

Toward a Weberian Public Administration: The Infinite Web of History, Values, and Authority in Administrative Mentalities

Eugenie Samier
Simon Fraser University

INTRODUCTION

In this paper I will describe a more comprehensive outline of Weber's work on administration in contrast to how it is usually characterised in administrative studies. In this case, I am emphasising three features most often ignored: history, values, and the intended combinate use of the three forms of authority (including the administrative systems and practices that are expressions of them), and the roles they play in mentality as they reflect the broad scope of his administrative writings. I have chosen these since their omission plays the greatest role in the many distortions, misrepresentations and misuses of Weber. I will also demonstrate what value a greater use of Weber's writings has for contemporary administration. What would it mean to reposition administrative theory on this foundation, compared to the more positivistic structural-functional or economically driven New Public Management currently being used in many international jurisdictions? In spite of radical developments on the theoretical level over the last 20 years, introducing history, cultural studies, biography, psychoanalytic studies, and even aesthetic and literary critique, all of which suggest that a more incisive understanding of administration rests on a valuationally-oriented individual analysis, the field has resisted a reevaluation of its treatment of Weber.

History, values and authority styles as they condition individual administrative mentality are deeply embedded in what is generally referred to as Weber's Central Question. If one takes, as Hennis argues, Weber's 'central'¹ interest or problematic to be the 'development of *Menschentum*', in which history provides evidence for this as the 'history of modern *Lebensführung*' (1983, p. 156), then one characteristic factor in this development are the ideologies that contribute to the changing nature of state bureaucracies, and, concomitantly, the type of *Herrschaft* (authority)²

¹ In 'Parliament and Government in a Reconstructed Germany' (1968, pp. 1413-1414) and in the essay 'Socialism' (1994, p. 292) respectively.

² *Herrschaft* will be translated as 'authority' throughout this paper. While considerable disagreement exists about the translation of the term – 'domination' considered to be a more accurate rendering – 'authority' is the more commonly used term in administrative studies, lending itself better to a discussion of *Herrschaft* internal to the administrative system as well as *Herrschaft* exercised by a political regime over an administrative system.

upon which they are constructed, conferring their legitimacy. Weber's theory of authority, and the three administrative ideal types derived from them, legal-rational (or bureaucratic), traditional, and charismatic, integral to his examinations of law, economy, religion, education, and politics, have meaning for Weber only insofar as they express and provide interpretive power for individual social action.³

I would like first to begin with the following passage that should be familiar to everyone who has read public administration texts:

Weber is one of those thinkers just about all educated people think they know something about. Weber was a sociologist. As a forerunner to positivistic and structuralist organisation theory, he is known as the "father" or "architect" of the "bureaucratic model." His work on bureaucracy was indifferent to variations in bureaucratic forms and the manner in which bureaucracy was related to historically specific social structures. Weber sought to explain bureaucracy by means of an historical law of increasing rationality. He promoted bureaucracy by providing a blueprint or plan for the ideal organisation. In his work on bureaucracies, he ignored organisational conflict, the informal organisation, and values.

Just about everything in this paragraph is false except for the first sentence.

Despite being one of the most cited of "social scientists", there are many controversies regarding how to interpret and use his writings that have conditioned his reception in administration. First are the substantive, mainly interpretive, debates referred to by Gustafson (1973) as the 'exegesis' battles, that centre on his Protestant ethic (1930) and political writings (1919) and whether he promoted charismatic leadership. The Marxist-Weber debates seem to be over, exhausted even before the 1989-1991 period of the collapse of the Soviet Union and its sphere of influence.⁴ A second controversy is one of neglect: that Weber is habitually referenced in the introduction to books and articles, then dropped from the discussion or analysis, referred to as 'ceremonial references', 'window dressing', or 'genuflection'. The third is an active misrepresentation or under-representation that leads to distortion, produced mainly by what Mommsen (2000) referred to as a common sociological practice of 'mining' for concepts, by taking them out of the context of his overall socio-historical theory and thereby rendering them distorted.⁵

One field that is guilty of the second two is administrative studies in English.⁶ With predictive monotony, they produce the following major categories of errors through omission:

1. Reference to Weber's historical work, *Verstehen*, elective affinities, the erotic, irrationality, traditional and charismatic authority and the organisational

³ See the introductory section of *Economy and Society* (1968).

⁴ However, in Russia a strong misapprehension still persists, the ideological rejection of Weber replaced by a slavish adherence to the mistaken 'bureaucratic model'.

⁵ One of my own theses in this regard is that much of the tension produced in Weber scholarship originates from a profound disjuncture between sociological and historical analyses.

⁶ With the notable exception of Pollitt & Bouckaert (2004).

qualities that derive from them, and the larger social and political environments that Weber thought central to the growth of modern organisations.

2. Well-formulated treatment of the value typologies (affective, traditional, legal-rational, valuational), from which all authority and administration is derived, and which in empirical reality is composed of various indeterminate combinations, variations and transitional forms.
3. Reference to his methodological writings (sometimes claiming they don't exist), including his insistence on an individual unit of analysis, and a misunderstanding of analytical ideal typologies often presented instead as empirical or normative types.
4. His critique of bureaucracy (instead presented as a design principle and normative ideal), rather than as part of his disenchantment thesis and the iron cage dilemma.

A field such as administration, subject to pressures of politics, professionalism and scientism (whether in "Western" or socialist states), emphasises those ideas having only direct and practical relevance to the types of organisations students will enter, and often upon which academics rely for access to research information, that is public and private bureaucracies. For this reason it has rationalised its reading of Max Weber. In other words, Weber is used to legitimise bureaucratic practices (its structures and procedures), transforming him into an apologist for technical rationality. And, by doing so, administrative studies has effectively eviscerated the most important and powerful aspects of his work leading to an interpretive and critical understanding, rendering him at the very least useless to the field, if not damaging to public organisations through a misuse of the bureaucratic ideal type.

Weber's contributions to administration extend far beyond the 'bureaucratic model' including a number of major essays exemplifying the elements of his work emphasised in this paper: his examination of administration in the development of world religions, the role of administration in his studies of Russia, the agricultural and industrial studies, the relationship between administration and political systems (bureaucracy with democracy and socialism), administrative secrecy, city administration, and a critique of bureaucracy; all of these requiring an understanding of mentality, the explanatory aim of *verstehen*, and an appreciation of the historical conditions, valuational orientations, and authority relations from which it issues.

Weberian Premises

The three features I have singled out for discussion here provide a necessary set of underlying principles for understanding Weberian administration.

1. History

The first, and most important is an historical perspective. While Weber's approach is often regarded as sociological, it is actually a comparative historical-sociology derived from and applied to actual empirical cases as a world history. As such, Weber's aim was to understand and emphasise the particularity of historical forces,

conditions, and cultural factors influencing the way that individuals conceptualise and act in the world. This character and purpose to interpretive human studies is clearly presented in the 'Objectivity' essay:

The type of social science in which we are interested is an empirical science of concrete reality (Wirklichkeitswissenschaft). Our aim is the understanding of the characteristics of uniqueness of the reality in which we move. We wish to understand on the one hand the relationships and the cultural significance of individual events in their contemporary manifestations and on the other the causes of their being historically so and not otherwise. (1949, p. 72)

Weber rejected a mimicking of natural science to discover the objective truth about social life. (Hekman 1983, p. 2) At best, any of the human studies (Geisteswissenschaften) can provide only interpretive understanding of an infinitely complex and irreducible historical reality: '[T]he way in which life confronts us in immediate concrete situations ... presents an infinite multiplicity of successively and coexistently emerging and disappearing events, both "within" and "outside" ourselves. The absolute infinitude of this multiplicity is seen to remain undiminished even when our attention is focused on a single "object"'. (Weber 1949, p. 72) Weber's perspective on 'being-in-the-social-or-organisational-world' is captured in his definition of Verstehen: 'the method which explores social phenomena from the individual's view outwards'. (1968, p. 6)⁷

The implications of this for organisational analysis are manifold. Kalberg (1994), one of the few commentators on Weber who systematically develops his historiography, identifies the following: 1) interpretive analysis of compared cases leading to verstehen, derived from the premise that social action is values-oriented; 2) an agency-structure linkage in which individual action is seen to lead to meso- and macro-societal structures; 3) multi-causality, meaning that one must assume a broad range and type of causal factors in producing social action and its collective social structures; 4) the use of ideal types as an analytical method for delineating empirical cases; 5) a conception of causal analysis, 'elective affinity', dependent upon world historical comparison; and 6) a model-building approach characterised by tentativeness, limited analytic generalisations, and contextualisation.

The sociology Weber advocates was never intended to be a stand-alone discipline, but was to serve as a handmaiden – a conceptual and methodological apparatus for comparative historical-sociology. Its role for interpretive and verstehende study is clear in his characterisation of it in his methodological writings and *Economy and Society*:

⁷ This term, generally meaning 'understanding' or 'interpretation', is an approach derived from German philosophy and social theory of primarily Dilthey, Weber, Sombart, Heidegger and Gadamer, emphasising how social actors understand themselves and their world. It is usually contrasted with positivistic research methods aimed at explanation, modelled on the natural sciences. In the case of Weber, Verstehen was intended to be complemented with explanatory approaches using 'elective affinity' as a conception of causal relations and employing a distinctive methodology consisting of such distinctive techniques as comparative analyses and ideal typing, but always to remain grounded in methodological individualism and a conception of social action based on valuational orientations from the perspective of the research subject.

We can accomplish something [in interpretive sociology] which is never attainable in the natural sciences, namely the subjective understanding of the action of the component individuals. The natural sciences on the other hand cannot do this, being limited to the formulation of causal uniformities in objects and events and the explanation of individual facts by applying them. We do not “understand” the behavior of cells, but can only observe the relevant functional relationships and generalize on the basis of these observations ... Nevertheless, subjective understanding is the specific characteristic of sociological knowledge. (Weber 1968, p. 15)

Individuals for Weber (1968) are both passive and active, both influenced by the conditions in which they find themselves and by their physical and psychological makeup (p. 7). They are both the cultural artefact and arteficer. Even though they do not choose the conditions into which they are placed and are exposed, ‘human beings make their history, and in actualizing historical values they obey neither a naturalist nor spiritualist, neither a conscious nor an unconscious, teleology of history’. (Schluchter 1981, p. 17)

The consequences of an historically grounded approach for public administration are threefold. First, administrative systems cannot be treated as static – they are continuously influenced by changing societal forces and conditions. These in turn occur within a world historical context requiring ideal typologies that can only collectively illuminate the nature of developments on this scale. Finally, each has a unique particularity of its own produced by the characteristic social action of the individuals comprising them.

