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Although both the practical and philosophical roots of modern public administration rise from the Egyptian and Chinese dynasties, as from the Greek polis and Roman imperium, the academic discipline of public administration has to a large extent developed directly pursuant to Wilson's Study of Administration. The use of films as teaching tools enriches teaching by framing pedagogic content in ways that enable students to discover the relationship of academic concepts to their own life experience. To use movies and other popular art forms as tools for teaching, and to invite students to explore them as tools for learning, is a risky venture. It requires that academicians move away from the forms of communication at which we tend to excel to those in which we also become students. But isn't this what real teaching is about?

At most elite graduate programs most students are most of the time discontented, in part because time constraints and close relationships with faculty pre-
clude real evaluation of their work. Insecurity mounts when, after several years of work, graduate students face a serious test—Ph.D. prelims. Prelims are especially unpredictable since a healthy academic department is a high pluralism environment; thus, faculty may disagree as to the purpose of prelims. To cope, the author recommends that graduate students maintain moderate levels of anxiety for a peak preparation and performance; also talk to all the faculty to “grok” (i.e., know very well) their diverse expectations. Most important, graduate students should remember that doctoral prelims are not designed to drive them crazy; that is a wholly unintended consequence.

**Analysis and Commentary**

**Foundations From Quantum Physics for a Normative Theory of Administration and Governance**

*R. Philip Brown*

The modern American ethos is a brand of Lockean individualism gone wrong that now embraces rapacious self-interest as its prime meridian. A new ethical model is necessary to combat this radical, soulless, and excessively particularistic form of individualism. The author proposes a journeyman philosophy of organization and governance for citizen and administrative practitioner alike based upon concepts from quantum theory. This normative model of administration, called authentic individualism, has certain ramifications for a more reflexive, creative and unorthodox approach to public administration. All institutions and organizations are systems guided by general organizing principles that should discard the humans as a resource model, make employee well-being an organizational purpose, encourage humans toward a sense of moral meaning in life and work, recognize legitimate leader-
ship as emerging from the people who make up the organization, and fulfill obligations to the community that supports them and makes them successful.

Private Emotions on the Public Stage: The Case of Envy and the American Presidency
Michael P. Riccards

This paper examines the different expressions of envy as they are manifested in the historical literature on American Presidents. The concept of envy is reviewed with an emphasis on its uncertain origins, its relationships to social learning theory, and psychoanalytical explanations of the emotion. Envy is especially prominent in consumer-oriented competitive societies with discrete youth cultures such as our own. American Presidents often exhibit envy as a result of childhood experiences, their resentment of advantaged people, highly charged professional competition, and their views of history and heroes. Envy is also an important element in expressing social reform and in the uncertain search for justice and equality.

Albert Speer: In Retrospect
David T. Twining

Albert Speer is frequently viewed the most sympathetically of the twenty-two defendants at the 1945-46 Nuremberg trial, where he acknowledged responsibility for Nazi war crimes and was sentenced to twenty years imprisonment. Speer's efforts at public rehabilitation are contradicted by his clear distinction between responsibility and guilt. By accepting responsibility, while denying guilt, Speer avoided the hangman's noose, thus rationalizing the salient crime of the century—the Holocaust. Speer's example stands as a
warning for the future that others may similarly reject moral and legal culpability for their involvement in destroying human beings.

_Fiction_

**A Chronicle of Higher Education**
_Morton Kroll_

Harry Birkin's battles with time and timing were evident from early childhood. In postcards, letters and memoranda we trace his development as a child, adolescent, undergraduate student, and his career in academia. We read of Harry's progress through his creative rationalizations for the delays and mishaps that characterized his personal and administrative behavior. He moved up the ladder to positions of increased responsibility, sufficiently admired by his colleagues, his profession and institution, to have had, upon his retirement, a campus building named for him. Harry, so to speak, marched to a different beat.

_Book Reviews_

_Sembem Ousmane. The Money Order_
_Reviewed by Samuel N. Woode_

_Tom Clancy. Executive Orders_
_Reviewed by B.J. Reed_
As a Surrealist, Dali had an aversion to bureaucrats. His father, who had expelled Dali from the family home, was a notary, which is a respected bureaucratic position in Spain. The bureaucrat's portrayal is not complimentary, for seashells occupy the space in his virtually empty head. Yet, Dali's continual devotion to his estranged father is represented by the two small figures to the left of bureaucrat's head, representing the father and son as in *First Days of Spring*. Ironically, nine years later a bureaucrat would be a key figure in the fate of Dali. When the artist fled Spain and the Civil War, his life or death clung to the rubber stamp of a bureaucrat at the border. The shadow, reminiscent of the shadow of Mt. Pani which overlooks the Bay of Cadaques, dominates one-third of this painting. This adds an ominous tone to the realistic portrayal of the landscape so familiar to Dali.

*Caption provided by the Salvador Dali Museum, Inc.*
Let's Go to the Movies! Using Film to Illustrate Basic Concepts in Public Administration

Ralph Clark Chandler
Barbara A.K. Adams

Introduction

Goodsell and Murray (1995) have made a convincing case for the extent to which public administration theory and practice stand to benefit from balancing the traditional technocratic and managerial emphases in the field with “the humane, provocative, imagination-firing qualities of the arts, both fine and applied” (p. 4). The relationship between the arts—or, more broadly, popular culture—and public administration is a complicated one. Goodsell and Murray (1995) propose five conceptual bridges that can be used to link public administration and the arts. The “Theory Bridge” joins the theoretical development of public administration with the theory and philosophy of aesthetics. The “Values Bridge” provides a means to “translate into concrete form such norm-laden abstractions as power, ambition, survival, caring, and vision” (p. 6). The Leadership Bridge uses works of art to provide a framework for dealing with the complexity of the competing values and demands to which public leaders are subject. The
"Policy Bridge" makes explicit the link that often exists between works of imagination and ensuing public policy trends. Finally, the "Teaching Bridge" focuses on the use of novels, films, and other creative works as a means of transmitting "the subtleties of administrative process to novice students in an otherwise sterile classroom..." (p. 7).

This paper focuses on the use of contemporary motion pictures as stanchions upon which such bridges may be built. For purposes of this discussion, we envision the Teaching Bridge as having four lanes: theory, values, leadership, and policy. At times the instructor may have to labor to open up one lane of traffic only. When environmental conditions are excellent, traffic may flow freely along all four lanes. We will focus on both types of scenarios.

First, some discussion about the relationship between works of art in general and movies in particular and the teaching of public administration is in order. Although both the practical and the philosophical roots of modern public administration rise from the Egyptian and Chinese dynasties, as from the Greek polis and the Roman imperium, the academic discipline of public administration has to a large extent developed directly pursuant to Wilson's Study of Administration. We state this as an empirical proposition because, in our observation, so many students come to public administration programs at both the undergraduate and the master's level for practical purposes that are entirely in line with what the nineteenth century reformers viewed as desirable developments in the field. One need not look far to find the rational basis for this pragmatic orientation. When public, non-profit and private organizations alike call for a bachelor's degree for almost any job that holds promise of organizational advancement, and when such organizations call for a master's degree in order to achieve further advancement, the central purposes of normal educational processes are inevitably subverted. To some extent, the problem of grade inflation about which there is so much discussion must be seen as related to this social reality in which academic degrees are treated as means to practical ends. A specific example of the extent to which education is treated in
such pragmatic and quantitative ways is the practice of some em­ployers to base the extent of their tuition assistance on the grade received: 100 percent for an "A," 75 percent for a "B," 50 percent for a "C," and nothing for grades below "C."

It may be useful, then, to look beyond the narrowly defined problem of grade inflation, which has developed as the result of such suspect practices on the part not only of employing organi­zations but of universities themselves, e.g., the role student evaluations play in promotion and tenure decisions, to the larger underlying problem of which it is but a symptom. We are calling this larger problem educational stagflation, a condition charac­terized not only by inflationary tendencies with respect to grades but also by the stagnation of the educational process itself.

The nineteenth century reformers would probably be entirely sympathetic to the "customer-driven" orientation that both gov­ernment agencies and universities strive for today. We would ar­gue, however, that if all we are teaching students is what is immediately useful, we should be running trade schools rather than academic departments. Real knowledge is expansive of both the internal psychological horizons of the individual person and the external horizons of organizations and, ultimately, society. Such knowledge tends, of course, to be challenging to and even subversive of the status quo, which is certainly a contributing fac­tor to why the invitation to this mode of learning finds resistance from many quarters. It seems clear, however, that if we do not undertake this process within the university setting, it probably is not going to happen elsewhere. This may be one of the reasons the whole cultural approach to teaching public administration is picking up steam.

Movies are an especially viable mode of creating linkages be­tween learning about public administration and placing such learning in a broader, ultimately more meaningful, context. They are viable from a cognitive standpoint because movies, television, and other video forms are so much a part of the lived reality of most people in the United States today. The use of movies as teaching tools enlivens the educational process and brings it into closer connection with life "out there." Movies are equally viable
because of the widespread availability of films on video and adequate technology in universities to support showing movie clips in classroom settings. And, finally, movies are viable because they tend to be a leveling device between the instructor and the students. Everyone knows how to watch a movie, right? And we all know how to talk about movies we have just seen. The role played by the instructor can be in deepening discussion, increasing observational capacity, and, hopefully, helping students to become more thoughtful about not just the particular movie under discussion, but also about their overall role as moviegoers.

**Schindler's List In An Introductory Undergraduate Course**

It was as an act of desperation that Adams introduced the film *Schindler's List* in teaching an introductory undergraduate course in public administration. Environmental conditions were decidedly bleak: an evening class at a rural campus in the midst of a Michigan winter, with a student population ranging from sophomores to seniors, and including both traditional and older returning students. One of the objectives of the course was to “explore how the values governing public and non-profit management have evolved, the extent to which the complexity of values contributes to administrative discretion, and the implications for thinking of public service as an art as well as a science.”

A central issue for public administration today is the extent to which a value system based on having and doing has so thoroughly permeated our society that the discussion of competing value systems may seem abstract and academic. This is a pity, because many students come into public administration with an incipient or active drive toward doing something with the soul (as one student put it), but unable to find a bridge between the reality they experience and the concepts they study. The text for the course under discussion here was David Rosenbloom's *Public Administration—Understanding Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector* (1993), which is built on the framework of three major value sets that undergird public administration in the United States. Many students had substantial difficulty grasping the idea of undergirding ontological orientations that drive action and that
are also susceptible to change within an individual, an agency, or a society.

Adams used the film *Schindler's List* as a means of bringing to life the institutional value systems discussed by Rosenbloom, as well as raising awareness of the importance of individual moral choice. The class discussions were wide-ranging. Schindler's List vividly portrays the extent to which bureaucratic routines provide a sense of order and stability that masks deeper levels of reality and leads to a superficial sense of social cohesion. The three main characters—the Jew Itzak Stern, the Nazi Amon Goeth, and the entrepreneurial Czech Oskar Schindler—provide contrasting images of relationships between state policy and the individual. We will focus here on four scenes from the film that portray the evolution of Schindler's relationship with the state and with people.

In the first, Schindler is at a restaurant with his wife Emilie:

**Schindler:** They won't soon forget the name Schindler here, I'll tell you that. "Oskar Schindler," they'll say, "Everybody remembers him. He did something extraordinary. He did something nobody else did. He came here with nothing, a suitcase, and built a bankrupt company into a major manufacturer and left with a steamer trunk—two steamer trunks full—of money. All the riches of the world."

**Emilie Schindler:** It's comforting to see that nothing's changed.

**Schindler:** You're wrong, Emilie. There's no way I could have known this before, but there was always something missing. In every business I tried, I can see it now, it wasn't me that failed. Something was missing. Even if I'd known what it was, there's nothing I could have done because you can't create this thing. And it makes all the difference in the world between success and failure.

**Emilie:** Luck?

**Schindler:** War.

This is the "original Schindler," a man with enterprise and ambition who sees the affairs of state through the lens of his own
aspirations. Although Schindler is not a member of the machinery of government, as a government contractor he has the right kind of mentality. His negotiations with Stern to acquire Jewish financial backing are entirely without moral overtones. Business decisions regarding his factory, such as whether to employ Poles or Jews, are made strictly on the basis of cost-benefit analysis. Even war is a neutral activity except as it creates favorable conditions for his own personal advancement. He well fits Max Weber's description of the "hedonist without heart, sensualist without spirit."

One of Schindler's great personal attributes is his ability to get along with people. By the time of the second scene to be cited here, he has established close relationships both with members of the regime and with the Jews who are working for him. His connections with the two populations are represented through his dialogues with Goeth, who is in charge of the concentration camp where Schindler's Jews live, and those with Stern, Schindler's general manager. Stern confronts Schindler about the extent to which Goeth is increasingly killing the Jews at random, cutting through Schindler's attempts to defend Goeth on the basis of the pressure he's under. ( It's the war. It brings out the worst in people. Never the good, always the worst. ) Under Stern's moral persuasion, Schindler engages in the following conversation with Goeth:

Goeth: I watch you. You're not a drunk. You've got control. Control is power. That's power.

Schindler: Is that why they fear us?

Goeth: We have the *$&@#$& power to kill. That's why they fear us.

Schindler: They fear us because we have the power to kill arbitrarily. A man commits a crime, he should know better. We have him killed and we feel pretty good about it. Or we kill him ourselves and we feel even better. That's not power, that's justice. That's different than power. Power is when we have every justification to kill and we don't.

Goeth: You think that's power?
Schindler: That's what the emperor said. A man stole something, he's brought in before the emperor. He throws himself down on the ground and he begs for mercy. He knows he's going to die. And the emperor pardons him. This worthless man—he lets him go.

Goeth: I think you are drunk.

Schindler: That's power, Amon. That is power. Amon the Good.

Goeth: I pardon you. (Both laugh)

At this point in the story, Schindler has advanced to a substantially different view of the relationship between “policy” and the individual administrator. “Justice” now is comprised of proper administration of the law, while “power” may be equated with the concept of administrative discretion. In essence, he is asking Goeth to view the Jews as individuals, one of the central tenants of the “legal approach” to public administration as discussed by Rosenbloom. This scene also yields to a political analysis, for Schindler’s view of his own role is one of mediating interests. He speaks Goeth's language, expressing sympathy for the pleasure of killing someone who has violated the law, while at the same time attempting to appeal to the latent positive tendencies that he believes Goeth harbors. Schindler’s role here might be equated with that of the “client population.” He is careful not to make the mistake of placing their interests above those either of the state or of the official with whom he is dealing.

