

Toward Public Administration as a Humanities Discipline: A Humanistic Manifesto

Eugenie Samier
Simon Fraser University

PREFACE

I would like to begin with an account of personal experience relating to my scholarly activities. From a humanities perspective, bias is not something that one eliminates, or at least attempts to reduce to an imperceptible influence on one's thinking as in positivistic forms of research, but instead one uses legitimate forms of bias to understand the experiences one has, bringing, in Weber's terms, a value-orientation theory of social action and method in achieving *Verstehen* that draws upon 'an empathic or artistically appreciative quality'. (1968, p. 5)

My own early university education was in philosophy, history, and literary studies. In other words, I am a humanities person. It was only later, and somewhat reluctantly, that I began studies in public administration. My father had been a Deputy Minister and Cabinet Secretary, and my impression while growing up was that public administration was one of the most boring technical fields one could study, and its practice fraught with an internal politics I did not find attractive. As I began my graduate programmes in administration I discovered that my initial impression was true. But only in certain respects. Public administration, at least as it exists in North America, is a technical enterprise. This means that it developed as part of the general pragmatic and practical tradition of Anglo-American scholarship and societal ethos. And as a professional discipline – unlike many European traditions of legalistic administration – it is primarily managerial. It was a shock moving from the humanities tradition centred on the individual and creative activity to one largely dominated by social systems, structures, functions, and cost-benefit analysis.

These initial impressions were reinforced by eleven years as a management consultant primarily to government, working with a small team of senior consultants who, to put it kindly, were technocrats. Our work involved the redesign of government departments, rationalising and downsizing government, and evaluating organisations regulated by government. I felt at times as we sketched out on oversized sheets of paper the amalgamation or reorganisation of a ministry that we were moving groups of people around as one would on a chessboard. And in projects where we calculated workload standards, a small adjustment in the number representing workload ratios, 60 or more people could lose their jobs. The drafting of legislation bringing new organisations into being meant that even minor changes in wording

would inevitably affect not only the number of people employed, but the structure of their work lives, and the quality of their social interaction.

My early work on Max Weber's reception in Anglo-American administration supported this view. Weber's work was generally misrepresented and distorted to fit a bureaucratic management agenda. The parts that were missing were the very ones I recognised from a humanities perspective, such as Weber's investigations into the relationship among human values, ideals and social relations (therefore organisational and administrative types), a critique of rationalisation and bureaucracy in values terms, a complex theory of ethics applicable to administration, and a historically mature approach to institutional change and reform. Kant, also, – I found in examining how his ethics was represented – was generally considered to be too theoretical to be of practical use and was consequently distorted to fit managerial assumptions, and thereby discarded.

I had suspected that administration, which attempts to capture certain dimensions of human experience, couldn't be that remote from the human experience represented in humanities fields. After all, these are experiential phenomena not different in kind from all other human experiences dealt with in the humanities. In fact, once one becomes accustomed to the technical part of administrative work, one discovers that the deep and difficult problems are really human ones the humanities have been developed to address. And so I have begun in my research to investigate where the connections and possibilities lie.

What I have been working on, therefore, is a reconceptualisation of public administration as a humanities discipline – in other words, what is the view of administration from the perspective of the liberal arts? This represents the development of a very personal philosophy. As is traditional for a manifesto, the intent of this essay is a declaration of a set of principles that can serve as a philosophical foundation to administration studies. It is the exploration of a new vision, a reconceptualisation, explicitly based on liberal humanistic values (with clear political implications). This project is intended to develop a multi-disciplinary humanities framework, similar in intent to Marx's view of a radical humanities, 'To be radical is to grasp things by the root ... for man the root is man himself'.

The Evolution of a Humanistic Agenda

Public administration, at least in English-speaking countries, is regarded generally as a social science, most frequently concerned with organisational structure and design, administrative functions, management techniques, and economic modelling. It is primarily informed by rationalism derived from modern economics, analytic philosophy, systems analysis, and behavioural science,¹ and pursued primarily through positivistic styles of research. The result has been threefold:

- 1) values of hierarchy, control, and power are implicit, if not explicit, and a hidden agenda of conformity permeates the literature and training program-

¹ See Kettl and Milward (1996) for a discussion of the disciplinary foundations of public administration.

mes, reducing effective critique;

- 2) historical and cross-cultural comparison is scant since value analysis and historical and anthropological theories and research methods are required for this kind of research; and,
- 3) problematic aspects of living in organisations, such as value conflict, experiential contradiction, and personal construction of meaning have been excised.

Those values and concerns central to humanism – ranging from humanity’s greatest aspirations and creative accomplishments to its most fundamental flaws, weaknesses and heinous deeds – consequently find no place for systematic study within the organisational and behavioural models produced. Scientific studies of systems, structures and functions do not satisfy in adequately answering questions about the relationship among values of freedom, authenticity, responsibility, and individual action. An understanding of the human condition is not only submerged in organisational levels of analysis, but is suppressed by the very assumptions and methods employed in constructing large-scale theories about human behaviour, efficient organisational design, and effective management techniques (and are obscured in the current fad of leadership training), and a positivist epistemology that poses for Haque (1996) a normative crisis. They gloss over complexities in the human character, power and politics dynamics, ethics in organisational life, and opposed contextual forces shaping the world and mentality of the administrator.

In spite of these managerial imperatives, a more humanistic discipline has been developing for a number of decades. At the same time that a critique of positivism in social sciences was articulated by people like Feyerabend (1975), Lakatos (1963/64, 1970), and Popper (1963), challenges in public administration theory were being formulated. A number of organisational and administrative theorists introduced discussion of personality, human nature, higher order potential, and values in organisational culture: Elton Mayo (1933, 1946) challenged the domination of the scientific, rationalist and structural approach; Chester Barnard (1938) concurred arguing that the leader’s role was to harness the human potential; Chris Argyris (1957) stressed the role of personality; Philip Selznick (1957) emphasised values in work culture; Douglas McGregor (1960) introduced Theory X and Theory Y; and Charles Lindblom (1968) promoted a view that individual beliefs, values and behaviour were intertwined in organisational culture. These new approaches, often labelled Human Relations, or Organisational Humanism, however, are still tied to the notion of managerial control, motivating staff to achieve organisational goals, and strive for a discipline that equips senior administrators with “softer” human tools to manipulate a work force. The purpose is still oriented toward making workers satisfied with the workplace, but not in bringing a fundamental critique or change to organisations that are premised on values that run contrary to humanism. Perhaps some organisations simply should not persist.

Some more “radical” propositions (that is, from the perspective of conventional

public administration and management theory) have been proposed since the 1970s, encompassing psychoanalysis (Baum 1982, 1983a, 1983b, 1987; Diamond 1990; Miller & Kets de Vries 1984),² feminist critiques of bureaucracy (Ferguson 1984), discourse analysis (Farmer 1995), values analysis (Hodgkinson 1978, 1996), ethics (Burke 1986; Cooper 1982; Gawthrop 1984; Rohr 1979), history (Gladden 1972; Adams 1992), biography (Theakston 2000), social experience (Hummel 1977), organisational culture (Smircich 1983), and most recently aesthetics (Gagliardi 1996; Strati 1990, 1992, 1996, 1999). These topics have been accompanied by exploration of new research frameworks, drawing upon more critical or interpretive approaches: hermeneutics (Hummel 1990, 1994), phenomenology (Brown 1978; Forester 1990; Harmon 1981), and critical theory (Denhardt 1981a, 1981b; Forester 1981, 1983, 1984); however, they have remained only in fledgling form or marginalised in the discipline. There are varying degrees of humanism, though, in these theories: many still adopt the values of organisational stability, consistency, and conformity as overriding principles.

The history of public administration in Anglo-Saxon countries, as they have incorporated more humanistically oriented perspectives, can be characterised through a Critical Incident Biography (see Chart 1). This suggested approach emphasises five features of the field consistent with a humanistic perspective: first, it is historiographical, emphasising the field in its evolving yet not deterministic character; secondly, it is intellectual history, the product of individuals influenced by the politics of scholarship and their personal biographies; thirdly, it presupposes the importance of societal context in the development of ideas, consisting of political, social and economic factors as they shape the social institutions in which individuals are located; fourth, it emphasises the role of philosophy and theory in shaping worldviews; and finally, it does not present a unified, homogeneous, or ‘building block’ approach to knowledge – instead, crisis periods represent self-conscious realisations of the inherent contradictions, inconsistencies, and ambiguities in the discipline as a function of individual values, historical forces, and institutional arrangements. This approach varies from Henry (1975) and Golembiewski’s (1974) that tend toward a linear developmental view.

The general tenor, or Geist, of society is most noticeably implicit in this kind of biography. In the preoccupations of the field during its initial pre-1941 period in the US, one can clearly see the influence of political and academic concerns ranging from the rise of psychologism to scientific pragmatism and nation-building politics. Public administration also follows the independent establishment of other disciplines, like sociology, psychology and economics, adopting theory and methods in each of these, albeit in a sometimes haphazard and even contradictory fashion. It has evolved as a hybrid and synthetic field, incorporating developments in its primary “feeder” disciplines at the same time that it responds to practical pressures and changes in the public sector.

² In this case, much earlier work was already oriented toward an examination of organisational experience through Karen Horney, Erich Fromm, and Bruno Bettelheim, and, as with most of these categories, is traceable back to pre-20th century writing. For example, organisational psychology was explored by Nietzsche, and organisational ethics is traceable to Plato and Kant.

The 1940s in North America were important for the professionalisation of the field since it is in this period that many schools of public administration were first founded and prominent journals established (e.g. the *Administrative Science Quarterly*). And it was also in this period that the first self-conscious “crisis” in its identity was articulated through debate over objectivity. The central issue in this decade for the nature, scope, and practice of public administration was its scientific nature. Edwin Stene (1940) and Herbert Simon (1946, 1947) were the main proponents of a continuing scientism, contending that principles in the literature amounted to speculation or opinion, and that the field be placed on firmer scientific ground in order to establish causal relationships as a rational basis for empirical research. Simon provided a logical positivist rationale for the separation of facts and values and the criteria for a programme of experimental research necessary to produce a “comprehensive” theory of administration. However, dissenting voices were already at work. Robert Dahl (1947) argued that value-freedom was not possible (or even desirable) and that a critique of capitalism was inherent to it, and Waldo (1948) critiqued the field’s move away from moral philosophy and political economy toward an ideology of administrative efficiency. Their position was complemented by Lilienthal (1944), Appleby (1945) and Morstein-Marx (1946) whose work demonstrated the impossibility of separating administration from politics, bringing into question a fundamental precept, the administrative-politics dichotomy.

In the following two decades, public administration was broadened through organisation theory, primarily through the human relations school (e.g. Argyris 1957; McGregor 1960), an introduction of comparative administration through the establishment of the Comparative Administration Group (1960) and the work of Heady & Stokes (1962) and Riggs (1964), and the beginning of the public policy movement in the field (e.g. Dror 1967).

The 1970s was the second major identity crisis period centred on whether public administration was an independent discipline with a distinctive theoretical foundation (ironically coinciding with a proliferation of schools and programmes of public administration with a largely technocratic and utterly pragmatic focus). This question was in part heralded by a key essay published by Waldo (1968a), followed by a flurry of articles and books addressing the field’s future direction development based upon various critiques of its inadequate theoretical development. For example, Ostrom (1971) regarded it tied too closely to public choice theory and preoccupied with efficiency (centralisation and control) at the expense of tackling more difficult and complex organisational and democratic problems resulting in a loss of confidence by theorists and practitioners. LaPorte (1971) contended that public administration existed in a state of antique maladapted analytical models and normative aridity: teaching and research tended to be based on past problems or instant response to present establishment problem definitions, which have limited utility for intellectual vigour or relevance to students and practitioners. Golembiewski (1977) claimed that as a field public administration was in drift, in intellectual crisis, and in need of a new perspective, and Caiden (1971) critiqued its ‘theory-less’ state. It was also in this period that Gladden’s (1972) history of public administration was published, suggesting a stronger role for historiography.

The 1980s and 1990s saw a major bifurcation in the field. On one side, the pro-

ponents of the New Public Management, adopted by governments first in the Anglo-Saxon world, and major international organisations like the World Bank, promoted what turned out to be an illusory “debureaucratisation” through the entrepreneurialisation of the public sector by private sector management ideology. Two of the most popular techniques associated with the new managerialism is a functionalist use of culture (e.g. Schein, 1985) and leadership training (Maccoby 1981; Tichy & Devanna 1986; Bennis 1989; Nanus 1992; Kouzes & Posner 1993; Bass 1998),³ a movement that has most recently spawned a branch charisma field (e.g. Bryman 1992; Conger & Kanungo 1988, 1998).

On the other side, one sees a proliferation of post-modern, interpretive and critical theory analyses, constituting what Stever (1988) has termed a new legitimisation crisis in administrative studies. One of the most significant of these is Robert Denhardt (1984) who argued that the traditional separation of theory and practice, and academicians and practitioners, had become even more pronounced. Part of the reason for a crisis of legitimacy for practitioners was a theory dominated by rational models, overly instrumentalised concerns, a structuralist approach excluding processes, and a positivist understanding of knowledge acquisition that failed to integrate explanation, understanding and critique. Additionally, it failed to provide a moral context for personal action in organisation addressing concerns practitioners had for values of freedom, justice, and equality associated with democratic responsibility. Denhardt’s proposal rested on an expanded conception of the field beyond narrow or mechanical views to a more fundamental intellectual heritage including interpretive and critical traditions derived from such thinkers as Marx, Weber, and Freud. It was also during this period that more interpretive and critical approaches to the organisational dimensions of administration developed, popularised by Morgan (1986), and symbolic cultural approaches and related aesthetic analysis of administration have developed, most notably with Smircich’s (1983) introduction of the root metaphor approach.

The minor status of comparative administration demonstrates a number of problems in public administration, relevant to this thesis. As early as 1947 (in English), Robert Dahl argued that claims for a “science” of public administration are hollow without a comparative perspective and knowledge upon which to base a body of generalised principles independent of their particular national setting. Gerald & Naomi Caiden provided a grim prospect for the comparative in their 1990 review of its history in American public administration: the *Journal of Comparative Administration* folded, the Comparative Administration Group had disbanded, the Duke University Press series came to an end, a drastic decline in the study, teaching and research of international and comparative administration had taken place, in many programmes dropping entirely from course offerings, The American Society for Public Administration’s Section on International and Comparative Administration (which

³ While leadership studies began much earlier with such foundational writings as R. Stogdill’s ‘Leadership, Membership, and Organization’ (*Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 47, pp. 1-14) in 1950 and F. Fiedler’s *A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness* in 1967, it was only with the advent of the New Public Management’s emphasis on managerialism that leadership (as a highly truncated form) entered public administration in a highly influential way.

had inherited the Comparative Administration Group) lost half its membership, and scholarly journals' interest in comparative articles declined. Randall Baker (1994) has pointed out that comparative administration has never played a central role in the discipline, or been a requirement in graduate programmes despite growing issues related to globalisation, the development of international organisations, health, tourism, communications, and environmental concerns. One could also add the vital global importance of transition states. Van Wart & Cayer (1990) note that the comparative is dominated in the journals by practitioner work to the detriment of theoretical and methodological writing. Larry Schroeder's (1990) study indicated that young faculty are encouraged not to pursue this field before tenure, and since the comparative (particularly international comparison) receives no accreditation or core course construction, it is marginalised to a peripheral value for career purposes. One of the reasons identified for such a lacuna, according to Ferrel Heady (1987), is a persistent parochialism in the US, a charge that could equally be made against Canadian public administration. The more recent resurgence of comparative work in the 1980s, arguably driven by interests in globalisation and internationalisation do not necessarily mean that the comparative is on a solid foundation. While the comparative public policy field has burgeoned, the overall field of comparative administration is still lacking in development and legitimacy.

To some extent, Christopher Hood's (1990) contention that public administration had crumbled, become outdated and lost its status as a main approach to an interpretation of the state and government, having been replaced by policy studies, public choice theory and neo-institutionalism, characterises the state of the discipline in the 1980s and 90s.

These approaches have been proliferating at a time when conventional administrative theory has had many of its "certainties" challenged, what Peters (1996) has termed 'the old chestnuts'. Four of those most important underpinning conceptions of the public service and its role in the process of governance are also those that excluded a role for humanities in the discipline. First, the assumption of an apolitical civil service expressed through the politics/administration dichotomy has been replaced by a recognition that civil servants have a critical role to play in policy. Secondly, the assumption of a hierarchical and rule-based management in the public service has been altered (partly through the NPM, and partly through democratisation of government) to be more market responsive and adopt participatory models. In addition, permanence and stability of government bureaucracy has been to some extent replaced by temporary personnel systems and new organisational structures. And finally, a traditionally acquiescent and obedient civil service has been influenced by an activist and entrepreneurial civil service. The decline of these conventional axioms opens a conceptual space for the subjective, individualistic and normative considerations of a humanities perspective.