2. Values

Weber’s emphasis on values existed on several levels, many of which are delineated in his ‘Objectivity’ essay, and further reinforced throughout his writings. First, all scholarship is dependent upon the perspective of the individual, who in turn is embedded in his or her own historical fabric, and therefore subject to values carried culturally. Secondly, the choice of research problem and its design is a function of values: one chooses a value-laden problem or phenomenon to study. Thirdly, Weber himself was preoccupied with a particular set of values related to his disenchantment thesis and the iron cage dilemma: the prospects for freedom and the fate of liberalism, known as his Central Question. And finally, his characterisation of human subjects rests upon the notion that human beings are value-oriented. The types of social action are derived analytically from these ‘rationalities’ or ‘orientations’ of meaning ascription: instrumental or calculative (*zweckrational*); value-rational (*wertrational*) or transcendent; affective; and traditional or habituated. (1968, pp. 24-26) This means also that individuals are ultimately moral agents (see Bendix 1984, pp. 40-41), positioned historically and organisationally between two major ethical orientations that they have to negotiate and reconcile, ethics of conviction (*Gesinnungsethik*) and ethics of responsibility (*Verantwortungsethik*).⁸

Value orientation is further complicated by both external and internal causes,

⁸ See Samier 2002.

and explicit and implicit expression. The first section of *Economy and Society* and the methodological essays reinforce the view that human beings exist experientially on both individual and social levels, on rational and irrational levels, on conscious and unconscious levels (using e.g. sublimation), all of which require an interpretive act on the part of the researcher:

In the first place the “conscious motives” may well, even to the actor himself, conceal the various “motives” and “repressions” which constitute the real driving force of his action. Thus in such cases even subjectively honest self-analysis has only a relative value. Then it is the task of the sociologist to be aware of this motivational situation and to describe and analyse it, even though it has not actually been concretely part of the conscious intention of the actor; possibly not at all, at least not fully. (1968, pp. 10-11)

It is clear from a closer examination of Weber’s underlying principles, interpretive approach and specific methodology that values drive people’s organisational behaviour and the types of administrative systems they create, affecting roles, social interaction, professional development, policy, administrative action, and the relationships to political authority and the population served.

3. Authority

Weber’s authority types are well known and frequently referenced in administrative and organisational literature, however, there are a number of problems and oversights in general presentations. Frequently, only the ‘bureaucratic’ type authority derived from the legal-rational is used, ignoring the traditional and charismatic types. A consequent problem is twofold: first, that the authority type is treated as an empirical or normative type, when it is analytic; and secondly, that using it in isolation from the other two distorts and diminishes its value, as empirical reality can only be examined by a combinant use of all three. Apart from the damage created by using Weber to justify bureaucratic styles of administration, the omission of the other two types reduces the role tradition and charisma play in administrative practice, and the necessary role Weber ascribed to these dimensions of organisational styles in maintaining social fabric, advancing liberal and democratic values, and most importantly in combating a thoroughly disenchanted world in which people find themselves.

According to Weber, authority expresses itself through administrative systems, and forms of administration are a function of the type of authority, or combination of types, operating at any given time: ‘Every domination both expresses itself and functions through administration. Every administration, on the other hand, needs domination, because it is always necessary that some powers of command be in the hands of somebody’. (1968, p. 948) Change in the administration of any social sphere reflects changing attitudes towards legitimate authority, and the elective affinity of political ideals, economic and institutional conditions, and administrative practice. Questions about current administrative reform associated with the New Public Management internationally are the same basic questions Weber faced in examining historical and contemporaneous administrative systems: those related to

the historical development of the West included establishing causal relations between politics and administration, for example post-Bismarckian rule of bureaucracy (*Obrigkeitsstaat*) in Germany, and his prescient analysis of socialism leading to a 'dictatorship of the official', or incipient nomenklatura, in Russia.

In considering all three of these features, history, values, and their expression in authority types from which administration is formed, one can posit a very different approach to administrative studies than that promoted and practised conventionally in most countries: a discipline strongly humanities-based, centred on political, social and cultural values, and one that must wrestle with the intractability of character, personality, and *Weltanschauung*, in other words the mentality of those comprising the public administration:

Interests, material as well as ideal, not ideas directly control action. But world images, which are the product of ideas, have often served as the channels along which action is moved by the dynamics of interests. After all, it is in response to an image of cosmological order whence the question arises from what and towards what one needs to be saved. (Schluchter 1979, p. 15)

To illustrate the relevance and application of a Weberian administrative studies, the following section proposes four possible cases, demonstrating how history, values and authority contrive to establish mentality as an essential feature of administration.

Case Illustrations

This section draws heavily upon a little used section of *Economy and Society*: Section 13 of Chapter Three, 'Combinations of the Different Types of Authority'. (1968, pp. 262-266) It is here that a number of features of Weber's administrative (as opposed to 'bureaucratic') theory can be found for comparative historical-sociology. These include: 1) pure types of 'ruling organisation' as historically exceptional requiring socio-historical context for analysis; 2) the composition of the basis of authority – belief – as rarely uni-dimensional (e.g. legal authority often combined with habituation and charismatic features); 3) the interdependent nature of rulership and administrative personnel relations; 4) the continuous conflict-ridden nature of chiefs and administrative staffs composing historical reality; 5) the variant role of values in organisational evolution (charisma operates by first changing people's values and mentality producing new conditions, and contrastingly, bureaucratisation operates by changing the conditions under which people live, leading to a change in values and mentality); and 6) the role of politics in altering administrative ideology. It is important to keep in mind that these principles were developed by Weber as a means by which to understand why there was an historical transition in the "West" from peoples' acceptance of a domination of tradition to that of the domination of rational principle.

This combined use of values and authority types was also promoted in 'The Profession and Vocation of Politics', where the 'general science of the state' involves a study of the 'extremely intricate variants, transitional forms and combi-

nations' of the pure types of legitimate authority (Weber 1994, p. 312) in order to understand the struggle for authority, changing styles of authority, and the conflict of values associated with a shift in ethos. In other words, drawing collectively upon the full range of typologies allows one to examine the dynamics of change in administrative practice, and to locate causal factors in administrative change and reform from the individual to organisational level and its causal connections with larger social, cultural and historical forces. This requires a shift of focus from 'bureaucracy' to 'administration', and from organisational structure to a more individual level of analysis. While the legal-rational bureaucratic type may describe an overall conception of an organisational idea, an exclusive use of the bureaucratic masks non-rationalised elements at play, compromising one's ability to adequately describe complex historical reality of actual 'bureaucracies'. One thereby misses many features of social action and relation Weber used in his examination of religion, politics, and economic action: the continued role of affective, traditional, and valuational rationality in modern bureaucracies; the role of ideology in administrative practice; the relationship between formal and substantive rationalities; and the role of the ethics of conviction (*Gesinnungsethik*) and of responsibility (*Verantwortungsethik*).

The method of this section is primarily that of ideal typing, drawing upon principles articulated in Weber's essay "Objectivity" in *Social Science and Social Policy*.⁹ The research interest here is in the 'empirical science of concrete reality' of administrative development, whose aim is 'the understanding of the characteristic uniqueness of the reality in which we move'. (1949, p. 72) This means, for Weber, using as a 'point of departure', 'the *real*, i.e. concrete, individually-structured configuration of our cultural life, and its development out of other social cultural conditions', intent on capturing the 'qualitative aspect of phenomena', with respect to 'cultural *significance*' and 'causal relationships', presupposing 'a *value-orientation* towards these events'. (1949, pp. 74-76)

The cases adopted for illustration of this approach are:

1. Charismatic Administration: Microsoft Corporation
2. The New Public Management: The Decline of the Mandarin
3. The Rationalisation of the University: The Rise of the Corporate Professor

In all three, the change in relative roles of charismatic, traditional and legal-rational factors are evident. In one of the most charismatic of organisations, Microsoft, an adequate understanding of its growth over time requires the use of the other two typologies, and in an excessively bureaucratic milieu of federal governments in the second case, tradition and charisma play a crucial role in their evolution over the last 25 years. The last case demonstrates how the traditional and charismatic features of the professoriate are replaced by a hyper-rationalisation associated with the NPM.

⁹ While there has been some question as to the value of Weber's monocratic bureaucracy type for non-Prussian systems (especially those not based on a system of public law), assuming (wrongly) that any one ideal type is adequate to any one system, one purpose of this paper is to demonstrate that Weber's ideal typologies, and the method of ideal typing, still have currency in general administrative scholarship.

1. Charismatic Administration: Microsoft Corporation

Microsoft Corporation has been chosen as a case study because it clearly demonstrates all features outlined in Weber's complex model, from the qualities of a charismatic leader to the character of a charismatic administrative staff, and the nature of a charismatic organisation, including its routinisation requiring the use of both traditional and legal-rational types. In addition, it exemplifies the problems inherent to charisma noted by Weber. Furthermore, this section proposes a theory of the demonisation of charisma, consistent with Weber's approach. It is also an organisation about which sufficient documentation in the public realm exists to allow for an examination of key personalities, its internal structure and organisational culture, and for tracing its evolution from its earliest form into the routinised character that it now has.¹⁰

While most charismatic studies are of the religious and political spheres, a close reading of corporate executive biographies suggests that charisma commonly appears where economic values are given higher order status, and therefore those with extraordinary abilities or gifts in this sector would theoretically be accepted charismatically. Most managerial literature tends to look at large corporate organisations with strong bureaucratic characteristics very late in their organisational history after the initial charisma establishing the organisation has routinised into bureaucracy. It is in this context that Microsoft is regarded as "unique" or "new" in organisational form. What is most interesting about this underdevelopment is the neglect of the clearly visible charismatic features of the organisation as a whole. This means that personality and cultural aspects of Microsoft are marginalised in the rational discussion rather than seen as necessary qualities. For example, Cusumano & Selby (1998) explain Microsoft's success in terms of rational managerial theory, effectively "neutering" the charismatic to fit conventional management models even though they acknowledge Microsoft's exceptionality in a general way. But, as with other management writers, they have selected only those functionalist traits that can be replicated, transforming the personnel strategy of putting knowledge of technology ahead of managerial skills as resulting in 'a shortage of middle managers with good people skills' (p. 22), but the skills they have in mind are only those consistent with normal management practice. It is on this basis, a significant misunderstanding of charisma, driven largely by the trivialised and simplistic models of charismatic leadership, that organisations like Microsoft are promoted as models for debureaucratisation in the private and public sectors. However, these attempts are doomed to failure given the highly idiosyncratic nature of charismatic organisations and their inherent instability, which make them nonreplicable and unsuitable in adoption within a highly legalised and codified organisational environment. Their discussion of Gates' managerial expertise and product expertise (see Chapter One), reduces his personality traits and idiosyncratic behaviour to a rational decision maker (see pp.