Schindler's metamorphosis is not complete; however, his original goal is still intact. This is revealed at the point that the order transferring the Jews to Auschwitz comes through. Stern asks Schindler if he will stay, using Polish laborers instead of Jews. Schindler replies, “No, I'm going home. I've done what I came here for. I've got more money than any man can spend in a lifetime.” As he and Stern talk, however, the last remnants of bureaucratic distancing are dissolved; the reality of what is happening becomes clear to Schindler as he faces the reality that Stern is doomed.
It is at this point that Schindler entirely lets go of his original goal and puts all his energy and resources into the goal of saving the lives of as many Jews as possible. In so doing, he pits himself against the power of the state, and now consciously uses his relationships with the Nazis to achieve a subversive end. But his relationship with his own former self is also transformed, to the point that by the end of the film he flagellates himself for having failed to make more money or trade away more of his possessions in the interest of saving more lives.

What makes Schindler’s List a great tool for teaching and talking about administrative values is the extent to which it bares the relationship between bureaucratic structuring and the individual’s perception of reality. McCurdy (1995) has suggested that what we believe to be good management may be largely dependent upon cultural values instilled and ingrained by works of the imagination. Schindler’s List draws upon contemporary Holocaust scholarship and puts human faces on it. In so doing, it can be a useful tool for enabling students to grasp the fact that managerial values such as efficiency absolutely cannot be viewed as ends in themselves and that, in the final analysis, the individual administrator must assess the relationship between state policy and its impact on real people and act accordingly.

Graduate Course in The Cultural Environment Of Public Administration

Twice during the last two academic years Chandler offered an experimental graduate course entitled The Cultural Environment of Public Administration. It will now be scheduled regularly. Each student in the two courses, a total of forty, undertook a project in his or her primary area of cultural or artistic interest. Among the resulting presentations were the following:

- Norman Rockwell on Public Administration
- Murals in Public Buildings
- The Architecture of County Courthouses in Michigan
- Cartoons About Public Administration
- Public Administration in Folk Music
The most popular subject area, however, was movies. "Let's Go to the Movies" took on new meaning as imaginative students explored the cultural environment of public administration in such films as *To Kill a Mockingbird*, *Clear and Present Danger*, *Crimson Tide*, *Richard II*, and *Henry V*. We will focus on two of these films, *Crimson Tide* and *Henry V*. We will also compare two versions of *Henry V*, that produced by Lawrence Olivier in 1943 and that produced by Kenneth Branagh in 1994.

**Crimson Tide**

The nuclear submarine, *USS Alabama*, has two very different leaders as Captain and Executive Officer. Captain Ramsey (actor Gene Hackman) lives by the book except when it does not suit his purposes. It is left to the Chief of the Boat, the leading enlisted man, really to live by the book as he agrees with the Executive Officer at a critical juncture of the story and arrests the Captain. One is left to wonder what the purposes of Captain Ramsey really are. We know they reside deep in his psyche, for he is courageous, patriotic, shrewd, knowledgeable, and wrong.

Lieutenant Commander Hunter (actor Denzel Washington) also lives by the book, except that for him the book is still being written. He has read the standard treatises on war, which is one reason he is less committed to the idea of war than Captain Ramsey. He is all starch and polish, but reserves the capacity for moral ambiguity, a quality in short supply in the officers' mess on any submarine or around any table of administrative decision. The hard-hitting ABC documentary on the *Challenger* disaster illustrates the point, as does the CRM film, *The Abilene Paradox*. The Executive Officer in *Crimson Tide* is courageous, patriotic, shrewd, knowledgeable, and right. In the end, at the Court of Inquiry at Pearl Harbor, both officers are acquitted of wrongdoing, the Cap-
tain because of his stubborn loyalty to the organization, the Executive Officer because of his willingness to live out contextual ethics.

The following dialogue takes place between Ramsey and Hunter in the officers' mess aboard the Alabama on patrol.

**Ramsey:** You think it was a mistake, Mr. Hunter?

**Hunter:** Sir?

**Ramsey:** Using the bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

**Hunter:** Well, if I thought that, sir, I wouldn't be here.

**Ramsey:** Interesting way you put that.

**Hunter:** How did I put it, sir?

**Ramsey:** Very carefully. You do qualify your remarks. If somebody asked me if we should have bombed Japan, a simple yes, by all means, sir, drop that @#$& twice. I don't mean to suggest that you're indecisive, Mr. Hunter. Not at all. Just . . . complicated. Of course that's the way the Navy wants you. Me, they want it simple.

**Hunter:** Well, you certainly fooled them, sir.

**Ramsey:** Be careful there, Mr. Hunter. That's all I've got to rely on, being a simple-minded son-of-a-bitch. Rickover gave me my command, a check list, a target, and a button to push. All I had to know was how to push it, and they'd tell me when. They seem to want you to know why.

**Hunter:** I would hope they want us all to know why, sir.

**Ramsey:** At the Naval War College it was metallurgy and nuclear reactors, not 19th century philosophy. "War is a continuation of politics by other means"—von Clausewitz.

**Hunter:** I think, sir, that what he was actually trying to say was a little more . . .

**Ramsey:** Complicated?

**Hunter:** Yes, the purpose of war is to serve a political end, but the true nature of war is to serve itself.
Ramsey: I'm very impressed. In other words the sailor most likely to win the war is the one most willing to part company with the politicians and ignore everything except the destruction of the enemy. You'd agree with that?

Hunter: I agree that that's what Clausewitz was trying to say.

Ramsey: But you wouldn't agree with it?

Hunter: No, sir. I just think that in the nuclear world the true enemy can't be destroyed.

Ramsey: Attention on deck! Von Clausewitz will now tell us exactly who the real enemy is. Von?

Hunter: In my humble opinion, in the nuclear world, the true enemy is war itself.

The student may be left with such questions as:

- Who was right during the crisis on the submarine?
- What type of leaders are Ramsey and Hunter?
- What administrative principles are competing in the minds of Ramsey and Hunter?
- Who would you rather serve with?

**Henry V**

Shakespeare's *Henry V* is a play about the evolution of a king. It is the closest thing in the Shakespearean corpus to a treatise on the nature of administrative responsibility. The play opens with a commentary about how a king should accept advice from bureaucratic experts. In this case, the Archbishop of Canterbury is explaining to Henry the Selig law as it applied to France. Did Henry have a legitimate claim on French territory?

In the film version, directed by Lawrence Olivier, the Archbishop and his assistant are shown as informed but unorganized. Under Kenneth Branagh's direction the Archbishop is shown as shrewd and calculating. Was Shakespeare making fun of the bureaucracy of his day, or was he recognizing it as a legitimate partner in statecraft? The viewer must decide.
Henry V ends the cycle of histories that Shakespeare began with Richard II. All of them had dealt with men unfit to be king. Henry VI was well-meaning, but more at home in a hermitage than on the throne. Richard III and John were villains. Richard II was irresponsible and incompetent. Even Henry IV had a past that all his abilities and virtues could not live down. Before Henry V, Shakespeare's histories were dedicated to exposing the pretentious that concealed themselves in the authority of kingship. He neglected to follow the rule dramatists laid down for themselves in a later age, namely that we are to presume the greatest virtues where we find the highest rewards. Although it is not necessary that all heroes be kings, yet heads of state by poetical rights are heroes.

Henry V was a true hero. More precisely, he became a hero. More precisely yet, he was imagined a hero, not only by Shakespeare, who probably spoke the choruses of Henry V himself, but by his countrymen as well. Henry was for Shakespeare what Aeneas was to Virgil, a man with a mission of national importance, and not merely a character to be viewed dispassionately according to our private predilections. Many believed that Henry carried in his soul the fortunes of England.

Many others did not believe that. It is tempting to say that many others believed in Whitewater, Paula Jones, and draft-dodging. They continue to believe in what they would describe as substance over style, disbelieving that leaders must be actors as well as men and women of character, and certainly disbelieving Cicero's famous remark that nothing is so unbelievable that oratory cannot make it acceptable.

Hazlitt's denunciation of Henry is historical:

In private, he seemed to have no idea of the common decencies of life, which he subjected to a kind of regal license; in public affairs, he seemed to have no idea of any rule of right or wrong, but brute force, glossed over with a little religious hypocrisy and archiepiscopal advice....Henry, because he did not know how to govern his
own kingdom, determined to make war upon his neighbors (Alexander 1958, p. 379).

Yet there was the victory at Agincourt. Yeats said it was because those who fought with Henry admired him the way schoolboys admire the sailor or soldier hero of a romance. Bernard Shaw said Henry was a jingo at Agincourt, an able young Philistine who inherited high position and authority but who would have been quite in place if he had been born a gamekeeper or a farmer.¹

In a way, then, Shakespeare and the people of England created Henry out of the commonplace. Shakespeare calls on us time and again to use our imagination in understanding who Henry was.

Oh, now, who will behold
The royal captain of the ruin'd Band
Walking from watch to watch, from tent to tent,
Let him cry, Praise and glory on his head!

The task of our imagination is to understand how a man who spent much of his youth in self indulgence with Falstaff could evolve into a king. Henry came eventually to realize that his personal wishes must be set aside in the interest of his subjects. Henry allows Bardolph to be hanged for stealing from a French church even though Bardolph was an old friend from Henry's youth. Henry had ordered that the French people were to be treated fairly and kindly since he had concluded the French were as much his subjects as the English. He thus advanced the common law of his time, which allowed the pillaging and plundering of civilians in vanquished nations. It was considered part of a soldier's pay in 15th century Europe.

Henry was interested in the views of his soldiers. Prior to the battle of Agincourt he circulated among them without his aides to determine their morale and reassure them. He sees they are apprehensive about the fight the next day because the French out-number them five to one. A conversation turns to the righteousness of Henry's cause. The soldiers are afraid that if they die badly, without honor and grace, they will be judged harshly
by God. But if Henry's cause is just, then regardless of their own
worth they will be judged honorable by God. They worry that no
matter how they die, if Henry's cause is unjust, they will be
judged unjust also. Then comes a philosophical breakthrough.

Henry says that while as a group they must follow their king,
and by doing so are absolved from any results of his judgment,
they will still be judged by their own individual actions prior to
and during the battle. While Henry is accountable for starting the
battle, once it begins every man must account for himself. Leaders
can influence the actions of others and cause others to move in
certain ways, but leaders cannot control them completely. Indi­
vidual actors determine outcomes more directly than do leaders
and administrators.

Henry knows that to be a king he must inspire. He and his
men are acutely aware that their chances of victory the next day
are slim. Most of them will die. A cousin of Henry, the Earl of
Westmoreland, wishes:

O that we now had here
But one ten thousand of those men in England
That do no work today!

Henry, in one of the great speeches of English literature, scoffs
at the idea that more men are needed. What is needed is for the
men present to believe in themselves and their destinies. There is
no need to bring in more men because that would only diminish
the glory of the few who believed and fought in the coming bat­
tle. Shakespeare is ahead of his time in realizing that soldiers fight
not for causes or their political leaders but for each other and the
praise of their comrades. Belief in the group and the approval of
others in the group is the key to personal motivation. Henry notes
that the Battle of Agincourt will be fought on Saint Crispian's
Day, October 25, 1415. "This day is call'd the feast of Crispian," he
says,

He that outlives this day, and comes safe home,
Will stand a tip-toe when this day is nam'd,
And rouse him at the name of Crispian.
He that shall live this day, and see old age,
Will yearly on the vigil feast his neighbors,
And say 'To-morrow is Saint Crispian.'
Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars,
And say These wounds I had on Crispian's day.'
Old men forget; yet all shall be forgot,
But he'll remember, with advantages,
What feats he did that day. Then shall our names,
Familiar in his mouth as household words—
Harry the King, Bedford and Exeter,
Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester—
Be in their flowing cups freshly rememb'red.
This story shall the good man teach his son;
And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,
From this day to the ending of the world,
But we in it shall be remembered—
We few, we happy few, we band of brothers;
For he to-day that sheds his blood with me
Shall be my brother; be he ne'er so vile,
This day shall gentle his condition;
And gentlemen in England now-a-bed
Shall think themselves accurs'd they were not here,
And hold their manhoods cheap whiles any speaks
That fought with us upon Saint Crispin's day.

In the film Renaissance Man, Danny DeVito picks up the theme of the heroic in the commonplace that suffuses Henry V. In this story, DeVito is called upon to teach a group of unteachable misfits how to get through basic training for the army. The process puts him in touch with both their humanity and his own. Out of that relationship evolves the discipline, strength, and courage that enables one of the young men, even as he is taunted by a drill sergeant in a pouring rain, to affirm their common humanity in the words of Henry's speech on the eve of the Battle of Agincourt. It is one of the great moments in the history of film literature.

Conclusion
There is much talk today about America's values crisis. The movement to teach public administration through the use of works of art is to a large extent highly responsive to the concern
about values. By focusing attention and discussion on artistic objects, students are able to see the genuine complexity that faces all those who seek to govern or to create social change, and often are able to bring abstract concepts into focus better. The above discussion is by no means intended to disparage the use of higher art forms, such as plays and novels, to achieve these ends. It is intended to suggest that popular art forms should not be dismissed as teaching tools simply because they are popular.

A century ago, people got their morality in weekly doses by attending religious services and listening to sermons. Today, it is as likely that people will watch 50 movies a year as it is that they will listen to 50 sermons. Arguably, movies and other forms of popular entertainment are major contributors to such assumptions and images as are held in common in an increasingly diverse and fragmented society.

The problem with using movies is more at the level of academic discourse than at the level of teaching. The reader who has read this article through to this point will have struggled with the limitations of attempting to communicate about the use of movies through the common means of scholarly discourse, i.e., the written word. Instructional methodology at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, however, is increasingly focused on learning rather than teaching. Using a "learning paradigm" requires instructors to frame pedagogic content in ways that enable students to discover the relationship of academic concepts to their own life experience. To use movies and other popular art forms as tools for teaching, and to invite students to explore them as tools for learning, is a risky venture. It requires that we move away from the forms of communication at which we tend to excel to those where we also become students. But isn't this what real teaching is all about?

In this paper we have provided a few examples of how we have used motion pictures as teaching bridges to open up lanes of mental traffic in the realms of theory, values, leadership, and policy. The bridge metaphor is one that particularly resonates for those of us from Michigan, where two separate peninsulas are linked by the "Mighty Mac" bridge, which itself was the work of
public administrators who dared to dream and dared to make their dream a reality.

Endnotes
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Doctoral Prelims as Pluralistic Peril

Robert A. Maranto

Graduate Student Disenchantment

One of the few universal laws in the social sciences states that at top Ph.D. programs most of the graduate students are most of the time insecure and unhappy.

