in order to counter the danger of falling into a 'practicalist over-doing', it will be important to explore the experiences and practices of 'Doing Nothing', understood as infraordinary 'non-events' (Ehn & Loeffgren, 2010, p. 5). These often subversive, embodied events and acts may manifest in occurrences such as waiting or daydreaming which are powerful undercurrents of daily life in organizations.

Doing nothing is something happening in seemingly minor, intimate spaces that are like poetic moments that offer ruptures from the mundane on-goingness of everyday doings. These poetic moments mediate, and enable not only reconnecting, but also, simultaneous descending and ascending, by entering other time-spaces, and evoking verticality of time in depth and in height as described by Bachelard (1969; 2013). As all events, these so-called "non-events" intertwine with 'Flesh'. They are en fleshed as bodies standing without doing something for example waiting for technician to arrive or interruptions related to problems in digital work or daydreaming for example as digital flaneur (Aroles & Küpers, 2022). Doing nothing but imaginative poetics helps create new rhythmic textures of how embodied members organize, relate to their work, and make novel connections.

Instead of being designed directly, embodied and en fleshed practice can only be designed for, that is, allowed and encouraged to unfold. Part of this challenge is to prepare and offer supportive conditions and relationships that engender targeted facilitations or circumstances on a situation-specific pheno-practical basis (Küpers, 2015), by which embodied sustainable inter-practices can flourish in every-day work-life.

Enfleshed practices of sustainable development can bring to the fore, for example, concrete forms of energy-consumption, recycling, transport, food practices in relation to natural and social ecology, in particular to environmental workplace behaviors. Such behaviors are realized by those of ‘green employees’ with environmental identities – intrinsic motivations to protect the environment through work, consistent with private behaviors (Ciocirlan, 2017).

Resonating with an enfleshed understanding is life-affirming, inclusive approaches towards biomimicry (Mathews, 2011) and the rise of the biophilic organization (Jones, 2016).

As research and examples show (Kellert & Calabrese, 2015; Abdelaal, 2019; Soderlund, 2019; Hahn et al., 2021) practices of biophilic design (Soederlund, 2019) and its manifestations as part of sustainable architecture are more than the mere application of vegetation in buildings. Rather it broadens the variety through encompassing different types of (nature incorporation, nature



inspiration, and nature interaction related to culture from physical, sensory, metaphorical, morphological, that is from the material to spiritual (Zhong et al., 2022). Moving to an ‘active’ biophilic designed office workplace (Wallmann et al., 2019) implies integrating elemental and bodily resonating dimensions (e.g., air, daylight, waterbodies, plants, animals and or naturalist shapes or gardens, see Image 1) that is enhancing health and well-being (Xue et al., 2019), biodiversity, circularity, and resilience. and thus, in turn proto sustainable practices.

Image 1: Biophilic learning space at Ohalo College in Israel.

(Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Biophilic_design#cite_ref-21)

Furthermore, as Kellert and Calabrese, (2015) have shown also, indirect bodily enfleshed experience of biophilia can be mediated by contact with images and or representations of nature. Implemented through paintings, photos, sculptures, murals, videos, etc. these can be sensually affective, emotionally appealing, and intellectually satisfying. Moreover, incorporating natural organic material, like wood or stone as well as natural fabrics and furnishings. can be likewise stimulating. Being susceptible to change, thus a patina of time, may invoke responses from people. Additionally, natural colors in earth-tones (rather than bright artificial ones) or natural patterns with winding flows (rather than the conventional straight structures with harsh angles) may be complementary affective. For expressing the in-between transitional spaces are providing embodied experiences by connecting interior spaces with the outside or creating comfort by providing access and movement from one space to another environment and reversion using porches, decks, atriums, doors, bridges, fenestrations, and foyers (Kellert et al., 2008).

Following an affective eco-phenomenological approach (Brown & Toadvine, 2003; Cataldim & Hamrick, 2007; Toadvine, 2009) and integral perspective on embodied responsibilities and practices within an enfleshed praxis can be qualified as proto-sustainable. This orientation is helpful for cultivating and enacting sustainability development in and through organizations (Küpers, 2012). Such enfleshed praxis and practices can use ‘leverage points’ for reconnecting with nature for leveraging deep change for sustainability (Ives et al., 2018).