¹⁰ There are a number of problems with the literature on Microsoft. One is the tendency of some sources to extrapolate from the behaviour of a highly selective group of individuals to the entire organisation, reliant in an uncritical manner on anecdotal evidence. The other is to bifurcate into romanticism on one hand, and hostility in the form of demonisation on the other.

23-28) despite many sources that characterise his decision-making as either inspired or incompetent, and disconnects these from organisational and administrative characteristics reflecting charisma.¹¹ This approach also affects the chronology of Microsoft to rationalistic elements. (see pp. 36ff)

There are a number of potential themes arising from the application of charisma to administration, that Microsoft illustrates in its corporate history:

1. what are the strengths of a charismatic organisation?
2. what are the characteristic weaknesses and problems, such as succession and relationships with other organisations that are traditional or bureaucratic?
3. how does the organisation avoid the psychopathologies associated with autocratic authority, often a result of charisma,¹² and associated moral problems often referred to as the dark side of charisma.
4. how is the charismatic character of the organisation preserved during routineisation from losing its potency and transforming into a bureaucracy?
5. what is the nature of its transformatory power on other organisations (e.g. financial, educational)?
6. what does administration and leadership theory have to learn from charismatic cases (e.g. transferability, formation of cultural capital, management models)?

While Gates' character and abilities easily exemplify the charisma Weber had in mind in writing of the exceptional individual, for administrative purposes it is not a consideration of Gates alone that is valuable, but the nature of the organisation that formed around him evidencing almost all features of Weber's comprehensive typology, effectively an administrative staff and organisational culture dominated by and replicating the essential features of Gates' personality, beliefs, and behaviour.

It is clear that for Weber, charisma is not just a quality of an individual, but forms out of the social relationship between an exceptional individual and the followership, evident in his famous definition:¹³

The term "charisma" will be applied to a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is considered extraordinary and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities. These are such as are not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a "leader". (1968, p. 241)

¹¹ Typical of Weber literature in English discussing the charismatic that tends to focus on the charismatic leader (or authority type), without embedding this phenomenon in the necessary administrative and organisational characteristics outlined by Weber.

¹² See for example the work of Manfred Kets de Vries in this respect.

¹³ This view of Weber's conception of charisma is adopted in a number of authors on charisma: e.g. Davies (1954), Dekmejian & Wyszomirski (1972), and Friedland (1964).

The organisational membership is oriented toward values that are ideally based, serving as ideal (*wertrationale*) motives, providing the legitimacy for the type of authority accepted, what Glassman refers to as the 'manufacture of charisma' providing the link between power and legitimacy. (1975, p. 617) The validity of legitimacy for followers rests, as is often quoted from Weber, 'on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him'. (1968, p. 215) The 'charismatically qualified leader' ... 'is obeyed by virtue of personal trust in his revelation, his heroism or his exemplary qualities so far as they fall within the scope of the individual's belief in his charisma'. (1968, p. 216)

Gates' exceptionality is legendary, documented in a number of sources in an extraordinarily consistent manner. For the purposes of this paper, only four major sources are used, ones that trace his early biography and the earlier years of Microsoft during which time the organisation demonstrated its most intensely charismatic nature, Andrews (2000), Cusumano & Selby (1998), Manes & Andrews (1993), and Wallace & Erickson (1992). The portrait they create is one of a highly gifted individual from an early age, whether in playing complex card games (Andrews 1999, pp. 13-14) or at school, but blossomed when, still as a teenager, he entered the nascent microcomputer industry. His 'charismatic gift' includes coding expertise (Cusumano & Selby 1998, p. 32; Wallace & Erickson 1992, p. 223), his prescience in seeing where personal computer development would go, and his initial outwitting of IBM lawyers in negotiating the first major contract for Microsoft that set a standard for the industry. This conferred upon him the status of a prophet of the computer industry and an industry icon who took on a societally (later a globally) important role. (Andrews 2000, p. 7) His eccentricities also contributed to the creation of a charismatic aura: not owning a TV in his early years, work, dress, eating and driving habits during Microsoft's initial years, his reported ambidexterity, and phenomenal memory.

Terms used to describe him by adherents are typical of the charismatic repertoire: 'hero', 'worship'. (Andrews 2000, pp. 19-20) Not only did Gates and Microsoft survive the early industry history when so many other small firms fell by the wayside, but they acquired the Midas touch – the ability to make people wealthy and to realise their dreams in the industry – 'it is the place to be', or the 'centre of the software world'. Language used throughout Microsoft organisational and biographical literature consistently employs religious and military metaphor in a highly dramatic way to capture what is essentially a mysterious social phenomenon, particularly in the early years. On the one hand, this is indicative of a strong charismatic presence, almost devoid of what Weber would call traditional or bureaucratic elements, and on the other, this created a counter reaction as Gates and Microsoft became progressively demonised. It does suggest that for those who respond to Gates charismatically, he was idealised, serving as an ego ideal attracting personal identification, and also that the potential for Gates to create a highly personalised organisation existed. And, in fact, that is what happened – it is almost impossible to think of Microsoft without Gates. But this leads to the next level of Weber's charismatic analysis, the nature of its social relations and the organisational structure that forms around a charismatic individual.

For Weber the basis of legitimacy is based on a recognition of the leader's special quality, or 'special gifts of body or mind' (1968, pp. 1112, 1114), dependent upon 'how the individual is actually regarded by those subject to charismatic authority' (1968, p. 242), that is the value that 'followers' ascribe to the charismatic individual's vision of ideals and qualities or powers that may accompany it. Where traditional and bureaucratic are based on the satisfaction of normal needs with ordinary, everyday means, the charismatic satisfies extraordinary needs, that is, 'those which transcend the sphere of everyday economic routines' are satisfied in a heterogeneous or charismatic manner. (1968, p. 1111) In other words, as Fagen stresses, 'the charismatic leader is always the creation of his followers'. (1965, p. 275) Smith, too, adopts this view of Weber's theory, in opposition to a number of writers who misinterpret Weber by assigning charisma to only personal qualities held by a leader rather than a form of social status, in other words, constructed by followers. (1998)¹⁴

The peculiarity of Microsoft's early culture provides strong confirmation of Weber's thesis. A charismatic organisation is consistent with its own principles, that is a new organisation with its own language, mores, myths, and roles derived from the personality and belief system of the charismatic founder, affecting staffing, working patterns, social behaviour, and the material environment.

Initially, Gates recruited a small, trusted close-knit group of friends and family contacts. As Microsoft grew in size it adopted a very particular recruiting approach based on replicating Gates' essential characteristics (Cusumano & Selby 1998, p. 58): usually young people, directly out of university, who were selected on the basis of exceptional intellectual ability relevant to Microsoft's main activity, coding. The core organisational philosophy was to bring together a 'bunch of smart people' (Andrews 2000, pp. 25-26), who are almost messianically driven to fulfil Microsoft's corporate mission of providing the world with software, and who regard their work as a lifestyle rather than a job. This was characterised by an essentially graduate student culture, working around the clock, sleeping at the office at irregular hours (e.g. on the floor under a desk), living off junk food (later routinised into the free beverage depots in each building in their central cores), and producing what Wallace & Erickson called a 'monastic' work culture (1992, p. 235), yet one that is also highly idiosyncratic, seen in the manner that individuals have considerable latitude in decorating their offices. Cultural success can also be measured by the frequency with which new language is created: flaming for overly critical email; RTM (Release to Manufacturing) to ship product; Seven Year Programmer's Burnout; 'happy accident' for a mistake; 'infinite defects' on World for Windows, meaning to find bugs faster than developers can fix them and each fix leads to another bug. (Cusumano & Selby 1998, p. 40) A particularly charismatic term for agents charged with Microsoft's external business dealings is 'evangelist' (Andrews 2000, p. 28), connoting religious conversion.

Very early in its history, Microsoft employees became aware of their special status, formulated in its collective identity construction as a contrast to an icon of pri-

¹⁴ Among those Smith critiques for this misrepresentation of Weber's concept of charisma are such writers as Downton (1973) and Willner (1984).

vate corporate bureaucracy, IBM: 'saying that is done by IBM is not a way to have it accepted at Microsoft'. (Andrews 2000) This was later formalised into the now famous Microsoft "Campus" at Redmond, designed to produce an environment and climate conducive to sustaining high levels of energy, intelligence and engagement. The flattened hierarchy, characteristic of charisma maintaining personal relationships between the leader and followership, is reflected in the low-lying buildings designed to maximise the number of equally sized offices and windows and relatively easy access among staff (reminiscent of faculty offices in research universities). Its initial plan produced a social environment more like an artistic colony or community of scholars, yet one highly strategically and tactically oriented towards positioning Microsoft at the top of the industry pile. Its formal organisational structure was informally constructed, remaining more a network of personal and work relationships consisting of a loosely affiliated 'brain trust'. (Cusumano & Selby 1998, p. 35) In such a hothouse environment, the interaction style was characterised by self-critique, self-analysis, and frequent and regular fights and arguments, later legitimised and routinised in post-mortem reports and a method of continuous critical review. The atmosphere of the early days is notorious: creative, innovative, but taking its cues from Gates' temperamental style and direct, if not rude, confrontations (including screaming and insults). While intensely personal in manner, arguments based on personal or emotional reasons or internal politics did not work with Gates, only technical arguments based on a model that disproved his. (Cusumano & Selby 1998, p. 35) Communication was intense, carried out through the routine copying of email to Gates of topics of potential interest and the way that ideas spread from top-down and bottom-up. (Andrews 2000, p. 8) In other words, Microsoft was an organically created organisation, not rationally planned.