There are at least two causes for this. First, the perennially bad academic job market for social scientists (which is perennially "just about" to get better) means that years of hard work in graduate school building towards professor-dom may mean, at least in terms of a career...nothing, or at least nothing more than work at a high pressure, low resources party school located in what you consider a geographically undesirable ("GUD") locale. Regarding the last point, a recently minted Ph.D. explained that:

They say that in academia you could wind up anywhere, and that means literally anywhere—southeastern Oklahoma, northeastern Idaho—anywhere!

This individual, an observant Jew, nearly accepted a position at such a GUD school, "and I realized that if I had ended up at___, I would probably never get married." In the end she left academia.

Second and more important, in elite Ph.D. programs all the students are used to being in the top 10% of the class. Unfortu-
nately, in grad school only 10% can be in the top 10%. Scott Turow (1977) notes the same tendency in elite law schools. This is compounded by the often hazy relations between faculty and graduate students. At all too many research schools, the “typical” undergraduate is regarded as the academic equivalent of cannon fodder. In contrast, faculty expect great things, or at least something, from their grad students. Exactly what that something might be is not always clear, either to faculty or grad students. Prolonged contact between the two groups makes the teacher-student relationship more complex than at the undergraduate level. At least if the program is fairly humane, faculty will find it difficult to give low evaluations to those they drink with, play volleyball against, and employ as TAs, RAs, and baby-sitters. (This paper describes conditions at humane Ph.D. programs—other rules may apply at your institution.)

Aside from the emotional discomfort of giving low grades to those they like, faculty at most publish or perish institutions simply don’t have time to adequately evaluate student output. Realizing this, they err on the side of leniency. Course evaluations are usually limited to a few basic grades ranging from B- to A, with relatively little written feedback. This sounds fine, but the result is that grad students, generally a competitive lot, get little clue of exactly where they stand in the program.

In part to make up for this, “prelim” or “comprehensive” exams are employed to give negative (and even failing) evaluations to inadequate work. The prelim system enables professors to assign real grades without making it personal, partly since evaluations are (at least officially) anonymous, but mainly because the evaluations are done by groups of three to five professors, so no single professor is to “blame” for failing someone.

I like the prelim system. Done well, it forces one to come to grips with the big issues of a subfield, rather than the smaller issues of particular courses. More important, in the absence of other evaluation, it can tell you whether or not you belong in the field. Of course, it’s unfortunate that such news comes only after two or three years of work. Moreover, capable scholars often do poor work at particularly trying times in their lives. In my own case, a
failed exam told me that I was a burned out case who needed to, in the words of my encouraging adviser, "take six months off and hitchhike around America." It was a potent message that no number of B's in my course work would have gotten across to me or the faculty. I took my adviser's sage counsel, retook the exam later, passed, and went on to a successful career.²

Despite the merits of the prelim system, it has, not surprisingly, itself increased grad student unhappiness and insecurity. Though this is true, it has attracted no attention in academic forums. In part, this reflects a general focus on research rather than teaching—even graduate teaching. There is more to it than that, however. Influential professors are many years removed from the prelim trauma, and the field is dominated by those who aced grad school, or else don't like to admit (or even remember) a checkered past.

**Prelims and Pluralism**

I did my own grad work at a well regarded Big Ten political science department, whose faculty had a much deserved reputation for treating the grad students as individuals rather than as mere receptacles for their own ambition.³ In this Department, the faculty and grad students, generally well meaning men and women, over the years tried again and again to reform the prelim system to make it more fair, predictable, and humane—all to no effect. Grad students felt that the problems of the system reflected an inflexible or uncaring faculty. Some even saw the prelim process as a deliberate effort to traumatize graduate students, to assure that only the toughest would survive to pass on their publications.

In fact, as in most things in life and academe, the problem was not so much inhumanity as incoherence. Or, as Minnesota state legislator and Humphrey Institute Economist John Brandl formulates in "Brandl's Law", "in public affairs there is far more confusion and far less deviousness than most people think." In short, the prelim process reflected the normal operation of a high pluralism environment in which different actors (faculty) had
very different views of doctoral prelims, with each actor free to carry out its own goals without the discipline of a strong state (or department chair).

After my second (and successful) bout with prelims, I penned the following guide to advise others of this and gently tweak a few faculty noses. I suspect it is broadly applicable, and may help others through their own prelim hells.

A Primer For Prelims: To all Grad Students in the Social Sciences

Many of you reading this will soon face the terror of the Ph.D. prelim process. As one who has been there and done that, there is much advice of little value I can give you. In particular, as any fan of TV Sports knows, you should "give 110%" and clearly demonstrate that you "came to take prelims." Aside from this, you might find the following particularly unhelpful.

1. Friendly faculty will tell you not to worry because hardly anyone fails. That's ridiculous! With a career riding on a few hours performance, you'd be a fool not to worry! Indeed, the main reason that at most programs few fail is that everyone is scared out of his/her wits. Fear can be a powerful motivator. Without it, not half so many of us would make it through. Don't knock anxiety. Get into your anxiety and be a friend to your anxiety. Nurture it against the sagest calls for calm assurance. When someone tells you not to worry, what they really mean is not to be terrified into paralysis, in which case you're dead meat; for even more than most motivations, fear is subject to rapidly diminishing and soon negative returns. Indeed, as George (1980, 48-9) notes in a rather different context (foreign policy decision-making), low levels of stress improve mental performance. As stress increases to higher levels, however, performance worsens.

2. If a committee member says some silly thing like "don't worry, you did well in class, so you'll do fine on prelims...", do not under any circumstances believe them. This isn't to say that the worthy dispensers of such advice don't believe it. They do. The problem at most institutions is that there is no consensus among
faculty on what prelims are all about—nor is one likely to develop. Ironically, those graduate students who most loudly question centralized authority are also those most apt to see sinister faculty plots in its absence. Since there is no consensus among faculty on prelims—or lots of other things, for that matter—there is a natural tendency for different professors to say and do radically different things. Grad students may view this as a deliberate attempt to give us high blood pressure and otherwise assure that only the fittest survive to get a Ph.D.. Actually, it is just the ordinary functioning of an academic state of nature where each has leave to do whatever he/she pleases without regard to the already vague official policies. 4

The implications for prelims are obvious. In my exam-taking, I found at one extreme the views of a professor who felt that “the object of this exam shouldn’t be to find out what you know, but rather where your weaknesses lie; thus questions must go far beyond what you learned in class.” Another professor on the same committee insisted that if I studied course material alone I’d be fine. (He was wrong!) Farther along the pass ’em high continuum was a professor on another committee who told me not to bother studying topic X, for I’d never get a question about it.

“Too bad,” I responded. “I like X.”

“Oh...would you like me to write a question about it?”

3. Be neat, organized, punchy, and authoritative in your writing. We’ve all graded enough essays to know that any trained evaluator can sense fear. Anyway, something easy to follow will attract less scrutiny, particularly from the harried, untenured assistant professors who are sure to have put off reading exams to the last minute. This is particularly important since junior faculty, often insecure in their own positions, may feel obliged to prove their own mental sharpness at the expense of grad students. Of course, this could easily be the subject for several more papers, and will not be treated here.

4. Both address the questions and demonstrate a broad knowledge of the literature. Some professors want a good essay.
Others want to know that you've read everything under the sun. Satisfy both if you can; and above all...

5. Be sure to talk to each member of each committee to get a sense of what may or may not be expected and what might or might not be fair game. Question your older peers about particular committee members to see how you should study for the test. This is especially important in so fragmented a field as political science, for it is hardly unusual for those of a particular current to ask highly esoteric questions which few of their peers in the same subfield could answer! For this reason, it is quite common for the same answer to receive very high scores from some professors, and failing marks from others. Fortunately, in such cases faculty usually have the good sense to compromise and split the difference.

All of the above is perfectly obvious to anyone who has seriously studied the prelim process. Yet it is amazing how often the obvious eludes intelligent, though myopic individuals. So good luck, and may there be bass under all your lily pads as you ace prelims and look forward to a life of long hours, occasional social utility, and laterally mobile professionalism.

Endnotes

1. I wish to thank April Gresham, John Heyrman, David Sousa, and Tom Weko for their comments. The usual caveats apply.

2. One of the most bizarre characteristics of fully institutionalized students is their common assumption that leaves of absence are not permissible. In my 12 years teaching I often needed to carefully explain to undergraduates (and their parents) that if they left college to find themselves for a year or two, the school would still be there if they decided to return. And if they chose not to return, that would not make them BAD people doing a BAD THING. Neither college nor grad school is for everybody.

One example will suffice. My graduate school placed its best graduates at other top Ph.D. programs and at prestigious liberal
arts colleges, while less accomplished graduate students landed jobs at less distinguished schools or in government. All were considered successful. In contrast, a friend attended a program whose professors considered all their students failures—save those few who landed top ten jobs. Others were not worthy of notice and were too ashamed to even show their faces at conventions!

As Jervis (1976) details, national elites tend to see elites from potential adversaries as united and coherent in thought and action, underhanded, and determining the nature of relations. They see themselves, on the other hand, as internally divided, honest, and responding to rather than initiating, action. Accordingly, behaviors from potential adversaries which may reflect internal division, bureaucratic function and malfunction, or unrelated concerns are often interpreted as indications of hostile intent. Of course, such beliefs can easily become self-fulfilling prophesies. See also Allison (1971). Sadly, the misperception of international politics is at least as common within universities—albeit with less disastrous consequence—particularly regarding relations between faculty and students. Each group often sees the other as united and scheming (or at least lazy), while it is forced into reaction.

References


Robert Anthony Maranto works at the Federal Executive Institute in Charlottesville, VA, where he attempts to teach career bureaucrats that politics in general and political appointees in particular are necessary but NOT evil. Currently, he is researching relations between political appointees and career executives, and the impacts of competition on American schools. He has written *Politics and Bureaucracy in the Modern Presidency: Political Ap-
pointees and Career Bureaucrats in the Reagan Administration, and co-authored The Politics of U.S. Civil Service Reform, among other works. He can be reached at RAMARANT@OPM.GOV or (804) 980-6280.
Foundations From Quantum Physics for a Normative Theory of Administration and Governance

R. Philip Brown

In philosophy and theoretical physics we deal with theories about the world, not with the world itself. Theories should be tested, and quantum theory has been tested extensively. Thus we take the predictions of quantum theory as our data, and ask how the requirement of compatibility with these data affects ideas about nature.

Physicist Henry P. Stapp in Philosophical Consequences of Quantum Theory, p. 163.

Introduction

In his recent article for the Public Administration Review (PAR), "What Makes Public Administration a Science? Or, are its 'Big Questions' Really Big?", Francis X. Neumann, Jr. (1996) asks public managers and public administrators to rethink the raison d'être for the discipline of public administration. Neumann challenges professionals in public administration to think deeper, aspire higher, and search farther for the questions that define the discipline. He suggests bringing new views of both physical and social systems that come from recent paradigm changes in science, such as nonlinear systems theory, to bear on questions in organizational theory: "What is the nature of an organization? Of a 'public'
organization? How is the public organization related to its environment? What does it mean to manage or administer the public organization?” (Neumann, 1996, p. 412).

In the same issue, PAR also published an essay written by Professor E. Sam Overman (1996) before his untimely death, titled “The New Sciences of Administration: Chaos and Quantum Theory.” It explains what the new sciences are and how they relate to public administration theory and practice. Professor Overman observed that science develops and defines “large-scale ways of thinking upon which we base our inquiries in many other disciplines, including social, political and administrative sciences.” He also notes that scientific thought and experiment have always had a strong influence on administrative theory and practice, and he expressly recognizes that natural science has changed while administrative science “remains wedded to Newtonian language and the logic of scientific determinism” (Overman, 1996, p. 487). Because of this present stagnation, Professor Overman urges public administration to break free of its outmoded paradigm and to employ quantum theory. As either method or metaphor, he believes it useful for “reconsidering our contemporary state of consciousness and awareness” and constructing a “world of quantum administration” (Id., p. 490).

As suggested by Neumann and Overman, the journeyman philosophy called authentic individualism described here is based upon concepts from quantum mechanics and presents a normative theory of organization and governance for citizens and administrative practitioners. There is, of course, the charge of “physics envy” that can and often is levied in academic circles against anyone who relies upon the hard sciences for proofs, or even inspiration, in the social (soft) sciences. The scientific method is unsuitable for the soft sciences, the argument goes, because a strictly scientific analysis makes no room for values. Then there is the opposing view that social science in general and public administration in particular does not engage in enough “scientific” research and, therefore, is not answering the important questions. The parameters of these arguments as applied to public administration can be studied in White (1994) and Behn (1992),
but this is a debate that cannot be won, and one I do not wish to enter.

To those who would charge "physics envy" because this article employs science as a metaphor to illuminate ideas in public administration, I simply point out that quantum theory is "based upon the opposite epistemological assumption" of that underlying Newtonian science (Zukav, 1979, p. 319). If the epistemology of quantum theory is opposite that of the hard sciences, then it ought to represent a way of thinking that is acceptable even to those who criticize science. The choice of quantum theory for this analysis recognizes that scientific administration hardly has room in it for the values expressed here. Quantum theory, in contrast, seems to make room for metaphysical values. Authentic individualism attempts to supply, or at least recognize, a "supplement of soul" missing from the scientific worldview.

On the other hand, there is still much disagreement about this use of quantum theory even among physicists, philosophers, and historians of science. They still debate such questions as (a) whether quantum theory describes real objects and events or the mathematics merely symbolize a reality we may never know, and (b) whether quantum theory should or can have any impact on philosophy or any application to the "real" macro-world that we all inhabit. Despite the disagreement among experts over the correct answers to these questions, knowing about quantum theory can powerfully illuminate real life situations. Because of the unusual perspective it offers, quantum theory can be a catalyst for thinking differently about intractable social, political, and organizational issues.

Those who object to using the micro-world to illuminate the macro-world must concede that many credible scientists, philosophers, and even quantum theorists, use quantum theory for just such a purpose. Physicist Henry Stapp observes that physicists have for more than fifty years been proclaiming the empirical evidence provided by quantum phenomena support such use at the macro level. This evidence entails "a peculiar kind of macroscopic wholeness—a strange sort of nonseparability of macroscopically separated parts of the universe" that opens "new
perspectives on the place of man in the universe" and "impacts on the question of values" (Cushing & McMullin, 1989, p. 154). Moreover, the fact that nearly every grand theorist of modern physics shares a metaphysical worldview, as pointed out by Wilber (1984), also supports such use. It suggests that learning about the micro-world and considering its implications is a highly enlightening process for understanding the problems of living and working together. This knowledge permits us to see relational aspects of our world that were hidden from us when we had only the Cartesian-Newtonian schism between subject and object as the frame of reference for viewing our place in nature.