In this context, Merleau-Ponty's philosophy contributes to and invites engagement in and enactment of an 'enlivening' that situates human beings in an entangled biopoetic web of dynamic, sensual, unfolding and creative relationships as well as the practice of 'commoning', (Weber, 2016; Küpers, 2022), a term given to serving a transformative, epistemic and political flourishing (Heron, 2006). This interpretation of an enlivening enfleshment means and implies to profoundly rethink our relationship to ourselves, Other and 'the world'. Such rethinking can help to overcome the dualistic alienation that prevents us from coming into more enlightened contact 'reality' and moving towards being wholly integrated with(in) Flesh.

Political Implications

Enfleshed enlivening and enacting interpractice sustainability in relation to organizations (and beyond) can be envisaged as a political project. As such, it is one that is concerned not solely with individual and communal agencies, but also with the structures and systems of organization in their political embedment. Accordingly, enfleshed practice often necessitates ethico-political restructuring of contemporary organizational life, to support employees and groups to be able to engender proper ways to negotiate and to respond. Critically, a body-integrating ethical approach calls for analyzing and recreating ways in which politically bound enfleshed practices in organizations are exercised to achieve and maintain power or control. This entails that certain forms of practicing are excluded or superimposed. Such a critical stance speaks to how specific embodied experiences, meanings and practices are discriminated against, marginalized, degraded, and ignored, or dominated, subordinated, or disciplined. Correspondingly, a critical approach towards corporeal, enfleshed politics can be used for studying the ordering and normalizing of disciplinary techniques and encumbering processes of forced or imposed practices. Furthermore, it would explore how the dynamics of power and distress increase insensitivity to the pain of others (van Kleef et al., 2008).

Embodied, enfleshed practices not only refer to purposive actions, but also to non-purposive, rational and especially silence(d) acting in organizational life. Thus, in relation to Flesh, it is important to explore what is not practiced or not said, including un-noted actions or actors and omissions. Additionally, such a political stance means considering, for example in decision-making, those phenomena that seem to be strategically unthinkable, supposedly un-doable or taboo, and those excluded as possible practices.

Following Rancière's (2010) post-foundational and postliberal democratic understanding of disruptive politics of dissensus, this includes a re-arrangement of political order and different regimes of perceptual part-taking. These regimes determine what can count as perception, experience, or sense, individually but also collectively. Reconfiguring them modifies a sensory framework that distinguishes differently the visible from the invisible, the sayable from the unsayable, the audible from the inaudible, the possible from the impossible regarding practical and ethical issues. Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of Flesh is not only applicable to all these sensual dimensions, but also to institutions and practices, from the body to language as well as from the arts of expression to the very being of society and the political realm (Plot, 2012). Considering a concrete political life and enlivening of sensations, with Rancière (2004; 2010) what we need is redistribution and reconfiguration of the sensible. This involves aesthetic ruptures that challenge the 'share of the sensible' that defines the respective places and the parts. It is only thereby that it becomes possible to alter the field of the possibilities and capacities of what and how something can be sensed, felt, seen, heard, thought, said or otherwise expressed.

When we take equality as a means of contesting hierarchical and exclusionary distributions of the sensible, this allows us to imagine other forms of arrangements, preserving the possible as possible and wandering threads of the novel, lightly joining one thing to another (Rancière, 2014).

Moreover, ethico-politics of resistance can be seen as a web of emancipatory practices that are operating pragmatically through localized and concrete ethical gestures and political activities. An affective, environmental politics of the Flesh is an ecological one of everyday life as well as one of corporeal poetics (Carolan, 2008; 2009). We can only know nature as ‘bodies-in-the-world’; as bodies doing nature, from somewhere, in a particular way. Thus, the implications of a radical embodied politics must not stop with a mere tidying up on the surface but reach to the roots of how we live. Yet to reach those roots requires that we begin ‘digging’ somewhere (Carolan, 2009, p. 12), to experiment with an alternative style to corporeal sensing and doing, and re-embodied more sensuously engaged forms of inter- and transactions. It calls for bringing people back into a sensuous kinship with the natural world that is seeing, hearing, feeling, touching, etc. in an interconnectivity and reciprocity, with subtle distinctions, instead of isolation and immutability within fixed boundaries (Carolan, 2009, p. 14). The inter-face of nature-culture can be interpreted as a place where experiences, practices, policies, ideas, and knowledge meet, are negotiated, discussed and resolved (Birkeland et al., 2018). However, such an approach needs to consider ambivalence, tensions and problems involved in such undertaking and avoid falling into a regressive retro-romantic orientation (Küpers, 2015, p. 86).