However, the logical structuring of graduate programmes in most universities in Canada and the US (and most texts in the field, and consequently most graduate theses) reflect the disjuncture between a professionally-driven need to train good civil servants, and the changing academic or scholarly research in the field. Courses in professional training most often replicate the functional structuring of bureaucracies, consisting of Organisational Theory and Behaviour, Public Policy Processes,

Planning (or Strategic Planning), Personnel or Human Resources, Finance and Budgeting, Accountability or Administrative Responsibilities, Information Systems, Intergovernmental Relations, Urban and Regional Government, Administrative Law, and predominantly positivistic Methods. The theoretical grounding of course design favours explanatory theory, statistical analyses, and descriptive case studies and biographies. It was the underdevelopment of theoretical and methodological rigor in the field that prompted a debate on this issue, beginning with McCurdy & Cleary's 1984 article, 'Why Can't We Resolve the Research Issue in Public Administration?' that examined recent dissertations in the field and concluded that only 6% met high standards of research. Box claimed in 1992, partly based on Cleary's subsequent re-evaluation based on improved dissertation quality in the interim, and a review of articles in the *Public Administration Review* from 1985 to 1989, that the quality of research in the field was not in the dire condition claimed by McCurdy & Cleary. It is interesting to note, however, that their survey demonstrates that the vast majority of articles still follow a strongly positivistic line, and that very few, only 4 of the 77 articles, dealt with explicitly theoretical (creativity and ethics) or comparative topics. It is important to note, also, that this journal more successfully tackles theoretical and philosophical subjects than most. In response, Adams & White (1994) compared research in public administration with a number of related professional disciplines (planning, management, criminology and social work) for the year 1992, presenting a number of disappointing findings: 24% were not guided by any theoretical or conceptual framework; 37% had obvious design flaws; 46% contributed nothing to knowledge development in the field, having no theoretical relevance; 33% appeared to have no practical relevance; 36% addressed unimportant topics in the field; 49% were under 250 pages in length; 13% used qualitative methods; and only 5% were theoretical and 10% historical.⁴ Adams & White conclude their evaluation by noting three general conclusions that can be drawn: the field is a theoretical wasteland, subject to mindless empiricism and parochialism.

In contrast, a programme of studies based on interpretive and critical research would favour courses in Ideologies and Doctrines of Administration, Problems of Modernity, the Fate of Liberalism, the Process of Bureaucratisation, Cultural Analyses of Administration, the History of Administration, Ethics, the Critique of Technical Rationality, Theories of Governance, the Feminist Critique of Administration, the Tension between Democracy and Bureaucracy, Comparative Administration, Aesthetic Dimensions of Administration, Political Philosophy and Values, and comparative interpretive and critical, and therefore qualitative, Methods.⁵ The theoretical grounding would consist of historiography, ethno-methodology, hermeneutics and phenomenology, narrative and discourse analysis, critical and interpretive case studies, and literary analysis. Where the dominating

⁴ Interestingly, Canadian and British dissertations in the sample were of significantly higher quality than the American dissertations on the measures used by Adams and White.

⁵ One methodological point to note is that the humanities offer a traditional empirical alternative to positivistic forms of research that have dominated the administrative and management studies fields for some time, to the point where many in referring to empirical research mean exclusively quantitative and statistical methods.

issues in a functionalist approach include techniques in the new managerialism, building corporate culture, instituting performance appraisal systems, technologisation, and establishing policy networks, those reflecting an interpretive and critical perspective include problems of cultural hegemony, critiques of rational decision-making models, a critique of capitalism, the role of cultural aspects of organisation including humour, rituals and ceremonies, a critique of administrative mentality, the role of language in establishing power and marginalisation, social construction, and the overriding values encased in managerial and administrative ideologies.

One other distinguishing feature of the newer approaches in public administration is a return to Grand Theories (although not necessarily essentialist in approach) in the form of political philosophy, ethics, and social and cultural theory encompassing the theoretical and philosophical foundation upon which post-modern and critical theory rests. Not only does this mean integrating directly into public administration detailed discussion of major figures, but also recognising writers who have traditionally been marginalised from a discussion about public life. One obvious category is women philosophers, whose work has only received nodding acknowledgement on occasion, but has yet to be treated with sufficient depth: authors such as Madame de Staël, Rosa Luxemburg, Hannah Arendt, Simone Weil, Susanne Langer, and Martha Nussbaum. Increasingly, major approaches associated with the socio-cultural studies are playing a role in refashioning a conception of public administration: political philosophy (Aristotle, Kant, Marx, Hobbes, Locke), historiography (Weber); hermeneutics (Dilthey, Gadamer, Betti, Ricoeur), phenomenology (Hegel, Heidegger, Husserl, Merleau-Ponty), existentialism (Nietzsche, Jaspers), critical theory (Horkheimer, Adorno, Habermas), literary analysis (Thompson), anthropology (Geertz, Turner), symbolic interactionist and critical sociology (Durkheim, Goffman); and humanistic psychology (Freud, Fromm, Mitscherlich). These recent movements in administrative theory are not without precedent, however much they may be regarded as innovative or new in some of the current administrative theory discussion – the groundwork for a humanistic discussion of administration was laid in the 19th century by a broad range of social and political theorists whose work provides the conceptual touchstone for current humanistic critics.

At the same time, driven largely by neo-liberalism, the New Public Management (NPM) has developed as a newly entrenched managerialism, bolstered by a large body of promotional literature, the leadership fad, and “how-to” manuals promoted by management “gurus” masquerading as well-grounded academics and, according to Micklethwait & Wooldridge (1996), prey on organisational anxieties to sell managerial snake oil.⁶ The dominance of this perspective is supported by the direction government has taken in reshaping the public sector along these principles, increasingly applying pressure on schools of public administration to prepare their students for this world, inevitably affecting curriculum and research. Any possibility of these more humanistically oriented approaches truly affecting the development of public

⁶ Micklethwait and Wooldridge identify four major problems with current managerial fads: “it is constitutionally incapable of self-criticism; that its terminology usually confuses rather than educates; that it rarely rises above basic common sense; and that it is faddish and bedevilled by contradictions that would not be allowed in more rigorous disciplines” (1996 p. 15).

administration theoretically or practically is, for the time being, effectively lost. Haque (1996) regards this shift as a normative one, effectively causing a crisis in public administration relating to the fundamental values and conceptions of the purpose and role of administration for the public sector. Where the public tradition has been governed by values and ethical standards rooted in social equity, the public interest, citizenship, welfare, and constitutional values, accompanied by professional standards of legality, representativeness, responsibility, accountability, commitment, responsiveness, equality and public disclosure, the new managerialism is grounded in norms of individual self-interest, utility, productivity, profitability, and efficiency. This is seen most clearly, according to Haque, in the increasing dominance of policy studies derived from utilitarian market culture and public choice theory heavily oriented towards a view of the public and public officials as driven by 'utilitarian, selfish economic interests' rather than a conception of the good society, and the good administrator that goes with it.

However, it is possible to outline what a humanistic public administration would be in general terms, based on traditional principles of humanism. It would be a human-focussed, individual-concerned study, grounded in the end-values of dignity and freedom, reflecting what it is to be human, and informed by values such as peace, justice, equality, and human rights presupposing tolerance and personal responsibility to oneself and others. It is a perspective from which administration is viewed as worlds that are humanly created, and therefore alterable. Its emphasis is on constructing a life of meaning on the basis of individual decision and choice, applied to all administratively encountered situations, events, objects, and relationships. It assumes that the individual is capable of becoming aware and creative in spite of the many psychological, social, and historical forces constraining these potentialities. In codified form, the humanist tradition, beginning with Greek rationalism departed from ancient mythologies and the authority of the clergy, has produced a political heritage consisting of the Magna Carta which challenged the authority of the crown, Enlightenment proclamations of liberty, equality, fraternity through such documents as the US Declaration of Independence and Bill of Rights. It also includes the UN Rights of the Child, patient's Bill of Rights, the International Association of Universities' Statement on Academic Freedom, University Autonomy and Social Responsibility,⁷ and other codes that establish rights of workers and clients in various fields directly affecting administrative practice.

In other words, it is in its humanistic formulation that one finds "good" public administration in contrast to the technocratic and bureaucratic formulations of administration that Drechsler (2000) argues leads to the disempowerment of the individual, the alienation of people from the state, and the machinery of autocracy. In Central and Eastern Europe, it has taken the form of traditional Soviet-style bureaucracy producing the so-called 'homo sovieticus',⁸ and in the West the dehumanised technocrat.

A re-conceptualisation of the field as a humanities requires the development of

⁷ First proposed and adopted at a UNESCO organised conference in 1950.

⁸ Arguably, more an analytical ideal type à la Weber than a pervasive empirical personality type.

a theoretical framework and foundation for understanding administration that locates the individual in all human aspects and capacities in a central position, drawing on both the knowledge and methods of the humanities disciplines. It also involves bringing the critical spirit associated with the humanities to human aspirations and ideals as well as the flaws of the human character. It places in the forefront and as a methodological intent human personality and character, as complex and inaccessible as they are. It should be a discipline that both represents and satisfies all fundamental aspects of what it is to be human: affect, spirit, social traditions, and rationality. A humanistic approach emphasises understanding one's individual place in the administrative scheme of things, and collectively how people relate to one another in public organisation settings. It is essentially a task of creating meaning, interpreting significance, and choosing one's path for the future against the backdrop of what came before.

It also focuses on what kind of people we become in administration – not just how tasks are carried out and organisational goals are formally fulfilled, but how cognisant one is of the moral dimensions of one's work, effects on personality and character, as well as the consequences for one's personal life. Liberal humanism assumes attention to a conception of the human condition composed of mind, identity, creativity, choice, capacity for sympathy and empathy, and a critical and interpretive approach to the organisational means by which we express these through politics, power, authority, and language. The goal of humanism is self-understanding and a unification of the moral, aesthetic and spiritual, rather than the compartmentalisation that the bureaucratic or technocratic imposes, including the right to resist and the right to civil disobedience. In contrast with the impersonalisation of bureaucracies, humanism does not mean disassociating oneself from cultural and religious traditions and personal history, or one's family and community relations. It examines administration and management in much the same way that Maranville argues that business and economics should be approached if appropriately united with the liberal arts, that is, 'as a complex of social, cultural, historical, and philosophical interactions'. In this way, he argues, business management can overcome its primary failing of ignoring the subjective and qualitative, laying a greater foundation for judgment and intelligence (1999, pp. 50-51).

A humanistic public administration, then, should be a discipline oriented toward an appreciation and support for what it means to be fully human, and to aid in the search for and construction of meaning, rather than a scientised technocratic training. As such, liberal humanism is necessarily positioned against a structural-functional, systems administrative studies tradition. The intent is not to lead to better managerial principles of efficiency and effectiveness, but to an authentic appreciation of the human truths in organisations. If anything, liberal humanism's task in practical terms is to remove those administrative impediments that inhibit free expression, choice, compassion and an overall concern for well-being. The perspective I am constructing here is similar to what Burrell & Morgan describe as the 'radical humanist' paradigm, whose intent is to demythologise the 'ideological super-

⁹ While Burrell and Morgan do acknowledge a role for idealism and existentialism in their definition of radical humanism, their paradigm is more closely tied to the Marxist and neo-Marxist traditions than I am

structures' that dominate consciousness of our social world, in other words, to combat alienation and false consciousness (1979 p. 32).⁹

I would like to contrast two statements about research and the human subject that characterise the approach I am writing against, and one that suggests what I am aiming at. First, from Selznick:

The design and maintenance of organizations is often a straightforward engineering proposition. When the goals of the organization are clear-cut, and when choices can be made on the basis of known and objective technical criteria, the engineer rather than the leader is called for. (1957, p. 137)

This is domination of the technical-rational kind translated into management terms, a belief in a technology of administration, creating standardisation in values, decision-making, and conduct. In other words, impersonalisation and control. Contrastingly, in reviewing a book Clifford Geertz once commented:

This is a book about the "primary male-female differences in sexuality among humans," in which the following things are not discussed: guilt, wonder, loss, self-regard, death, metaphor, justice, purity, intentionality, cowardice, hope, judgment, ideology, humor, obligation, despair, trust, malice, ritual, madness, forgiveness, sublimation, pity, ecstasy, obsession, discourse, and sentimentality. It could be only one thing, and it is. Sociobiology. (1980)

Geertz's list represents the general categories of humanities knowledge: aspirations and ideals, morality, and language. It is centred on the human individual, rather than abstracted social, organisational or institutional architectonics, and, as such, includes more traditional "narrative" history as a humanities discipline. One can add to the list: deceit, lust for power, and creativity. In administrative terms, this includes much of organisational life that falls outside the formal and sanctioned: secrecy, or the covert; ethics in terms of the dark side of power and authority, and moral dilemmas; cultural dimensions including myths and rituals (and the cultural differences among staff); administration in extremis, that is, under extreme conditions like revolution, decolonisation, wars, societal transitions; the ideational level both in terms of ideological compliance and civil disobedience in administration; the aesthetics of authority and power; the biographical, investigating the development of personality and character; the spiritual in its existential form; the role humour plays; and the erotic as both a natural dimension of interpersonal relations and sexual politics. These excludanda, however, constitute the very stuff of the humanities. And from a humanities perspective, are really the only things that matter in investigating human

proposing here. The radical humanist perspective developed here is a combination of many of the elements Burrell and Morgan ascribe also to the interpretive tradition, oriented towards what Weber would call *Verstehen*, with potential for the emancipatory goals associated with neo-Marxism and critical theory.

experience in administration.

The humanities disciplines

The disciplines presented here, traditionally accepted as those of the core humanities – history, philosophy,¹⁰ anthropology,¹¹ and the fine arts – are discussed in only general terms and with illustrative examples for their potential in addressing administrative life. One distinguishing dimension of the humanities is the nature of its questions, oriented toward understanding (*Verstehen*), interpretation and critique.¹² Applied to the public administration realm, they produce a distinctive discipline for which purely structural, functional, and formalist explanations mask true underlying realities.

The first category of questions is concerned with what it means to BE an administrator, beyond and underlying the professional duties and technical skills formally prescribed. This is an ontological question bound up with identity formation, deeply held values and capacities of the human spirit. Rather than asking in a more reified way, what is public administration, one would ask existentially, what is the administrative experience, or more authentically, how does one live administratively? Following Kierkegaard, should one ask what does it mean to be an administrator through the nature and direction of one's perpetual becoming? What is the significance of and relationship among commitment, free will, imagination, and humour? What roles do emotion and the erotic play?¹³ The transcendental? What constitutes mind beyond the truncated models of conscious and rational decision-making? What assumptions are made about the human constitution? For example, is Kant's contention that human nature is fundamentally fallible, composed of the 'crooked timber' of radical evil giving rise to inevitable corruptions and evils fundamental to an understanding of the administrative persona? As well as regarding oneself in one's full humanity, should one as an administrator, as Buber suggests in *I and Thou*, view others in their complete and complex humanity? Or is it being passive, composed of deference towards external authority and bowing to the pressures of personality politics, or is it intellectually and morally more robust? How extensive is the experiential – can one really assume that actions one takes not contaminate the organisational community one is a member of? What is one willing to be disturbed by – is one willing to experience administrative angst?

The second category concerns behaviour, essentially an ethical category, consisting of decisions, actions, and the quality of social relations. The positive ethics

¹⁰ Theology, also, can be placed in this tradition, however, I am not pursuing it outside the philosophy of religion.

¹¹ Anthropology, while sometimes viewed as a social science, is treated here as a highly symbolic-oriented discipline, sharing many of the same features as the traditional humanities.

¹² Collectively, these variously draw on phenomenology, hermeneutics, ethnography, historiography, literary criticism and critical theory and other humanities-based approaches to inform theoretical frameworks and research.

¹³ Generally, the emotional and erotic are excluded from structural-functional or technical-rational discussions of the administrator, however, I would posit here that it is not just that they are granted little or no meaningfulness, but that there is a fear of the emotional and erotic in organisational life bureaucratically oriented, due to an inherent puritanical fundamentalism of bureaucratic mentality.

of freedom, liberty of thought and conscience, free inquiry, respect for diversity and privacy, and the right to pursue one's own lifestyle need to be tempered by an acceptance of individual obligations, responsibilities, and duties, accompanied by moderation, self-restraint, self-control, and the adoption of the common moral duties of truth-telling, promise-keeping, concern and care of others, and fairness, in other words, good will. The converse – corruption, pursuit of self-interest, abuse of power and privilege, domination, oppression, dehumanisation – are of central concern. In the administrative realm, these ought to be accompanied by sensitivity, sympathy and empathy – and an acknowledgement that decisions always have personal effect (contrary to the common administrative adage that many decisions are not meant personally, but collectively over time create dehumanised organisational cultures). The more problematic forms of social relation are found in the politics of organisation: do they consist of collegial connections, or are they composed of damaging networks, alliances, closing of ranks, accompanied by scapegoating, exploitation, degradation, alienation, demonisation, and exclusion? Another way to look at politics is through an examination of covert practices – how many decisions take place behind closed doors, between actors who manipulate social relations to their own and their allies' ends? And finally, following Bonhoeffer (1955, 1963), what risk is one willing to incur to act on principle? Essentially, this approach leads to questions of personality and character, instead of technical expertise, professional qualifications, and rank.