The simple connections between quantum reality and everyday reality suggested in this essay do not stretch the limits of quantum theory's illumination of real life issues. Many scientists and philosophers attribute to quantum theory many more far-reaching implications for everyday reality. For example, Physicist M. David Mermin states: "We now know that the moon is demonstrably not there when nobody looks" (Cushing & McMullin, 1989, p. 50). Philosopher Abner Shimony believes that quantum theory provides "definitive empirical resolution" of metaphysical questions (Ibid., pp. 9). Harvard physicist and University Professor Emeritus Edward Purcell states he is happy to have seen "a philosophical problem settled in the laboratory" (Ibid., p. 60). Moreover, no less a historical figure and scientific icon than Niels Bohr, who debated the consequences of the quantum postulate with Albert Einstein, sees a quantum connection with everyday reality. He believed quantum theory represented a discovery of something new about nature that called for "a revolution in metaphysics: 'a radical revision of our attitude towards the problem of physical reality'" (Ibid., p. 264).

Compared to these claims for quantum theory, its use here is quite unassuming. This essay does not seek to prove any particular scientific principle or demonstrate mathematically a definitive change in reality, and it makes no claims that quantum theory demands authentic individualism or any specific organizational theory. It does not argue that quantum theory proves a science of administration, or that authentic individualism is a part of
such a science. Rather, the claims here are much more modest than any like those made above by any number of illustrious experts. This article merely ask readers to rethink the role of institutions in our lives and communities and reconsider familiar administrative and organizational issues, because of the questions being raised and answers being provided by physicists and philosophers as a result of quantum theory.¹

**Need For A New Worldview**

Self-interest was intended by the Founders to play the role of virtue in early America. In modern America, however, it became the dominant model for individual action. Instead of recognizing, as our forebears did, that self-interest was a real but destructive force in the world requiring conscious countervailing action, modern America abandoned any effort to contain it. The most significant historical observation about this American experience relevant to our present political and social climate is the persistent survival of separatist forces in our culture. These divisive energies were present at the drafting of the Mayflower Compact, they attended the signing of the Declaration of Independence, they relentlessly drove the national boundaries westward, they fueled the Civil War, they embraced industrialism and laissez-faire capitalism, and they nurture a politics of isolation yet today.

Factional pressures lined the path between individualism and social solidarity, continually agitating for excess of the former over the latter. They interacted to create certain consequences leading first to independence from Britain and then propelling the U.S. toward anarchy several more times: the rapid expansion of the western frontier and decimation of the native American population was a lawless frenzy; the Civil War was an obvious rebellion to perpetuate enslavement; the industrial abuses of the late 1800s, depression in the 1890s, and subsequent labor revolts brought bloodshed and suffering; the 1920s saw criminals become heroes; and nowadays seemingly insoluble social issues tend to atomize the polity into helpless, functionless, non-principled, solitary drifters without unitary purpose.
Ignorance or misunderstanding of the Founders' negative perception of self-interest led modern Americans to mistake the realistic recognition of it in early U.S. culture—by attempting to use it in the role of virtue—as positive legitimation for a credo of self-interest in public policy and personal conduct. Accordingly, self-interest climbed from playing the role of virtue to being a virtue in American life, and the modern conception of self eclipsed aspiration to moral excellence. Personal particularity replaced singularity of thought as the cornerstone of American individualism, while human prerogatives were elevated above the integrity of the human soul.

The need for change in point of view within politics and administration could not be more poignantly demonstrated in strictly human terms than through the words of the suicide note found in the briefcase of White House counsel Vincent Foster, that said: "Here ruining people is considered sport." (Staff, 1993, p. 1A). This is a clarion call for a paradigm of cultivation to replace the old Lockean individualism gone wrong that is now the American ethos. From Watergate to Soonergate, from sports hero to TV evangelist, from Iran-gate to the savings and loan, from boardroom to warroom, from Wall Street to Main Street, and from the Crack House to The White House, all manner of intimidation, dishonesty, corruption, assault, abuse, and crime bombard us. These circumstances leave us feeling fragmented, loose, unconnected, alienated, drifting, fearful, and bitter. We blame our institutions, we reject government, and we withdraw from one another.

The culture of self-interest that supports the atomistic individualism of the modern U.S. brings to mind the question asked of Benjamin Franklin as he left the last session of the federal Constitutional Convention in 1787. Someone shouted, "We have a republic, but can we keep it?" There was no answer to that question then, and today it goes unanswered still, but the beginnings of an answer may be found in the words uttered by the "informal reporter" to the 1788 Virginia ratifying convention in Ralph Clark Chandler's (1988) play "When Eagles Gathered." Observing how the cast of characters in the U.S. Constitutional Convention had
changed from those who drafted the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia reporter unconsciously noted a change in the personal character needed for the new task then being undertaken. He said, "It takes a different kind of man to build than to tear down." (p. 7). Applying to the present day that reporter's notion of a need for change in character coincident with change in the nature of the task, one should add, "It takes a different message to sustain a republic than to conquer and build one."

**Newton and Descartes**

The age old philosophical problem is to find a syncretic balance between the individual and the collective, the few and the many, the majority and the faction, the Wild Heart and the conformist. Historically, such philosophical and social ideas were greatly influenced by scientific and cosmological views. Cosmology refers to the philosophical or astrophysical study of the universe as a whole—the entire physical world of space, time, and matter—how it came to exist, and how it will end. From the early Greek poets and philosophers to Thomas Hobbes, Adam Smith, and John Locke, science has influenced the way we think about social and political issues. Similarly, from Woodrow Wilson, Frederick Taylor, and Henri Fayol to present day influences of behavioral psychology, science has been the dominant paradigm for administration. Linking science with politics and society or organization theory is not new, and today many thoughtful people believe science and technology can greatly change the course of economic and social evolution.

However, science must be coupled with a worldview that recognizes the importance of enhancing human dignity before it can be a powerful force for good in society. Until now, scientific views of the cosmos have injected pessimism and despair into American social and political development. Before Einstein's Special Theory of Relativity in 1905 and the rise of quantum physics, the cosmological view of the universe held by Western humanity was a universe composed of solid objects occupying empty space.

Newtonian-Cartesian science viewed the universe strictly as deterministic mechanical events, governed by cause and effect,
and all things intrinsically separated. The Newtonian-Cartesian mechanistic paradigm, or conceptual scheme, interpreted the physical universe as merely a collection of material particles interacting in a gigantic purposeless machine, to which the human body and mind were insignificant. Humans simply occupied space with no relationship to their surroundings in any transcendent manner, and the differences between self and others made each individual sovereign and singular. This notion of matter as inert substance conceived of human beings and other life as no more than a collection of material particles, bounded by an outer surface—skin encapsulated objects.

**Cosmos and Society**

Newtonian science and Cartesian philosophy perceive things in the physical world as fragmented and logically unrelated. They share an effort to find relationship between pre-existing separate parts. Philosopher Paul Teller (Cushing & McMullin, 1989, p. 213) labels this *particularism*, which defines the world as composed of individuals that have non-relative properties. He believes particularism unreflectively conditions all thinking in Western culture without ever being explicitly stated in a conception of the world. Consequently, Western populations inherited the tendency to think of themselves in everyday life as autonomous, individual physical bodies with fixed and absolute boundaries. Until recently, this Newtonian science and Cartesian philosophy nurtured a very limited view of human beings.

Conventional cosmologists are still nearly unanimous in the belief that the universe originated in an immense explosion of an infinitely hot, point-like ball or *singularity* smaller than the tiniest atom. According to this Big Bang theory, the singularity expanded a trillion-trillionfold in one-trillionth of a second as all space, matter, and energy was created. This undoubtedly fantastic and bizarre idea subjects human purposes to decay, and hostile, alien forces in a universe that is a one-way street from explosive start to ignominious end. This model dooms the universe to end in either a Big Crunch, where it collapses into a universal black hole from which not even light can escape, or a Big
Chill, where it expands and decays into entropic nothingness and eternal, cold darkness. Wound up twenty billion years ago, the universe is now running down as is human progress on earth, progress or evolution is at best an accident, and decay will finally triumph.

The Big Bang of cosmology—this idea that the universe originated in a single cataclysmic explosion some ten or twenty billion years ago popularized in the U.S. during the pessimistic Fifties and Sixties—has become central to astronomy and all current theories of the basic structure of matter and energy. St. Augustine included this doctrine of creation ex nihilo as part of a profoundly pessimistic and authoritarian worldview denigrating all earthly endeavor and condemning material existence. He interpreted the fall of Rome to the Visigoths as a consequence of cosmic decline beginning out of nothing and returning to nothing. Conventional cosmology adds credibility to the counsels of despair today just as Augustine’s cosmology did in fourth-century Rome. It gives a scientific veneer and cosmic endorsement to the pessimism and despair in the prevailing ideas of many leading thinkers, yet entropy and decline are not inevitable phenomena that ultimately limit human achievement. New ideas of a still emerging scientific revolution bring an entirely different outlook.

**Conceptual Framework For Change—Quantum Theory And The Universe**

An evolving universe, of which humankind is a part, can be a powerful concept for both religion and science, but they require a primary human component as their guiding inspiration. Such a toward-the-future outlook can encourage social progress, offer renewed hope, and provide the motivation human beings need to engage in collective efforts rather than to fragment into the anarchy of self-centered groups. Modern changes in cosmology, particle physics, and thermal dynamics are molding a transformation that sees an infinite universe evolving and changing over infinite time. Quantum physics, in particular the way quantum systems relate, provides a general model for much that we are now begin-
ning to hope for and understand in human social relations (Zohar and Marshall, 1994).

Now an exciting new vision for the cosmos and human nature is emerging that has extraordinary meaning for individual and collective life. First, relativity theory exposed the universe to shifting and warping. In Einstein's Special and General Theories of Relativity, space is not three-dimensional, time is not linear, and space and time are not separate, but integrated into a four-dimensional continuum known as space-time. Moreover, this space-time field from General Relativity interacts with matter, behaving more like a substance than under either Special Relativity or Newtonian kinematics. Second, quantum mechanics reveal newly discovered subatomic particles exhibiting strange behavior that defies Newtonian principles. From this perspective, boundaries between objects and distinctions between matter and space are less obvious. Instead of objects simply occupying empty spaces, the complete universe is one never-ending field of varying density.

For example, in a phenomenon called the wave-particle paradox, quantum particles behave in some physical experiments as material entities, and in others they appear with wave-like properties. As Davies (1983, p. 108) explains, the wave-particle paradox is the name given to a phenomenon occurring in Thomas Young's famous two-slit experiment, when single photons of light (atoms, electrons, or other subatomic particles will work too) are fired through apertures in a screen toward a photographic plate. Over time, they form the same interference pattern expected from beams of particles fired through the slits. However, it should be noted here that the quantum "wave" of the wave/particle paradox is not like a wave of any substance or physical stuff. Instead, it is a probability wave composed of knowledge or information about where you can expect the particle to be and the properties (rotation and energy) it will have. (Ibid., p. 107). Additional explanation of this phenomenon appears in the discussion of Emergent Leadership below.

Despite centuries of trying to reduce reality to indivisible entities, scientists have now learned that elementary particles do not
have an existence of their own. "[S]ubatomic particles inhabit a shadowy world of half-existence" and quantum fields consist "of quivering patterns of invisible energy" (Davies, 1992, p. 85). The universe is an infinitely complex system of vibratory phenomena rather than an agglomerate of Newtonian objects (Grof, 1992). In place of Newton's deterministic machine and rigid rules of causality, quantum theory substitutes an invisible and conflicting conjunction of waves and particles governed by probabilities and chance.

Thus, quantum field theory reveals solid matter dissolving into weird excitations and vibrations of invisible field energy in which little difference remains between material substance and apparently empty space that itself "seethes with ephemeral quantum activity" (Davies & Gribbin, 1992, p. 14). The 1913 Nobel Prize winning Danish physicist Niels Bohr observed, "[a]n elementary particle is not an independently existing, unchangeable entity. It is in essence a set of relationships that reach outward to other things" (Zukav, p. 94). Moreover, the quantum non-locality principle—pursuant to which all quantum particles are thought to exert influence on all other quantum particles—forbids one from considering even widely separated particles as independent entities.

The quantum nonlocality principle and the indivisibility of interactions at the microlevel result from thought "experiments." The first resulted in the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) paradox; the second in Bell's Theorem that disproved the EPR results. In 1935, EPR questioned the completeness of quantum mechanics, and they designed a mathematical thought experiment to demonstrate their belief. Part of their experiment showed that quantum theory required some kind of faster than light connection between widely separated particles. This superluminal communication, or action at a distance, is still believed by many physicists and quantum theorists to be prohibited by Special Relativity Theory, which requires all signals and causal influences to travel no faster than the speed of light. Thus, EPR contained a kind of locality principle prohibiting nonlocal causes, and quantum theory was thought
to fail by its own formalism, which contradicted Special Relativity and did not match experience in the real world.

However, in 1964 John Bell introduced his theorem proving that a deterministic, local theory (like that relied upon by EPR) and quantum theory could not both be correct. Later, when the Clauser-Freedman experiment in 1972 proved that the statistical predictions of quantum theory are correct, the conclusion was inescapable that the EPR locality principle was false. (Cushing & McMullin, 1989, pp. 225, 257-266; Davies, 1983, pp. 102-106; Zukav, pp. 309-311; Herbert, pp. 226, 245). “What Bell has given us is a proof that there is as a matter of fact a genuine nonlocality in the actual workings of nature, however we attempt to describe it, period.” (Albert, 1992, p. 70). Therefore, Bell’s Theorem seems to entail a nonlocality principle, and quantum theory suggests that now widely separated particles that originated from the same quantum system (those that share a common past) are still interconnected over great distances of space and time.

Separated particles share an “intrinsic identity” (Cushing & McMullin, 1989, p. 37), “[t]he universe is in reality an interconnected whole” (Davies, 1992, p. 157), and “each part of physical reality is constructed of all other parts” (Zukav, p. 255). British physicist and professor of theoretical physics Paul Davies (1983) also notes an all-embracing wholeness here, with interlocking levels of description and “everything somehow made up of everything else” (p. 163). Physicist Henry Stapp describes the physical world according to quantum mechanics as “a web of relationships between elements whose meanings arise wholly from their relationship to the whole” (Zukav, p. 96).