In spite of Microsoft's growth into a quasi-charismatic, quasi-bureaucratic organisation, Gates' presence still permeates. Referred to as 'Bill' within, the early emulation of his personality and person is evident in the constant awareness of his attitudes, judgments, activities, and whereabouts, indicative of the charismatic exercise of cultural and personal control regardless of the later acquisition of managerial staff and routinised monitoring and reporting methods. Microsoft still largely works around projects, many staff self-organising into work groups and responsible for self-management. Despite initial criticism of Microsoft for not having 'good' management and organisational principles (Wallace & Erickson 1992, pp. 296-297), its practices soon gained notoriety, spawning a sub-literature of how to manage in the Microsoft way (all of which neglect charismatic theory). A number of these practices are interesting to note for charismatic value. Gates instituted the annual Gateway retreat on the shores of Hood Canal for Microgames (Andrews 2000, p. 10) and the twice-yearly ritual for himself of 'Think Weeks', during which time he reads historical biographies (Andrews 2000, p. 11) and anything else of relevance to Microsoft and the industry. (Andrews 2000, p. 6) His business strategy exhibits what for Andrews is paranoia in relation to other organisations, always being prepared for the next opportunity, the next 'killer opp'. (2000, p. 26) His management style is characterised by the injunction to executives, 'For every piece of good news you send me, tell me a piece of bad news' (Andrews 2000, p. 12) and a philosophy about screwing up consisting of all being forgiven as long as one learns something from a

mistake and avoids repeating it. (Andrews 2000, p. 18)

One can see how Microsoft exemplifies the principles Weber outlined for a charismatic organisation. The charisma that forms, its various characteristics and traits, are not solely those of the charismatic leader but are shared by followers composed of a charismatic aristocracy forming, in Burns' terms, a leadership structure of the administrative core or discipleship who themselves hold these positions by virtue of their own charismatic qualifications and the general followership. Being self-determined, setting their own limits, rejecting all external order, transforming all values and breaking all traditional and rational norms (see 1968, pp. 1115-1117) are not solely qualities of the leader, but shared by the entire membership. Dow emphasises this aspect of Weber's theory in stressing that the follower identifies with the charismatic leader, adopting him or her as a model 'because he sees in the leader forces that exist within himself, forces that are being freed from the restraint of convention by the being and action of the leader'. (1978, pp. 83-84) Davies, also, emphasised the characteristics of followers oriented toward a charismatic tendency. He postulated, and found some evidence for, followers with a charismatic predilection having the four following aspects of personality structure related to their political pattern of behaviour: 1) less able to tolerate indecision and crisis; 2) less able to maintain ambiguous perceptions, instead prone to making categorical judgments; 3) more likely to believe that others share his opinions and act similarly; and 4) less likely to have strong political party ties because of a preoccupation with leaders. (1954, p. 1090)

In each historical period, the form charisma takes is conditioned by prevailing societal practices, higher order values, and personal qualities or abilities that correspond to these. For example, in a modern industrialised and predominantly secularised society, it is not surprising that an individual like Bill Gates can be acknowledged as charismatic on the basis of exemplary technological abilities and a vision of technological ubiquity, where in other cultures charismatic individuals are those with military or religious prowess. What is important to note here about charisma is that there is NO universal charismatic character – it is contextual bound to the conditions, values, and institutional structure of society.

The organisational fabric of charisma is derived directly from the leader's exemplification of those values held most strongly by the followership. Due to this strong non-rationality, that is, role of emotional and higher order values, the personal reaction to a leader forming charisma creates a group with a communal character. Mission and power are delimited from within, not by external orders, directed to a specific vocational, political or other group. (1968, p. 1113) On the ecstatic character of charisma (see Weber 1968, pp. 401, 535) constituting part of its irrational character Dow explains that 'Charisma discovers, expresses, and releases that Dionysian life-force power; it literally "revolutionizes men from within", freeing emotional and instinctual elements previously repressed by convention'. (1978, p. 85) Therefore, as Dow stresses, charisma is not inherently 'ethically oriented', but rather 'daemonic'. And because of its emotional nature, it remains beyond the scope of bureaucratic domination.

Because pure charisma constitutes a call in the most emphatic sense of mission or spiritual duty, it is, according to Weber, foreign to economic considerations, dis-

dain and repudiating economic exploitation of the gifts of grace as a source of income (although this often remains more an ideal than a fact). In its pure form, there is no such thing as a salary or a benefice – followers live primarily in communalistic relationship with the leader on means provided by voluntary gift. Charisma does not always demand a renunciation of property or of acquisition, but the attainment of a regular income by continuous economic activity devoted to this end (e.g. the bottom-line as an ultimate goal), as ‘charisma rejects as undignified all methodical rational acquisition, in fact, all rational economic conduct’. (1968, p. 1112) It can only tolerate irregular, unsystematic acquisitive acts. A charismatic organisation located within a capitalist system is in an antagonistic relationship, evident historically in the case of ‘robber capitalism’. (1968, p. 1118). Followers and disciples must be free of worldly attachments (1968, pp. 1113-14), characteristically having rather ascetic tastes. It is only in the later routinisation phase that economic values take on a higher order value.

In spite of Gates’ and Microsoft’s legendary wealth, there is more than enough evidence in the public record to demonstrate that the primary motivation for Gates is not monetary acquisition – in spite of his stock holdings, his salary is relatively low for an American corporate executive and much of his wealth is locked into trust fund and foundation arrangements. And during its early years Microsoft employees were not driven in this manner – even now, their motivations appear to be ambivalent. Microsoft still operates in a highly unconventional fiscal manner, eschewing the methodical rational acquisition and management of wealth by maintaining extraordinarily high cash reserves and sinking high level of resources into potential projects and products. Consistent with its revolutionary nature, organisational rules and laws flow from personal experience (1968, p. 1115), inclined toward breaking all traditional and rational norms.

Administratively, charisma has a definite social structure ‘with a staff and an apparatus of services and material means adapted to the mission of the leader’ (1968, p. 1119), in Gates’ case to ‘set the standard’ for the industry. Therefore, the administration of a charismatic community has none of the characteristics conventionally associated with administrative systems, being sharply opposed to both rational bureaucratic and traditional authority. The administrative staff does not consist of ‘officials, based on technical training, or social privilege, but of agents who are chosen on the basis of their own charismatic qualities – producing a charismatic aristocracy composed of a select group of adherents united by discipleship and loyalty, and chosen according to their own charismatic qualifications’ (1968, p. 1111) and devotion to the cause, evident in their internalisation of the leader’s eccentricities. (In the early days, Microsoft officials were known for rocking back and forth in their chairs like Gates, and the systems division functioned through a chaotic ‘gunslinger process’. (Cusumano & Selby 1998, pp. 52-53) There is no hierarchy; the leader merely intervenes in general or in individual cases when he considers the members of his staff lacking in charismatic qualification for a given task. There is no appointment or dismissal, no career, no promotion; only a call at the instance of the leader on the basis of the charismatic qualities of those he summons. In Weber’s terms, there is no definite sphere of competence or appropriation of official powers on the basis of social privileges, but there may be territorial or functional limits to

charismatic powers and to the individual's mission. Instead of established administrative organs there are agents who have been provided with charismatic authority by the leader or possess it on their own, for example Steve Ballmer (Andrews 2000, pp. 36-37) and Myhrvald's proximity to Gates. (Andrews 2000, p. 32)

The greatest organisational problem for charisma is longevity. Because of its irrational character and dependence upon the person and personality qualities of a leader for its existence, a charismatic organisation must find some way to "routinise", that is, stabilise itself on more independent structural foundations to survive either the death of the leader, or the leader's loss of gift. Weber identified three other motives originating in the followership: 1) the continuation and reactivation of ideal and material interests; 2) the continuing relationships among the charismatic aristocracy of administrative staff and disciples; and 3) having their relationships and positions put on a stable everyday basis that allows them to participate in normal family relationships and to have a secure social position and economic security. While followers are first willing to live communistically in a community of faith and enthusiasm, only a small number are prepared to devote their lives purely idealistically; the majority will in the long run want to make a living out of the calling in a material sense. The organisation thereby becomes either mechanised (bureaucratised) or displaced by other structures, or fused with others in diverse forms. The desire for transformation into a permanent form comes often from the master, always from the disciples, and most often from the 'subjects'. (1968, p. 1121)

There are a number of things that have to happen in successful routinisation through the appropriation of powers and economic advantages and of regulating recruitment:

1. either finding a successor regime or transforming the charismatic leader into one with traditional and/or legal-rational authority;
2. altering its anti-economic character by taking on some form of fiscal organisation;
3. recruiting new staff who do not have a personal devotion and attachment to the leader and who may never meet the leader; and
4. overcoming the tension or conflicts that will arise between pre-routinisation and post-charismatic staff and practices.

These can be fulfilled in a variety of ways:

1. searching for a successor charismatic leader on the basis of qualities that fit him for the position of authority through a process of traditionalisation which reduces the purely personal character of leadership;
2. seeking a revelation manifested in some technique of selection that is legitimate, often through legalisation;
3. designating a successor by the original charismatic leader and recognised by the community;

4. designating a successor by the charismatically qualified administrative staff and recognition by the community;
5. achieving a hereditary succession leading to either traditionalisation or legalisation; and/or
6. transmitting through ritual means an individual to a charisma of office (in effect, a type of coronation).

Most importantly, its anti-economic character has to be altered, allowing for the development of some form of fiscal organisation to provide for ongoing economic needs. This is necessarily accompanied by the change in legitimate authority to a more differentiated hierarchy on rational grounds. And this is the general pattern adopted by Microsoft. Routinisation has taken on both traditional and bureaucratic elements, creating a complex entity of institutionalised charisma, requiring all three of Weber's authority types to be used for analysis. To some extent, labour and roles have become rationally differentiated and based on expert qualification and certification. Many managers are now non-coders, Gates' personal involvement is reduced, and Ballmer has taken over as CEO introducing more regular structure and procedure. The post-1991 generation of employees are recruited in a less personal manner, and the entering of new markets (e.g. publishing) has broadened recruitment to new areas. All this signals a significant shift in values, and raises the question as to how much charisma is left, and whether Gates' charismatic qualification is waning.

2. The New Public Management: The Decline of the Mandarin

Since knowledge of cultural reality is 'knowledge from *particular points of view*' (Weber 1949, pp. 81-82), that adopted for this topic is the perspective of the senior civil service. This involves constructing contrasting ideal types of senior civil servants from empirical sources (*concrete individual* phenomena) that delineate the relative "ideas" of a traditional senior service and their replacement in the New Public Management by new public managers through their relative perceptions and beliefs.¹⁵ The reasons for focussing on an organisational elite are threefold. First, they occupy a crucial interface between politics and the bureaucracy where political and administrative ideologies meet, representing a unique group within the public service. They encompass in their responsibilities the dividing line between the managerial realm of continuity and regulated relationships and the political realm of flexible, personal relationship and openness to forces of change. (Hodgetts 1973, p. 163) Secondly, they comprise a discrete status group, within which individual per-

¹⁵ Generally, reference to Weber in NPM literature has played a small role since his administrative theory is usually severely truncated and decontextualised to an exegesis of the „bureaucratic model“ in administrative writings in general. Weber is referenced commonly as „the Weberian model of bureaucracy“ which the NPM is instituted to overcome (e.g. Barzelay 1992, *Breaking Through Bureaucracy*). Occasional reference is made to Weber's relevance to the principal-agency problem through his observation that politicians are often at the mercy of knowledgeable and skilful bureaucrats, always finding themselves in the 'position of a dilet-

ceptions and beliefs as they affect authority can be closely examined without excessively over-generalising, meeting Weber's stricture about maintaining an individual unit of analysis. And, lastly, change, or the historical process, is clearly evident in the replacement of those embodying in the organisation one combination of authority types, the traditional mandarin, with those embodying a different combination, the new public managers.