While understandable as a yearning for returning to a pre-reflective unity for the disembodied, alienated humans in late modernity or as fragmented as relativistic postmodernism consciousness appears, there is no nostalgic way back to a retro-regressive coincidence with nature or supposed pre-existing given ‘Truths’. Because the reversibility of being is always imminent and never realized in fact, “the coincidence eclipses at the moment of realization” (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 147); relations to nature and to the body are always-already culturally mediated, as much as culture is ‘natural’ and embodied.

Theoretical and Methodological Implications

Regarding future research, the proposed approach provides bedrocks for theory building and empirical research for understanding the intricate nature of the processes and patterns of Flesh and embodied relational practices in organizations. As reminders of the multidimensionality and complexity of Flesh and intricacies of ‘living’ relational practices in organization, an advanced phenomenological approach may serve as helpful antidotes to reductionist methods.

To investigate Flesh with its divergent reversibilities and its various bodies and embodiments, whether they be organic or biological, technological, virtual, or otherwise, in their corporeal situatedness a processual approach is required. Such an approach enacts the literal meaning of method as ‘following along a way’ (i.e., ‘*meta ton hodon*’). By disclosing descriptions and interpretations of actual experiences and phenomena of Flesh as they appear, organizational researchers can develop a much-needed a-causal, non-reductionistic and non-reifying approach towards a post-Cartesian understanding of the underlying intertwining. Longitudinal studies and multiple case studies as well as sensually oriented and art-based methods are suitable for a pheno-pragmatic research practice (Küpers, 2015, p. 253). Such an approach “offer an alternative to managerial, instrumental, and technological ways of understanding knowledge, and they lead

to more ethically- and experientially-sensitive epistemologies and ontologies of practice” (Adams & van Manen, 2008, p. 615) and multi-level action-inquiries (Torbert et al., 2004).

Researching and putting into practice an embodied, chiasmic, and enfolded processual understanding opens possibilities for a critique and practical approach towards organizing, as an inter-practicing of sustainable development. On the one hand, such an approach helps to critique disembodied and non-creative orientations that neglect individual and collective bodies and embodiments or merely renders them as instrumentalized or objectified resources for utilitarian exploitative ‘practicalism’. On the other hand, focusing on inter-practices may contribute to the emergence and realization of alternative, ingenious forms of organizational practices for sustainability. Such enactment becomes even more relevant as these are placed in increasingly complex and often paradoxical or dilemmatic settings. Furthermore, actualizing an embodied practice may facilitate the cultivation of practical well-being and practical wisdom in organizations (Küpers, 2005) and thereby sustainable life-worlds.

Conclusion

Re-searching and ‘re-membering’ and the living experience and dynamic intricacies of enacted bodily inter-practising and embodied organizing is a challenging endeavor. But this undertaking is a timely and worthwhile one, as it contributes to more integrally transformative and hence sustainable approaches and practices in the current interdependent worlds of leadership and organization and beyond. Thus, reviving and cultivating embodied inter-relationalities in organizations with all its potential may mediate the incarnation and unfoldment of alternative economic, political, societal, and ethical relationships and realities to ‘inter-be-come’. These alternative relations are situated and moving between sedimented and new meanings, forms of practices thus being both instituted and instituting (Merleau-Ponty, 2010). They are ‘instituted’ in the sense of being habituated by the past and dependent upon being exposed to an already meaningful world. At the same time, there exists the possibility for re-instituting that involves an initiation of the new, the opening of a future as an opening of the new within the existing, familiar institutional arrangements. While including elements of receptivity and indeterminacy, it is a divergence or differentiating interval in relation to a norm of sense or a splitting off from what is already there which characterizes this entangled ‘institution-instituting’. Out of this circulation and dialectical relation between historical sedimentation and originating establishment an embodied agency can emerge that can move on new pathways of creative thinking, acting, and living that break with determinism (Merleau-Ponty, 2010, p. 11).

To realize this undertaking, what will be needed are transition pathways and narratives for interrogation and negotiating about what a life-membership in ‘eco-culturological’ communities of kindred beings mean (Plumwood, 2009), including ‘other-than-human beings’. If we remain highly ‘anthrocentric’ and ‘anthroparchal’ – characterized by systematic forms of human domination, exploitation and marginalization of others, Flesh cannot unfold fully. Even more, such a human-oriented approach endangers or even negates the diversity of Flesh, especially concerning singularities of ‘other-than-human-beings’.