The “indivisibility of interaction” embodied in the non-locality principle (Cushing & McMullin, 1989, p. 261) at the quantum level expresses “the need for revising the concept of physical reality” (p. 262). In his book Wholeness and the Implicate Order, David Bohm writes, “The quantum theory has a fundamentally new kind of non-local relationship, which may be described as a non-causal connection of elements that are distant from each other” (Davies, 1984, p. 219). Philosopher Jon Jarrett (Cushing & McMullin, 1989, p. 79) says this “worldview challenges any
straightforward notion of the individuation of physical objects.” David Bohm, a leading quantum theorist agrees and echoes the words of Werner Heisenberg, who won the Nobel Prize in Physics for his crucial and brilliant contributions to the development of quantum mechanics: “The common division of the world into subject and object, inner world and outer world, body and soul is no longer accurate” (Davies, 1983, p. 112).

Bohm sees a new reality in the holistic individuality of quantum theory:

A centrally relevant change in descriptive order required in the quantum theory is thus the dropping of the notion of analysis of the world into relatively autonomous parts, separately existent but in interaction. Rather, the primary emphasis is now on undivided wholeness, in which the observing instrument is not separated from what is observed.” (Ibid.).

Apparently separate parts of the universe could be intimately connected at the deepest, most fundamental level. (Ibid., p. 320).

As a result, Paul Teller and David Bohm see a new reality in quantum theory’s holistic individuality, and philosophers Paul Teller and Don Howard (Cushing & McMullin, 1989) both espouse an ontological holism, or nonseparability based on quantum mechanics. Teller calls his theory relational holism, which takes into account the likelihood of a commonality from the past that binds otherwise separate particles together. Howard’s holism tries to reconcile the spatio-temporal separability principle that individuates physical states and systems in general relativity theory with the nonseparability of quantum mechanics that binds spatio-temporally separated particles together, creating a kind of interconnected system. He argues physicists should give up the separability principle associated with general relativity and accept a worldview in which spatio-temporally separated, but previously interacting physical systems, lack separate states and perhaps separate physical identities.

Contributing to this notion of nonlocality and lack of separate states is the uncertainty principle attributable to Werner Heisenberg. When the exact position of a particle is measured, only an
approximate reading of its momentum is possible. When the momentum of a wave is measured, only a partial reading of its position is possible. The principle says you cannot know where and atom, electron, or other subatomic particle is located and know how it is moving at one and the same time. In quantum theory you can ask either question and get a sensible answer, but not both. Position and momentum form two mutually incompatible aspects of reality for a quantum particle (Davies, 1983, pp. 102-103). This was the basis of substantial disagreement between Einstein and Bohr.

Albert Einstein and Niels Bohr debated whether quantum theory was complete and whether it describes reality. Bohr believed it was complete and did not describe reality, while Einstein believed it was not and did (or should). Einstein, seen as the realist, stated quantum theory did not characterize reality as any complete theory should, because the properties of its theoretical constructs did not correspond with that of an independent reality. Bohr saw quantum theory as stating something new about nature, but he was nevertheless said by many to "throw out reality" because he believed atomic objects were not independent of their being observed. (Cushing & McMullin, 1989, pp. 159-160, 262, 268-271). He recognized, "Isolated material particles are abstractions, their properties being definable and observable only through their interactions with other systems" (Herbert, 1985, p. 161).

Even the great realist Albert Einstein observed an illusion of separateness between individuals in the macro-world:

A human being is a part of the whole called by us the 'Universe'; a part limited in time and space. He experiences himself, his thoughts and feelings as something separated from the rest—a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to the affection for a few persons nearest us. Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty. Nobody is able to achieve this completely, but the striving
for such an achievement is, in itself, a part of the liberation and a foundation for inner security. (Herbert, 1985, p. 250).

What accounts for the fact that a realist like Einstein held such metaphysical beliefs? To answer precisely this question, Wilber (1984) collected "virtually every major statement made" on metaphysical issues "by the founders and grand theorists of modern (quantum and relativity) physics . . ." (p. 5): Albert Einstein, Erwin Schrödinger, Werner Heisenberg, Prince Louis de Broglie, Max Planck, Wolfgang Pauli, all Nobel Prize winners in physics, plus Sir James Jeans and Sir Arthur Eddington, both knighted for their contributions to physics. According to Wilber, it is their general consensus that modern physics "neither proves nor disproves, neither supports nor refutes" a metaphysical worldview (Ibid.). Nevertheless, each of these great minds embraced such a worldview, and Wilber found a general commonalty of views among them. For Example, de Broglie, whose idea that moving electrons produced waves won him the Nobel Prize, said:

[M]an is in need of a 'supplement of soul' and he must be forced to acquire it promptly before it is too late. It is the duty of those who have the mission of being the spiritual or intellectual guides of humanity to labour to awaken in it this supplement of soul. (Wilber, 1984, p. 125).

"Obviously, there is some type of profound connection here," that Wilber believes lies in the teachings from quantum physics that "we are not yet in contact with ultimate reality" (p. 10). The authentic individualism paradigm that follows is an attempt to understand "ultimate reality;" to escape the "illusion of separateness;" to find a social and organizational ethic in the "quantum" connection, or nonseparability of interactions, between individuals; and to awaken a "supplement of soul" in public administrators, organizational leaders, and citizens alike.

Changing The Paradigm: Foundations Of A Normative Administrative Philosophy

Copernican-Newtonian science and Cartesian-Kantian philosophy taught complete separation of the personal and conscious
human subject from the impersonal and unconscious material universe. However, quantum theory's observer-participatory reality draws subject and object back into relationship. The fact that subject and object are no longer separate and distinct, but dependent upon one another, makes us aware of another reality. By attending the relationship between one human being and another, we come in contact with a reality that was ignored when a subject treated another human being as an object. This realization is not a revelation that can be traced to the discovery of quantum physics, and it has been explored in the social sciences as early as the beginning of our century by such names as Max Weber, Georg Simmel, Wilhelm Dilthey, and Kurt Lewin, as well as the Phenomenologists of the "New Public Administration" during the latter half of the century, among others. Therefore, the notion discussed here of another reality in the relationship between human beings is already a part of the public administration literature from organization theory and organization behavior. Nevertheless, quantum theory clearly strengthens this point of view by (a) demonstrating "Decartes' Error" in formulating the subject/object dichotomy and (b) providing a physical science affirmation of the proposition espoused by earlier writers in public administration that such a dichotomy is no longer viable.

**Authentic Individualism**

"Authentic individualism" is not just some New Age, politically correct term, but instead comes from the study of individualism in anthropology, philosophy, political science, and social science. The old world term "individualism" was synonymous with selfishness, social anarchy, and individual self-assertion, but early America transplanted it to denote the Jeffersonian ideals of self-government, free society, and the rights of man. Since that time modern America transformed the concept of individualism again, and the literature uses many adjectives to describe it, i.e., radical, popular, expressive, corporate, utilitarian, and narcissistic. Here, the term "authentic" as an adjective to describe individualism stems from its use in Sartre's branch of the Phenomenological movement in philosophy (Lyotard, 1991; Luijpen & Koren, 1969),
Camus' kingdom of the human heart (Ellison, 1990; Woelfel, 1975; Onimus, 1970), Berman's politics of authenticity (Berman, 1970), and Heller's derivation of the term (Heller et al., 1986) from psychoanalysis, social theory, existentialism, ethnography, and literature. It is intended to carry the notion of ontological holism, such as Paul Teller's *relational holism* and David Bohm's *holistic individuality* (Cushing & McMullin, 1989)

Authentic individualism's foundations are derived from a synthesis of Western philosophy and American political history that is developed in more detail elsewhere and cannot be fully described here. The very idea that modern American individualism needs revamping arose out of this larger study of political history, but how authentic individualism impacts ideas in public administration was influenced by a different conceptual scheme. Authentic individualism is an attempt to develop a journeyman philosophy with a message for rejuvenating our institutions and sustaining the Republic that does not ignore but nurtures the moral sense.

Authentic individualism does not seek to make some political or ideological point, but to lift up the human and ethical dimensions of public life. It is not a confirmation of the popular rejection of equal rights, and it does not condemn all self-interested action. It is an effort toward helping change the perception of our institutional environment, and it asks three questions of institutions and individuals in their everyday lives and work: What does this action do for people? What does it do to people? How may people participate in it?

Authentic individualism sheds the pessimism, finality and futility of conventional cosmology and existentialist philosophy in pursuit of an optimistic look toward-the-future view of humanity, and it rejects the Newtonian-Cartesian mechanistic view of the universe and of human existence as self-contained objects occupying empty space. In place of that limited outlook, it adopts a relativistic and quantum frame of reference that space and time—indeed all components of the universe—are interrelated and interdependent, not merely interacting, in a never-ending continuum of evolution and development. This evolution is the purpose
for humankind's existence; conscious and conscientious development of humanity and the world is the reason for being; and no thing or no one is outside this other-interested purpose in life.

Accordingly, authentic individualism is evolutionary—not in the sense of static activity or inert substance waiting for change to evolve—but in the sense of individual development and change on a daily basis. It abhors that part of modern American life and society that admires and gives sustenance to rapacious self-interest, or radical individualism. This does not bury self beneath the collective, where it is subservient to group will, or is mired in other-directed conformity. Rather, the highest expression of self is not self-interest, or serving as the instrument of others, but interest in, development of, and adherence to a moral sense in self and others.

Authentic individualism combats the harshness of extreme particularity with a balance of individual and group identity. It locates the origin of human actions and desires inside the relationship between the person and environment rather than within the individual. By emphasizing qualitative and value-laden criteria, it struggles to escape the restrictive effects of pure reason in scientific and economic approaches to problem-solving and decision-making. Accepting intuition as a source of knowledge, it abandons authority or science as the only seat of truth. This viewpoint resists the notion that social, political, government, or business organizations should be inert substances reacting to forces from without, compelled by fixed conceptions along predetermined paths.

Authentic individualism makes human dignity the starting point for moral decision-making. It defines morality in turn as a growing appreciation for what enriches human dignity and what truly injures it. Every decision is judged in light of whether it protects or undermines the dignity of the human person. If that happens, organizational leaders will cease reifying their organizations, managers will stop treating individuals as acquisitive (driven by wants, needs, and desires for goods), and business and government will stop treating each other as tools to create a business climate and both will put people first. Then each person
will be treated as deserving of respect, driven by values, principles and the desire to do good.

Organizational transformation of this kind does not just happen, even with the dedication of a few tireless individuals. The entire organization—every individual at every level, especially the leadership—must be utterly committed to the project. It is a continuous, never-ending process of human development that takes planning, training and the contribution of significant organizational resources to implement and maintain. It requires that organizational members be viewed as important enough to demand such a commitment, beginning with a change in the way individuals and their leaders think about the role their organizations play in life and society within a quantum world.

A Quantum Connection

Organization consultants and theorists Gertz and Baptista (1995) believe that organization issues remain the last frontier of modern management, where development of a usable theory has been slow despite all that is preached and written about motivation and leadership. They note that success in growth companies seems to come from management respect for employees, and those firms that perform the best maintain alignment between the values of their employees and organizational goals. Building on this notion, authentic individualists can use a quantum framework to transcend the organization or institution, give it a new paradigm or vision, and transform it in the process into a place healthy for humans.

In a quantum framework, organizations are more than just boxes on a chart. Instead, they include processes, leadership, relationships, symbols, myths, narratives, incentives, penalties, and most basic of all, tension between a desire for control and independent action by groups and individuals. Organizations and groups of people are seen from a quantum perspective as systems constructed by humans; guided by general organizing principles; and encouraging humans toward a sense of becoming, and moral meaning in life and work. The idea of quantum connections derived from the indivisibility of interactions of the New Physics suggests that the humans as resource model is outmoded. In-
instead, employee well-being becomes an organizational purpose, legitimate leadership is recognized as emerging from the people who make up the organization, and all institutions and organizations are required to fulfill obligations to the community that supports them and makes them successful.

**Rejection of the Humans as Resource Model**

Organizational bureaucracy achieves efficiency through depersonalization and transformation of true individuals into tools of production. Downs (1995) observes that employees are seen more often than not as expenses or as consumable commodities under the current reductionist paradigm. When times are good you buy the people you need, and when demand for their services subsides you discard them. Employees are interchangeable components that can be plugged in wherever and whenever needed. Similarly, the social theorist Jürgen Habermas (1984) describes an institutional ethic in which “functionally driven subsystems” denigrate the individual. These are complexes of organization driven by the demands of their own functioning, rather than needs of the people who serve them.

The consequent managerial philosophy flowing from bureaucracy can be summarized:

Employees are being paid to produce, not to make themselves into better people. Corporations are purchasing employee time to make a return on it, not to invest in employees to enrich their lives. Employees are human capital, and when capital is hired or leased, the objective is not to embellish it for its own sake, but to use it for financial advantage (Norton, 1991, 154).

This management theory totally robs individuals of their personhood and treats them no different—with no greater redeeming values—than money or private property. The purely mechanistic view of individuals as objects with no spiritual or moral bond between them is outmoded and dangerous in an interconnected world growing ever more complex and diverse.

In such a logical-rational, control oriented organization, people become estranged from themselves, others, and the world,
and they become confused and angry about their work. These phenomena actually contribute to individual and group differen­tiation as individuals experience isolation, function simply as technicians, fail to gain fulfillment, and become detached from their moral and spiritual side. The challenge of these fragmented times is to link the inner world of the self to the outer world of society.

Humans are more than mere parts of a machine, or even of a process; they are the process, the focus and the ends-in-themselves. Instead of collective skin-encapsulated objects—individual, inert, and ready formed—humanity is a sharing of commonality across boundaries. Rather than accidental by-products of extra-terrestrial forces, humanity is a logical, ordered and important sub-system in an otherwise chaotic process of cosmic evolu­tion from base substances, through life, and toward perfection. No part of humankind can be divorced from the rest, because the effects from that separated part reverberate through the remain­der in a life version of quantum non-locality.

Each individual plays a role in and has a responsibility to the whole, as each plays an active role in creating reality for all. Those who take this other-interest role seriously and practice it daily impart an invisible field energy to others as observer and ob­served become intimately interwoven one within the other. On the other hand, those who do not accept other-interest, but embrace self-interest as the guiding principle for politics and society, contribute to a social and political “uncertainty principle” of sub­jectivity in which one’s essential nature, momentum or position—in short, reality—can never be determined until it is observed.

**Employee Well-Being as Organizational Purpose**

Quantum theory depicts a state of nature in which the self is de­fined through its relationship to others in a natural world. The fundamental forces of quantum relationships bind the universe together and cause it to evolve. Self, society, and nature all share the same common source and are bound together in an emergent, unfolding, constantly evolving reality. The dynamics of our bod­ies and minds seem to emerge from the same quantum laws and
forces, which connect our work lives and non-work lives in a single, seamless life project. In this kind of other-interested reality, workers are seen as persons rather than as objects to be used.