The contrast between managers and mandarins, presented in abbreviated form below,¹⁶ demonstrates through the exaggeration of typical features drawn from empirical reality, as is typical in ideal typing, the significance of values in shaping administrative mentality, and in particular here, how administrative reform is dependent upon these factors. The four major dimensions of these types of relevance here are: value orientation of the senior administrative staff, their social origin and educational background, the nature of authority they construct, and their organisational roles.

a. The Manager Type

The value orientation of the new public managers consists of an enforced private sector mentality, whose basic aim is to achieve results or goals, meet client demand quickly, and do so at least cost. It is a belief in the replacement of traditional 'top-down' bureaucratic control with technical 'bottom-up' authority as 'good' administration, and business-style decision-making. It enforces a high degree of internal rationalised authority based in financial and goal-oriented accountability measured ideally by market analysis and performance measurement schemes. (see Yeatman 1990) In this manner, underlying value issues are suppressed, and indifference to ends is reinforced leading to a suppression of value issues and an indifference to ends, in Weberian terms, a domination of formal over substantive rationality. The overriding imperatives are efficiency and effectiveness, characteristic of a mercenary competitive self-interest requiring the objectification of human relations and roles. They live, in Weberian terms, from the state rather than for the state, representing a significant departure from a number of features of Weber's ideal type of bureaucracy, reflecting, instead, occupational features outlined in his examination of Economic Action.¹⁷

Their social origin and education is typified by technical training, oriented toward drive, initiative, expertise in the techniques of accounting, operational monitoring and strategic planning. The entrepreneurial emphasis on their personal qualities and private sector leadership techniques in motivating staff to higher levels of productivity, in other words, a routinised charismatic, has created a fascination with 'leadership' training, since motivation of employees to greater productivity and acceptance of an economically-oriented public sector mindset is regarded as a pri-

tante facing the expert' (Weber 1968, p. 991) (e.g. Campbell & Wilson 1995, pp. 19-20; Savoie 1994, p. 107), and a concern, therefore, about whether politicians will ever be able to control them. In other words, Weber seems to have had little relevance in this discussion.

¹⁶ See Samier 2001 for a detailed exposition of the two ideal types.

¹⁷ *Economy and Society*, II: 24, pp. 140-144.

mary function. However, as Beyer (1999) observes, their conception of leadership (and charisma) is based more on a psychological treatment of individuals and individual differences, in contrast with a more sociological conception derived from Weber that emphasises a social structure emerging from complex interactions having a normative basis in the belief systems of followers. The managerial model, and a large popular literature supporting it, assumes that the charismatic is composed of common, quite likely learnable skills, creating a kitsch-culture of leadership training. Beyer notes that this 'taming' of charisma has reduced the element of vision to a technical capacity to articulate organisational goals in either clear and motivational or budget-maximising terms. In contrast to Weber's emphasis on a transcendent, 'magical' quality of charisma, the only 'magical' power of managerialists is an ability to produce gold.

The nature of authority characteristic of the spirit of managerialism rests on an ethos of economic efficiency, impersonal rules, and objective competence based in a goal-oriented accountability measured by market analysis and performance measurement. It results, in authority terms, in a less deferential attitude toward policy expertise, and a more slavish adherence to the new fashion of 'entrepreneurial leadership' exhibiting obedience to political authority ideologically driven by private sector values.

Their organisational role is permeable, resulting from a high level of mobility between the private and public sectors. It has also been personalised: they are held personally responsible for not achieving results, enforced through open recruitment or external sourcing, performance contracts or fixed term appointments with salary and status dependent upon individual performance rather than length of service, and performance pay.¹⁸ They are governed by the purposive contract (*Zweck-Kontrakt*) peculiar to private law (Weber 1968, p. 672), holding their rank in their person rather than position, and therefore they are more easily dismissed without the usual civil service protections. The new public managers combine the capitalist rationalised authority derived in part from their superior 'knowledge of techniques and facts' as well as their 'relative immunity from subjection to the control of rational bureaucratic knowledge'. (Weber 1968, p. 225) Consequently, the tradition of collegial attitudes towards knowledge as common property of the senior civil service and an ethic of cooperation is replaced by a business-style competitive attitude.¹⁹

Accentuating the features of new public managers ideal typically results in a legitimate authority type based in an ethos of economic efficiency. As a technical managerial elite, or 'management/can-doers' who are good at implementing policy, concerned with good management, and value for money (Richards 1997, p. 15), they correspond to Weber's entrepreneurial class who are economically oriented in their social action, wherein 'every action, which, though primarily oriented to other ends, takes account, in the pursuit of them, of economic considerations' and for whom

¹⁸ Rewards for entrepreneurial achievement are sometimes termed merit pay in the US, or discretionary performance-related pay in the UK (Hood 1995, p. 105) at some senior levels.

¹⁹ See the observations of George Wedd, a long-time member of the British civil service administrative class, commenting on the establishment of business-style agencies created under the Next Steps programme. (1997, p. 228)

“technical” questions always involve the consideration of “costs”’. (1968, pp. 64, 66) The new public manager adopts essentially an entrepreneurial concept of profession (*Beruf*) in which the ‘conception of labour as an end in itself, [is] a calling’. (1930, p. 63) They are technically educated or trained, on short-term appointments, and perceive labour to be non-political. Through performance goals their authority is legitimised in ‘strategies of control’. While factors other than the NPM have contributed to creating the conditions for entrepreneurialism in the public sector, private sector consultants represent the ideal to which the new public managers are to aspire, leading some critics to refer to them as a ‘new nomenklatura’²⁰ or a ‘consultocracy’. (Hood & Jackson 1991, p. 24)

b. The Mandarin Type

In contrast with the manager, the mandarin is essentially a form of extra-patrimonial traditionalism.²¹ The mandarin is distinguishable from other civil servants by its position in the hierarchy, its particular role and function, and exclusivity as a status group. Their group characteristics are essentially the same as those Weber described in *The Religion of China*.²² they are life-tenure servants of the government, whose responsibilities were closely tied to the legitimacy of the ruling elite.

Their value orientation is characterised by a preoccupation with higher order political end values, in other words, substantive rationality. Just as Weber ascribes to the Chinese literati, the administrative mandarin in Westminster systems assumed an ethos of “official duty” and of the “public weal” (Weber 1951, p. 111), and aspiration to a gentlemanly ideal. Their strong public service ethic, Campbell & Wilson argue, allowed them to overcome tendencies to self-interest (1995, p. 6), enabling them to live, in Weberian terms, for the state, rather than from the state.

They occupy a unitary status group theoretically open to all social strata yet dependent upon an elite literary or generalist education rather than training suitable for policy analysis. In the UK they are recruited largely from Oxbridge; in Canada traditionally from large universities in Ontario, and often from Oxford, the London School of Economics, Harvard and Yale. (Campbell & Szablowski 1979, pp. 112-113) Through enculturation they act as specially educated, nationalised administrative agents overseeing national interests for political authority, often selected young as protégées being groomed for the highest positions. (Campbell & Szablowski 1979, p. 114) It is to a large extent the collegial life of the senior civil service that attracts its members (Campbell & Wilson 1995, p. 16), and the bureaucratic feature of fixed pay scales contributes to the development of esprit de corps.

The type of authority enjoyed by a civil servant varies with level in the bureaucratic hierarchy: at lower levels it has been predominantly ‘legal-rational’, however mandarin authority has corresponded more with traditional and charismatic values. Just as in traditional businesses described by Weber – where a traditional ethos

²⁰ T. Smith & A. Young, *The Fixers*. (1996, p. 156)

²¹ See *Economy and Society*, III: ii, 7. (1968, p. 228)

²² Characteristics identified in Chapter V: ‘The Literati’ (1951).

governing manner of life, social relationships, and a traditional circle of contacts dominate day-to-day activity (Weber 1930, p. 67) – the mandarin, while at the apex of a bureaucratic hierarchy, are not part of the “bureaucratised” world in the manner in which they relate to political authority, to each other, and in some cases even to subordinates whom they patronise. The mandarin, as a body, manages its authority as an informal collegial system. They are a status group within which little hierarchy exists – permanent secretaries enjoying considerable autonomy from the Head of the Civil Service. (Campbell & Wilson 1995, p. 21) Their distinctive socialisation set them apart from politicians and from the rest of the bureaucracy.

Their authority, in contrast to that of the more contractually and calculably determined public manager, is not based primarily on impersonal rules and objective competence, but on their willingness to speak ‘truth to power’. In other words, they were valuable agents of policy development, preventing ministers from pursuing disastrous policy initiatives or rescuing them from over-enthusiasm or ignorance.²³ What characterises their unique civil service relationship with ministers and other senior bureaucrats is what one permanent secretary describes as ‘moral courage’ (Barker & Wilson 1997, p. 225), and dependence upon the personal character of the minister and changing political circumstances. To one respondent in Richards’ interviews with senior officials (1997, p. 156), they were of charismatic stature: ‘I always felt, looking back, that the Permanent Secretaries of the 1940s and ’50s were great men. Maybe that is an illusion of youth from when I first joined, but Permanent Secretaries appeared to be really powerful people who had views of their own’. This authority was protected through tenure. They have held a virtual monopoly on providing advice to ministers (Campbell & Wilson 1995, p. 18), a monopoly over policy-related knowledge that has diminished through the increased policy activities of think-tanks, consulting firms, universities, and regional levels of government. (Wildavsky 1988, p. 254)

Their administrative role is clearly described as quasi-political (1951, p. 110), much in the manner of the traditional modern mandarin. Unlike most West European jurisdictions, the rights and duties of British civil servants are not set out in statute, instead, they are established under Royal Prerogative, thereby governed in their practices more by convention than legal-rational principle encoded in law. Their responsibilities in Canada, and other Commonwealth countries following the British example, have also been primarily based on a traditional role, whose permanence developed as a matter strictly of conventional usage (Hodgetts 1973, p. 209), resulting in a great variation in mandarin allocation of duties and personal *modus vivendi* with ministers. These conditions are a result partly of an administrative tradition that, as Weber notes, was ‘an administration of notables’ in Britain, in contrast to the Continental development towards bureaucratisation. (1968, p. 970)

Their brilliance is evident not in the mastery of organisational but of political problems, contrary to the bureaucratic type described by Weber (1968, p. 1417), clearly differentiating them from legal-rational authority. Zifcak (1994) found, in

²³ Epitomised in the parodic character Sir Humphrey in the popular *Yes, Minister* television series. Albeit a caricature, Sir Humphrey represents an ideal typical construction of the mandarin.

interviews with mandarins, not just a lack of familiarity and training in managerial tasks, but also an uninterest bordering on impatience, contempt and cynicism for managerialism.