Dwelling in Flesh requires a bio-cultural inclusive hospitality that makes space on Earth for the ‘domiciling’ of ‘other-kind’, while we transition to a new eco-cultural-logical civilization. Such transition is informed by acting in recognition and in resonance that we are all at the same time

fleshly immersed in circular ecological relationships, a deep non-linear poly-causal interpenetration and mutual implicatedness, as well as ‘more-than-humanize-activities’. All these enfleshed interdependent relations and processes are mediated by living bodily and embodied dimensions. We live our bodies through the world, and we live the world through our bodies, while we are fundamentally connected to all Earthlings through our shared carnality.

Flesh is that kind of embodied force and medium of endless creative differentiation, integration and re-differentiation that finds richness and depth in the fullness of the present (McCann 2011, p. 506). Our bodies are not only what makes ‘being-enfleshed-in-the-world’ possible, enacting bio-sociality and ‘nature-culture’ we carry with and live through our bodies in Flesh as potentialities (Merleau-Ponty, 2012, p. 126) that is a potential of the not yet embodied. For Merleau-Ponty Flesh ‘is...a pregnancy of possible ‘Weltmöglichkeit’, the possible world variants of this world, the world beneath the singular and the plural’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 250). The notion of pregnancy and the ‘world-Flesh’ as ‘pregnant’ refers to reciprocal enshrouding, co-implication and unfolding as an imminent being (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 245). Such being is always (virtually) ready, but never fully deployed, thus a coming to be of that which is not yet present, but full of ambiguities. As we have seen, calling Flesh pregnant and suggesting that the movement inherent between the sensation and the thing sensed, is highly relevant for organization studies and practices that realize sustainable developments. The ontological situation of an organization, its members, and its stakeholders is a ‘whole that does not reduce itself to the sum of its parts’ (Merleau-Ponty, 1995, p. 149), but in which the reversible, chiasmic relation of the perceiver and the perceived is a ‘pregnant whole’ or ‘Gestalt’. This metaphor and concept of world-fleshly pregnancy as ‘Gestalt’ helps understanding and realizing ‘eco-bio-socio-cultural’ being and becoming towards ‘birthing’ more sustainable practice. The living inter-between of Flesh is pregnant with meaning and new ways to interrelate. Enacting the outlined bodied, enfleshed inter-practicing in and beyond organizational life-worlds, carries potentials for utopian movements towards different practices (Johnson, 2003), qualified as sustainable. Thus, it mediates and realizes the incarnation and enacted unfoldment of ‘alter-native’ that is ‘other-birthly’ approaches as well as economic, societal, socio-cultural, thus political, and ethical ‘inter-ests’ and inter-relationships for a more sustainable world to be-come.

Embodied practices in Flesh indicate and invite one to enter an inter-between space, opening up more sustainable forms and processes of organizing. They represent an innovative and intensified approach and medium that by integrating attuning bodies, things, social and relational dimensions in space and time, also enhances entangled professional learning and partnership-based practices (Green & Hopwood, 2015; Hopwood, 2016). Such an orientation can help practitioners prepare and qualify for the challenges they face and will have to deal with in work and life. In addition to practitioner in organizations an enfleshed opening and enactment can contribute to more sustainable presences in economies, societies, and the planet overall.

It is hoped that the outlined propositions and discussions here support a transformative (re)creation of bodies and embodiment as part of a more comprehensive understanding and inter-practicing within and through Flesh for the sustainable development of organizations and civilizations. Through that process unfoldments of a genuine conviviality towards a coevolving symbiogenic ‘Ecozoic’ Era (Swimme & Berry, 1992) can emerge, that is still be(com)ing born.