In fact, a new Biopsychosocial Model of Medicine posits mind and body as interactive, not separate, distinct, and impermeable entities (Brody, 1995). According to this medical model, there are no fixed boundaries between biological, psychological, and social events and processes. Human health and illness are looked upon as joint products of bodily, mental, and social forces, rather than things that exist solely within the body with no connection to thought and culture. Mind and body are not separate sorts of things occupying different realms. Instead, social forces affect mind, mental forces affect body; body, mind, and culture "talk" to each other; and all influence human health (Brody, 1995).

From this perspective, organizational goals and purposes must simultaneously serve the organization and the combined wave aspect—"psychic well-being" as Selznick (1993) calls it—of the employees. Research indicates that what today's workers see as normal has changed, and they are not willing to just take orders, and management consultants Gertz and Baptista (1995) recognize it does not pay to demoralize workers. Therefore, the psychic well-being of a business's employees contributes directly to the bottom line, and the well-being of an organization's members is an appropriate goal that should be a major concern of all organizational leaders, if for no loftier reason than its impact on productivity and the selfish interest in reducing costs.

Social forces and culture, including what happens to group members inside the organization, impact their health, which also goes straight to the bottom line: Witness the national debate over the cost of health care, its impact on corporate profits, and its role in collective bargaining. Productivity is adversely affected by all emotional or physical injuries to organizational members, because they necessarily affect the organization as part of the members' physical and psychic well-being, where they interfere with the efficiency, effectiveness, and economic success of the organization. The best interests of the organization are served by maintaining and improving—certainly not worsening—employee
well-being. When this kind of being-in-the-world-with-responsibility becomes an organizational goal, appreciation of human spirituality rises and organizational transformation occurs.

Recognizing the Need in Individuals for Moral Decision-Making

In his recent book, The Moral Sense, James Q. Wilson (1993) noted that a person who contemplates the endless litany of tragedy and misery in the world would be pardoned for concluding that humans are at best selfish, aggressive animals whose predatory instincts are only partially and occasionally controlled. That person would agree with Thomas Hobbes’s observation that the natural human state is a war of all against all. Yet Wilson adheres to a profoundly hopeful view of human nature as fundamentally decent and good. He warns us against accepting a narrow vision of our humanity and against making a world that fulfills our diminished expectations. Despite the daily evidence of human immorality, Wilson argues that humans have a biologically based moral sense.

Similarly, in the book The Moral Animal, Robert Wright (1994) concluded—through the lens of an evolutionary psychologist—that humans have a technical capacity to be moral. Because we have self-awareness, memory, foresight and judgment, we are potentially moral animals, but we are not naturally moral. Natural selection biases us toward unconscious, hidden self-interest. Self-interest rules us unless we take morality seriously and build on our foundation of decency.

Whether you adopt the point of view that a moral sense is biological, or that only the capacity for morality is biological, that sense or capacity must be fashioned, sensitized and honed. It is developmental and must be pursued, not ignored. Without conscious and conscientious attention to it the moral sense will wither from disuse, and self-interest will assume the role of prime virtue. Thus, individuals must make moral judgments, but they are not a sufficient basis for ethical action.
Moral judgments require the reasoned assessment of the consequences of human actions for human beings. The psychic well-being of organizational members requires that the actions forced upon individuals by the organization must be consistent with the developmental nature of moral consciousness. Disconsonance between moral conscience and the institutional requirements for action can be a constant source of irritation and psychic harm to members of the organization. Practitioners in public administration, as all organizational leaders, must take account of the necessity for moral judgment and moral development in individuals and adapt organizational goals, missions, and decision-making processes to facilitate it.

In accord are developmental psychologists, such as Piaget, Kohlberg, and Erikson, who reject the needs, wants and passions approach to analyzing individual behavior (Joy, 1973; Erikson, 1974). Instead, they describe individuals as passing through multiple, invariant, qualitative stages of moral development in which certain principles guide behavior. There are no disjunctive leaps in these stages, only an ascending journey, ebbing and flowing, upward to complexity and mature responses to life and experience. The Piaget-Kohlberg contribution to understanding moral reasoning and motivation fixes moral responsibility with each person.

No organization or institution can thrive without providing for this sense of moral meaning in the work lives of the individuals who maintain their separate identities within the combined corporate existence. Not only are humans capable of self-determination, each is morally accountable for how experience is processed and the consequences of actions and intentions. The organization or institution cannot successfully incorporate the individuals who make up its core unless the distinct individual states of their being are sustained by attuning organizational goals and purposes to the shared meanings and values of the group.
Emergent Leadership

As noted earlier, there is a radical character to contemporary social and political consciousness, and the public is impatient with traditional top-down structures. Gertz and Baptista (1995) agree that the source of authority and decision should be relocated to the grass roots and front lines where citizen and workers think, feel, and act. Authentic individualism based upon quantum connections articulates a vision of leadership that emerges from within the people who comprise the organization. This idea of emergent leadership can be illuminated by considering again the wave/particle paradox in quantum theory.

Quantum systems are both wave-like and particle-like at the same time. This "wave/particle duality" results in some experiments where light behaves like a series of waves, and others in which it behaves like a stream of individual particles. According to classical physics, light is an electromagnetic wave, an undulation in the electromagnetic field. But around 1900 Max Planck demonstrated mathematically that light waves can also behave like particles now called photons. This was demonstrated in the laboratory by Thomas Young's two-slit experiment. When high intensity light illuminates two slits in a screen, the waves of light spill through in two beams, spread out and overlap, creating a characteristic interference pattern on the photographic plate. However, when the intensity of the light is lowered and individual photons are fired through the slits, they hit the photographic plate at a particular point and make little spots as one would intuitively guess they should. Given long enough, however, the accumulated speckles of the individual atomic particles will still build-up to give the interference pattern characteristic of the overlapping beams of light waves. They do so despite the fact that any individual particle can presumably pass through only one of the slits, while the interference pattern requires two overlapping wave trains (beams of light). The answer to the paradox seems to be that individual photons, atoms, electrons, and so on, manifest both wave and particle aspects. DeBroglie settled on the view that quantum phenomena are not simply wave or particle, but both wave and particle (Bell, 1987, p. 191), a point of view
with which Bell himself also agrees (Ibid., p. 194). The wave part of the paradox is the fact that information about the whole seems to be imprinted in individual photons (the one is the many), and the whole is the form for the singular (Davies, 1983, pp. 107-109).

Each particle is both wave and individual, both part of the group and singular, both social and solitary, but it can never be just particle or wave. This relationship between wave aspect and particle aspect in a quantum system is like that which we should expect between individuals and groups in our social reality. When two quantum systems meet, their particle aspects tend to remain separate and maintain their original identity, but their wave aspects merge, giving rise to a new system that enfolds the originals. As the two systems relate internally, they get inside one another, evolve together, and take on their own particle/wave aspect within a new corporate identity. (Zohar & Marshall, 1994).

Just as photons of light are both particle and wave, indivisibly interconnected, human individuals are paradoxically autonomous and at the same time a part of the social realm, where they derive a significant measure of their being from others.

All particles (people) are connected by an invisible conjunction of waves (interaction). These interactions create an interference pattern (relationship) in which new combinations (more conjunctions) develop and change the participants. With our particle aspect, we stand apart and are autonomous beings, but with our wave aspect we can never be truly singular, because we are taken up and woven into the being of others and all that surrounds us, just as the influences of others dissolve into our being. Organizational and institutional leaders must recognize this connectedness and cultivate it for their employees' well-being and their own success.

Yet there is a still deeper manifestation in all of this that has to do "with human efficacy, with the source of our empowerment to act as personal and moral agents." (Ibid., p. 236). We are not the center, but at the center, and "ontologically part and parcel of everything around us." (p. 240). We are not the end for which all else was created but are part of natural unfolding into a more mature stage. This vision is more common to ancient Greeks or native
peoples, yet it comes to us from the latest insights in science, and it suggests to us that individual moral development is the reason for being.

It is this new emergent reality that organizational and institutional leaders must come to understand. Quantum holism suggests that control and domination stifle creativity, and are less effective than organizational structures and processes that pay genuine tribute to the people of the organization. Because quantum systems have the potential to be both particle and wave, with the capacity to relate on both terms, individual achievement is important, but so is the sense of belonging to a group purpose greater and more noble than self. Individuals are both separate and parts of a group, and both aspects of their psyche need nurturing inside the organization.

Researchers Gertz and Baptista (1995) give numerous examples of firms that succeed because they respect the dignity of their employees. Demonstration of such respect for the self and work of others does not guarantee success, but ignoring or abusing it guarantees destruction. The leader that realizes parts of his or her own identity emerge through relationships with others will respect human dignity and facilitate development of moral meaning in the work of self and others.

The Obligation of an Organization to the Community

In quantum theory, a structure exists called the Bose-Einstein concentrate, so-called because it is made of bosons, one of two basic groups of particles that make up the entire universe. They are particles of relationship that facilitate all the fundamental forces of nature; the gravitational, the electromagnetic, and the strong and weak nuclear forces. All these forces are thought to operate by the exchange of bosons, which include things like photons, gluons, and gravitons. (Zohar & Marshall, 1994).

Bosons are social and cluster together, while the other basic group of particles called fermions slightly repel one another and stay at a distance. As boson wave fronts overlap and get inside each other's boundaries, they pull together, share an identity, and
become one aggregate particle. This indivisibility makes Bose-Einstein concentrates the most unified structures in nature, and accounts for the coherence of photon (light) lasers, and now atom lasers. (Ibid.). It is also the first stage in complex organization of quantum self-organizing systems, which suggests that organizations finding a "boson unifying force" are most likely to become strong, focused, and successful.

The nature of this unifying force for organizations and institutions can be found in "quantum field theory." (Ibid.). According to Physicist D. Z. Albert (1992), relativistic quantum theories conceive of every single mathematical point in space as a quantum mechanical system each of which interacts in a particular way with its neighbors, and the complete array of them is called a field. This quantum field resembles a background of evanescent reality in constant interaction with all surface existing things, and each individual is an excited state or fluctuation in this field of potentiality, or new reality. (Zohar & Marshall, 1994, pp. 213, 238). Here, particles of matter are actually momentary interactions between energy fields. These interactions seem particle-like because fields interact instantaneously at one single point in space. Instead, however, individual particles have no personality at all, particles contain no attributes of their own, and the essence of a particle's so-called attributes are really in the relationship between the fields. In this relational reality, all meaning in these exchanges is carried in the interactions, which leave both participants changed as a result.

Applied to organizations, these ideas have powerful ramifications because an organization itself is part and parcel of its community, and the latter is more responsible for success of the organization than any organizational member, executive or otherwise. Having received the same benefits, or in many cases more, from the community as any individual, the organization has reciprocal obligations to the community that extend beyond merely paying taxes and hiring human resources. The heart of our individual being is embedded within and defined by relationships—our social self—inside our organizations and out. Each of us is reflected in these engagements, and each of us bears respon-
sibility to others for the mores, practices, and policies of the group.

In the quantum worldview, an observer does not stand outside the observation. The observed—an event, a single person, or all of nature—is not object. Rather, the quantum observer participates in what takes place, whether it be nature's unfolding, social change, or organizational practice. The observer is not just observer, but a part of the process that influences the outcome. The same is true of the organization member and leader, who is a part of and shares responsibility for the organization's policies, and where it goes and what it does. From this point of view, all organizations and institutions are simply the social construction of relationships among people for the accomplishment of a chosen social purpose, and no one has greater social responsibility than the leaders of our private and public organizations and institutions.

Conclusion

So it seems we are out of touch with reality, and the way public life is viewed in the United States is in desperate need of revamping. Today, Americans embrace ever more radical manifestations of individualism, but the history of our 220 year social experiment is not yet complete. The conformity, alienation, devotion to self, and obsession with personal rights now dominating the American psyche are powerful repelling forces that may yet drive us apart.

Everyone knows that the coordinated efforts of a group can accomplish more than the hardest work of individuals all working on their own. In an interconnected world, where the resources for progress are becoming more scarce, we need a culture of sharing and supporting one another, but instead we practice our past by guarding that which is already ours and seeking more at the expense of others. Instead of such a self-oriented view of reality and the self-interested pursuit of progress it engenders, progress itself must be reformulated. What we are and what we pursue as good in life needs redefining, and we need to take being human as seriously as we take our personal rights. This can
begin with change in the way we view the world and perceive the reality that surrounds us, including our organizations and institutions.

Albert Einstein was a seeker after reality all of his life, yet he had this to say about the illusion of separateness:

A human being is part of the whole, called by us 'Universe'; a part limited in time and space. He experiences himself, his thoughts and feelings as something separated from the rest—a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affection for a few persons nearest us. Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty. Nobody is able to achieve this completely, but the striving for such is, in itself, a part of the liberation and a foundation for inner security (Herbert, 1985, p. 250).

Those who point out that difference among us is also universal and ask if unity is not just a trump card to be laid accusingly by the majority on the break-away faction, should note that authentic individualism teaches dignity and primacy of the other—regarding individual to combat tyranny of the majority. Beyond that, it is clear that human differences fairly leap to the forefront and need no emphasis to gain our attention, especially in a radically individualistic society like our own. However, in a culture where the conditions described in the Introduction are extant, what we share in common does need emphasis. Moreover, physicists have for years suspected a interlocking unity underlying the new physics. (Davies, 1983, pp. 157-158). Certainly in our time, and perhaps for all time, this is the message for sustaining the Republic.

Endnotes

1. This article is previously unpublished. Short parts of it are drawn from my 1996 book: Authentic Individualism: Reclaiming
2. This modern use of the term singularity to describe the origin of the Big Bang is too powerful a metaphor to be mere coincidence when compared to basic premises of particularism in Newtonian-Cartesian thought and the modern emphasis on individualism.

3. Some may think it trite, or trivial, to say that everything is related to everything else. To them I say it seems neither trite, nor trivial, to know that quantum theory suggests widely separated and singular particles are interconnected and influence one another because of sharing a common past. The normative value in this observation for social living in a fragmented culture is obvious to me.

4. This passage is only a summary of the philosophical synthesis I call authentic individualism. The foundation for it is fully discussed in Chapters 2-4 and a more complete explication of its parts appears in Chapter 9 of Authentic Individualism.