The third set of questions concerns what form administration should take. I have in mind here a broader notion than, yet one inclusive of, organisational design and restructuring. The social world as it is constructed is essentially an aesthetics function through the creation of form and representation. This includes the shaping of interpersonal relations through ritual, ceremony, social roles, dramaturgy, and the narrative forms that demarcate worldview and value horizons such as stories, myths, and legends. It includes the totemic, the symbolic and the iconography of administration, and the principles governing style in the material culture of architecture, furnishings, and technology that structure cognition, language, and action. From an aesthetic perspective, for example, how do the productanda like organisational charts and organograms, economic modelling, demonstrate a parsimony conforming to a utilitarian aesthetic. How are one's administrative actions embodied?

The fourth focuses on knowledge and its construction. In contrast to the dominant positivism of administration, a humanist epistemology draws more heavily for subjective reality on empathy, intuition and the tacit, finding value in ambiguity, uncertainty, dilemmas, contradictions, paradoxes, and the implicit. And for objective reality these questions rests upon a broad range of research traditions that are able to balance particularity and multi-dimensional contextualisation (e.g. history, biography, cultural anthropology) with the present-oriented and large-scale organisational models typical of sociology.¹⁴ Its explanatory goal is interpretive, critical and hermeneutic rather than predictive and controlling, eschewing the administrative

¹⁴ See Elias (1987) for a detailed discussion of the epistemological cleavage between history and sociology.

fundamentalism associated with the wielding of technical tools of management and the messianic impulse promoted in managerial leadership. Instead of ideology, a critical humanism strives for intellectualism tempered by good will (in the Kantian sense), and is oriented towards values of social justice. In a sense, it is a return to human studies grounded in social relatedness, such as the normative emphasis of traditional political philosophy, socially-minded and policy-oriented economics, historically and normatively inclined philosophy, and literary historicism that dominated prior to the 1950s when

In one professional academic field after another, then, the diachronic line, the cord of consciousness that linked the present pursuits of each to its past concerns was either cut or fraying. At the same time as they asserted their independence of the past, the academic disciplines became increasingly independent of each other as well. Far from providing any unifying premises or principles of coherence for comprehending the multiplicity of contemporary culture, the autonomous disciplines reinforced the culture's pluralism with an academic specialization that was its analytic parallel. (Schorske, 1979 p. xx)

The essence of this mentality was presaged by Goethe in *Faust II*, in a response Mephistopheles gives to the Chancellor, an early ideal type of the technocrat:

What you can't touch, is miles away to you;
What you can't grasp, is totally lacking in you;
What you can't calculate, you believe cannot be true;
What you can't weigh, has no weight for you;
What you can't cost, has no value for you.¹⁵

Finally, the last category is associated with the purposes public administration should be serving and what meaning it should have. This encompasses the temporal range from the historical to posited ideal states, and the subjective range from the individual through group to societal and global. It includes both the quality of interpersonal relationships, inter-community relations, the relationship between state and society as well as socio-political values pursued in international relations, and the service public administration provides to all these constituencies on cultural, social and political levels.¹⁶ Implicit in this perspective is a reconsideration of action appropriate to these end-values: an evaluation of action based on authority, liberty, and civil disobedience (e.g. in the form of whistle-blowing) and their underlying legitimation.

What follows here is a suggestive discussion of the role of the humanities disciplines in addressing these questions.

1. History

¹⁵ "Was ihr nicht tastet, steht euch imeilenfern;/was ihr nicht faßt, das fehlt euch ganz und gar;/was ihr nicht rechnet, glaubt ihr, sei nicht wahr;/was ihr nicht wägt, hat für euch kein Gewicht;/was ihr nicht münzt, das, meint ihr, gelte nicht." Author's translation from Goethe, *Faust* (1955 p. 12).

¹⁶ Here communitarian, governance and civil society literature is relevant.

Questions of the purpose and nature of public administration are partly historical. We are, after all, temporal creatures, both subject to historical forces as well as responsible for how change unfolds. It is not enough to say, as one frequently hears in administrative life, that individuals must simply deal the hand that has been dealt them (“that’s the way things are”). This kind of inevitability dogma, or fatalism, serves to render administrators passive, and denies the nature of forces and processes underlying the recent fashion in organisational restructuring and reform. Another major dimension of historicity is the context within which an administrative system functions in a regional or national setting – a factor that is finally being recognised by some Western critics of post-Soviet systems in appreciating the relative difficulties experienced by these “transition” states, in particular Russia, which is heir to centuries of strong cultural and geographic factors that still to a large extent influence administrative identity and practices.

Many administrative phenomena are really historical topics rather than strictly managerial problems. First, those involving external changing societal conditions: instead of regarding these simplistically as “environmental factors” characteristic of systems theory, it would be more fruitful to pursue what happens to administration under different historical conditions (e.g. colonisation and decolonisation, social unrest, revolt, revolution, new political and social values like equality and equity). Secondly, internal changes in public organisations are part of a micro-historical process that includes both structural evolution and the biographies of its participants. For example, when the type of person hired in administration changes, such as the managerial type introduced under the New Public Management into senior levels, the culture, values, mentality, and proclivities change making certain structural and functional changes or designs possible or more conducive, an example of Weber’s ‘elective affinity’. History also serves to bring into question many assumptions about the nature of administration that are falsely assumed to justify interpretations of the role of the public sector in a society and theories about management. Administration also can be seen as subject to intellectual history, in part, an examination of ideology, but also of overriding conceptions and values shaped by significant administrative theorists in national traditions. And finally, historical work is necessary in understanding and identifying causal relations: as Weber argues, only comparison can distinguish between necessary and contingent socio-political and economic causes for changes in organisations.¹⁷

In spite of the relatively minor impact of history and historical methods on public administration, particularly in the English-speaking world, a number of signifi-

¹⁷ For example, rationalisation of educational institutions may in some jurisdictions appear to result from economic factors and a desire for rationalisation as a cost-saving factor, which one could take as necessary to this kind of transformation, whereas in other jurisdictions, it has been driven more by political and ideological factors. This means that one cannot necessarily assume that economic conditions are wholly responsible for certain types of rationalisation.

¹⁸ Unlike a number of European public administration traditions, the Anglo-Saxon has been developed relatively ahistorically however has been accompanied by a number of significant historical studies in the literature, although these play an insignificant role in graduate training programmes and dominant research practices. An overview of the recent development of administrative history in other countries, accompanied by an extensive bibliography, is provided in Raadschelders (1998).

cant texts have been written in the US, Canada, and the UK for decades.¹⁸ Notable examples in the US are Leonard White's four volume study of administrative institutions (1948, 1951, 1954, 1958), Paul Van Riper's *History of the U.S. Civil Service* (1958), Sidney Aronson's *Status and Kinship in the Higher Civil Service* (1964), Stephen Skowronek's *Building a New American State* (1982), and Ralph Chandler's *A Centennial History of the American Administrative State* (1987). In Canada, J. Granatstein's *The Ottawa Men* (1982) and J. Hodgetts et al. *The Biography of an Institution* (1972) have provided significant historical perspective, and in the UK, Samuel Finer's three volume *The History of Government* (1997), have provided significant historical perspective.¹⁹ However, in the North American public administration literature, much more attention is paid to the history of administrative theory than actual history of administration, a consequence of a continuing heavy domination by positivistic research and some of the more radical post-modern theory that is arguably anti-historical.

The adequate scope and structure of administrative history is debatable. While some authors promote conducting historical studies replicating organisational structural and functional categories of administration (e.g. Gladden 1972; Molitor 1983), a less restrictive and historically broader approach, informed more by social, political and cultural history, are conceptions offered by Madara (1980), Tiuhonen (1989) and Raadschelders (1998) that include institutions, ideas or ideologies, customs, relations with society, type of domination, and the civil service.

One feature of history as a discipline, is its particularist nature, emphasising the role of individuals and the conditions under which they act, whereas administration, as it is predominantly studied as a discipline, suppresses or ignores conditions of individuality except for significant elite figures and is largely a- if not anti-historical.²⁰ Despite significant historical studies in the field, public administration still suffers from a 'persistent atemporality'. (Adams 1992) Generally, the history of administration one finds in administration texts is an acknowledgement only of developments in the nineteenth century when the current form of modern bureaucracy appeared in the industrialised world, in contrast with the view of Waldo (1956, 1980), Nash (1969), Cooper et al. (1998), and Raadschelders (1998) who regard administrative history as beginning in the ancient world. Waldo & Nash press it back to pre-history through evidence achievable in archaeology. According to Caiden (1994), public administration has 'concentrated on the emergence of the administrative state, virtually ignoring anything that preceded it'. It is generally accepted to be the 'product' of political science, social psychology, economics (Frederickson 1979), law, sociology, and business administration,²¹ and only more lately of anthro-

¹⁹ Noted for approaching the field as an ideographic discipline more akin to the humanities than the conventional social sciences.

²⁰ See D. Waldo, *The Study of Public Administration* (1955, p. 16); G. Nash, *Perspectives on Administration: The Vistas of History* (1969, p. 1); and J. Raadschelders, *Handbook of Administrative History* (1998, p. 5).

²¹ H. McCurdy, *Public Administration: A Bibliographic Guide to the Literature* (1986, p. 17), who lists the preceding six.

pology through organisation studies and philosophy in values analysis and problems of administrative ethics.

Rugge's survey of selected international administration journals²² in 1993 demonstrates that the percentage of articles and reviews of an historical nature rarely exceeds 6% with the exception of *Die Verwaltung* whose percentage is approximately 15%. Raadschelders' recent survey of major international journals in administration, political science and (one in) history²³ confirms Rugge's general conclusion that 'the field of public administration does not devote much attention to the past'. While there is a general trend of increasing interest from 1973 to 1992, generally peaking in the period from 1981 to 1984, the percentages rarely exceeded 10% (with many under 5%), with the exception of the UK *Public Administration* journal (ranging from 3.7 to 21.1 during this period) and *Comparative Studies in Society and History* (ranging from 15.4 to 33%). McCurdy's survey of the most frequently cited books in administration demonstrates also that historical works, biography, and subjectively-oriented studies play virtually no role in the field (1986, pp. 3-9). This should be no surprise: as Borins has noted of graduate schools of public administration in Canada, not dissimilar to those in the US, faculty positions are heavily representative of economics and political science PhDs primarily oriented toward public policy analysis (Borins 1990). In his survey of programmes, it is clear that history plays no obvious role in the curricula in Canadian schools of public administration. While there is a greater development of administrative history in France, Germany, Great Britain, and Italy (Raadschelders 1998, p. 30), it is closely entwined with political and constitutional history, and in the case of German scholarship, with legal history (Raadschelders, 1998 p. 4).

A number of fruitful areas in administrative history that bring into question many assumptions made by an ahistorical, and, in the English-speaking world, largely parochial discipline, include the following: Examination of the development of modern public administration in Prussia, which was very much part of the liberalist movement and a force for reform and social change at the time of Hardenberg and von Stein, belies public administration's current conservative character (and problems associated with reform of administrative regimes). Another topic is the relationship between Freemasonry and the development of modern public administration, including philosophical principles of citizenship and human rights as they are reflected in the 18th and 19th century drafting of constitutional documents and accompanying administrative orders, oftentimes, by freemasonry members. In contrast to some of the radical feminist critique of administration, which assumes a male-dominated history of administrative power and practice, there are valuable periods in which women wielded organisational and political power, not unlike that

²² F. Rugge 1993, 'Eine Wissenschaft ohne Vergangenheit – eine Geschichte ohne Zukunft? Ein kleiner Streifzug durch verwaltungswissenschaftliche Zeitschriften', *Jahrbuch für Europäische Verwaltungsgeschichte*, vol. 5, pp. 369-380. The following journals are surveyed: *Public Administration* (UK), *Public Administration Review*, *öffentliche Verwaltung*, *Die Verwaltung*, *Revista trimestale de scienza dell'amministrazione*, *Amministrazione*, *Administrative Science Quarterly*.

²³ *Administration & Society*, *Political Studies* (UK), *Public Administration* (UK), *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *Die Öffentliche Verwaltung*, *Public Administration Review*, *Bestuurswetenschappen*, *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *Revue Française de Science Politique*.

of their male counterparts – particularly evident in medieval abbesses like Hrotswitha von Gandersheim and Hildegard von Bingen.

Administrative history is also marginal to the field of history. Waldo argues that administration is generally conceived of ‘as the lives of great men, as the stories of nations, as the influence of economics, and so forth’ (1955, p. 16), or as legal-institutional studies (1956, p. 60). For Nash, institutional administrative studies developed as a ‘by-product of political history’ (1969, p. 25). The historical treatment of administration is incidental to political, economic and social development, often collapsed into a study of the ‘machinery of government’ (Waldo 1956, p. 61; Raadschelders 1998, p. 250) or tends to focus on the relationships between senior administrators and political actors and regimes. Or, as Waldo argues (1956, pp. 67-68), historical accounts of administrative activities are not identified as such, for example V. Gordon Childe’s chapter on ‘The Urban Revolution in Mesopotamia’ in *What Happened in History*, in which the supervision of agricultural activities by priests as members of divine households is described, or Behringer’s *Shaman of Oberstdorf* (1998), examining the judicial administration of witchcraft trials in 17th century self-governing and self-administering towns like Nuremburg and Oberstdorf and self-administering trades organisations, the guilds.

Another form of conflation affecting both history and public administration studies is that of administration to bureaucracy. Bureaucratic studies emphasise the administrative apparatus of the state, concentrating on the rational features of organisation – such as structural and functional characteristics, rules, procedures and provisions – instead of capturing the agency of individuals, particularly those not at the apex of the bureaucratic pyramid. While Waldo and Raadschelders promote historical study, they also fall victim to bureaucentrism: Waldo advocates an administrative history based in the POSDCORB (planning, organising, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, budgeting) perspective (1956, pp. 58-59), emphasising these functional features of formal managerial action, and Raadschelders focuses on macro- and meso-level historical analyses of administrative systems (1998, pp. 6-8, 23). The result is that little attention is paid to the problem of individual agency or issues beyond organisational demands.

There is, therefore, a two-fold problem of agency in administrative history. History is a low priority in administrative studies, compounded by a concentration on formal organisational requirements of bureaucratic-style organisations and interest in the present and short-term future dictated by a managerial horizon, to the detriment of individual agency. Detailed administrative analysis is a relatively unfamiliar approach in historical studies, compromising the degree to which agency can be determined to play a role in administration history, particularly at middle and lower levels of organisational hierarchies.

Historical study includes another vital area: biographical writings. Not only are they important in determining the key role individuals play, arguably a richer and more significant approach than much of leadership and charismatic literature. Surveys and even interviews cannot substitute for the complexities of contextualised decision-making, power, and interpersonal relations captured in autobiography, memoir, and correspondence complemented by the documentary and archival evidence typically examined in historical research. Biographical study helps to over-

come a constraint in administrative life – invisibility. In part, this is a function of structural-functional and systems approaches in the field, which tend to eliminate individuals from examinations of organisations, but it is also a consequence of a professional ethos restricted by statutory requirements of secrecy and confidentiality, and the anonymity required in the tradition of ministerial responsibility. This is complemented by a socialised obedience to authority, most highly developed in bureaucratised organisations. Lifting the veil of secrecy and removing the mask of anonymity only happens in many circumstances when retired civil servants publish memoirs and letters, and only then can the complex conditions under which senior officials worked be uncovered.²⁴ One field in which this is critically important is Soviet-period Russian administrative history – biographical sources provide a necessary realistic counterpart to Kremlinologist-style analyses of Soviet practices, overburdened by inapplicable “Western” social theories and a strong tendency to over-generalise Soviet administration as a monolithic, homogeneous system.

2. Philosophy

Public administration is also partly a philosophical field, concerned with understanding thought, knowledge and conduct. A few authors have approached the field from an explicitly philosophical perspective: for example, Christopher Hodgkinson in *Towards a Philosophy of Administration* (1978) and *Administrative Philosophy* (1996), and Rosamund Thomas in *The British Philosophy of Administration* (1978). However, an explicitly developed philosophical discussion is eclipsed by the many administrative theory textbooks that identify the theories, concepts, models and approaches, tending toward a distillation of material primarily from sociology, political science (rather than political philosophy, even if Marx and Hegel are noted, en passant), and psychology.