References

- Abdelaal, M. S. (2019). Biophilic campus: An emerging planning approach for a sustainable innovation-conducive university. *J. Clean. Prod.* 215, 1445e1456.
- Adams C., & van Manen M. (2008). Phenomenology. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (pp. 614–619). Sage.
- Aroles, J., & Küpers, W. (2022). Flânerie as a methodological practice for explorative re-search in digital worlds. *Culture and Organization*, 02, 1–14.
- Bachelard, G. (1969). *The poetics of reverie*. Beacon Press.
- Bachelard, G. (2013). *The intuition of the instant*. Northwestern University Press.
- Bannon, B. (2012). Flesh and nature: Understanding Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology. *Research in Phenomenology*, 41(3), 327–357.
- Bannon, B. (2014). *From mastery to mystery: A phenomenological foundation for environmental ethics*. Ohio University Press.
- Bannon, B. (2016). Nature, meaning and value, nature and experience: Phenomenology and the environment. In: Bryan E. Bannon (Ed.), *Nature and Experience: Phenomenology and the Environment* (pp. 60–61). Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bendor, R., Maggs, D. Peake, R. Robinson, J., & Williams, S. (2017). The imaginary worlds of sustainability: Observations from an interactive art installation. *Ecology and Society*, 22(2), 17.
- Birkeland, I., Burton, R., Parra Novoa, C., & Siivonen, K. (2018). *Cultural sustainability and the nature-culture interface, livelihoods, policies, and methodologies*. Routledge.
- Bradbury, H., & Lichtenstein, B. (2000). Relationality in organizational research: Exploring the space between. *Organization Science*, 11(5), 551–564.
- Brook, I. (2005). Can Merleau-Ponty's notion of 'Flesh' inform or even transform environmental thinking? *Environmental Values*, 14(3), 353–362.
- Brown, C., & Toadvine, T. (2003). *Eco-phenomenology*. State University of New York Press.
- Calori, R. (2002). Organizational development and the ontology of creative dialectical evolution. *Organization*, 9(1), 127–150.
- Carolan, M. (2008). An ecological politics of everyday life: Placing flesh on Whitehead's process philosophy in search of "Green" possibilities. *Global Religions, Culture and Ecology*, 12(10), 51–73.

- Carolan, M. (2009). 'I do therefore there is': Enlivening socio-environmental theory. *Environmental Politics*, 18(1), 1–17.
- Carolan, M. (2014). Affective sustainable landscapes and care ecologies: Getting a real feel for alternative food communities. *Sustainability Science*, 10(2), 317–329.
- Cataldi, S., & Hamrick, W. (2007). *Merleau-Ponty and environmental philosophy*. State University of New York Press.
- Cecil, P. (2004). Changing cultures in organizations: a process of organic-ization. *Concrescence: The Australasian Journal of Process Thought*, 5(101), 1445–4297.
- Ciocirlan, C. E. (2017). Environmental workplace behaviors: Definition matters. *Organization & Environment*, 30, 51–70.
- Clarke, M. (2002). Ontology, ethics, and sentir: Properly situating Merleau-Ponty. *Environmental Values*, 11, 211–225.
- Clough, P., Goldberg, G., Schiff, R., Weeks, A., & Willse, C. (2007). Notes towards a theory of affect-itself. *ephemera*, 7(1), 60–77.
- Cooke, B., West, S., & Boonstra, W. J. (2016). Dwelling in the biosphere: Exploring an embodied human–environment connection in resilience thinking. *Sustainability Science*, 11(5), 831–843.
- Dillon, M. C. (1988). *Merleau-Ponty's ontology*. Northwestern University Press.
- Diprose, R. (2002). *Corporeal generosity: On giving with Nietzsche, Merleau-Ponty and Levinas*. State University of New York Press.
- Ehn, B., & Löfgren, O. (2010). *The secret world of doing nothing*. University of California Press.
- Evans, J., Davies, B., & Rich, E. (2009). The body made Flesh: Embodied learning and the corporeal device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30(4), 391–406.
- Faugstad, A. (2010). Merleau-Ponty's concept of nature and the ontology of flesh. *Biosemiotics* 3, 331–345.
- Green, B., & Hopwood, N. (2015). The body in professional practice, learning and education: A question of corporeality? In B. Green and N. Hopwood (Eds.), *The Body in Professional Practice, Learning and Education: Body/practice*, (pp. 15–33). Springer.
- Hahn, N., Essah, E., & Blanusa, T. (2021). Biophilic design and office planting: a case study of effects on perceived health, wellbeing, and performance metrics in the workplace. *Intelligent Buildings International*, 13(4), 241–260.
- Hailwood, S. (2014). Estrangement, nature and 'the flesh'. *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 17(1), 71–85.