As an ideal type, mandarin authority is vested in three dimensions of the role, or necessary qualities, that Barberis determined through extensive demographic analysis that traditional Permanent Secretaries have: personal qualities including resilience, independence of mind, loyalty to ministers without sacrificing their own integrity or that of their office, and charisma; intellectual prowess; and technical attributes of sound judgment and discrimination. (1996, p. 140) The most important feature of mandarin authority, in contrast to the new public managers' unquestioning obedience to government policy, is the ability of 'speaking truth to power', allowing them, as Weber notes of traditional authority, greater discretion over decisions and actions not bound by tradition. The normative values associated with the mandarin, especially of responsibility and accountability to the public interest are replaced in the NPM by accountability to procedural and policy initiatives in force at any time. The charismatic qualities associated with mandarins are grounded in the determination of substantive values, where in the new public manager they are derived from formal rationality associated with pre-established ends.

3. The Rationalisation of the University: The Rise of the Corporate Professor

The New Public Management is generally regarded as a global phenomenon of change in the public sector in most industrialised countries, however, a lesser examined part is the effect of the NPM on the educational sector, and the universities in particular. While there has been an increasingly large volume of literature on the corporatisation of the university in the English speaking world, in the US, Australia, the UK, and now in Canada, little connection has been established administratively with the NPM. Titles of recent books on the university are telling, though, suggesting the same underlying logic: *Digital Diploma Mills* (Noble 2002), *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* (Slaughter & Leslie 1997), *The Academic Marketplace* (Caplow & McGee 2000), *The University in Ruins* (Readings 1996), and *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*. (White & Hauck 2000)

It is the intent of this section to explore the effects of this type of administrative reform on the university generally, and on the professoriate specifically. This involves examining the overall rationalisation of universities structurally, but also the creation of a new mentality in the professoriate that provides the compliance necessary in accepting a very new conception of their role: their values, the nature of their relationships with students and each other, and how they conduct their teaching and research. In other words, how does one transform a traditional professoriate into an entrepreneurial and managerially oriented cadre who adopt obedience to bureaucratic authority and performance management?

Since conduct and ideas are mutually conditioning, universities do not simply change because of external forces, but are assisted by mentalities within which they tolerate or support the very practices that finally erode intellectual ideal. Can bureaucratisation of the intellectual realm take place without the complicity of intel-

lectuals in creating rationalised systems of activity? In order to explore these questions I will first outline the New Public Management model, describing the type of new manager it promotes, then construct a model of the managed university that follows from these principles. Finally, I will try to describe what the new entrepreneurial professor is beginning to look like, and what some of the ultimate consequences will be for higher education.

a. The New Public Management Model

What follows here is a sketch of the most important features of the NPM relevant to an examination of the 'corporate' transformation of the university; a detailed exposition of this model can be found in Samier (2001). The NPM originated in its purest form in the 1980s in Anglo-Saxon countries with Westminster-style governments, namely Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The causes were multiple, but provided collectively a rationale for departing from a long-standing public service tradition: constrained resources due to budget deficits, loss of public confidence in the public sector, a taxpayers' 'backlash', and increased information technology. However, the driving force has been the popularity of a conservative political ideology intent on 'rolling back the state', meaning to reduce the power of the bureaucracy and transform public administration along private-sector managerial principles.

For decades there had been attempts to rationalise the civil service, and this failure was seen by many politicians by the 1980s to originate with resistance by senior bureaucrats (Hennessy 1989, p. 205), leading to direct and public attacks on civil servants in the late 1970s, popularly known as 'bureaucrat-bashing' (Savoie 1994, p. 4) and laying at the feet of civil servants sole responsibility for incompetence and corruption. This negative view of public administration was legitimised by a number of academic theorists and popular management writers, promoting public choice theory and corporate culture doctrine. What is important for the thesis of this paper, is that a significant shift in causal perception occurred from a structural or systems view to a personalisation of reform: in effect, the struggle to change the public sector became a battle of mentalities.

The NPM is an administrative ideology providing a 'strategy of containment' aimed at regaining political power over bureaucrats as part of an overall strategy of retooling the state along market principles (the three E's of economy, efficiency, effectiveness that have replaced the three C's of traditional administration, conduct, code of ethics, and culture). These changes are based upon the belief that private sector management is superior to public administration, and that its discrete body of knowledge is portable to the public sector. In an NPM ethos, more management is a good, reflected in some instances in significantly increased staffing at the managerial level, and universally imposed measurement regimes. After a time, as Weber noted (1968, p.13; 1930, pp. 181-182), the material interests of management shed their ideological justifications, and take on a life of their own, resulting in goal-displacement, in the case of universities, economic efficiencies over educational value. This changes the purpose and nature of education from *Bildung* (individual development) and politicisation for democratic society to training for economic interests.

The essential features of the NPM include (derived in part from Aucoin 1990):

1. a shift from senior administrative responsibility grounded in policy development to a managerial style typified by cost-consciousness producing a 'scientised' managerialism ideology affecting role, structure and staffing.
2. decentralisation from a monopoly system of government regulation and service delivery to corporatised units, internal markets, and rivalry (regionalisation, devolution, and decentralisation), although accompanied by a more centralised control over policy and civil service monitoring.
3. a shift from planning and public service welfarism to cost-cutting and labour discipline, producing deregulation and downsizing.
4. a shift from administrative processes adhering to policy initiatives to an emphasis on output through control and accountability mechanisms, performance and efficiency measurements, and accountability regimes.
5. a separation of permanent public bureaucracy provision of services from private sector production of public services for 'consumers' through term contracts, the use of contracting out, quasi-governmental organisations, privatisation and a heavy reliance on consultants.

These principles created a very different ideal of senior bureaucrat, the new public manager, from that of the traditional mandarin described in the previous section of this paper. The process of replacing the traditional mandarin with managers requires the legitimisation of managers on the one hand through an enforced business entrepreneurial culture, but also the delegitimisation of the mandarin by undermining their traditional authority. This has been carried out through three primary means: deprivileging civil servants; politicisation of the ranks; and exposure to public scrutiny.

1. Deprivileging the civil service has been carried out through the introduction of new classification systems, the replacement of tenure with term appointments or contracts and performance agreements between ministers and heads of departments specifying tasks and departmental 'outputs', and the withholding of pay increases and bonuses. This is accompanied by reducing their traditional human resources, the 'policy shops' that have either been reduced or eliminated in many ministries.
2. Politicisation of the senior civil service has taken place through private sector or political appointments reversing the tradition of meritocracy, in effect a reintroduction of patronage compromising their autonomy and ability to provide 'frank and fearless' advice (see Renfrow & Hede 1998), or speak truth to power.
3. Public scrutiny is achieved through transparency of administrative activity. This includes either extending the powers of existing review agencies, or creating new agencies to impose more private-sector style performance assessment regimes and codified standards of conduct and 'objective' performance standards.

The main negative results of NPM has been: significant and sometimes continuous reorganisation of government leading to administrative instability, a proliferation of agencies and increased managerial staff, sometimes at greater financial cost, and a human cost in low morale, job insecurity, increased rates of stress-related illnesses, a widening gap between private and public sector salaries, fewer university students pursuing careers in government, and high levels of resignations. New public managers have often pursued their entrepreneurialism to the detriment of public service standards, or have acted so independently of each other that they compromise unity in the civil service. The problems are due, in part, to inherent tensions and contradictions within managerialism: 1) that it requires both centralised financial and administrative control as well as devolution and decentralisation – seen in the increased authority financial experts in central agencies have over programmes and policy implementation in service ministries reducing their flexibility; 2) that it regards itself as value free, yet promises to achieve effective public service requiring a strong political and social value orientation; and 3) that the entrepreneurial freedom managers should exercise has been hampered by strong accountability and performance regimes. All conditions that feature prominently in the Corporatisation of the University literature.

b. The Rationalisation of the University

From a purely bureaucratic perspective, the university is an alien institution.²⁴ Social relations are personal and idiosyncratic, and intellectuals appear to be driven by theoretically abstruse and overly complicated ways of thinking and communicating. What is necessary in rationalising it is a taming or domestication of intellectuals toward exhibiting a ‘rational bourgeois mindset’. In contrast, a bureaucratic mentality is characterised by a ‘materialisation of mind’, given to expanding its powers through the rationalisation of the groups it regulates. This mentality produces a collective rather than individual identity, a system in which status is conferred only through administrative function. In its pure form, it is hostile or indifferent to intellectual achievement, generally regarded by bureaucrats as a morally questionable egocentrism. It even affects language: “bureaucratese” lacks in substantive intellectual characteristics – there are no individuals or personalities, no idiosyncrasy or critique, and a low tolerance for ambiguity, passion, and abstraction.

Universities, like many other organisations, have been rationalising for some time as they are increasing in numbers, size, complexity, and specialisation, growing in some cases into “multiversities”. In the case of North American universities particularly, they have moved from guild to pluralistic governance (Kerr 1972, p. 36), accompanied by increased administrative personnel and business attitudes and practices. The measure of rationalisation is the degree to which intellectuals conduct their own activities in a bureaucratic manner, producing a social structure and psychological climate conducive to administrative control and yielding predictable results. The permeation of rationalisation occurs at a number of levels: individual,

²⁴ A detailed account of this structural and relational rationalisation can be found in Samier (1997).

interpersonal, group, organisational, and inter-institutional.