5. Some may accuse me of being presumptuous, maybe even egomaniacal, for claiming to know and state the purpose of life. Of course, I do not claim to know that purpose in any objective sense. Rather, I am offering some basic tenets for a normative, ethical administrative philosophy that must begin with some suppositions about the basis for collective life.
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Private Emotions on the Public Stage: The Case of Envy and the American Presidency

Michael P. Riccards

As we come to see the American presidency less as a chief magistrate and more as a projection of our collective imaginations, the role of emotions becomes more significant in understanding the office and our way of life. We have always known that the private characters of public men and women were worth examining. Indeed, that is why we read biography and tolerate the stilted art form called autobiography. Classical historians, such as Plutarch, were careful in distinguishing the emotions, the "humors," and individual eccentricities, even while they acknowledged the deciding forces of the gods, fate, and fortune. This essay focuses on the little examined and frequently overlooked emotion of envy and its varied manifestations as seen through the historical prism of the American Presidency. This approach is meant to be exploratory on the subject and not definitive in any way. This study seeks to ask: first, what are the definitions and characteristics of envy, and then what are the drawbacks and advantages to the expression of envy by preeminently public people?

1. The Nature of Envy

Of all the pagan vices, Christian sins, and vague psychoanalytic concepts, envy may be the least examined and the most confused. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines envy as "feeling displeasure and ill-will at the superiority of (another person) in happiness,
success, reputation, or the possessor of anything desirable." Webster's Dictionary defines envy as "uneasiness, mortification, or discontent at the sight of another's superiority or success, accompanied with some degree of hatred or malignity, and often or usually with a desire or an effort to depreciate the person envied." Indeed, the root of the word that has come to us through the old French from Latin to English means "to look with malice" ("invidire").

The origins of envy in the human personality are unclear. In 1890, William James defined emotions in general as the detection of bodily changes, but within his framework it is possible to identify envy only by its originating stimuli. Similarly, behavioral psychologists can identify and measure some of the common physiological consequences of heightened emotions, but they too cannot differentiate among envy, hatred, anger or several other internal states. Another perspective is to examine envy as a consequence of social learning. A connectionist theory of learning views envy as a product of the attraction of reinforcers between stimuli and responses. A more cognitive interpretation is concerned with the perceptions or attitudes or beliefs that a person has about the environment; those cognitions, in turn, determine the individual's behavior (Hill, 1971). Learning thus is seen as the examination of how cognitions are modified by experience. Consequently, envy would be viewed as a learned response based on the environment one is in and how others react to perceived similar or related situations.

In addition, there is the work done by Sigmund Freud and his adherents, who claim mainly that envy is a natural and usually malevolent human instinct. Freud generally examined envy using his concept of "penis envy," or the alleged feelings of anatomical deficiencies especially prevalent in females. More recently, sophisticated disciples of his, however, have broadened that explanation. Madeline Klein (1975), for example, has argued that envy develops from a child's earliest resentments toward his/her mother and her nurturing breasts that can gratify or frustrate the child's immediate needs. Another psychoanalytic theorist, Judith Hubback (1988) has concluded that the human personality exhib-
its two forms of envy: the genetically earlier, hungry, wanting form, and a later "shadow" form which embraces an impulse to spoil, denigrate, or show malice. Helmut Schoeck (1966) in his comprehensive treatment of envy presents it as both a drive and as a mental attitude, inevitably and deeply rooted in our biological and existential situation.

The difficulty with the social learning approach is that emotional states involve complex interactions between internal personal dynamics and the environment that are rather unclear to the observer. Individuals are not just responding to stimuli with predictable patterns of behavior or simply linking up perceptions with their surroundings. According to some cognitive theorists, emotions such as envy are the product of qualifying and mediating perceptual screens which need to be understood. And the fact that envy appears to be a nearly universal emotion indicates that we may be witnessing some innate human characteristics. The difficulty with the psychoanalytical discussion is one that is common to much of its epistemology—it begs a tautology. People exhibit envious behavior because they have an emotion which is called envy. How do we know they have that emotion—because they exhibit envious behavior (Bandura, 1986).

The ancient Greeks called this emotion "phthonio," which means that one begrudges, refuses, or withholds one's approval because of envy or jealousy. Aristotle found envy to be intrinsically evil, and a contemporary philosopher, Miguel de Unamuno, said it was the vice of those who lacked "deep personal preoccupations" (Ulanor, 1983). Although envy was not classified as a mortal sin by the Roman Catholic Church until the reign of Gregory the Great, it has a long history of censure and severe disapproval. The Bible has differing examples of envy: the Philistines envied Isaac, Rachel envied her sister, Joseph's brothers envied him, and in the Book of Job, we are told, "Wrath killeth... and envy slayeth." Jesus warned about the envy that brothers feel toward each other, and that stewards assert toward less responsible workers. And Cain, of course, slew Abel in an act of hostility growing out of envy.
Some observers have speculated that envy is especially prominent in consumer-oriented cultures such as our own, although it appears in a variety of societies as well. In Egypt and Southern Italy, for example, envy is frequently linked up with the curse of the evil eye, and people in rural cultures often take deliberate steps to avoid showing off their true wealth or fine possessions (Ghosh, 1983; Galt, 1982).

Envy is frequently compared to jealousy, even though modern society seems to accept more easily jealousy with its romantic and sexual connotations. Jealousy is the collection of thoughts and feelings that one has when an actual or desired relationship is threatened. Envy in a similar context is the thoughts and feelings that arise when our personal qualifications, possessions, or achievements do not measure up to those of someone relevant to us. Folk ballads and country songs explore the socially acceptable expressions of jealousy and the fear of the loss of a loved one to a rival. But no one writes songs to celebrate envy. Both envy and jealousy, of course, are related to feelings of insecurity, and often to a sense of inferiority that is derived from a comparison to (real or idealized) others (Smith, et al, 1988; Stewart and Beatty, 1985).

Just as some anthropologists have spoken of "man the toolmaker," or "man the symbol maker," Schoeck writes of "man the envier" who would not be able to develop social systems without controlling or sublimating the diffuse expressions of the emotion of envy. Schoeck maintains that even some animals are supposed to have certain predisposition towards envy. Ironically, the more a person is envious of another, the more that person gives in to a form of narcissism, and the more the person denies his/her own worth. The person is forced back upon himself/herself and exhibits often self-pitying or even rageful behavior. Some societies deal with the natural expressions of envy effectively, but others, especially those that emphasize consumption and possessive individualism, such as capitalist countries, may be especially susceptible to being disrupted by the consequences of the severe manifestations of this emotion (Schoeck, 1966).

One of the reasons for our susceptibility in a heightened way to this emotion may be the comparatively long duration of child-
hood in humans which exposes individuals to the tensions of sibling rivalry and also to long-standing feelings of dependency and personal anxiety. Also, one might expect that a society that glamorizes prolonged adolescence, supports a discrete youth culture, and exhibits loose family ties, as in the United States, would be especially prone to expressions of private envy and public resentment. Schoeck points out how societies have recognized holidays to express mourning and thanksgiving, but none to express or channel envy. Some public expressions of such feelings, however, such as steep progressive income tax rates, ritual death duties, and a variety of customs among primitive peoples, are meant to sublimate or at least direct the expression of that emotion. Schoeck further argues that the more public authorities can downplay or even ignore envy, the greater will be the possibilities of economic growth and innovation (Schoeck, 1966).

As has been noted, in some primitive and traditional societies envy is often associated with a feeling of impotence and with black magic, witchcraft, and the unique powers supposedly possessed by specially gifted or powerful women. The expressions of envy, though, are often restrained, because those societies and their economies are not very dynamic and rarely generate the variety of goods, the distinction of class and status, and the places of preferment and patronage more obvious in modern industrialized societies. The same dynamics of resentment can be seen in the envy between generations or the genders. The young resent the power and privileges of the established, and their elders fear the innovations, the experimentations, the energy, and the robust sexuality of the young. The changing roles of men and women can also call into question a society’s “givens” and promote a further development of the ideology of victimization that seems so prominent in late 20th century America (Sykes, 1992).

Still, envy can be seen as a spur to social and political reforms, revolution, and critical institutional change. Richard Hofstadter has analyzed the Progressive movement in America, saying that it was due in part to the loss of prominence on the part of the traditional Protestant middle class. Because of this “status anxiety,” this group was ripe for a reform agenda. The same hypothesis
has been used to explain the reform movements of the ante-bellum generation, especially the rise of abolitionism in America. Thus, one can speculate that anxiety over status, if it really existed historically in those classes, was due, not just to the loss of their privileged positions, but also to envy toward those who took their place (Hofstadter, 1955).

Envy consequently can be seen as a stark vice that has salutary consequences at times. This usually malevolent emotion may have some explanatory power in helping us to understand our most powerful political leaders and the cultural milieus in which they matured and acted out their own personal conflicts. Envy is not simply a solitary emotion of a disgruntled individual. It is frequently the leaven in social and political movements, right and left. It can often be a salient explanation in understanding the mass behavior of poorer or less developed nations, an emotion as powerful as the awakening of tribalism or nationalism.

2. Childhood Envy

If the Freudian, neo-Freudian, and social learning literature are suggestive and somewhat correct, then the traumas and anxieties of childhood carry over into adulthood and adult personalities. Whether the central factor is sibling rivalry or not, public people have pasts, and those pasts can be useful in explaining adult manifestations of envy. In the American experience, we can indeed see the early roots of envy expressed in the character development of some of our Presidents. Our first President and national patriarch, George Washington, lost his father early in life and his subsequent attachment to a father-substitute, his older brother, led him into adaptive behavior that was highly and consciously derivative and probably envious in nature. He had a very strained relationship with his mother, and during the height of the Revolutionary War she publicly let her neighbors know that she was not being properly taken care of by her children, including George. A moody man with an explosive temper, he consciously framed a whole personal code of maxims (which we still possess today) that would allow him to fit into polite Tidewater
Virginia society and control the expressions of envy, resentment, and self-abjection that he obviously felt. His early twenties was a difficult period of adjustment marked by tremendous negative reactions towards the British military hierarchy and its allegedly haughty attitude toward the colonials, including himself. One can only get a full appreciation of the depth of his feelings by realizing that at the time of the American Revolution, this wealthy planter was willing to risk all in a seemingly hopeless battle against the greatest empire in the world. The tinderboxes of civic liberty and national self-determination were kindled in many ways by the expressions of personal envy in his early life and the resulting resentments (Emery, 1976).

Childhood envy can be seen in the more recent intense sibling rivalry of John F. Kennedy towards his older brother, Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., who died in World War II. The rivalry stroked purposefully and constantly by their father was meant to push the two sons toward success, and in part led to accelerated and brief careers. As in a Greek tragedy, the patriarch was to see the death of all of his male heirs but one, and the bringing of that last son to public humiliation again and again. Like a Sophoclean tragedy, the dynasty knew power and glory, destruction and decline. Central to this family's pathos was the continuous generation of envy as an unreliable spur to ambition (Hamilton, 1992).

Unlike Kennedy, though, many of our Presidents had no fathers, or relatively weak ones, and these men of ambition when young often were formed either through their mother's efforts or their own: Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Lyndon Johnson, Nixon, Reagan, Carter and Clinton, just to name a few examples. The psycho-dynamics of a President's family may be one in which these strong currents of emotions, including envy, are often given free play rather than being stymied or repressed. Thus, while the "correct" way to come to grips with society is by curbing envy and rage through sublimation or denial, some leaders may end up not doing that very extensively. It may be that they are excused by either mother or by surrounding society from having to make those compro-
mises. Thus, they emerge as fields of force unto themselves with very strong personalities.

3. The Envy of the Advantaged

Just as the resentment of other people's advantages and good fortune can be the engine of social reform and the movements for justice or retribution, so too it can be a motive for ambitious people who attempt to climb high in the world. It is not unusual to expect that aspiring people who aim at the presidency should be animated by feelings of envy towards the advantages that others had in their early years. One would think, though, that their later achievements, especially capturing the top political post in society (an opportunity that only several people in each generation have a chance to achieve), would compensate for past slights and neglects. Presidents by their nature are personalities blown up large, and their ego needs which are so important at times to their contemporaries emerge on the public stage showing their overriding ambitions and also their personal inadequacies in bold tones.

In explaining his fall from grace, Richard Nixon told a television interviewer, David Frost, that it all began with the slights of childhood, the small hurts and indignities that the young live with, often out of the sight of adults (Nixon, 1978; Frost, 1978). Abraham Lincoln, who seemed remarkably mature in his ability to separate his personal feelings from his duties, once referred to his family's history almost blandly as "the short and simple annals of the poor." He deliberately cut himself off from his siblings, his father, and even his beloved stepmother, as he made his way up the ladder of success. The ultimate self-made man in our history thus made himself over and over again; the American dream of the poor boy made good is also the tale of the rootless wanderer and a circuit-riding lawyer who spent a good portion of his adult life in the saddle away from hearth and home. He once explained openly his envy of rival Stephen Douglas, who seemed to have gone so much farther than he did...until the election of 1860 (Oates, 1977).
Remarkably, Harry Truman, from similar small town roots, was not a captive of envy. He seemed to exhibit a sense of ambition and self-confidence, but not the sort of hungry passion of Lyndon Johnson or the restlessness of academician Woodrow Wilson. There was little envy in his personal life and a remarkable forbearance towards his wife and in-laws who rarely seemed to be around when he needed emotional support and care the most. He was comfortable, though, with himself; once when he was told that his father was a failure in life, Truman sharply disagreed: No, he had brought forth a child who became an American President, he remarked. How many men could say that, indeed (McCullough, 1992). Among other Presidents, such as Millard Fillmore, Warren Harding, Dwight Eisenhower, Gerald Ford, and George Bush, there is also a sense of personal equanimity that seems to have served them well even as they moved into the Executive Mansion or as they flourished in the male-dominated worlds of politics, business, and the military.

4. Envy of Others

Any public figure who has charged to the top of his or her profession surely has exhibited competitiveness and a sharp eye toward others on the same narrow path. But some Presidents have managed to contain those aggressive forms of behavior, to cover over envy, and to put a good face on it all in a society that demands bland fellowship, sometimes honest sportsmanship, and a graceful, but not celebratory, acknowledgment of defeat.

On the other hand, Andrew Jackson was one of those figures whose public behavior could barely be contained within conventional boundaries. He seems at times to have lived a life of permanent rage, exhibiting the passions of anger and envy as he went on his way. After he had the presidential election taken away from him in 1824, he became even more bitter and vindictive towards his many enemies, real and imagined. And although he seemed perpetually ill, he managed to live through two full terms and into a functioning old age. He was ferociously angry, both at those who sought to take away credit from his great milli-
tary victory in the battle of New Orleans, and those who conspired later to deny him the presidency that he was sure he had won. When Adams and Clay worked together to thwart his election in 1824 and the choice was thrown in the House of Representatives, his fury knew no bounds (Rogin, 1975).