A central problem from a philosophical perspective is ‘diminished capacity’. Certainly there are ontological and epistemological aspects to the field, and much more work to be done drawing on political philosophy (for example Hegel), but ethics has been of most interest to me, for it is here that some fundamental aspects of administration are implicated: what principles one uses to inform decisions and actions, what one’s notion of professionalism is, how one judges the consequences of one’s actions, and what dilemmas one recognises and faces. This means redefining the administrator as a moral agent, rather than one who defers to superiors or a rationalised code of conduct. To not wrestle with morality personally, is, in existential terms, bad faith, and a derogation of one’s personal responsibility. To look the shadow, or dark, side in the eye implies having fashioned a cohesive administrative identity suffused with higher order values and principles through retaining some measure of meaningfulness beyond organisational terms, having achieved some clarity about what motivates one, and assuming some portion of responsibility for the overall character of the organisation of which one is a part.

An interesting related problem arises in both Kant and Weber’s work. For

²⁴ Particularly in foreign service biographical writings (memoirs, letters, and autobiographies), which are plentiful.

Weber, the ‘mature man’ is one who is informed by both the ethics of responsibility (*Verantwortungsethik*), characterised generally by the external structures of authority, and by the ethics of conviction (*Gesinnungsethik*), that requires an inner search for higher order principles not bound to any regime structure. For Kant, as well, moral behaviour consists in adhering to the categorical imperative, that is, in not treating others simply as a means, and in thinking independently with a view to contributing to a moral community. For Kant, this did not mean exhibiting a servile adherence to rules, his or anyone else’s,²⁵ but it is achieved instead through the exercise of one’s own freewill, moral strength and courage, and self-mastery. In other words, and contrary to most administrative and managerial writings, one cannot simply adopt an organisational perspective – one must be both of and outside the socialising effects of career.²⁶

One way to approach the diminishment of moral agency philosophically is to examine it through the problem of secular evil in both active and passive forms, through what Buber (1953), Fromm (1955), Arendt (1977), and Kekes (1990) define as causing harm through human agency. Evil behaviour (including all the little daily evils perpetrated in organisations, resulting in what some refer to as toxic cultures) can take a variety of forms that can be differentiated logically or analytically according to the individual’s intent, actions (initiative and reactive), and character. For example, one may intend an evil act, but be unable to carry it out; conversely one may not have intended an evil, but inadvertently caused an evil action. And one may have caused an evil act and done nothing to redress the harm. Or, one may have intended and carried out an evil act, yet is not habitually an evil person. In administrative terms, evil translates into harm done by those holding an organisational position, by virtue of their position and access to resources and influence. The rationale for recasting administrative theory into such a normative mode, and concentrating on evil as one of its dimensions, is as a means of evaluating the human consequences both for those within the organisation and as a quality of “service” to its clientele.

A more intriguing and perhaps pervasive problem in bureaucratic organisations one could frame as “Passive Evil in Administration: The Moral Implications of Doing Nothing”. Abrogating one’s moral responsibility is a phenomenon recognised for centuries. But two formulations of particular application to administration are Edmund Burke’s, ‘The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing’ and Hannah Arendt’s ‘The sad truth is that most evil is done by people who never made up their minds to be either good or evil’. And, given the organisational conditions in a bureaucracy that support or encourage passivity through obedience to authority, inclination to groupthink, and the diffusion of responsibility, the ethics of doing nothing is a pervasive problem.

For the examination of ethics related to power, authority, and politics inspired by a theological disposition, two important writers come to mind, Reinhold Niebuhr

²⁵ A frequently mistaken impression conveyed in administrative ethics writings, that Kant expected a slavish adherence to rules (sic) he laid down in the *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*.

²⁶ For another perspective on the limiting effects of scientised public administration, see Gadamer’s essay ‘Die Grenzen der Experten’ (‘Limitations of the Expert’) for a critique of the morally and politically debilitating consequences of positivistically-dominated human studies fields for both research and practice.

and Dietrich Bonhoeffer, whose writings have not yet been examined for their implications for administration. Niebuhr (1932, 1968) approached these issues by practicing a dialectic method of evaluating social and political policy setting Machiavellian politics against a Christian notion of the common good, oriented toward building a foundation for a social ethics informed by Christian theology, cognisant of historical factors, and aimed at achieving social justice. Bonhoeffer's theology, in particular, is relevant for administrative studies. By establishing a theology embedded in a concept of sociality,²⁷ he laid a foundation from which to articulate ethical standards for the individual's relationship to political leadership, the state, and its administrative arms (e.g. 1955, 1963).

3. Anthropology

One can also regard anthropology as belonging to the humanities in so far as it is highly narrative in character, focussing on ritual and ceremonial structures, as well as values, belief systems, symbols, myths, legends, cautionary tales, and material culture. It is also through this approach that one can capture more elusive aspects of climate, culture and politics; particularly attitudes towards power and authority that can either enhance or damage people's working relations. Culture is responsible for socialising, or enculturating, people into the organisation through rites of passage and integration, and maintain or reinforce the existing power structures through rites of degradation, intimidation, and conflict reduction. It is also the source of counter-cultures of resistance, sustaining one's independent identity, and providing critique. Humour, also, is important in this respect, as bureaucratic humour can be used as a safe form of critique or avoidance, ways of coping with unhealthy or toxic cultures,²⁸ or as a weapon in the political arsenal.

It is possible to "read" administrative behaviour through a cultural lens – and by doing so demonstrate that much of what is assumed to be rational, is, in fact, habitual, and therefore resistant to change, except as a cultural development. If one examines the structuring of time, space and behaviour culturally, one can see that most activity can be captured under a scheme of ritual categories: calendrical rituals, interaction rituals, and outward signs – all of which adequately explain the majority of administrative life. Everything from the structuring and conduct of meeting, to the structuring and substance of daily work and social relations, are created and bound by the culture of the organisation. Legitimacy is constructed through taboo, reinforced by organisational myth and legend, and maintained through regular enactment.

While culture had been regarded as a more trivial or less meaningful aspect of the informal organisation, in the last twenty years it has come to be accepted as a central functional aspect of administration. There exists here, though, a theoretical, and ultimately practical, problem. A functionalist approach to administrative cul-

²⁷ Drawing upon a long tradition of liberal theology grappling with the relationship between Christian ethics and politics, including Adolf von Harnack and Karl Barth.

²⁸ Here both Jungian and Freudian psychologies can contribute to explaining the significance of humour in organisational life.

ture, promulgated through the recent fashion in popular leadership techniques and managerialism tends towards a highly simplistic model of culture, presumably to enable easy packaging for sales in the lucrative management training market and accessibility to the broadest audience (even to the extent of promising that everyone can become a leader). On a practical level, superficial manipulations of cultural factors do not “take”. A more anthropologically sound, yet far more complex and demanding approach yielding interpretive and critical power, is a symbolic approach. One of the most fruitful and theoretically grounded approaches is found in literature derived from Smircich’s (1983) ‘root metaphor’ model in which culture is seen to be the product of thought, language and interaction expressed in images, symbols, rituals, and styles of behaviour.

4. Fine Arts: The Aesthetic Critique

Pioneering work in the 20th century in English on aesthetic approaches to administration were conducted in symbolic interactionism giving rise to dramaturgy studies, largely influenced by Erving Goffman (1959). A major constraint to a purely aesthetic study until the 1990s has been the expressive viewed through a sociological and social psychology lens, and the dominance of functionalist cultural studies in administration. Additionally, dramaturgical studies went into decline in the mid-1980s as it seemed that little new could be attained, effectively ending contributions the dramaturgical could have made just as leadership studies became fashionable, monopolising discussion of expressive and organisational form.

The true origin of an aesthetic critique of administration, however, derives in the modern historical period in large part from German idealism, for which the aesthetic is integral to creative cognitive processes leading to insight, intellectual freedom, concept formation. Two of the earliest representatives of this tradition were Baumgarten (1750), who proposed an aesthetic theory of knowledge for socially-oriented studies, and Kant (1790), for whom there was a concrete correlation of particulars and conceptual representation. Subsequent writers pursuing this line include Schelling (1807), who adopted a romantic emphasis on the antirational, organic, and vital and the individual, aesthetic intelligence creates the world, Schiller (1795), for whom beauty mediated between the sensible and the rational, Hegel (1807, 1832-40), for whom beauty is the rational rendered sensible, sensible appearance being the form in which the rational is made manifest through symbolic art, classical art and romantic art, and Schopenhauer (1818), through his theory of representation. Aesthetic analysis was carried from this tradition into social and political theory, through Vico, Nietzsche, Croce, Dilthey, Simmel, Weber (through neo-Kantian theory), Cassirer, Maritain, Collingwood, Whitehead, Dewey, Heidegger, and Langer. For Cassirer, for example, conventional artistic activity serves an ordering function to our understanding: ‘Art gives us order in the apprehension of visible, tangible, and audible appearances ... The infinite potentialities of which we had but a dim and obscure presentiment are brought to light by the lyric poet, by the novelist, and by the dramatist’. (1956, pp. 213, 215)

It has only been since 1990 that an organisational aesthetics, using aesthetic philosophy as a foundational discipline combined with aesthetic aspects of organisa-

tional culture, has developed. Antonio Strati (e.g. 1990, 1992, 1999) can be credited with a consistent development in this vein, subsequently followed by Gagliardi (1996), Ramirez (1996), and White (1996). This approach avoids 'any distinction between what is a piece of artwork and what is an object of routine practice, and between what are art events and the events of every day life' (Strati 1992, p. 570). As a study of form and the meanings it holds, the arts encourage people to see new meanings in formal relationships, provide understanding of emotion and ideas in their relation to form, and allow one to recombine elements in searching for potentialities for new patterns and new meanings.²⁹ The arts also encourage and guide creativity and higher order judgment, aspects of cognition not adequately included in rational decision-making models.

Administration is accessible to aesthetic analysis like any other human creation – both in its formal properties and in what one could term its social utility (e.g. aims, enjoyments, ascriptions, psychological and epistemic factors). The underlying principles of an aesthetic critique include: the construction and representation of administrative activity and organisational form both by its membership and the outside world; the acceptance of social reality as heterogeneous, dynamic and conflictual or even contradictory (since significant organisational and subjective change is inherent to the phenomenon); and viewing organisational activity as creatively and continuously evolving – symbols, myths, and customs are themselves the products of processes borne out of a continuous flux. The primary media of expression for an administrative aesthetic are the material culture, social action, and the presentation of ideas. Through these, meaning is created, emotional, existential and rational needs are satisfied, and politics (both internal to the organisation and its role in constructing and perpetuating political regimes) is conducted. In administrative terms, the aesthetic has a number of social functions: structuring organisational form and content; masking or denying unpleasant realities by inducing, sustaining, and rewarding compliance; structuring, sustaining, and conveying meaningful social action; and constructing and conveying, if not reinforcing, ethical and political norms.

The argument made here, is that by viewing administration as an aesthetic activity, it is therefore appropriate to use aesthetic criticism in research and analysis to arrive at an understanding of administrative experience not wholly captured in the social sciences. For example, one could meaningfully use Lessing's principle of *Materialgerechtigkeit*: treating the unique qualities of the material with respect and employing it to bring out its full potential rather than treating the aesthetic as incidental, thereby seeing that the medium of the art influences the way subject matter is presented.³⁰ Or, one can draw on Gottschalk's (1962, pp. 1-14) thesis of creativity as an interaction between the artist and the material producing an imaginative reintegration of symbolic elements. His four principles of artistic form apply easily

²⁹ The possibilities for aesthetic understanding are seen, for example, in some Western and Eastern European perspectives, which still incorporate literary reference in their discussion of social relations, a feature of administrative intellect that was more common in Anglo-Saxon discourse before the strong rationalisation effects in the field starting in the 1960s, particularly among senior administrative officials.

³⁰ Essentially the same conception credited later to Marshall McLuhan, in 'the medium is the message'.

to social action: 1) centrality, an overriding theme, element, figure or idea; 2) harmony or controlled recurrence, like repletion, thematic variation or parallelism; 3) balance, such as the play between opposites, or contrast; and 4) development, such as a progression of events that can be seen in an author's introduction of characters, plot complication, climax and unravelling. Collectively the arts of charisma are a comprehensive social aesthetic in the Wagnerian sense of *Gesamtkunstwerk* (total work of art), an approach that can be analytically organised along conventional arts disciplines: the architectural and artefactual, the performative or theatrical, and the literary.

An aesthetic critique is suggested in a number of "classical" theorists, particularly those who introduced leadership concepts into administrative studies. Weber, more accurately viewing the charismatic as a form of legitimate authority that is at least latently inherent in any organisation, however bureaucratic, associated personality, inner freedom, spontaneity, and imaginative flights of genius with charisma, in contrast to the legal-rational qualities providing a tension in bureaucratic life of routine, mass identity, convention, institutional rules, and drudgery and boredom. Following Weber's tradition, at least in part, Burns identified a number of aesthetic functions as central to leadership and its senior administration: a creative intellectual capacity (1978, p. 163) resulting in new institutions (1978, p. 454) and performative abilities (1978, p. 244). House emphasised 'creative or innovative quality' and impression management (1977, pp. 190, 205-206). Bennis & Givant (1975) and Willner (1968) also attribute powerful creative potential to expressive skills. Bass, drawing largely from this literature, regards the stimulation of followers' imagination (1985, p. 62) as the use of impression management and 'symbolism, mysticism, imagery and fantasy' to construct and convey distal goals and utopian outcomes (1985, p. 6).

More recent writers, although collapsing the distinction between charisma and administration, have emphasised creative social action as it causes change in administration, further establishing an implicit aesthetic analysis. Conger & Kanungo (1988a, 1988b, 1988c), Shamir et al. (1993), Boal & Bryson (1988) have been most active in developing this perspective, through their emphasis of administrative leadership (as charisma) in mythmaking, using impression management, articulating a vision, using the 'skills of artful persuasion and meaning making' being expressive of feelings, aesthetic values and self-concepts, and 'intimately and unusually involved in the creation of a new or different world ... [consisting] of all the sensory, affective, and cognitive events subjectively experienced by the actor' (Boal & Bryson 1988, pp. 12-13).

Architectural and Artefactual Analysis

Architecture and the inner furnishings of bureaucratic sites provide a valuable source for capturing both the explicit messages and values of an organisation, and also the often contradictory and underlying social realities. Such an analysis is provided by Guillén (1997), who examines the relationship between scientific management values (unity, order, purity) and European modernist architecture (German Bauhaus, Italian Rationalism and Futurism, French Purism, and Soviet

Constructivism).

Power and politics is expressed architecturally through horizontal and vertical location of significant structures – symbolic dimensions and positioning of major government buildings, and hierarchical location of executive level government officials' offices, and central agencies wielding power in the administrative landscape are what Duffy calls 'bürolandschaft in excelsis' (1992, xii). Even a brief historical overview reveals that grandiosity is the administrative (not just political) expression of power and resources, seen in the processional arcade leading to the Babylonian Ishtar Gate, the Egyptian pyramids, Roman senate building, and the monumentalism of Stalin and Hitler's apparatus (what could be termed the 'Ozymandias syndrome' from Shelley). So-called democratic regimes also tend to grandiosity: symbolic monuments of Kennedy's NASA or Reagan's 'Star Wars' programmes, and the competing architectural expansiveness of American and Soviet intelligence departments. On a much smaller scale in the educational realm, it is not uncommon for departing university presidents to erect symbolic structures to permanently embody their term in office.

Architectural and artefactual elements reproduce dominant ideologies and social relations, reinforcing disciplinary divisions and hierarchies (open space structures representing different attitudes toward power and authority). Hierarchical position is signalled by the quality of design, materials, and construction, examined in Strati's study of offices (1992) and chairs (1996), and Witkin's (1990) study of conference rooms. Even the reassignment of space holds significance in an aesthetic critique. Höpfl (2002) has examined incidents of 'the cancellation of the space' producing a melancholy aesthetic and a 'saprophytic' consumption of dismembered attributes of organisational members, appropriated to work goals. A well-known private sector organisation, Microsoft, exemplifies the role of the architectural on its main Campus in Redmond, Washington. Architecture was used, at least in Microsoft's earlier organisationally charismatic history, to create and convey an intentional departure from conventional corporate practices: all offices remained relatively small (including that of Bill Gates), relatively simply and inexpensively furnished, and buildings were designed to maximise horizontal extension allowing for equal access to windows, with a central hub for amenities and facilities. Dress codes throughout most divisions are idiosyncratic, and individual offices can be completely transformed to create a highly personalised (and at times startling) environment. These features represent and embody intentional idiosyncratic interactional styles: a high degree of structural fluidity, intensive work style, and a confrontational style of communication. The atmosphere and working social relations are not unlike those of a research university, however, as Microsoft has enlarged and diversified its activities, it is taking on what Weber refers to as the routinisation of charisma, in this case bureaucratic principles are being integrated into their administrative style.

Examples of architectural theories applied to administrative embodiment are the following:

- 1) Representational theory: structures with a primitive natural reference, like

columns in classical buildings representing tree trunks – a theme dominating Nazi architecture.

