

(1950 Brown V)

If we are

~~We are concerned~~ to know what expert leadership in democratic administration is, we must first clarify a point regarding the nature of social science, including administrative science. The science of human relations may be distinguished from the natural sciences by its preoccupation with ends or goals. Whether these ends or goals are induced from behavior or studied directly by inquiry or introspection, they present an indispensable subject for the methodology of social science. In the words of Aristotle, "every act and every inquiry, and similarly every action and pursuit, is thought to aim at some good." This is a generally accepted hypothesis in the science of human behavior. Even the extremists of the Behaviorist school of Psychology, in their learning theory and in such utopian political writings as Skinner's Walden II, find themselves occupied with motives. For how can science find itself a role to play unless it ~~connects~~ with human desires? The father of modern methodology in the natural sciences, Francis Bacon, himself declared in the Novum Organum that Aristotle's fourth type of cause--final or goal cause--"corrupts the sciences except in the intercourse of man with man."

We may take it to be true, then, that the sciences of human relations, especially when it is applied as in administration, concerns the ends of action. Thus the word "expert" can only have meaning in relation to goals. If the expert is operating in a consultative or dispassionate capacity--that is, tending to be purely staff--he shapes the intellectual perspectives of a directive. If the expert is acting in a situation under a general license, he provides the directive itself. These two functions, frequently intermingled, make the expert already a leader. The expert leader in administration, therefore, formulates the situation or directs action, or does both together.

The problem is framed for us now. We must ask what kind of moral perspectives the expert administrator possesses. And then we must ask ourselves whether such perspectives are adequate.

The moral perspectives of the administrator are first of all those of the culture in which he is born and bred. It would be foolish to ignore this fact, even though we cannot in this paper assay the character of such breeding. We must eye, gloomily or joyously, general societal diagnoses of social philosophers. It may well be that the predictions of Gaetano Mosca and Brooks Adams of two generations ago are being borne out and that the twentieth century will end in a flowering of bureaucratic societies.

At this moment, we are entitled only to speak of the formation of character of administrative leadership in isolation, as if societal influences did not ultimately determine the essential qualities of political leadership. We assume that we control freely the processes by which administrative leaders are created and wish to know what kind of process we are employing.

It is my opinion that the priesthood of public administration--the professors, reformers, and employers of administrative skills--have set themselves a formula composed of four major elements: "dictionarism," "orientation to expectations," "neutrality and efficiency," and "executive control." The formula does not separate facts from moral exhortations, nor does it even have that degree of clarity that would allow us to separate the scientific concepts or fictions from the practical or moral concepts or fictions.

Least interesting of the elements of the formula on which administrative leadership is nurtured is "dictionarism." The jargon of bureaucracy and the facts of the U.S. Government Manual are mostly inert and harmless. They fill out the inadequate structure of administrative theory with facts which are true and undisputed. They dampen down the sparks of dismay and querulousness that arise from mediocre minds when faced with unanswerable problems.

The second element, "orientation to expectations" is more important. A good part of the expertness of administrators consists of knowing what to expect in the way of decisions from above and acting in conformity with the, sometimes before

the superior's directive is formulated. The expert administrator, like the expert lawyer, is often judged by his ability to foresee events affecting his condition. Much teaching in administration contains principles for getting ahead in the administrative establishment. Thus, we hear commonly the injunction that "a lengthy report will never be read; confine your remarks to one typed page." Orientation to expectations is orientation to past values and existing ideology. It is conformity. It is, of course, opportunism, and opportunism is always reactionary in motive, if not in effect. Yet what teacher of administration does not count his successes by the number of former students in high posts, and pride himself on having taught them what to expect and ergo how to get ahead. And when we and our students are ahead of the game, do we not credit ourselves with expertness and imagine that we have ascended a ladder of skill? We do, and others study us so that they too may streamline their descriptions of public administration, leaving out principles of behavior unconnected with vocational advancement, narrowing thereby the study and practice of public administration.

"Neutrality and efficiency" are the next element of the formula provided expert administrators. Fortunately, the word has gotten around among the conoscenti that expert administrators do not make neutral decisions. They augment, subtract from, or take the place of the policies of politicians in many instances. An administrator is not neutral merely because he wears no party label. Not wearing a party label has important consequences, of course, that I would never deny and I am sorry for those students of administration who see no difference between a Republican bureau chief who is influential and a non-partisan bureau chief who is influential. But administration is not neutral except by the exercise of gigantic fictions of clear directives working upon automatons. Neutrality is foreign to purposive behavior. Any fiction that makes administrative behavior neutral is bound to have consequences striking at the heart of democratic theory.

To illustrate this, we may refer to the famous essay by Woodrow Wilson that is

recommended indiscriminately by many teachers. As Wilson put it, with a kind of rationalistic psychology even then out-moded, we may learn to sharpen knives from cut-throats without having their motives: Prussian and Napoleonic systems of administrative procedure were to be equally applicable to American needs. Indeed, however, we should be well aware of the dangers of imitation. Wilson might have quoted Gabriel Tarde or Theodore Ribot on the complex and often unconscious factors operating within the process of imitation. We should never forget that mankind's three great teachers of administrative science have been despotisms, armies, and the factory system of the nineteenth century.

But, as yet, we have not pursued the idea of neutrality to its remote lair. We must confirm, hence, that administration is always a moral act, that administrative science is a branch of moral science, and that the expert administrator always acts morally. The extreme refuge of the idea of neutrality lies in the faction of Efficiency."