- Hamington, M. (2008). Resources for feminist care ethics in Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology of the body. In G. Weiss (Ed.), *Intertwinings: Interdisciplinary Encounters with Merleau-Ponty*, (pp. 203–220). SUNY.
- Hancock, P. (2008). Embodied generosity and an ethics of organization. *Organization Studies*, 29(10), 1357–1373.
- Haraway, D. (2003). *The companion species manifesto: Dogs, people, and significant otherness*. Prickly Paradigm Press.
- Heron, J. (2006). *Participatory spirituality*. Lulu Press.
- Hopwood, N. (2016). *Professional practice and learning: Times, spaces, bodies, things*. Springer.
- Ives, C. D., Abson, D. J., von Wehrden, H., Dorninger, C., Klaniecki, K., & Fischer, J. (2018). Reconnecting with nature for sustainability. *Sustainability Science*, 13(5), 1389–1397.
- Johnson, G. (2003). Merleau-Pontian phenomenology as non-conventionally utopian. *Human Studies*, 26, 383–400.
- Jones, D. R., (2016). The 'biophilic organization': An integrative metaphor for corporate sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 138(3), 401–416.
- Kellert, S. R., Heerwagen, J. H., & Mador, M. (2008). *Biophilic design: The theory, science, and practice of bringing buildings to life*. Wiley.
- Kellert, S. R., & Calabrese, E. F. (2015). *The practice of biophilic design*. Retrieved on 5.5.2023. from <http://www.biophilic-design.com>.
- Küpers, W. (2005). Phenomenology and Integral Pheno-Practice of Embodied Well-Be(com)ing in Organizations; 'Culture and Organization', Vol. 11(3), 221-231.
- Küpers, W. (2012). Integral response-abilities for organising and managing sustainability. In G. Eweje and M. Perry, (Eds.). *Business and Sustainability: Concepts, Strategies and Changes, Critical Studies on Corporate Responsibility, Governance and Sustainability*, Volume 3, (pp. 25–58). Emerald.
- Küpers, W. (2014). Embodied inter-Be(com)ing – The contribution of Merleau-Ponty's relational ontology for a processual understanding of chiasmic organising. In J. Helin, T. Hernes, D. Hjorth, & R. Holt, (Eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Process Philosophy and Organization Studies*, (pp. 413–431). Oxford University Press.
- Küpers, W. (2015). *Phenomenology of the embodied organisation: The contribution of Merleau-Ponty*. Palgrave Macmillan.

- Küpers, W. (2016). Phenomenology of embodied and artful design for creative and sustainable inter-practicing in organizations. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 135(1), 1436–1445.
- Küpers, W. (2016a). Embodied, Relational Practices of Human and Non-Human in a Material, Social, and Cultural Nexus of Organizations. *On_Culture: The Open Jour- for the Study of Culture 2*. <http://geb.uni-giessen.de/geb/volltexte/2016/12352/>.
- Küpers, W. (2021). From anthropocene to ecocene—eco-phenomenological perspectives on embodied, anthro-decentric transformations towards enlivening practices of organising sustainably. *Sustainability*, 12(9), 1–20.
- Küpers, W. (2022). Integrating en fleshed prâxis, practices, phrônêsis and sustainable action for organising and embodied living common(ing) and common viviality. In F.-X. de Vaujany, J. Aroles, and M. Pérezts (Eds.), *Phenomenologies and Organisation Studies: Problematising Management and Organizing as Appearing and Appearances*, (pp. 577–603). Cambridge University Press.
- Ladkin, D. (2010). *Rethinking leadership: A new look at old leadership questions*. Elgar.
- Landes, D. (2013). *Merleau-Ponty and the paradoxes of expression*. Routledge.
- Low, D. (2000). *Merleau-Ponty's last vision: A proposal for the completion of 'The Visible and the Invisible'*. Northwestern University Press.
- Macauley, D. (2010). *Elemental philosophy: Earth, air, fire and water as environmental ideas*. State University of New York Press.
- Manning, E. (2009). *Relationscapes: Movement, art, philosophy*. MIT Press.
- Manning, E. (2013). *Always more than one: The collectivity of a life*. Duke University Press
- Mathews, F. (2011). Towards a deeper philosophy of biomimicry. *Organization & Environment*, 24, 364–387.
- Mazis, G. A. (1993). *Emotion and embodiment: Fragile ontology*. Routledge.
- Mazis, G. A. (2002). *Earthbodies, rediscovering our planetary senses*. State University of New York Press.
- Mazis, G. A. (2016). *Merleau-Ponty and the face of the world - silence, ethics, imagination, and poetic ontology*. State University of New York Press.
- McCann, R. (2011). A sensuous ethics of difference. *Hypatia*, 26(3), 497–517.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964). *Eye and mind: The primacy of perception*. Northwestern University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964a). *Sense and non-sense*. Northwestern University Press.

- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964b). *Signs*. Northwestern University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964c). *Le visible et l'invisible, suivi de. Notes de travail*. Gallimard,
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1995). *The visible and the invisible*. Northwestern University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2003). *Nature: Course notes from the College de France*. Northwestern University Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). *Phenomenology of perception* (D. A. Landes, Trans.). Routledge.
- Merleau-Ponty, M., (2010). *Institution and passivity: Course notes from the Collège de France (1954–1955)*. Northwestern University Press.
- Morris, D. (2010). The enigma of reversibility and the genesis of sense in Merleau-Ponty. *Continental Philosophy Review*, 43(2), 141–65.
- Perey, R. (2016). *Ecological imaginaries, reframing organisation*. Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Plot, M. (2012). Our element: Flesh and democracy in Merleau-Ponty. *Continental Philosophy Revue*, 45, 235–259.
- Plumwood, V. (2009). Nature in the active voice. *Australian Humanities Review*, 46, 113–29.
- Pullen, A., & Rhodes, C. (2014). Corporeal ethics and the politics of resistance in organizations. *Organization*, 21(6), 782–796.
- Rancière, J. (2004). *The politics of aesthetics: The distribution of the sensible*. Continuum.
- Rancière, J. (2010). *Dissensus: On politics and aesthetics*. Continuum.
- Rancière, J. (2014). The thread of the novel. *A Forum on Fiction*, 47(2), 196–209.
- Rhodes, C., & Wray-Bliss, E. (2013). The ethical difference of organization. *Organization*, 20(1), 39–50.
- Shotter, J. (2004). Responsive expression in living bodies: The power of invisible 'real presences' within our everyday lives together. *Cultural Studies*, 18(2/3), 443–460.
- Shotter, J. (2006). Understanding process from within: An argument for 'witness'-thinking. *Organization Studies*, 27, 585–604.
- Shrivastava, P. (2010). Pedagogy of passion for sustainability. *Academy of Management Learning And Education*, 9(3), 443–455.

- Simanke, R. T. (2016). Flesh and matter: Merleau-Ponty's late ontology as a materialist philosophy. *Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 3(11), 7–13.
- Soederlund, J., (2019). *The emergence of biophilic design*. Springer.
- Sparrow, T. (2014). *Plastic bodies: Rebuilding sensation after phenomenology*. Open Humanities Press.
- Stolz, S. (2014). Embodied learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 47(5), 474–487.
- Swimme, B., & Berry, T. (1992). *The universe story from the primordial flaring forth to the Eozoic Era*. Harper.
- Toadvine, T. (2009). *Merleau-Ponty's philosophy of nature*. Northwestern University Press.
- Torbert, W., & Associates (2004). *Action inquiry: The secret of timely and transforming leadership*. Berrett-Koehler.
- van Kleef, G. A., Oveis, C., van der Löwe, I., LouKogan, A., Goetz, J., & Keltner, D. (2008). Power, distress, and compassion: Turning a blind eye to the suffering of others. *Psychological Science*, 19, 1315–1322.
- Wallmann-Sperlich, B., Hoffmann, S., Salditt, A., Bipp, T., & Froboese, I. (2019). Moving to an “active” biophilic designed office workplace: A pilot study about the effects on sitting time and sitting habits of office-based workers. *International Journal of Environmental Research Public Health*, 16(9), 1559.
- Weber, A. (2016). *Biopoetics. towards an existential ecology, towards a theory of life-as-meaning*. Springer.
- Wolkowitz, C. (2006). *Bodies at work*. Sage.
- Xue, F., Lau, S. S. Y., Gou, Z., Song, Y., & Jiang, B. (2019). Incorporating biophilia into green building rating tools for promoting health and wellbeing. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* 76, 98–112.
- Zhong, T. S., Schroder, T., & Bekkering, J. (2022). Biophilic design in architecture and its contributions to health, well-being, and sustainability: A critical review. *Frontiers of Architectural Research* 11, 114–141.