- 2) Semantic theory: buildings that denote other man-made objects, like the Sydney Opera House a sailing boat.
- 3) Exemplification: details of a building retaining a reference to the means of construction, as in Gothic cathedrals' "soaring" walls, popular now with post-modern architecture.
- 4) Functionalism: modernist architecture's symmetry of form and function – form is aesthetically appropriate to the utility for which it was designed (however, austere functionalism as purely utilitarian, does not synthesise a sophisticated aesthetic idea with function – in other words it is both ugly and depressingly functional on the lowest order)

Complementing these general architectural styles, are Wölfflin's (1950) analysis of style that allows for a more detailed and critical treatment of organisational values and their expression through structures of power and influence:

- 1) Painterly rather than Linear: stress is placed on the limitless quality of the objects as part of an apprehension of the world as shifting semblances, instead of the line acting as the path of vision resulting in a perception of an object by its tangible character in which is stressed the limits of things as isolated, solid bodies
- 2) Recession rather than Plane: objects represented in depth instead of in a plane
- 3) Open rather than Closed: presenting objects contextually instead of as objects as part of finite wholes
- 4) Multiplicity over Unity: viewing objects as a harmony of free parts, instead of as parts interrelated in a single theme
- 5) Relative instead of Absolute clarity: representing things as they look and seen as a whole instead of singly (as parts)

The highly bureaucratic tends toward the linear, plane, closed, unitarian, and absolute ends of these continua, whereas many theories of public administration arguing for more open, democratic, and good governance models exemplify a conceptual shift to the other ends.

Performative or Theatrical Analysis

The performative consists of those theatrical elements that shape interpersonal relations: its roles, scripts, and styles of interaction, and the structuring necessary in staging organisational life. An early source for this perspective is found in Machiavelli's *The Prince*, where he elaborates on the functional role of theatre for both rulership and its administration in conspicuous displays, lavish and costly garments, elaborate rituals, royal progresses and 'joyeuses entrées'. From the school of critical theory, Walter Benjamin (1979) regarded the social and political as a stage

for social performance, providing a fruitful approach to a more detailed analysis of administrative power and privilege. The administrative leadership literature also regards the performative as critical to success: Katz (1972) noted that a 'natural' performance appears to flow out easily from within; for Bass (1988), they are great actors and always 'on stage', using dramatic and persuasive words and actions; Conger & Kanungo (1988) identify the specific expressive modes of action to be verbal, appearance, body language; and Awamleh & Gardner (1999) note the performative qualities of eye contact, fluency, gestures, facial expressiveness, eloquence, energy and voice tone variety.

Gardner & Avolio (1998) suggest four dimensions to organisational dramaturgy, and although oriented toward 'leadership', they are equally applicable to the conveyance of administrative status:

- 1) framing: communication that shapes followers' perspective and the meaning of socially constructed reality [e.g. higher order policy/goal statements], the fundamental mission;
- 2) scripting: directions that define the scene, cast roles and outline expected behaviours in dialogue through metaphor, analogue and stories, and non-verbal and emotional displays (use of eye contact, voice quality, animation, gestures, touch, body posture, speaking rate);
- 3) staging: including the 'set' design, various props that serve organisational purpose (in leadership terms, the furnishings), costumes, and lighting;
- 4) styles of performing [or character roles]: such as exemplification [portraying their integrity and moral worthiness through self-sacrifice, the underlying logic for the 'good soldier' metaphor], self-promotion, ingratiation, intimidation, and supplication.

Literary Analysis

The literary in administration has a number of social functions. It legitimates power relations, rationalises practices and traditions, conveys valuational content, as stories and legends creates the mythic foundations of organisational reality – thereby conditioning what is perceived to be real, possible, and valuable. In effect, it creates *Weltanschauung*. The organisational use of literary aesthetic is the manner in which a number of linguistic features are employed to administrative purpose: the power of rhetoric through eloquence or 'colourful, incisive, inspiring speeches'; the use of metaphor, analogy and stories; features of rhythm, repetition, balance, and alliteration; and images rather than abstracted concept-based terms. Formal literary qualities include: style; syntactic and rhetorical features (repetition, accumulation, hyperbole, climax, etc.); poetic devices (meter, rhythm, euphony, imagery and metaphor); semantic density, meaning a high level of implicit meaning; features like ambiguity, paradox, tension and irony; genre, such as romantic, comic or historical; and form, such as narrative, poetic, and dramatic.

This is also a narrative approach to administrative experience. In responding to the question, 'Is telling stories science?', Peter Reason has responded: 'The best sto-

ries are those which stir people's mind, hearts, and souls and by so doing give them new insights into themselves, their problems and their human condition. The challenge is to develop a human science that can more fully serve this aim. The question then, is not "Is story telling science?" but "Can science learn to tell good stories?" (1981, p. 50) The power of the story, whether captured through interpretive research, or through the literary writer's eye, has been recognised by few in the field until recently – McConkie & Boss (1986), Boje (1991), Hummel (1994), Czarniawska (1997), and Gabriel (2000).

There is a long, but relatively undeveloped, tradition of using literary works for administrative and management training as well as critique. The value of literature lies in its closer examination of experiential aspects of administrative life – through representation it gives order and meaning to experience, providing both an interpretation and critique. For Waldo, literature provides what the "professional-scientific" literature omits or slights: 'the concrete, the sensual, the emotional, the subjective, the valuational'. (1968c, p. 5) He identified seven ways in which literature complements social science type knowledge in administrative studies:

1. one can better understand administrative theories through the personal experience represented in literature
2. one can extend one's range of knowledge in other countries, times, and under different conditions
3. one can view the "Organisation Man" as those from the outside view him
4. one can get an emotional stimulation or release, or a sympathetic identification with a portrayed administrator dealing with a difficult decision, and the frustrations of dealing with excesses of administrative formalism, such as red tape (through literary portrayals primarily of irony, humour, sarcasm)
5. one can gain a better professional balance and humility by recognising the limits of bureaucracy and its control, particularly resistance to bureaucracy
6. literature better portrays the psychological and moral aspects of decision making
7. one can gain "wisdom" through a rounded and balanced picture, conflict of good and evil, the commingling of rational and irrational, noble and petty, high achievement and tragedy

To these, one can add a number of other important features. First, literature is also a social and historical document, necessitating the requisite critical and methodological skills in handling such texts, and, at least, in more realistic and narrative styles is firmly embedded in the socio-cultural, historical and political context. It also better recreates the atmosphere and culture of organisations, since it translates large scale structures and processes into tacit knowledge, and personalities and their interpersonal relations, as well as the complex and often contradictory or ironic nature of bureaucratic language, and the personal impact of bureaucratic pathologies or maladministration. Characterisation is also more vivid (portraying the emotional, spiritual and visceral), including past history such as childhood experiences, social class, and

early education and training, allowing for a deeper existential or phenomenological understanding, and even identification by the reader (whether as an ego ideal or a cautionary morality tale). It recreates more fully the inner world of the administrator, especially in creating a personal biography in which the tension between the private and the organisational are reflected, and also those with “distorted” personalities like narcissists and sociopaths. And, it also captures the administrative experience in positive and negative forms as more than a rational process, representing the role that the intuitive, speculative, normative play, and differing styles of judgment. Literature is also assumed to provide a moral education and guiding principles by conveying meaning and dealing more closely through intention, motive, will, and their consequences and dilemmas. Whether one can, as some argue, gain “wisdom” through a rounded and balanced literary representation capturing the conflict of good and evil, the commingling of rational and irrational, noble and petty, high achievement and tragedy, certainly, it is these dimensions of administrative experience that are more highly developed in a literary text than in most social science writing.

For some time, Waldo’s initial work, and Wolfe’s (1924) even earlier exploration, did not have much effect on public administration. However, more recently, through both business management and public administration, interest has renewed – McCurdy (1973), McDaniel (1978), Marini (1992), Carroll & Gailey (1992), Breischke (1993), Adams & Pugh (1994), Czarniawska-Joerges & Guillet de Monthoux (1994), Cohen (1998), and Howe (2002) have subsequently promoted literary study, however, in many cases for purely functional purpose.

Through initial surveys of Western literature (over 300 pieces to date), I have found so far that the literary critique falls into six major themes. The first, ‘Organisational Structure and Purpose’ consists of examining the dehumanisation of bureaucratic structure, the nightmare world of the bureaucracy, with psychological, political and moral implications. Authors who have emphasised these characteristics include Tolstoy in *The Death of Ivan Ilyich*, Kafka in *The Trial* and *The Castle*, Zamyatin in *We*, Orwell in *1984*,³¹ and Huxley in *Brave New World*, or even in Gogol’s ‘The Nose’, a satire on the human consequences of hierarchical bureaucracy.

The second theme is ‘Administrative Culture’ focussing on the symbolic, ritual and ceremonial aspects of administration, including its customs, myths, stories, legends, and material culture. Such exploration is found in Lawrence Durrell’s *Mountolive*,³² Joseph Roth’s *Radetzsky March*, and Thomas Mann’s *Royal Highness*.

‘Administrative Politics’ is another richly developed theme in literature, focussed primarily on careerism, power relations, and the covert. Representative writings in this area include Balzac’s *The Bureaucrats*, LeCarré’s *Tinker, Tailor*,

³¹ Although Orwell derived this text heavily from Zamyatin.

³² Durrell’s work is situated primarily in foreign service life, and includes also the trilogy *Esprit de Corps*, *Stiff Upper Lip* and *Sauve qui Peut*.

³³ Continued in the subsequent volumes in the series, *Honourable Schoolboy* and Smiley’s *People*.

Soldier, Spy,³³ Havel's *The Garden Party*, Gogol's 'The Government Inspector', and Dumas' *The Count of Monte Cristo*.

The fourth thematic category is 'Personality, Identity Formation, and the Personal Life of Bureaucrats', covering such topics as early education, personality types, the "inner world", ethics, and the effect on personal relations, particularly family life. Fontane's *Effi Briest*, H. Mann's *Man of Straw*, Sophocles' *Antigone*, Gogol's 'The Overcoat', Chekov's 'The Lady with the Pet Dog', and Wassermann's *Kasper Hauser* explore these.

A feature of the literary critique most important for understanding administrative experience is the treatment of personality through the dominant types presented. Most are of a negative form. This includes the Corrupt or Evil/Demonic (Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* on the "rogue" bureaucrat Kurtz and Heinrich Mann's *Mephisto*), The Amoral Functionalist (minor characters in most literature on bureaucracy, although several examples of this appear in Gogol's *Dead Souls*), Dead Souls (Tolstoy's *Ivan Ilyich*), the Fellaheens, Oppressed, Self-debased, Servile, or Slaves (Gogol's 'The Overcoat' and Melville's 'Bartleby, the Scrivener'), the Impotent or Dilettante (Balzac's *The Bureaucrats*, Greene's *The Honorary Consul*, and T. Mann's *Effi Briest*), Idiots (Heller's *Catch-22*), the Absurd or Irrational (Kafka's *The Trial*), Sociopaths or the Cruel or Sadistic (Kesey's *One Flew over the Cuckoo's Nest*), the Narcissist (H. Mann's *Man of Straw*), the Obsessive/Compulsive (Heller's *Catch-22* and Tolstoy's *Death of Ivan Ilyich*), The Mad (Gogol's 'The Overcoat' and 'Diary of a Madman'), the Philistine (Forster's *Passage to India*), The Self-deceived (Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* – in the character Marlow), and the Alcoholic (Durrell's *Mountolive* and Graham Greene's *The Honorary Consul*).

Positive types are rare, however, three notable types exist in well known texts: the Heroic (in Wassermann's *Kasper Hauser*), the Martyred (in Balzac's *The Bureaucrat* and Bolt's *A Man for all Seasons*), and the Good Soldier (in Le Carré's *Smiley's People*).

And finally, the style and politics of language has been a literary focus, through what one could call an examination of 'Bureaucratic Poetics'. Authors most sensitive to this aspect of administrative life include Vaclav Havel (*The Memorandum*), Milan Kundera (*The Unbearable Lightness of Being*), and George Orwell (1984).

Aesthetic Judgment: The Problem of Kitsch

The images most often associated with kitsch are cheap souvenirs, sentimental greeting cards, tasteless advertising, and "cute" household objects like creamers in the form of cows, black velvet paintings, or happy pictures portraying anthropomorphised puppies and kittens, and Disneyfied figures. Many (if not most) hotel rooms are systematically decorated in kitsch. Garden ornamentation is frequently mentioned: pink flamingos, gnomes, servants in black-face. Harlequin romances are kitsch, as are soap operas, and Muzak. Most of these examples are low kitsch, poorly conceived and poorly executed, mostly produced from cheap materials. In other words, they are generally considered to be cheap, trashy, crass, vulgar, saccharine, gaudy, ersatz or pseudo-art, and indicative of bad taste.

But what of high kitsch – goods that are produced with greater skill and craft

and of quality materials, the “objets d’art” which most of us own, but would not own up to as kitsch (for, as Milan Kundera reminds us, ‘none among us is superman enough to escape kitsch completely. No matter how we scorn it, kitsch is an integral part of the human condition’. (1999, p. 256)) Dorfles characterises kitsch as ‘every ambiguous, false, tearful, emotional exaggeration [bringing] about that typically kitsch attitude which could be defined as “sentimentality”’ (1969, p. 129). His definition points to a meaning for kitsch that applies to human need and interpersonal relations that are the stuff of charisma, and which may pervade charismatic leadership, the organisations it produces, the behaviour and thoughts it engenders, and the theories or models upon which it is built.

A taxonomy of kitsch is suggested in its historical and social origins. Kitsch is generally regarded as becoming pervasive in modern industrial society where the conditions for mass production and consumption were created; however, some point to its origins in debased forms of the Romantic movement, when dramatic effects, pathos and sentimentality arose in artistic production. Its essential characteristics derive from both. Kitsch lacks some of the aesthetic values of unity (e.g. balance or harmony comprised of an inner logic of structure and style), complexity (consisting of multidimensionality, repleteness, combinations of heterogeneous forms, elaboration of structures, concern for detail), and intensity (vitality, forcefulness and vividness of presentation), thereby lacking the basic criteria of art: the inherent and irreplaceable originality of the fusion of time, place, idea, skill, form, and material into an “original” concept. For Kulka, it lacks artistic value of creative and innovative contribution to the history of art, that is, opening new possibilities and suggesting solutions to topical artistic problems (1996, pp. 55-56). It does not enrich our associations relating to the objects or themes, but rather is parasitic in nature, since it does not create a beauty of its own.

Kitsch also consists in an unreflective emotional appeal – predominantly sentimentality. While common kitsch images appear to be harmless, like cute puppies and kittens, pastoral landscapes, sad clowns, sentimental embraces in front of a full moon, children in tears, and sentimentalised religious and political images, Solomon argues that since it produces superficial emotion rendering one emotionally manipulable (1997, p. 452), it distorts our perceptions and interfering with rational thought and understanding (1997, p. 454). Kundera, in *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, has provided one of the most insightful descriptions of kitsch: ‘Kitsch causes two tears to flow in quick succession. The first tear says: How nice to see children running on the grass! The second tear says: How nice to be moved, together with all mankind, by children running on the grass! It is the second tear that makes kitsch kitsch’. (1999, p. 251) In other words, it does not remind us of unpleasant or disturbing aspects of reality, and is universally accessible, that is, easily understood. Therefore it uses the most ‘conventional, standard, well-tried, and tested representational canons’, rather than esoteric, idiosyncratic, original or innovative styles. It must achieve an unchallenging, explicit, unconfusing, and effortless identifiability and is therefore aesthetically conservative and stylistically reactionary (Kulka, 1996). From a consumption perspective, it must be predominantly figurative rather than abstract or cubist, formulaic, explicit and one-dimensional (meaning no ambiguity or hidden meanings), and allows for only one interpretation (it is fundamen-

talist). Kitsch requires no knowledge, understanding, critique, or analysis: it is pre-digested and pre-packaged, sparing effort and providing a short-cut to pleasure. Its appeal (for the Kitschmensch) lies in the following principles: it is easily understood, satisfies an immediate desire, does not disturb or challenge basic sentiments and beliefs, does not question socio-political reality or vested interests, it reinforces our prejudices, avoids unpleasant conflicts, and promises a happy ending. In Klinghoffer's examination of kitsch religion, he observes that it provides the spirituality without the requirement of orthodox belief and action (1996, p. 259). Translated into administrative or managerial terms, it is the promise of a painless, effortless, and conflict-free path to organisational improvement.