1. On an individual level the autonomy of one's day-to-day activities is affected. Senior academic positions are increasingly managerial, for which management experience is increasingly an important qualification. (Woodhall 1991, p. 48) Corporate-style presidents are essentially chief executive officers, inclined toward the demands of external interest groups. As universities increasingly rely upon funding from industry and comply with government for public funding, a privileged caste are those who hold strictly administrative positions, or academics who function well bureaucratically.
2. On an interpersonal level, behaviour becomes rule-based resulting from a legalistic attitude toward formal duties producing an undue emphasis, virtually a fetish, on procedural matters. As rules become internalised, interpersonal relations are redefined to meet rule-based procedures, reducing politics to management, and the selection of means to choices of techniques. This is assisted by the administrative myths of rationality through consultation, the 'institution' as the ideal unit, operation through consensus and shared interests rather than hierarchy, and the impartial maintenance of law and order.
3. On a group level, relationships among definable members are increasingly formalised through written agreements, contracts, and collective bargaining.
4. On an organisational level, the university is subjected to measurable organisation-wide corporate strategic plans and objectives and information technology systems that impose standardisation. Auditing techniques measuring academic performance as 'product' or 'outputs', tying scholarly activities to budgets, enrolments, workforce entry rates, and economic indicators, is based on a 'skill-set' approach to learning promoting a dominating ideology of 'human capital theory'. This removes the traditional powers that effectively insulated academics from administrative staff by diminishing the power of departments as the effective scholarly unit of the university (Nisbet 1971, p. 94), and furthering the wrestling of control over the means of intellectual production from intellectuals.
5. On an interinstitutional level, the primary role of the university shifts from independent scholarship to contributing to a competitive economy and solving social problems (Bok 1990, p. 39), taking on a market activism measured by 'enhanced responsiveness' to 'community' demands. These values, applied to intellectual pursuits through an attitude toward intellectual property and a competitive ethos (Slaughter 1990, p. 28), engender entrepreneurialism. Investment in basic research is calculated by economic return through patentable and profitable products selected on the basis of greatest promise of payoff resulting in a distribution and transfer of knowledge on the basis of industrial application. (Bloch 1991, pp. 26-28).

Government influence over universities is most effectively carried out through mechanisms of accountability, defined formally as 'value-for-money', and colloquially as 'the biggest bang for the buck'. Intellectuals are thereby transformed into

managers of public resources, subject to the same kinds of statutory and policy requirements as other public servants. Educational systems, as socialising and allocation systems, function as agencies legitimising economic, technical-rational, and technological values. From a Weberian perspective, 'Wertfreiheit', as a moral principle of academic duty towards disinterestedness (see Weber 1949, 'Objectivity' essay), is compromised, not in political, but in governmental and industrial, terms. As public funding has declined and the utility role of universities increased, corporate-academic relationships have formalised through a variety of collaborative arrangements: 'interface' institutes, joint ventures, contract research, cooperative education, and education services for government and private organisations. (Maxwell & Currie 1984) Such collaboration is promoted by government through statutory provisions, the establishment of more entrepreneurial types of universities, and reductions in public support while recommending that universities aggressively seek private sources. Resulting effects on the university include a competitive commodity mentality, and support from university administrators in promoting 'corporatisation' because it give them more control and power, increased staffing and other resources (empire-building and self-interest).

c. The Corporate Professor

It is important to first characterise the traditional professoriate in ideal typical terms in order to measure the degree of change in underlying values and attitudes towards authority typifying the corporate professor. Intellectual mentality is fundamentally different from that of the bureaucratic, identified by Weber indirectly in the 'Protestant Ethic' essay as the spontaneous, indulgent cultural activities of the arts in opposition to the sober, puritanical, and uniform lifestyle engendered by rationalised mentality. (1930, pp. 185, 188) Intellectuals can be described as skilled wielders of verbal systems and concepts for the purpose of moral and political discourse, reflection and polemic aimed with some frequency at existing institutional ideas and structures (Knopfmacher 1968, pp. 4, 6), and as guardians of higher values such as justice, truth, liberty, and equality possessing individual characteristics of articulateness, disinterestedness, and an opposition to misuse of power. (MacLean 1990, pp. 163-164) These traits translate administratively into systems of autonomy, quasi-traditional and charismatic in orientation (Shils 1972b, p. 29), given to organising in ways derived partly from medieval traditions of tenure and academic freedom (Nisbet 1971, pp. 60-61), and with strong charismatic social relations culminating in the cultivation of extraordinary abilities and mentorship. They typically resist rationalised organisation, since organisation is seen to exist ideally to further individual intellectual ends.

Bureaucrats, as holders of public trust, have a legitimate duty to impose their technical-rational will on intellectuals through values of efficiency and effectiveness. And increasingly, intellectuals perceive them to have the right to do so, and a duty to obey. For this, the beliefs of organised intellectuals must adjust to provide legitimisation. And democratic ideology among intellectuals, particularly those who view the traditional university as an elitist institution, support the rights of bureaucrats acting in the public interest. What emerges from this process is a new model of

the entrepreneurial professional, akin to the new public manager in government organisations. The essential characteristics of the corporate professor are the following.

First, professorial roles become administrative through increased consulting, management of large research projects or institutes, and service on public agency committees. (Kerr 1972, p. 43) One of the most powerful agents of change is the effect grants from government and foundations have, transforming many academics into entrepreneurs who must manage institutes, centres, bureaus, and other capitalistic enterprises. (Nisbet 1971, pp. 72-73) These activities break down the traditional unity of teaching and researching (Ben-David & Zloczower 1962, p. 49), causing them to become increasingly differentiated and competitive. Research itself changes from a flexible, spontaneous form free from managing and reconcilable with the 'sovereign role of teaching' into 'development' research that is larger in scale requiring managerial staff. (Nisbet 1971, p. 80) The formalisation and rationalisation of intellectual activity is itself a mode of domination as one engages more in strict calculation, converting intellectual activities into capital subject to rational techniques of cost-benefit analysis. As intellectuals become increasingly dominated by the process itself, the quest for resources becomes the new slave-driver.

On an interpersonal level, traditional and charismatic-style social relations are replaced by technical-rational ones, meaning that relationships with colleagues and students are more impersonal, calculative and formalised, increasingly governed by detailed codes of conduct. One major effect on teacher-student relationships is a decline in mentorship, which requires that a strong affective dimension be cultivated based more in verbal than written interaction.

On a group level, they are transformed from 'members' of the university to 'employees' who are 'hired' rather than 'appointed' (Nisbet 1971, p. 102), from a community into a class. Academic tenure can be replaced through contract positions subject to performance evaluations. (Woodhall 1991, p. 48) Indicative, as well, is the increased proportion of 'professional' specialties demonstrating calculative or technological value. This justifies the amalgamation of training programmes in the university, causing a decline into polytechnical institutes (Spurr 1990, p. 46), whose consequent structural differentiation is of benefit to bureaucratic styles of planning and regulation. Those traditional academic tools of autonomy, tenure and academic freedom, instituted through the powers of Chairs and Senate, are viewed from a purely bureaucratic perspective as obstacles. A governance consequence of bureaucratisation is the separation of policy-formation, a political function, from its implementation, the duties and ethics of public servants. Senates' powers can be reduced or eliminated and Advisory Committees, composed of 'stakeholder' or industrial representatives, can be attached to faculties as 'policy-makers' with some control over the curriculum.

If adopted as a legitimate reduction in their autonomous governance over academic matters, the professoriate will become cautious and timid intellectually and politically, partly due to a believed 'objectivity' in their academic lives, or simply decline into apathy and submission. According to Weber, bureaucracy, through its rationalised values and ways of thinking produces a 'passion for bureaucracy' characterised by 'men who need "order" and nothing but order, who become nervous and

cowardly if for one moment this order wavers, and helpless if they are torn away from their total incorporation in it'. (1976, p. 362) It threatens the moral, spiritual, and emotional qualities necessary to further democratic freedom (1976, p. 362), crippling the personality of the bureaucrat, reducing him to a cog in a machine who clings to his position, desperately hoping to be a bigger cog. (1930, p. 182)

A number of developments in the history of intellectuals, their organisation, and relationship to other social institutions have already assisted in their integration to bureaucracy. Bureaucratisation in public bureaucracies is causally related to the rise and expansion of the university through a dual dependency that can be expressed in exchange values: the universities train and qualify public servants, and public bureaucracies in turn provide them resources. (Mosher 1982, p. 27) The public utility value that served to legitimise intellectuals for the general public (Hofstadter 1963, p. 206) is the very value that is transforming intellectuals into public servants. In a fully rationalised world, all intellectual activity is 'educational'. It must legitimise itself in terms that serve other interests. The institutional development of intellectuals has developed into a trend toward incorporating intellectuals into organised institutions making scholarship the almost exclusive jurisdiction of universities. (Shils 1972a, p. 13) The intellectual, as Weber noted in a letter to Lukacs, writes for his own salvation, the academic belongs to the university. (Weber 1991, p. 190) This produces a legitimacy problem for those intellectuals who are not members of a recognised institutional structure. From a purely bureaucratic perspective, intellectuals are ideally located in such organisations subject to regulation.

All of this changes the nature of the professorial role. They are producers, who are encouraged to view their own knowledge as product, and themselves as human capital stocks in a competitive educational environment. They are no longer members of a university community, but of a profit-maximising enterprise making them both capitalists in the public sector and state-subsidised entrepreneurs. They are consumed with all the market-oriented activities and attitudes that go with the need for revenue-generation and profit-making values: patents, royalty and licensing agreements, creating spin-off companies, and a greater concern for corporate partners than colleagues, or even their students. In Weberian terms, and corresponding to the shift from mandarin to new public manager, they eschew living for the state for living off the state.

There is a tendency on the part of intellectuals to see the bureaucratic as an external agency. Nisbet has regarded this attitude as a mythology of blaming government and industry for causing the university to change to a utility, when in the 1940s in the U.S. it was the academics themselves who chose 'to do business' (Nisbet 1971, pp. 81-82), seduced by affluence after World War II (Shils 1975, p. 43), and leading to an embourgeoisification of intellectuals. (Mills 1951, pp. 142-160) In effect, they also have themselves to blame for the corporatisation of the university, or, as Julien Benda (1969 [1928]) observed in the early historical stage of the rationalisation of the cultural sphere, they are engaged in the 'Treason of the Intellectuals'.

Conclusion

In the 'Objectivity' essay Weber explicitly identifies the distinction between 'things' and our apprehension of them: 'It is not the "actual" interconnections of "things" but the conceptual interconnections of problems which define the scope of the various sciences. A new "science" emerges where new problems are pursued by new methods and truths are thereby discovered which open up significant new points of view'. (1949, p. 68) This basic principle of interpretive studies points to the importance of mentality over technique in administration, and three of the causal factors producing it. Historical forces create both the conditions we inherit and the conceptual frameworks through which we perceive and interpret the world. Within this 'concatenation' and Weber's broad conceptualisation of human nature form the values from which our social action is derived and authority fashioned. It is the tension among these values that gives rise to conflict and contradiction in administrative systems that propel change. In the two latter cases examined above, the relationship between a political neo-conservative ideology producing the New Public Management in government and the university sector is causally related through an 'elective affinity' (Weber 1930, pp. 91-92) to changing material conditions. In a similar manner, the emergence of the charismatic organisation Microsoft is produced by an elective affinity of mentality and nascent technological innovation, further evolved into routinisation through bureaucratisation corresponding primarily to the internal needs of its members.