Fictions are inescapable in science and social action. They are needed in science to provide concepts abstracting, summarizing, and picturing data. They are needed in social action to symbolize goals like "freedom" and "community," and in this latter sense are termed by Hans Vaihinger to be "practical fictions." When practical fictions intrude into scientific work--pure or applied--without our assent and control--they deserve Bacon's epithets as idols of the market.

Efficiency is such an intrusive practical fiction. It makes its way into all of the textbooks and means everything and nothing. Beware of the expert who shows us the "efficient way" to do things. He may mean by his words some incarnation of stipulated or desired qualities that are not shared by us. He may mean that he can produce "results" with which we would agree ex post facto. He may be a technocrat

employing the narrowest possible view of a situation in order to be able to prescribe a definitive means. This he does by isolating the specific operation studied from all influences, effects, consequences, and evaluations unnecessary for the defined goal of the measuring unit.

It is even likely that he will use the term as a practical fiction, in order to play on a word that ordinarily has positive symbolic effects. Propaganda that works with the newspapers, congressmen, and ex-Presidents can also be expected to work with bureau chiefs. I should prefer, however, that the word "efficiency" if it is to be taught our future experts and allowed in the language of the expert administrator, be taken only in the sense of rationality--that is, as an abstractive fiction denoting a full exploration in any given situation of all behavioral and valuational consequences of the introduction of change.

When we turn finally to the concept of "executive control" we again see that the trees have been cleared before us. Writers have already pointed out that most American administrative theorists have been ideologues. Their theory has been skewed in the direction of centralized, executive -- directed nationalism. This is so whether they have been Republicans or Democrats. When we read the reports of commissions on executive reorganization, we no longer need believe them to be neutral statements of fact. Few "experts" have emerged from the Schools and offices of this century without an unquestioning faith in executive control as the essence of good administration. This has been done under the noses of the most equalitarian people on earth! The more sophisticated of our brethren who are engaged in turning out leaders in the struggle for executive supremacy conceal well their efforts. The less sophisticated among them present us with inspiring messages like the following, taken from The Report on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government of Puerto Rico in 1949:

"In reviewing the organization of the Executive Branch, the Commission has made use of eight standards which have stood the test of experience. These standards are:

1. The chief executive should be equipped with authority adequate to match his responsibility, and with sufficient staff to aid him in doing those things which he must do.
2. The subordinates of the chief executive should be accountable to him and, through him, to the legislature and to the people.
3. The responsibilities of the subordinates of the chief executive should be properly located and clearly fixed.
4. The various organization units should be grouped by major purpose so as to minimize conflict, duplication, and overlapping.

5. Each activity of the government should be administered through the form of organization best suited to achieve its stated objectives.
6. Good organization should include adequate provision for planning, coordination and control.
7. Special provision should be made for continuing attention to efficiency and economy.
8. The executive Branch as a whole should be so organized as to manage with maximum effectiveness its relations with the other branches of the Insular Government and with the Federal Government. -- Report on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government of Puerto Rico Presented to the Governor by the Commission for Reorganization (San Juan, Puerto Rico, October 17, 1949), pp. 3-4."

The most impressive fact about this declaration of "standards which have stood ^{the} test of experience" is its emphasis on executive control and efficiency.

When the cry of "executive dictatorship" is raised against the demand for executive control by "misguided and selfish" congressmen, the banner of executive control is replaced by the flag of the "national interest." In the literature of administration there is a suspicious correlation between executive control and the national interest. The national interest is, of course, used to refer to various individual and disputed criteria of national wealth, national productivity, military power, and the like. In fact, however, it is of no use to the language of science. It is entirely a practical fiction dedicated to extending the area of the individual's identification a little beyond his navel. We have no control over the term and we must continue to hear it employed by our expert administrators as propaganda for executive integration and control.

I think I have painted a picture of what kind of expert leader in democratic administration the science and profession of public administration nowadays turns out. Unless the culture undoes our good work, he is devoted to dictionarism, opportunism, a mistaken sense of neutrality and efficiency, and the increased power of the executive.

Reform of this condition is necessary if we are to justify the use of the term science with respect to the teaching public administration and if we are to train experts who know the limits and obligations of their expertness. We should hope to saturate the thought and actions of administrators with the principles that one cannot lift a finger to administer any thing or any person without *vent*ing a preference, unconsciously or consciously, and without helping some moral viewpoint and harming another. John Stuart Mill said it well when he wrote that "the rules of action...must take their whole character and color from the end to which they are subservient."

A first step in the reorientation of expert administrators is education in the philosophy of political science. A course on basic methodological questions should be part of every graduate curriculum and should follow a liberal undergraduate education. The elementary course in public administration, given to undergraduates ought to be excluded or converted into a course on human motivation in administrative situations. We should encourage research that multiplies our insights into the evaluational decisions made daily by every administrator from the postal clerk to the President. We ought to intensify interest in problems of administration that are now believed to be out-moded, irrelevant, illegal, or foreign. Among these problems are federalism, local home-rule, interest representation, and popular consultation.

Lest one think these reforms are without root, we may refer to studies by Herring, Gans, Leiserson, Thompson, Hardin and others, noting especially their emphasis on the plural values in administration. There may be mentioned also the new textbooks of

Professors Simon, Smithburg, and Thompson on Public Administration, in which a formidable attack is launched against the fictional structure of administrative theory. This book shows how fruitful is the teaching of administration from a multiple-value viewpoint and also how difficult is the task of reworking the concepts of traditional administration. I suppose I neednot dwell on the evangelism of Paul Appleby. The materials, in short, are being readied for a new philosophical synthesis that may produce expert administrators that are more in harmony with the several major currents of democratic beliefs.