The motivations of the kitsch producer are most relevant to the administrative realm. As interest lies in conventional stylistic features that please the fantasy, it makes something appear more valuable than it actually is, and is therefore essentially deceptive – an artistic imposter, camouflaged as art. Calinescu, in applying this aesthetic analysis to the political realm, emphasises its deceptive qualities: 'the whole concept of kitsch clearly centres around such questions as imitation, forgery, counterfeit, and what we may call the *aesthetics of deception* or *self-deception*'; it is a '*specifically aesthetic form of lying*' (1987, p. 229). It serves to distract people from more important underlying realities, used by political authority to ingratiate themselves, and creates dogma through political force, a broad social participation in which the individual cannot preserve individuality and the artist cannot create unusual works: 'whenever a single political movement corners power, we find ourselves in the realm of *totalitarian kitsch*' (Kundera 1999, p. 251), and 'In the realm of totalitarian kitsch, all answers are given in advance and preclude any questions'. (1999, p. 254) Schiffer points to its over-dramatisation of authority: 'To most people ... political figures ... are just like box-office attractions in the field of entertainment – this despite the fact that many politicians are often bearers of ideals and ideologies ... We embrace images ... popular actors, actresses, and musicians who, above and beyond their talents, have been given charismatic status despite – or perhaps because of – certain flaws in their character or theatrical skills' (1983, p. 9), not unlike the sensibility promoted in popular leadership literature for administration and management. And, because of its unreflective, uncritical nature, and dominance by emotional appeal, kitsch lends itself easily to the injection of propaganda.

Freidin examines Soviet 'socialist realism' as a state ideology of art from this perspective. It not only sanctioned but imposed kitsch, creating a 'perfect, fairy-tale world' of extravagant and socialist-realist rococo style theme parks, spectacular military parades, organised rallies, banners, sports Olympiads, gala atmosphere of party congresses, and Potemkin Villages that are a Disney-like prototype. (2000, pp. 134-135) Sabonis-Chafee portrays the Soviet 'sentimental images of citizenship, state and progress', such as blissful peasant girls, heroic labourers, hammers, sickles and sheaves of wheat, as employing a 'hypodermic effects model' in which it is assumed the audience absorbs the information immediately without altering the message. (1999, p. 362) For Kulka, too, the Soviet system represents a rich repository of kitsch including 'portraying smiling workers in factories, young couples on tractors cultivating a collective farm or building a hydroelectric power station' supporting the myth of the joy of work and the 'enthusiasm for building a classless society'.

(1996, p. 28) But, capitalism, too, provides kitsch exemplified in advertising using ‘class distinctions and status symbols to create artificial needs and illusions to foster the ideology of the consumer society’. (Kulka 1996, p. 28) While Soviet Russia is commonly used to illustrate the effects of kitsch socially and politically, Western systems can equally be subjected to this kind of critique.

The implications for administrative studies are an example of intellectual kitsch. One can kitschify anything, reducing it to decontextualised, uncritical, and popularised stereotype or cliché lacking historical or textual accuracy, including academic thought. Popular versions of Machiavellian management and Sun Tzu’s *The Art of War* abound in bookstores, on the internet, and sadly, in some university seminars. Intellectual kitsch also lacks theoretical provenance – the origins (particularly in textbook-style volumes) are missing, particularly theories that clearly originate with major social and political thinkers, like Weber, Marx, Durkheim, Hegel, and Habermas. Instead, simplified and easily applied versions of their work, without critical and self-reflective character, historical context or moral implications of the original, alleviate readers (and their instructors) of the effort and commitment necessary to a more comprehensive and complex understanding. As with any other form of kitsch, administrative technique can be pre-digested, prepackaged and sold as a largely unproblematic activity with a barely disguised “how-to” training guide intent.

Administrative research, particularly much of the more recent leadership material, demonstrates another form of kitschification. Using behaviour scales, reducing complex human interactions and experiences to statistical representation is an example of what Husserl called the ‘ontological reversal’. This notion of taking the abstract mathematical models of phenomena as more real than the phenomena themselves, is part of the underlying logic of kitsch – as ersatz substitutes for authentic experience.

Another trait, the sanitisation of reality, removing what is for Kundera in a representational rendering of socio-political reality anything that is essential unacceptable (1999, p. 248), is also an effect of administrative ideology. Even though a significant literature has accumulated on the shadow side of organisation and bureau-pathology, administrative texts persist generally in conveying a highly rationalised worldview, exacerbated by the faith of the new public management. Reform, change and transformation models that systematically avoid the human toll both for organisational members and society at large display an aesthetic ideal akin to kitsch, defined by Kundera as: ‘categorical agreement with being is a world in which shit is denied and everyone acts as though it did not exist’. (1999, p. 248) Politically, kitsch promises the image of a perfect society, whether on a nation-state, organisational, or group level – proffering an image that is ‘beautiful, orderly, humane, eminently positive’. (Carter & Jackson 2000, p. 191) It is a chimeral construction, driven by superficiality, the intellectual equivalent of sentimentality, laying the foundation for excessive power, leadership idolatry, and eventually the suppression of divergent beliefs and values, and a denial of ‘disorder, indifference to welfare, “organized chaos” and asymmetry’ inherent in the general normal experience of organisational life. (Carter & Jackson 2000, p. 191)

Friedländer summarises the political process by which kitsch is effective, and

thereby objectionable in moral terms:

Such kitsch [as state policy] has a clear mobilizing function, probably for the following general reasons: first, what it expresses is easily understood and accessible to the great majority of people; secondly, it calls for an unreflective emotional response; thirdly, it handles the core values of a political regime or ideological system as a closed, harmonious entity which has to be endowed with “beauty” to be made more effective ... Finally, this peculiar linkage of “truth” and “beauty” leads to a stylisation which tends to capture obvious mythical patterns; political myths and religious myths fuse. In modern societies, political religions are the natural world of uplifting kitsch. (1990, p. 203)

Kitsch provides a mythology consisting of a shared image of the leader, of organisational goals, and a desired self – all of which are the key elements of charisma and transformational leadership currently promoted in leadership studies as a panacea for hyper legal-rationality, referred to often as the ‘malaise of modernity’, or in Weber’s terms ‘disenchantment’. To some extent this is a consequence, particularly in the Anglo-Saxon world, of an over-reliance on scientisation at the expense of the more traditional humanities-based disciplines whose *raison d’être* is value analysis and the critical construction of meaning.

REFERENCES

- Adams, E. & Pugh, D. 1994, ‘The Humanities and Professional Studies: Adding People to Policy’, *College Teaching*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 63-65.
- Adams, G. 1992, ‘Enthralled with Modernity: The Historical Context of Knowledge and Theory Development in Public Administration’, *Public Administration Review*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 363-373.
- Adams, G. & White, J. 1994, ‘Dissertation Research in Public Administration and Cognate Fields: An Assessment of Methods and Quality’, *Public Administration Review*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 565-576.
- Agassi, J. 1963, ‘Towards a Historiography of Science’. *History and Theory*, Beiheft 2.
- Alvesson, M. & Berg, P. 1992, *Corporate Culture and Organizational Symbolism: An Overview*, W. de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Appleby, P. 1945, *Big Democracy*, A. A. Knopf, New York.
- Arendt, H. 1977, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil*. Rev. and enlarged edn, Penguin, Harmondsworth.
- Argyris, C. 1993, *On Organizational Learning*, Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Argyris, C. 1957, *Personality and Organization*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Aronson, S. 1964, *Status and Kinship in the Higher Civil Service*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- Arora, R. 1992, *Politics and Administration in Changing Societies: Essays in Honour of Professor Fred W. Riggs*, Associated Publishing House, New Delhi.
- Awamleh, R. & Gardner, W. 1999, 'Perceptions of Leader Charisma and Effectiveness: The Effects of Vision Content, Delivery, and Organizational Performance', *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 345-373.
- Bailey, M. & Mayer, R. (eds) 1992, *Public Management in an Interconnected World: Essays in the Minnowbrook Tradition*, Greenwood Press, New York.
- Baker, R. 1994, 'Comparative Public Management: Coming in from the Cold', in *Comparative Public Management: Putting U.S. Public Policy and Implementation in Context*, ed. R. Baker, Praeger, Westport, pp. 1-8.
- Balfour, D. & Mesaros, W. 1994, 'Connecting the Local Narratives: Public Administration as a Hermeneutic Science', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 559-564.
- Barnard, C. 1938, *The Functions of the Executive*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Barzelay, M. 1992, *Breaking through Bureaucracy: A New Vision for Managing in Government*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Bass, B. 1998, *Transformational Leadership: Industrial, Military, and Educational Impact*, Erlbaum Associates, London.
- Bass, B. 1985, *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*, Free Press, New York.
- Baum, H. 1987, *The Invisible Bureaucracy: The Unconscious in Organizational Problem Solving*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Baum, H. 1983a, 'Autonomy, Shame, and Doubt: Power in the Bureaucratic Lives of Planners', *Administration and Society*, vol. 15, pp. 147-184.
- Baum, H. 1983b, *Planners and Public Expectations*, Schenkman, Cambridge.
- Baum, H. 1982, 'The Advisor as Invited Intruder', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 42, pp. 546-552.
- Baumgarten, A. 1750, *Aesthetica*.
- Behringer, W. 1998, *Shaman of Oberstdorf: Chonrad Stoeckhlin and the Phantoms of the Night*, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Belenky, M. 1986, *Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind*, Basic Books, New York.
- Benjamin, W. 1979, *One-Way Street and other Writings*, NLB, London.
- Bennis, W. 1989, *On Becoming a Leader*, Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. 1985, *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Bensman, J. & Givant, M. 1975, 'Charisma and Modernity: The Use and Abuse of a Concept', *Social Research*, vol. 42, pp. 570-614.
- Berlin, I. 1993, *The Sense of Reality: Studies in Ideas and their History*, Chatto & Windus, London.
- Blondel, J. 1990, *Comparative Government: An Introduction*, Philip Allan, Hemel Hempstead.
- Boal, K. & Bryson, J. 1988, 'Charismatic Leadership: A Phenomenological and

- Structural Approach', in *Emerging Leadership Vistas*, eds J. Hunt et al., Lexington Books, Lexington, pp. 11-28.
- Boje, D. 1991, 'Storytelling Organization: A Study of Story Performance', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 106-126.
- Bonhoeffer, D. 1963, *The Cost of Discipleship*, Macmillan, New York.
- Bonhoeffer, D. 1955, *Ethics*, Macmillan, New York.
- Borins, S. 1994, *Public Sector Innovation: Its Contribution to Canadian Competitiveness*, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, Kingston.
- Borins, S. 1990, 'The Role of Universities in Public Administration Education', *Canadian Public Administration*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 348-365.
- Box, R. 1992, 'An Examination of the Debate over Research in Public Administration', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 62-69.
- Breischke, P. 1993, 'Interpreting ourselves: Administrators in Modern Fiction', *Theory into Practice*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 228-235.
- Brown, R. 1978, 'Bureaucracy as Praxis: Toward a Political Phenomenology of Formal Organizations', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 365-382.
- Brownlow, L. 1955, *A Passion for Anonymity: The Autobiography of Louis Brownlow*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Bryman, A. 1992, *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*, Sage, London.
- Buber, M. 1953, *Good and Evil*, Scribner's, New York.
- Burke, J. 1986, *Bureaucratic Responsibility*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Burns, J. 1978, *Leadership*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Burrell, G. & Morgan, G. 1979, *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*, Heinemann, London.
- Caiden, G. 1994, 'Getting at the Essence of the Administrative State', in *Handbook of Bureaucracy*, ed. A. Farazmand, Marcel Dekker, New York, pp. 65-78.
- Caiden, G. 1971, *The Dynamics of Public Administration: Guidelines to Current Transformation in Theory and Practice*, Dryden Press, Hinsdale.
- Caiden, G. & Caiden, N. 1990, 'Towards the Future of Comparative Public Administration', in *Public Administration in World Perspective*, eds O. Dwivedi & K. Henderson, Iowa State Press, Ames.
- Calinescu, M. 1987, 'Kitsch and Modernity', in *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism*, ed. M. Calinescu, Durham, Duke University Press. Pp. 225-262.
- Caro, R. 1974, *The Power Broker: Robert Moses and the Fall of New York*, Knopf, New York.
- Carroll, V. & Gailey, J. 1992, 'Using Literature to Teach about Bureaucratic Structure', *College Teaching*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 24-26.
- Carter, P. & Jackson, N. 2000, 'An-Aesthetics', in *The Aesthetics of Organization*, eds S. Linstead & H. Höpfl, Sage, London.
- Cassirer, E. 1956, *An Essay on Man*, Doubleday, Garden City.
- Chandler, R. (ed.) 1987, *A Centennial History of the American Administrative State*, Free Press, New York.

- Cohen, C. 1998, 'Using Narrative Fiction within Management Education', *Management Learning*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 165-181.
- Cohen, J. & Arato, A. 1992, 'Politics and the Reconstruction of the Concept of Civil Society', in *Civil Society and Political Theory*, eds J. Cohen & A. Arato, MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Conger, J. & Kanungo, R. 1998, *Charismatic Leadership in Organizations*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Conger, J. & Kanungo, R. 1988a, 'Behavioral Dimensions of Charismatic Leadership', in *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*, eds J. Conger & R. Kanungo, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 78-97.
- Conger, J. & Kanungo, R. 1988b, 'Conclusion: Patterns and Trends in Studying Charismatic Leadership', in *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*, eds J. Conger & R. Kanungo, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 324-336.
- Conger, J. & Kanungo, R. 1988c, 'Training Charismatic Leadership: A Risky and Critical Task', in *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness*, eds J. Conger & R. Kanungo, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, pp. 309-323.
- Cooper, P. et al. 1998, *Public Administration for the twenty-first Century*, Harcourt Brace, New York.
- Cooper, T. 1982, *The Responsible Administrator: An Approach to Ethics for the Administrative Role*, Kennikat Press, Port Washington.
- Cormack, P. (ed.) 1998, *Manifestos and Declarations of the twentieth Century*, Garamond Press, Toronto.
- Czarniawska, B. 1997, *Narrating the Organization: Dramas of Institutional Identity*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. & Guillet de Monthoux, P. 1994, *Good Novels, Better Management: Reading Organizational Realities*, Harwood Academic Press, Chur.
- Dahl, R. 1947, 'The Science of Public Administration: Three Problems', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1-11.
- Deal, T. & Kennedy, A. 1982, *Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life*, Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Dearlove, J. 1979, *The Reorganisation of the British Local Government: Old Orthodoxies and a Political Perspective*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- De Leon, P. 1988, *Advice and Consent: The Development of the Policy Sciences*, Russell Sage, New York.
- Denhardt, R. 1990, 'Public Administration Theory: The State of the Discipline', in *Public Administration: The State of the Discipline*, eds N. Lynn & A. Wildavsky, Chatham House, Chatham.
- Denhardt, R. 1984, *Theories of Public Organization*, Brooks/Cole, Monterey.
- Denhardt, R. 1981a, *In the Shadow of Organization*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Denhardt, R. 1981b, 'Toward a Critical Theory of Public Organization', *Public*

- Administration Review*, vol. 41, pp. 628-635.
- Denison, D. 1990, *Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness*, Wiley, New York.
- Diamond, M. 1990, 'Psychoanalytic Phenomenology and Organizational Analysis', *Public Administration Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 32-42.
- Dorfles, G. 1969, 'Kitsch', in *Kitsch: The World of Bad Taste*, ed. G. Dorfles, Universe Books, New York, pp. 14-35.
- Drechsler, W. 2001, 'On the Viability of the Concept of Staatswissenschaften', *European Journal of Law and Economics*, vol. 12, pp. 105-111.
- Drechsler, W. 2000, 'Public Administration in Central and Eastern Europe: Considerations from the "State Science" Approach', in *Institutions and the Role of the State*, eds L. Burlamaqui, A. Castro & H. Chang, Edward Elgar, Northampton, pp. 267-279.
- Dror, Y. 1967, 'Policy Analysts: A New Professional Role in Government Service', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 27, pp. 197-203.
- Dunleavy, P. 1982, 'Is there a Radical Approach to Public Administration?', *Public Administration*, vol. 60, pp. 215-233.
- Dunleavy, P. & O'Leary, B. 1987, *Theories of the State: The Politics of Liberal Democracy*, Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Dunn, N. & Fazouni, B. 1976, *Toward a Critical Administrative Theory*, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Dwivedi, O. & Henderson, K. (eds) 1990, *Public Administration in World Perspective*, Iowa State University, Ames.
- Edelman, M. 1977, *Political Language: Words that Succeed and Policies that Fail*, Academic Press, New York.
- Edinger, L. 1964, 'Political Science and Political Biography: Reflections on the Study of Leadership', *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 26, pp. 423-439.
- Elias, N. 1987, 'The Retreat of Sociologists into the Present', in *Modern German Sociology*, eds V. Meja, D. Misgeld & N. Stehr, Columbia University Press, New York, pp. 150-172.
- Farazmand, A. (ed.) 1991, *Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration*, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- Farmer, D.J. 1995, *The Language of Public Administration: Bureaucracy, Modernity, and Postmodernity*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Ferguson, K. 1984, *The Feminist Case against Bureaucracy*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.
- Feyerabend, P. 1975, *Against Method: An Outline of an Anarchist Theory of Knowledge*, Verso, London.
- Finer, S. 1997, *The History of Government*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Fischer, F. 1992, 'Beyond Empiricism: Policy Inquiry in Postpositivist Perspective', *Policy Studies Journal*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 129-136.
- Fischer, F. 1989, 'Beyond the Rationality Project: Policy Analysis and the Postpositivist Challenge', *Policy Studies Journal*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 941-951.
- Follett, M. 1949 [1926], 'The Giving of Orders', in *Freedom and Coordination: Lectures in Business Organization*, ed. M. Follett, Management