All three cases illustrate the role Weber intended for the use of ideal types in organisational and administrative analysis. As constructions informed by history, values, and authority, they are interdependent methodologically: empirical cases are admixtures of the various authority types, 'extremely intricate variants, transitional forms and combinations' of the pure types of legitimate authority (Weber 1994, p. 312) relating the individual level of administrative experience with the form and structure of the organisation, and its causal connections with larger social and historical forces. This requires a shift in analysis from 'bureaucracy' to 'administration' and from organisational structure to a more individual level of analysis.

The character and principles of a Weberian public administration are aimed at both the consequences of legal-rationality for society, as well as the administrative discipline turned positivist. 'Mystery' to Weber had a positive value, reflecting those experiences and values that transcend the calculable:

The increasing intellectualization and rationalization do not, therefore, indicate an increased and general knowledge of the conditions under which one lives. It means something else, namely, the knowledge or belief that if one but wished one could learn it at any time. Hence, it means that principally there are no mysterious incalculable forces that come into play, but rather that one can, in principle, master all things by calculation. This means that the world is disenchanted. (1946, p. 139)

REFERENCES

- Andrews, P. 2000, *How the Web Was Won: How Bill Gates and his Internet Idealists Transformed the Microsoft Empire*, Broadway Books, New York.
- Aucoin, P. 1990, 'Administrative Reform in Public Management: Paradigms, Principles, Paradoxes and Pendulums', *Governance*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 115-137.
- Barberis, P. 1996, *The Elite of the Elite*, Dartmouth, Aldershot.
- Barker, A. & Wilson, G. 1997, 'Whitehall's Disobedient Servants? Senior Officials' Potential Resistance to Ministers in British Government Departments', *British Journal of Political Science*, vol. 27, pp. 223-246.
- Benda, J. 1969 [1928], *The Treason of the Intellectuals*, Norton, New York.
- Ben-David, J. & Zloczower, A. 1962, 'Universities and Academic Systems in Modern Societies', *Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, vol. 3, pp. 45-62.
- Bendix, R. 1984, *Force, Fate and Freedom: On Historical Sociology*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Beyer, J. 1999, 'Taming and Promoting Charisma to Change Organizations', *Leadership Quarterly*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 307-330.
- Bloch, E. 1991, 'Positioning U.S. Science Policy for the New World Order', in *The Changing University: How Increased Demand for Scientists and Technology is Transforming Academic Institutions Internationally*, ed. D.S. Zinberg, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Campbell, C. & Szablowski, G. 1979, *The Superbureaucrats: Structure and Behaviour in Central Agencies*, Macmillan, Toronto.
- Campbell, C. & Wilson, G. 1995, *The End of Whitehall: Death of a Paradigm*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Caplow, T. & McGee, R. 2000, *The Academic Marketplace*, Transaction Publishers, Garden City.
- Chang, Y.Z. 1941/1942, 'China and English Civil Service Reform', *The American Historical Review*, vol. 47, pp. 539-544.
- Cusumano, M. & Selby, R. 1998, *Microsoft Secrets: How the World's Most Powerful Software Company Creates Technology, Shapes Markets, and Manages People*, Touchstone, New York.
- Davies, J.C. 1954, 'Charisma in the 1952 Campaign', *American Political Science Review*, vol. 48, pp. 1083-1102.
- Dekmejian, R.H. & Wyszomirski, M.J. 1972, 'Charismatic Leadership in Islam: The Mahdi of The Sudan', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 14, pp. 193-214.
- Dow, T. 1978, 'An Analysis of Weber's Work on Charisma', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 83-93.
- Downton, J. 1973, *Rebel Leadership: Commitment and Charisma in the Revolutionary Process*, The Free Press, New York.
- Fagen, R.R. 1965, 'Charismatic Authority and the Leadership of Fidel Castro', *Western Political Quarterly*, vol. 18, pp. 275-284.
- Friedland, W.H. 1964, 'For a Sociological Concept of Charisma', *Social Forces*, vol. 43, pp. 18-26.

- Glassman, R. 1975, 'Legitimacy and Manufactured Charisma', *Social Research*, vol. 42, pp. 615-636.
- Granatstein, J.L. 1982, *The Ottawa Men: The Civil Service Mandarins, 1935-1957*, Oxford University Press, Toronto.
- Gustafson, P.M. 1973, 'Exegesis On The Gospel According To St. Max', *Sociological Analysis*, vol. 34, pp. 12-25.
- Hekman, S. 1983, *Weber, The Ideal Type, and Contemporary Social Theory*, University of Notre Dame Press, Notre Dame.
- Hennessy, P. 1989, *Whitehall*, Fontana, London.
- Hennis, W. 1983, 'Max Weber's "Central Question"', *Economy and Society*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 135-180.
- Hodgetts, J.E. 1973, *The Canadian Public Service: A Physiology of Government, 1867-1970*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Hood, C. 1995, "'Deprivileging" the UK Civil Service in the 1980s: Dream or Reality?', in *Bureaucracy in the Modern State: An Introduction to Comparative Public Administration*, ed. J. Pierre, Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Hood, C. & Jackson, M. 1991, *Administrative Argument*, Dartmouth, Aldershot.
- Kalberg, S. 1994, *Max Weber's Comparative Historical Sociology*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Kerr, C. 1972, *The Uses of the University*, 2nd edn, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Knopfmacher, F. 1968, *Intellectuals and Politics and Other Essays*, Thomas Nelson, Melbourne.
- MacLean, I. 1990, 'Responsibility and the Act of Interpretation: The Case of Law', in *The Political Responsibility of Intellectuals*, eds I. MacLean, A. Montefiori & P. Winch, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Manes, S. & Andrews, P. 1993, *Gates: How Microsoft's Mogul Reinvented an Industry –and Made Himself the Richest Man in America*, Doubleday, New York.
- Maxwell, J. & Currie, S. 1984, *Partnership for Growth: Corporate-University Cooperation in Canada*, Corporate-Higher Education Forum, Montreal.
- Mills, C.W. 1951, *White Collar: The American Middle Classes*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Mommsen, W. 2000, 'Max Weber's "Grand Sociology": The Origins and the Composition of "Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Soziologie"', *History and Theory*, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 364-383.
- Mosher, F. 1982, *Democracy and the Public Service*, 2nd edn, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Nisbet, R. 1971, *The Degradation of the Academic Dogma: The University in America, 1945-1970*, Basic Books, New York.
- Noble, D. 2002, *Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education, Between the Lines*, Toronto.
- Pollitt, C. & Bouckaert, G. 2004, *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*, 2nd edn, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Readings, B. 1996, *The University in Ruins*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

- Renfrow, P. & Hede, A. 1998, 'A Comparative Analysis of Senior Executive Services in Australia', *Public Productivity & Management Review*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 369-386.
- Richards, D. 1997, *The Civil Service under the Conservatives, 1979-1997: Whitehall's Political Poodles?*, Sussex Academic Press, Brighton.
- Samier, E. 2002, 'Managerial Rationalisation and the Ethical Disenchantment of Education: A Weberian Perspective on Moral Theory in Modern Educational Organisations', *Special Issue of the Journal of Educational Administration*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 589-603.
- Samier, E. 2001, 'Demandarinisation in the New Public Management: Examining Changing Administrative Authority from a Weberian Perspective', in *Max Webers Herrschaftssoziologie. Studien zu Entstehung und Wirkung*, eds E. Hanke & W. Mommsen, Mohr/Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Samier, E. 1997, 'The Capitalist Ethic and the Spirit of Intellectualism: The Rationalized Administration of Education', in *L'éthique Protestante de Max Weber et L'esprit de la Modernité*, Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris.
- Savoie, D. 1994, *Thatcher, Reagan, Mulroney: In Search of a New Bureaucracy*, University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh.
- Shils, E. 1975, 'The Academic Ethos Under Strain', in *Universities in the Western World*, ed. P. Seabury, The Free Press, New York.
- Shils, E. 1972a, *The Intellectuals and the Powers and Other Essays*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Shils, E. 1972b, 'Intellectuals, Tradition, and the Traditions of Intellectuals: Some Preliminary Considerations', *Daedalus*, vol. 101, no. 12, pp. 21-34.
- Schluchter, W. 1981, *The Rise of Western Rationalism: Max Weber's Developmental History*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Schluchter, W. 1979, 'The Paradox of Rationalization', in *Max Weber's Vision of History: Ethics and Methods*, W. Schluchter & G. Roth, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Slaughter, S. & Leslie, L. 1997, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Smith, D.N. 1998, 'Faith, Reason, and Charisma: Rudolf Sohm, Max Weber, and the Theology of Grace', *Sociological Inquiry*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 32-60.
- Spurr, B. 1990, 'The New Idea of the University', *Quadrant*, pp. 42-46.
- Teng, S. 1943, 'Chinese Influence on the Western Examination System', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*, vol. 7, pp. 267-311.
- Wallace, J. & Erickson, J. 1992, *Hard Drive: Bill Gates and the Making of the Microsoft Empire*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Weber, M. 1994, *Political Writings*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Weber, M. 1991, 'Letter to Georg Lukacs', in *George Lukacs: Life, Thought, and Politics*, A. Kadarkay, Basil Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Weber, M. 1976, 'Some Consequences of Bureaucratization', in *Sociological Theory*, eds L. Coser & B. Rosenberg, Macmillan, New York.
- Weber, M. 1968, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

- Weber, M. 1951, *The Religion of China: Confucianism and Taoism*, The Free Press, New York.
- Weber, M. 1949, *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, The Free Press, New York.
- Weber, M. 1930, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Unwin Hyman, London.
- Weber, M. 1919, *Gesammelte politische Schriften*, Mohr/Siebeck, Tübingen.
- Wedd, G. 1997, 'Ministers and the Civil Service in 1997', *Contemporary Review*, vol. 270, no. 6, pp. 225-231.
- White, G. & Hauck, F. (eds) 2000, *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, Prometheus Books, Amherst.
- Wildavsky, A. 1988, 'Ubiquitous Anomie: Public Service in an Era of Ideological Dissensus', *Public Administration Review*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 753-755.
- Willner, A.R. 1984, *The Spellbinders: Charismatic Political Leadership*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Woodhall, M. 1991, 'Changing Patterns of Finance for Higher Education: Implications for the Education of Scientists and Engineers', in *The Changing University: How Increased Demand for Scientists and Technology is Transforming Academic Institutions Internationally*, ed. D.S. Zinberg, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Yeatman, A. 1990, *Bureaucrats, Technocrats, Femocrats: The Contemporary Australian State*, Allan and Unwin, Sydney.
- Zifcak, S. 1994, *New Managerialism: Administrative Reform in Whitehall and Canberra*, Open University Press, Buckingham.