- Publications, London.
- Forester, J. 1990, 'No Planning or Administration without Phenomenology?', *Public Administration Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 56-65.
- Forester, J. 1989, *Planning in the Face of Power*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Forester, J. 1984, 'Bounded Rationality and the Politics of Muddling through', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 44, pp. 23-32.
- Forester, J. 1983, 'Critical Theory and Organizational Analysis', in *Beyond Method*, ed. G. Morgan, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Forester, J. 1981, 'Questioning and Organizing Attention: Toward a Critical Theory of Planning and Administrative Practice', *Administration and Society*, vol. 13, pp. 161-207.
- Fox, C. 1996, 'Reinventing Government as Postmodern Symbolic Politics', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 56, pp. 256-262.
- Fox, C. & Miller, H. 1995, *Postmodern Public Administration: Toward Discourse*, Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Frederickson, G. 1979, 'The Lineage of New Public Administration', in *The Dimensions of Public Administration*, ed. J. Uveges, Allyn and Bacon, Boston, pp. 20-41.
- Freidin, G. 2000, 'Transfiguration of Kitsch: Timur Kibirov's *Sentiments*', in *Endquote: Sots-Art literature and Soviet Grand Style*, eds M. Balina, N. Condee & E. Dobrenko, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, pp. 123-145.
- Friedländer, S. 1990, 'Preface to a Symposium: Kitsch and the Apocalyptic Imagination', *Salmagundi*, pp. 85-86, 201-206.
- Fromm, E. 1955, *The Sane Society*, Fawcett, Greenwich.
- Gabriel, Y. 2000, *Storytelling in Organizations: Facts, Fictions, and Fantasies*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Gagliardi, P. 1996, 'Exploring the Aesthetic Side of Organizational Life', in *Handbook of Organization Studies*, eds S. Clegg, C. Hardy & W. Nord, Sage, London, pp. 565-580.
- Gardner, W. & Avolio, B. 1998, 'The Charismatic Relationship: A Dramaturgical Perspective', *The Academy of Management Review*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 32-58.
- Gawthrop, L. 1984, *Public Sector Management, Systems, Ethics*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.
- Geertz, C. 1980, 'Sociosexology', *New York Review of Books*, January 24, Review of Donald Symons, *The Evolution of Human Sexuality* (Oxford University Press).
- Gladden, E. 1972, *A History of Public Administration*, Frank Cass, London.
- Goethe, J. 1955 [1832], *Faust: Der Tragödie zweiter Teil in fünf Akten*, D. C. Heath, Boston.
- Goffman, E. 1959, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Doubleday, Garden City.
- Golembiewski, R. 1977, *Public Administration as a Developing Discipline*, Marcel-Dekker, New York.

- Golembiewski, R. 1974, 'Public Administration as a Field: Four Developmental Phases', *Georgia Political Science Association Journal*, vol. 2, pp. 24-25.
- Goodnow, F. 1900, *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*, Macmillan, New York.
- Gottshalk, D. 1962, *Art and the Social Order*, Dover, New York.
- Granatstein, J. 1982, *The Ottawa Men: The Civil Service Mandarins, 1935-1957*, Oxford University Press, Toronto.
- Gronn, P. 1993, 'Psychobiography on the Couch: Character, Biography and the Comparative Study of Leaders', *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 343-358.
- Guillén, M. 1997, 'Scientific Management's Lost Aesthetic: Architecture, Organization, and the Taylorized Beauty of the Mechanical', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 682-715.
- Gulick, L. & Urwick, L. (eds) 1937, *Papers on the Science of Administration*, Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, New York.
- Hanson, N.R. 1958, *Patterns of Discovery*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Haque, M. 1996, 'The Intellectual Crisis in Public Administration in the Current Epoch of Privatization', *Administration & Society*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 510-536.
- Harmon, M. 1990, 'Applied Phenomenology and Organization', *Public Administration Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 10-17.
- Harmon, M. 1981, *Action Theory for Public Administration*, Longman, New York.
- Heady, F. 1987, 'Comparative Public Administration in the United States', in *A Centennial History of the United States*, ed. R. Chandler, Free Press, New York, pp. 477-508.
- Heady, F. 1966, *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Heady, F. & Stokes, S. (eds) 1962, *Papers in Comparative Public Administration*, University of Michigan, Institute of Public Administration, Ann Arbor.
- Hegel, G. 1979 [1832-40], *Hegel's Introduction to Aesthetics: Being the Introduction to the Berlin Aesthetics Lectures of the 1820s*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hegel, G. 1977 [1807], *Phenomenology of Mind*, Humanities Press, London.
- Henry, N. 1975, 'Paradigms of Public Administration', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 378-386.
- Hodgetts, J. et al. 1972, *The Biography of an Institution: The Civil Service Commission of Canada, 1908-1967*, McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.
- Hodgkinson, C. 1996, *Administrative Philosophy: Values and Motivations in Administrative Life*, Pergamon, Oxford.
- Hodgkinson, C. 1978, *Towards a Philosophy of Administration*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Hood, C. 1990, 'Public Administration: Lost an Empire, not yet Found a Role?', in *New Developments in Political Science*, ed. A. Leftwick, Gower, Aldershot, pp. 107-125.
- Hood, C. & Dunsire, A. 1981, *Bureaumerics: The Quantitative Comparison of*

- British Central Government Agencies*, Gower, Farnborough.
- Höpfel, H. 2002, 'The Aesthetics of Reticence: Collections and Recollections', in *The Aesthetics of Organization*, eds S. Linstead & H. Höpfel, Sage, London, pp. 93-110.
- House, R. 1977, 'A 1976 Theory of Charismatic Leadership', in *Leadership: The Cutting Edge*, eds J. Hunt & L. Larson, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, pp. 189-207.
- Howe, L. 2002, 'Mourning Administrative Generosity in a Postgenerous Time: Lessons from Wallace Shawn's "The Designated Mourner"', *Administration & Society*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 583-609.
- Hummel, R. 1991, 'Stories Managers Tell: Why they are as Valid as Science', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 31-41.
- Hummel, R. 1990, 'Uncovering Validity Criteria for Stories Managers Hear and Tell', *American Review of Public Administration*, vol. 20, pp. 303-314.
- Hummel, R. 1977, *The Bureaucratic Experience*, St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Ingersoll, V. & Adams, G. 1992, *The Tacit Organization*, JAI Press, Greenwich.
- Ingraham, P. & Romzek, B. 1994, *New Paradigms for Government: Issues for the Changing Public Service*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Kant, I. 1987 [1790], *Critique of Judgment*, Hackett Publishing, Indianapolis.
- Karl, B. 1963, *Executive Reorganisation and Reform in the New Deal: The Genesis of Administrative Management, 1900-1939*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R. 1966, *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, Wiley, New York.
- Katz, J. 1972, 'Deviance, Charisma, and Rule-Defined Behaviour', *Social Problems*, vol. 20, pp. 186-202.
- Kekes, J. 1990, *Facing Evil*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Kelly, M. & Maynard-Moody, S. 1993, 'Policy Analysis in the Post-Positivist Era', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 53, pp. 135-142.
- Kernaghan, K. 1994, 'The Emerging Public Service Culture: Values, Ethics, and Reforms', *Canadian Public Administration*, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 614-630.
- Kets de Vries, M. & Miller, D. 1984, *The Neurotic Organization: Diagnosing and Changing Counterproductive Styles of Management*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Kettl, D. & Milward, H. (eds) 1996, *The State of Public Management*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Klinghoffer, D. 1996, 'Kitsch Religion', in *Dumbing down: Essays on the Strip Mining of American Culture*, eds K. Washburn & J. Thornton, W. W. Norton, New York, pp. 250-260.
- Kotter, J. 1992, *Corporate Culture and Performance*, Free Press, New York.
- Kouzes, J. & Posner, B. 1993, *Credibility: How Leaders Gain and Lose it, why People Demand it*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Kravchuk, R. 1992, 'Liberalism and the American Administrative State', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 52, pp. 374-379.
- Krislov, S. 1974, *Representative Bureaucracy*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Kundera, M. 1999, *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, HarperPerennial, New

- York.
- Lakatos, I. 1970, 'Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs', in *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, eds I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lakatos, I. 1963/64, 'Proofs and Refutation', *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, vol. 14, pp. 1-25, 120-139, 221-243, 296-342.
- Lane, J.-E. 1993, *The Public Sector*, Sage, London.
- LaPorte, T. 1971, 'The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organization', in *Toward a New Public Administration: The Minnowbrook Perspective*, ed. F. Marini, Chandler, San Francisco, pp. 17-47.
- Lilienthal, D. 1944, *TVA: Democracy on the March*, Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Lindblom, C. 1968, *The Policy-Making Process*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- Linstead, S. 2004, *Organization Theory and Postmodern Thought*, Sage, London.
- Linstead, S. & Höpfl, H. 2000, *The Aesthetics of Organization*, Sage, London.
- Lowi, T. 1969, *The End of Liberalism: Ideology, Policy, and the Crisis of Public Authority*, Norton, New York.
- McAllister, T. 1996, *Revolt against Modernity: Leo Strauss, Eric Voegelin, and the Search for a Postliberal Order*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Maccoby, M. 1981, *The Leader: A New Face for American Management*, Simon and Schuster, New York.
- McConkie, M. & Boss, W. 1986, 'Organizational Stories: One Means of Moving the Informal Organization during Change Efforts', *Public Administration Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 189-205.
- McCurdy, H. 1986, *Public Administration: A Bibliographic Guide to the Literature*, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- McCurdy, H. 1973, 'Fiction, Phenomenology, and Administration', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 33, pp. 52-61.
- McCurdy, H. & Cleary, R. 1984, 'Why Can't We Resolve the Research Issue in Public Administration?', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 49-55.
- McDaniel, T. 1978, 'The Search for the Administrative Novel', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 38, pp. 545-549.
- McElroy, W. (ed.) 1982, *Freedom, Feminism, and the State: An Overview of Individualist Feminism*, Cato Institute, Washington, DC.
- McGregor, D. 1960, *The Human Side of Enterprise*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- García Madarí, J. 1980, 'Metodología del estudio de la Historia de la Administración pública Española y aproximación a sus Fuentes', *Revue International des Sciences Administratives*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 35-47.
- March, J. 1965, *Handbook of Organizations*, Rand McNally, Chicago.
- March, J. & Simon, H. 1958, *Organizations*, Wiley, New York.
- Marini, F. 1992, 'The Uses of Literature in the Exploration of Public Administration Ethics: The Example of Antigone', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 420-426.
- Marini, F. (ed.) 1971, *Toward a New Public Administration*, Chandler, Scranton.
- Marshall, G. & White, O. 1990, 'Public Administration in a Time without a Name', *American Review of Public Administration*, vol. 20, pp. 61-76.

- Maslow, A. 1954, *Motivation and Personality*, Harper, New York.
- Mayo, E. 1946, *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Mayo, E. 1933, *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*, Macmillan, New York.
- Meyer, M. 1979, *Change in Public Bureaucracies*, Cambridge University Press, London.
- Micklethwait, J. & Wooldridge, A. 1996, *The Witch Doctors: What the Management Gurus are Saying, why it Matters and how to Make Sense of it*, Heinemann, London.
- Molitor, André. 1983, 'The History of Administration', *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 1-3.
- Morgan, G. 1986, *Images of Organization*, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- Morstein-Marx, F. (ed.) 1946, *Elements of Public Administration*, Prentice-Hall, New York.
- Mosher, F. 1968, *Democracy and the Public Service*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Nanus, B. 1992, *Visionary Leadership: Creating a Compelling Sense of Direction for your Organization*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Nash, G. 1969, *Perspectives on Administration: The Vistas of History*, Institute of Government Studies, Berkeley.
- Niebuhr, R. 1968, *Faith and Politics: A Commentary on Religious, Social and Political Thought in a Technological Age*, George Braziller, New York.
- Niebuhr, R. 1932, *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics*, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. 1992, *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, Addison-Wesley, Reading.
- Ostrom, V. 1973, *The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Peters, B. G. 1996, 'Models of Governance for the 1990s', in *The State of Public Management*, eds D. Kettl & H. Milward, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, pp. 15-44.
- Peters, B. G. 1988, *Comparing Public Bureaucracies*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Peters, T. & Waterman, R. 1982, *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-Run Companies*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Pierre, J. (ed.) 1995, *Bureaucracy and the Modern State: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*, Brookfield, Aldershot.
- Pitt, D. & Smith, B. 1981, *Government Departments: An Organizational Perspective*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Popper, K. 1963, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Raadschelders, J. 1998, *Handbook of Administrative History*, Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick.
- Ramirez, R. 1996, 'Wrapping Form and Organizational Beauty', *Organization*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 233-242.

- Ramos, A. 1981, *The New Science of Organization: A Reconceptualization of the Wealth of Nations*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Reason, P. 1981, 'Methodological Approaches to Social Science', in *Human Inquiry*, eds P. Reason & J. Rowan, Wiley, New York, pp. 43-51.
- Riggs, F. 1964, *Administration in Developing Countries: The Theory of Prismatic Society*, Houghton Mifflin, Boston.
- Roethlisberger, F. & Dickson, W. 1939, *Management and the Worker: an Account of a Research Program Conducted by the Western Electric Company, Hawthorne Works, Chicago*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Rohr, J. 1986, *To Run a Constitution: The Legitimacy of the Administrative State*, University of Kansas Press, Lawrence.
- Rohr, J. 1979, *Ethics for Bureaucrats: An Essay on Law and Values*, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- Rosenbloom, D. 1989, *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector*, Random House, New York.
- Rowat, D. (ed.) 1988, *Public Administration in Developed Democracies: A Comparative Study*, Marcel Dekker, New York.
- Sabonis-Chafee, T. 1999, 'Communism as Kitsch: Soviet Symbols in Post-Soviet Society', in *Consuming Russia: Popular Culture, Sex, and Society since Gorbachev*, ed. A. Barker, Duke University Press, Durham, pp. 362-382.
- Savoie, D. 1993, 'Innovating to Do Better with Less', *Management and the Public Sector*, vol. 4, no. 1.
- Schein, E. 1985, *Organizational Culture and Leadership*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Schelling, F. 1978 [1807], *System of Transcendental Idealism*, University Press of Virginia, Charlottesville.
- Schiller, F. 1967 [1795], *On the Aesthetic Education of Man, in a Series of Letters*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Schopenhauer, A. 1969 [1818], *The World as Will and Representation*, 2 vols, Dover, New York.
- Schorske, C. 1979, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*, Vintage Books, New York.
- Schroeder, L. 1990, 'International Research and the Tenure/Promotion Process', Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, Salt Lake City, October.
- Schultz, M. 1994, *On Studying Organizational Cultures: Diagnosis and Understanding*, W. de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Selznick, P. 1957, *Leadership in Administration*, Harper & Row, New York.
- Senge, P. 1990, *The fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, Doubleday/Currency, New York.
- Shamir, B., House, R. & Arthur, M. 1993, 'The Motivational Effects of Charismatic Leadership: A Self-Concept Based Theory', *Organization Science*, vol. 4, pp. 1-17.
- Simon, H. 1947, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, Macmillan, New York.

- Simon, H. 1946, 'The Proverbs of Administration', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 6, pp. 53-67.
- Skowronek, S. 1982, *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Smircich, L. 1983, 'Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis', *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 28, pp. 339-358.
- Solomon, R. 1997, 'Kitsch', in *Aesthetics: A Reader in Philosophy of the Arts*, eds D. Goldblatt & L. Brown, Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, pp. 450-454.
- Stene, E. 1940, 'An Approach to a Science of Administration', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 34, pp. 1124-1126.
- Stever, J. 1987, *The End of Public Administration: Problems of the Profession in the Post-Progressive Era*, Transnational Publishers, Ardsley-on-Hudson.
- Stivers, C. 1990, 'Toward a Feminist Perspective in Public Administration Theory', *Women and Politics*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 49-67.
- Stone, D. 1988, *Policy Paradox and Political Reason*, Scott Foresman, Glenview.
- Strati, A. 1999, *Organization and Aesthetics*, Sage, London.
- Strati, A. 1996, 'Organizations Viewed through the Lens of Aesthetics', *Organization*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 209-218.
- Strati, A. 1992, 'Aesthetic Understanding of Organizational Life', *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 568-581.
- Strati, A. 1990, 'Aesthetics and Organizational Skill', in *Organisational Symbolism*, ed. B. Turner, de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Suleiman, E. (ed.) 1984, *Bureaucrats and Policy Making: A Comparative Overview*, Holmes & Meier, New York.
- Taylor, F. 1911, *The Principles of Scientific Management*, Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Thayer, F. 1973, *An End to Hierarchy! An End to Competition! Organizing the Politics and Economics of Survival*, New Viewpoints, New York.
- Theakston, K. (ed.) 2000, 'The Biographical Approach to Public Administration: Potential, Purpose and Problems', in *From Bureaucrats and Leadership*, ed. K. Theakston, St. Martin's Press, New York, pp. 1-16.
- Thomas, R. 1978, *The British Philosophy of Administration*, Longman, London.
- Thompson, J. 1967, *Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Tichy, N. & Devanna, M. 1986, *The Transformational Leader*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Tiihonen, S. 1989, *Institutions and Bureaucrats. Studies on Administrative History*, Publications of the Commission on the History of Central Administration in Finland, Helsinki.
- Van Riper, P. 1958, *A History of the U.S. Civil Service*, Row, Peterson, Evanston.
- van Wart, M. & Cayer, N. 1990, 'Comparative Public Administration: Defunct, Dispersed, or Redefined?', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 238-248.
- Waldo, D. 1980, *The Enterprise of Public Administration: A Summary View*, Chandler & Sharp, Novato.

- Waldo, D. 1969, 'Reflections on Public Administration and National Development', *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 294-309.
- Waldo, D. 1968a, 'Scope of the Theory of Public Administration', in *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods*, ed. J. Charlesworth, American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, pp. 1-26.
- Waldo, D. 1968b, 'Comparative Public Administration: Prologue, Performance, and Problems', in *Comparative Administrative Theory*, ed. P. LeBreton, University of Washington Press, Seattle.
- Waldo, D. 1968c, *The Novelist on Organization and Administration: An Inquiry into the Relationship between the two Worlds*, Institute of Governmental Studies, Berkeley.
- Waldo, D. 1965, 'Public Administration and Culture', in *Public Administration and Democracy: Essays in Honor of Paul H. Appleby*, ed. R. Martin, Syracuse University Press, Syracuse.
- Waldo, D. 1956, *Perspectives on Administration*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa.
- Waldo, D. 1955, *The Study of Public Administration*, Random House, New York.
- Waldo, D. 1948, *The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*, Ronald Press, New York.
- Walmsley, G. et al. 1990, *Refounding Public Administration*, Sage, Newbury Park.
- Weber, M. 1968 [1922], *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Weiss, C. & Barton, A. (eds) 1980, *Making Bureaucracies Work*, Sage, Beverly Hills.
- White, D. 1996, "'It's Working Beautifully!'" Philosophical Reflections on Aesthetics and Organization Theory', *Organization*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 195-208.
- White, J. 1992, 'Knowledge Development and Use in Public Administration: Views from Postpositivism, Poststructuralism, and Postmodernism', in *Public Management in an Interconnected World*, eds M. Bailey & R. Mayer, Greenwood, Westport, pp. 159-176.
- White, J. 1990a, 'Images of Administrative Reason and Rationality: The Recovery of Practical Discourse', in *Images and Identities in Public Administration*, eds H. Kass & B. Catron, Sage, London.
- White, J. 1990b, 'Phenomenology and Organization Development', *Public Administration Quarterly*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 76-85.
- White, L. 1958, *The Republican Era*, Macmillan, New York.
- White, L. 1954, *The Jacksonians*, Macmillan, New York.
- White, L. 1951, *The Jeffersonians*, Macmillan, New York.
- White, L. 1948, *The Federalists*, Macmillan, New York.
- White, L. 1926, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, Macmillan, New York.
- White, O. & McSwain, C. 1990, 'The Phoenix Project: Raising a New Image of Public Administration from the Ashes in the Past', *Administration & Society*, vol. 22, pp. 3-38.

- Wildavsky, A. 1964, *The Politics of the Budgetary Process*, Little Brown, Boston.
- Willner, A. 1968, *Charismatic Political Leadership: A Theory*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- Willoughby, W. 1918, *The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States*, Appleton and Company, New York.
- Wilson, W. 1887, 'The Study of Public Administration', *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 2, pp. 481-507.
- Witkin, R. 1990, 'The Aesthetic Imperative of a Rational-Technical Machinery: A Study in Organizational Control through the Design of Artefacts', in *Symbols and Artifacts: Views of the Corporate Landscape*, ed. P. Gagliardi, de Gruyter, Berlin, pp. 325-338.
- Wolfe, H. 1924, 'Some Public Servants in Fiction', *Public Administration*, vol. 2, pp. 39-57.
- Wolff, C. 1754, *Grundsätze des Natur- und Völkerrechts, worin alle Verbindlichkeiten und alle Rechte aus der Natur des Menschen in einem beständigen Zusammenhänge hergeleitet werden*, Halle.
- Wölfflin, H. 1950, *Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art*, Dover, New York.

Critical Incident Biography of Anglo-Saxon Public Administration

A. 1880-1941 THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ORTHODOXY (Manifest Destiny Period)

Depoliticisation

- Wilson 1887, 'The Study of Public Administration'
- Goodnow 1900, *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*

Scientisation

- Taylor 1911, *The Principles of Scientific Management*
- Willoughby 1918, *The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States*
- White 1926, *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*

Structural/Functionalism

- Gulick & Urwick 1937, *Papers on the Science of Administration*

Social/Psych. Management

- Follett 1926, 'The Giving of Orders'
- Mayo 1933, *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*

- Barnard 1938, The Functions of the Executive
- Roethlisberger & Dickson 1939, Management and the Worker

B. 1940S CRISIS I - OBJECTIVITY

Repoliticisation

- Lilienthal 1944, TVA: Democracy on the March
- Appleby 1945, Big Democracy
- Morstein-Marx 1946, Elements of Public Administration

Rescientisation

- Stene 1940, 'An Approach to a Science of Administration'
- Simon 1946, 'The Proverbs of Administration'
- Simon 1947, Administrative Behavior

Dissension

- Dahl 1947, 'The Science of Public Administration'
- Waldo 1948, The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration

C. 1950-1960S THE "DECLINE OF THE DISCIPLINE" OR DISCIPLINARY EXPANSION?

Institutionally

- American Political Science Association (representational decline)
- Literature: in reduction of % of articles; "area of interest or emphasis"

A Comparative Glimmer

- Comparative Administration Group 1960
- Heady & Stokes 1962, Papers in Comparative Public Administration
- Riggs 1964, Administration in Developing Countries
- Waldo 1965, 'Public Administration and Culture'
- Heady 1966, Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective
- Waldo 1968b, 'Comparative Public Administration: Prologue, Performance, and Problems'
- Waldo 1969, 'Reflections on Public Administration and National Development'

Organizational Alternative

- Argyris 1957, Personality and Organization
- March & Simon 1958, Organizations
- McGregor 1960, The Human Side of Enterprise
- March 1965, Handbook of Organizations
- Thompson 1967, Organizations in Action
- Katz & Kahn 1966, The Social Psychology of Organizations

Motivational Management

- Maslow 1954, Motivation and Personality

Public Policy

- Dror 1967, 'Policy Analysts' (large body of literature develops at this point, much of which is informed by public choice theory)

Dissension

- Wildavsky 1964, The Politics of the Budgetary Process
- Lowi 1969, The End of Liberalism
- Mosher 1968, Democracy and the Public Service

D. 1970S CRISIS II - IDENTITY AND SEPARATISM

Institutionally

- proliferation of departments & schools of public administration

Normative (social equality)

- Waldo 1968a, 'Scope of the Theory of Public Administration'
- Marini 1971, Toward a New Public Administration
- Caiden 1971, The Dynamics of Public Administration
- LaPorte 1971, 'The Recovery of Relevance in the Study of Public Organization'
- Thayer 1973, An End to Hierarchy! An End to Competition! Organizing the Politics and Economics of Survival
- Ostrom 1973, The Intellectual Crisis in American Public Administration
- Krislov 1974, Representative Bureaucracy
- Golembiewski 1977, Public Administration as a Developing Discipline

Introduction of The Historical

- Gladden 1972, A History of Public Administration

E. 1980-1990S CRISIS III - INTERDISCIPLINARITY OR FRAGMENTATION?

Intellectual Crisis

- Stever 1987, The End of Public Administration: Problems of the Profession in the Post-Progressive Era
- Hood 1990, 'Public Administration: Lost and Empire, Not Yet Found a Role?'

1. THE NEW MANAGERIALISM

Organizational Reform (Fixing Bureaucracy)

- Meyer 1979, Changes in Public Bureaucracy
- Weiss & Barton 1980, Making Bureaucracies Work
- Pitt & Smith 1981, Government Departments: An Organizational Perspective

- Hood & Dunsire 1981, Bureaumerics

Entrepreneurialism (Transforming Bureaucracy)

- Peters & Waterman 1982, In Search of Excellence
- Osborne & Gaebler 1992, Reinventing Government
- Barzelay 1992, Breaking Through Bureaucracy
- Savoie 1993, 'Innovating to Do Better with Less'
- Borins 1994, Public Sector Innovation

Culture: Functionalist

- Pfeffer 1981
- Deal & Kennedy 1982, Corporate Culture
- Schein 1985, Organizational Culture and Leadership
- Denison 1990, Corporate Culture and Organizational Effectiveness
- Deal & Peterson 1991
- Kotter 1992, Corporate Culture and Performance
- Kernaghan 1994, 'The Emerging Public Service Culture'
- Ingraham & Romzek 1994, New Paradigms for Government
- Deal 1995

Regenerating the Individual/Interpersonal

- Harmon 1981, Action Theory for Public Administration
- Ramos 1981, The New Science of Organization
- Thayer 1981, An End to Hierarchy and Competition

The Learning Organisation

- Senge 1990, The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization
- Argyris 1993, On Organizational Learning

Leadership Fad

- Maccoby 1981, The Leader: A New Face for American Management
- Bennis & Nanus 1985, Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge
- Tichy & Devanna 1986, The Transformational Leader
- Conger & Kanungo 1988, Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor in Organizational Effectiveness
- Bennis 1989, On Becoming a Leader
- Nanus 1992, Visionary Leadership
- Bryman 1992, Charisma and Leadership in Organizations
- Kouzes & Posner 1993, Credibility
- Conger & Kanungo 1998, Charismatic Leadership in Organizations
- Bass 1998, Transformational Leadership

2. POST-MODERN STRESSES & LEGITIMATION CRISIS?

Public Interest (The Blackburg Manifesto)

- Walmsley et al. 1990, Refounding Public Administration
- White & McSwain 1990, 'The Phoenix Project: Raising a New Image of

Public Administration from the Ashes in the Past'

Feminism

- McElroy 1982, Freedom, Feminism, and the State: An Overview of Individualist Feminism
- Ferguson 1984, The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy
- Belenky 1986, Women's Ways of Knowing
- Stivers 1990, 'Toward a Feminist Perspective in Public Administration Theory'

Post-Positivist Policy

- de Leon 1988, Advice and Consent: The Development of the Policy Sciences
- Stone 1988, Policy Paradox and Political Reason
- Fischer 1989, 'Beyond the Rationality Project: Policy Analysis and the Postpositivist Challenge'

Hermeneutics & Narrative Theory

- Edelman 1977, Political Language
- Bailey & Mayer 1992, Public Management in an Interconnected World
- Balfour & Mesaros 1994, 'Connecting the Local Narratives: Public Administration as a Hermeneutic Science'
- Hummel 1991, 'Stories Managers Tell: Why They are as Valid as Science'

Discourse Analysis/Deconstruction

- White 1990, 'Images of Administrative Reason and Rationality: The Recovery of Practical Discourse'
- Marshall & White 1990, 'Public Administration in a Time without a Name'
- White 1992, 'Knowledge Development and Use in Public Administration: Views from Postpositivism, Poststructuralism, and Postmodernism'
- Ingersoll & Adams 1992, 'The Tacit Organization'
- Lane 1993, The Public Sector: Concepts, Models and Approaches
- Fox & Miller 1995, Postmodern Public Administration: Toward Discourse
- Farmer 1995, 'Deconstruction' in The Language of Public Administration: Bureaucracy, Modernity, and Postmodernity
- Fox 1996, 'Reinventing Government as Postmodern Symbolic Politics'

Experiential/Phenomenology

- Hummel 1977, The Bureaucratic Experience
- White 1990, 'Phenomenology and Organization Development'
- Forester 1990, 'No Planning or Administration without Phenomenology?'
- Kelly & Maynard-Moody 1993, 'Policy Analysis in the Post-Positivist Era'

The New Organisational Interpretive & Critical

- Morgan 1986, Images of Organization
- Linstead 2004, Organization Theory and Postmodern Thought

Culture: Symbolic

- Smircich 1983, 'Concepts of Culture and Organizational Analysis'
- Alvesson & Berg 1992, Corporate Culture and Organizational Symbolism
- Schultz 1994, On Studying Organizational Cultures: Diagnosis and Understanding

Liberalism

- Rohr 1986, To Run a Constitution
- Rosenbloom 1989, Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector
- Kravchuk 1992, 'Liberalism and the American Administrative State'

Critical Theory: Enlightenment Regenerated

- Dunn & Fazouni 1976, Toward a Critical Administrative Theory
- Denhardt 1981a, In the Shadow of Organization
- Fischer 1989, 'Beyond the Rationality Project: Policy Analysis and the Postpositivist Challenge'
- Fischer 1992, 'Beyond Empiricism: Policy Inquiry in Postpositivist Perspective'
- Benhabib 1992, 'Models of Public Space: Hannah Arendt, the Liberal Tradition, and Jürgen Habermas'
- Cohen & Arato 1992, 'Politics and the Reconstruction of the Concept of Civil Society'

Neo-Marxist

- Dearlove 1979, The Reorganisation of the British Local Government
- Dunleavy 1982, 'Is There a Radical Approach to Public Administration?'
- Dunleavy & O'Leary 1987, Theories of the State

The Return of Comparative

- Baker 1994, Comparative Public Management: Coming in From the Cold
- Suleiman 1984, Bureaucrats and Policy Making: A Comparative Overview
- Rowat 1988, Public Administration in Developed Democracies
- Peters 1988, Comparing Public Bureaucracies
- Blondel 1990, Comparative Government
- Dwivedi & Henderson 1990, Public Administration in World Perspective
- Farazmand 1991, Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration
- Arora 1992, Politics and Administration in Changing Societies
- Pierre 1995, Bureaucracy and the Modern State: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration

Depth Psychology

- Baum 1987, The Invisible Bureaucracy: The Unconscious in Organizational Problem Solving
- Kets de Vries & Miller 1984, The Neurotic Organization: Diagnosing and Changing Counterproductive Styles of Management

Ethics

Toward Public Administration as a Humanities Discipline: A Humanistic Manifesto

- Rohr 1979, Ethics for Bureaucrats: An Essay on Law and Values
- Cooper 1982, The Responsible Administrator
- Gawthrop 1984, Public Sector Management, Systems, Ethics
- Burke 1986, Bureaucratic Responsibility

Aesthetic

- Strati 1990, 'Aesthetics and Organizational Skill'
- Strati 1992, 'Aesthetic Understanding of Organizational Life'
- Gagliardi 1996, 'Exploring the Aesthetic Side of Organizational Life'
- Ramirez 1996, 'Wrapping Form and Organizational Beauty'
- White 1996, "'It's Working Beautifully!'" Philosophical Reflections on Aesthetics and Organization Theory'
- Guillén 1997, 'Scientific Management's Lost Aesthetic: Architecture, Organization, and the Taylorized Beauty of the Mechanical'
- Strati 1999, Organization and Aesthetics
- Linstead & Höpfl 2000, The Aesthetics of Organization

Literary

- Carroll & Gailey 1992, 'Using Literature to Teach about Bureaucratic Structure'
- Marini 1992, 'The Uses of Literature in the Exploration of Public Service Ethics: The Example of Antigone'
- Breischke 1993, 'Interpeting Ourselves: Administrators in Modern Fiction'
- Czarniawska-Joerges & Guillet de Montoux 1994, Good Novels, Better Management: Reading Organizational Realities
- Cohen 1998, 'Using Narrative Fiction within Management Education'
- Howe 2002, 'Mourning Administrative Generosity in a Postgenerous Time: Lessons from Wallace Shawn's "The Designated Mourner"'

History

- Adams 1992, 'Enthralled with Modernity: The Historical Context of Knowledge and Theory Development in Public Administration'
- Raadschelders 1998, Handbook of Administrative History

Biographical

- Edinger 1964, 'Political Science and Political Biography: Reflections on the Study of Leadership'
- Gronn 1993, 'Psychobiography on the Couch: Character, Biography and the Comparative Study of Leaders'
- Theakston 2000, 'The Biographical Approach to Public Administration: Potential, Purpose and Problems'