The same is true of Richard Nixon in 1960. After the election results, which were probably fraudulent, he became even more bitter and unscrupulous in his dealings—becoming again almost like a Greek classical figure laying out his own undoing where character is indeed fate, and fate was driven by the charioteer, envy (Ehrlichman, 1983).

The same sort of compulsive behavior is seen in the case of Lyndon Johnson, the most powerful practitioner of the Congressional style of politics usually characterized by moderate compromise and reciprocal log rolling. Propelled to the White House unexpectedly, embraced by the forces of domestic reform, and elected by the most enormous of majorities, he seemed fixated, however, on an envy of the Kennedy brothers—on their wealth, style and élan. It is almost comical, if not sad, to read again and again of his denigration of his education at a modest Texas normal school compared to Kennedy’s Harvard College. That sense of inferiority is in marked contrast to Ronald Reagan and Gerald Ford—lesser driven men who seemed to care little about their educational pedigrees, and both of whom were never fascinated by the Kennedy mystique the way their counterparts were. The one, Gerald Ford, lived an easy life with common pleasures, and the other, Ronald Reagan, cared little about history and created his own celluloid myth, greater and longer lasting than the ones he scrutinized around him (Kearns, 1976; Cannon, 1990).

Sometimes Presidents' and public figures' emotional problems are worked out privately as they mature, but often they are transposed onto the public arena. Washington frequently mediated a classic sibling rivalry between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton. They both seemed to be bickering brothers, at war over public issues behind a real backdrop of private hatreds. Their correspondence reads like the complaints of envious brothers over whom the father, and by implication, the nation loved
more. On one occasion, the weary Washington even tried to get them together at a picnic to quiet the noises of animosity, envy, and endless squabbling! Eventually they both quit Washington's cabinet and went their own separate ways to continue their struggle once again (Riccards, 1987).

Envy is a non-rational response. Sometimes individuals are envious of their so-called loved ones, their best friends, and even their own past accomplishments. Theodore Roosevelt fostered the career of his closest colleague in politics, William Howard Taft, and then came back from a hunting trip to Africa and began soon attacking the latter's presidency. The falling-out was supposedly over issues of public policy, but T. R. just seemed to be angry that Taft was not Roosevelt, and that he dared to sit where Teddy had placed him in the first place. Poor Taft tried to understand what was the cause of T. R.'s envy. What did I do wrong, he kept asking. The answer was clear. He was the holder of the office T.R. never wanted to give up (Anderson, 1981; Manners, 1969).

James David Barber has argued that one can understand a President's behavior by looking at his style, character, and world view. Style is defined as the habitual way of performing three political tasks: rhetoric, personal relations, and homework; his world view consists of his primary politically relevant beliefs, especially about social causality, human nature, and the central moral conflicts of his time; character is the way he orients himself toward life in an enduring way. One can see the possibilities of the manifestations of envy, among other emotions, in this schema. A President's style could very easily use the rhetoric of resentment and be characterized by the jaded personal relationships so often found in bitter people prone to envy. That President's world view could also be one in which his notions of human nature and social behavior are saturated with these interpretations, and his character could surely lead him towards a life where envy is a part of the way he views the allegedly hostile world. Jackson, Nixon, and Lyndon Johnson are three prime candidates for such a description (Barber, 1985).

One can see the same sort of envy and dissatisfaction in the attitudes of Jackson toward his successor and friend, Martin Van
Buren, of James Buchanan and John Tyler toward Lincoln, and of the older Eisenhower toward the much younger Kennedy. No one wants his successor to look too good, especially in comparison to himself, regardless of past allegiances and friendships. The mirror held up is one of personal envy and resentment rather than the grandiose yardsticks of public policy and national purpose.

5. Envy in the Context of History

American Presidents are public figures, and they live in a world peopled by historical figures. These figures are the models, the exemplars against which these larger than life individuals measure themselves. They are transported into a different dimension of time, and they become immortal in the sense that their deeds are recorded and live beyond their years. Some Presidents, such as Cleveland, Taft and Bush, seemed to have little sense of history about them and their times. Others, like Washington, Jefferson, Wilson and Kennedy, worked consciously to create their own myths in their lifetimes. Still others, like Lincoln and Franklin Roosevelt, were so immersed in doing important deeds that there is no doubt they were making history at the time and recording themselves in the very process.

It is heady stuff to walk with the gods. Even Alexander the Great felt inadequate when he read of Achilles’ feats in Homer’s Iliad. One can also become insanely envious of the past, of the greatness that once was, or may not have actually been, but which is handed down as history or fable. Even Martin Van Buren talked wistfully of the Founding Fathers’ generation, and that his fellow citizens and he had to be worthy of that heritage (Niven, 1983). Lincoln at the age of twenty-nine seemed to lament the Founders’ overarching greatness and warned that men of true ambition had to avoid the beaten path that was set by others. It is no coincidence that an older and more calculating Abraham Lincoln destroyed the old temple of the Founding Fathers and erected in its place a new one, one firmly consecrated at Gettysburg to a more noble Republic, one cleansed of the foulest of
curses—slavery—the blight the Founding Fathers had tolerated and even enshrined in their Constitution (Anderson, 1982; Wills, 1992).

Washington and Jefferson seemed to have wondered when they were in their forties if they were failures, as did Wilson in academia, and Reagan in Hollywood during those same years in the lifespan. To be envious of an individual in one's neighborhood is one matter; to be envious of extraordinary men living in the distant past doing extraordinary deeds is quite another. There are dangers to such escalating expectations. Kennedy, so overwhelmed by a thirst for greatness, sought to transform the uncertain Cold War into a great moral crusade, and consequently put the planet at risk during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Great men must live in perilous times, he once concluded; the problem is that he helped to make his times more perilous than they should have been (Beschloss, 1992). His successor, Lyndon Johnson, constantly moved back and forth judging himself against his early patron, FDR, who in turn was fascinated by the careers of his cousin Teddy and his patron Woodrow Wilson.

The major Presidents associated with American domestic reform have been very willing to stoke the fires of envy and resentment in order to prevail. The Jeffersonians attacked Hamilton's economic agenda by citing its alleged favoritism toward the commercial classes over the farmers and mechanics. The Federalists in turn used the nation's hostility toward immigrants (many pro-Democrat) to pass the restrictive legislation termed collectively the "Alien and Sedition Acts." Jackson, in his major domestic challenge, took on the "hydra-headed" Bank of the United States and railed at its class-oriented privileges granted at the expense of state and local banks and individual entrepreneurs. He skillfully used the envy that segments of American society felt towards bank president Nicholas Biddle and his system of privileges.

The Progressive movement epitomized by Teddy Roosevelt, and later Woodrow Wilson, rested, as Hofstadter (1955) has hypothesized, on the cumulative envy and resentments of the agrarian and older middle classes towards the new capitalist or-
der and the immigrant masses arriving in such numbers in the United States. The next great reform movement, the New Deal, was spearheaded by an articulate President who promoted class consciousness, attacked the sinister moneychangers in the temple, and took the wealthy to task for their conspicuous consumption and their ineptitude in managing economic affairs. One of Franklin Roosevelt's great achievements was that he convinced working-class Americans that the Depression was not their fault, but that of the capitalist ruling class (Burns, 1956 and 1970). He willingly incurred the hatreds of the hereditary rich (from which he came) and major commercial establishments, while allowing the envy of the people to be mobilized for social reforms and a progressive agenda. His disciple, Lyndon Johnson, avoided such emotional appeals, preferring a milder rhetoric and no real challenge to the power structure. Having drained reform of its indignation, however, he found that the forces of liberal resentment needed some target on which to focus, and it soon became him because of his war in Vietnam.

It is customary to say that American reform movements have a paranoid style about them, that they are suspicious rather than uplifting, prone to scapegoating, especially of foreigners, and frequently susceptible to racism, xenophobia, and redneck populism. But in fact behind those expressions lurk the dark shadows of envy, of a free-floating resentment that is seeking ways to work itself out of the body politic and be lanced by public actions. Rather than link the dark sides of reform to some American character flaw, it is best to see them as manifestations of the cluster of attitudes that revolve around envy: resentment, insecurity, hatred, jealousy, ill-will, intense personal scrutiny, self-loathing, Utopian thinking, and corrective reform.

Like it or not, those Presidents who have been most successful in promoting domestic reform, such as Jackson, Wilson in his first term, Teddy Roosevelt, FDR and Reagan, are those who exploited envy and resentment and mobilized them as allies. Great reforms need great enemies: Jackson versus the bank; T. R. versus the Northern Securities Company; Wilson versus the tariff lobbyists;
FDR versus the mossbacks and the isolationists; Reagan versus the spendthrift Congressional liberals.

Moderate reform may be more pleasant to contemplate, easier to manage, and even more lasting to institutionalize. But politics is not a ballet, but a sloppy disjointed set of stops and starts. Even the best politicians are amateurs, for the mass of men and women are not predictable, calculating human beings. Easier to decipher, less slippery to manipulate are our feelings, our emotions which permit politicians to better calculate our likely responses. They seem to understand us well at times, for they know that emotions and interests are firmer bases for political action than reason and restrained ideology.

6. Envy, its Vices and its Virtues

Judeo-Christian doctrines teach us that we should avoid the capital vices of life, and envy is one of them, for envy distorts judgment, builds up resentments, and takes away from the moral objectives of the balanced life. But vices sometimes have their place in the political world, for politics is the accommodation of passions, animosities and conflicting claims.

Envy can be, as we have seen, the leaven for social movements that demand justice, equality and a more humane way of life. It is only by feeding the public at times the red meat of resentment that it has the stamina to do the job of transforming itself. Envy is the raw edge of politics; it can lead to an unsettling of society, characterized by extensive mobilization, greater visibility, and powerful alternative politics, which in turn introduce new visions of society and even inspiring Utopian ideals.

Envy thus is a tool that can lead to disequilibrium, social disturbances and prolonged social movements that are in turn the nurseries of leaders. The greatest virtue of a society, it is said, is justice, and often it is an unbalanced sense of resentment that leads to re-adjustment, reform and simple equity. Especially in the television age, it takes a great deal of effort to get people out of their homes and into the streets. Envy is one such stimuli, but
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like any passion once unbridled, it can be a terrible force upon which to rely. To understand one's personal life and the role that envy plays can be of limited importance to the rest of us; it is illuminating, however, to see also that American Presidents have exhibited publicly that emotion as well. For even more than the calmer, common people, they live in worlds where their personal feelings are magnified; their envy is more consequential, their character traits and flaws more linked up with the public things of life. Envy indeed may be like jealousy, a green-eyed monster, but in democratic and non-democratic politics alike, it is one of the great beasts that stalks the landscape and it will not go away even if we were to wish it so.
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Albert Speer: In Retrospect

David T. Twining

The Nuremberg Trial of 1945-46 represents the primary international effort to achieve justice for the victims of the Third Reich. This extraordinary and unprecedented undertaking was considered imperative because the scale and nature of Nazi crimes overwhelmed any possible depiction of human suffering and far exceeded existing legal remedies to punish this "radical evil" (Arendt, 1971, pp. 217-53). One of the twenty-two defendants at Nuremberg was Albert Speer, an exceedingly complex individual who gained notoriety during the proceedings by admitting his responsibility for Nazi crimes. His failure to admit guilt, however, has been termed "ethical tunnel-vision" (Biddiss, 1995, p. 42), leaving an enduring and troubling legacy of moral ambiguity for future generations.

I met and spoke with Speer, Hitler's Minister of Munitions and Armaments, during his imprisonment in then-West Berlin's Spandau Prison. In his memoirs (1970), Speer wrote that various warders and guards befriended him during his years of imprisonment, and perhaps I was one such person. Only later have I come to recognize the subtleties associated with violating the limits of the acceptable, particularly for those who shape the destiny of nations—people like Albert Speer.

How can one truly assess the role of a single person in the systematic murder of an entire people? In viewing Albert Speer against the broad sweep of history, the unfathomable angst of the Holocaust continues to haunt all who think and reflect. As Elie Wiesel (1983) has observed, "Between the dead and the rest of us there exists an abyss that no talent can comprehend" (p. H12).
Many individuals played a role in Nazi Germany's genocide of six million Jewish people, along with countless Ukrainians, Gypsies, and others. The extermination process “was self-justifying, an end in itself. The victim was born into it; once placed in an undesirable category, he could not escape” (Davidson, 1966, p. 8).

To accomplish this unspeakable feat, Einsatzgruppen or operational squads of the Nazi's security service, the SD (Sicherheitsdienst), operated death vans and mobile execution squads behind German lines. The German army also performed executions and provided logistical support for the war against the Jews (Marrus, 1987, p. 64). Troops were ordered by Field Marshal Wilhelm Keitel, Chief of the High Command of the German Armed Forces, “to use all means without restriction, even against women and children so long as it insures success” (Jackson, 1946-47, p. 94). The SS (Schutzstaffeln) numbered one-half million by the end of the war; it ran the death camps and its Gestapo (Geheime Staatspolizei) served as the dreaded secret police of the Hitler regime (Reitlinger, 1957, pp. 1-2).

Killing so many people so methodically was addressed by the commandant of Auschwitz, SS Lieutenant Colonel Rudolf Hoess, in an April 1946 conversation with G. M. Gilbert, prison psychologist at the Nuremberg war crimes trials. As head of a camp responsible for one and one-half million deaths, Hoess said “That wasn't so hard—it would not have been hard to exterminate even greater numbers....The killing itself took the least time” (Gilbert, 1947, pp. 249-50). This callous barbarity represented the “industrialization of death” (Adler, 1995, p. 49), realized through “corpse factories and holes of oblivion” (Arendt, 1971, p. 252).

In reflecting upon the mass deaths, there is ample evidence to answer the question, how?, but to this day people continue to ask the more important question, why?

As a young U.S. Army lieutenant serving with the American occupation forces in West Berlin in 1966, I came face to face with three of the primary perpetrators of Hitler's scheme to create a Pan-German empire across Europe. These individuals all played pivotal roles in Hitler's designs and all were convicted of war
crimes at the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal, where the top Nazi officials were tried. The tribunal acted under authority of a special charter established by the Allied powers which held senior military and civilian officials individually accountable for four categories of war crimes: crimes against peace, crimes against the customary laws of war, crimes against humanity, and conspiracy to commit these acts. Less senior Nazi officials and war criminals were judged by tribunals in each Allied zone of occupation.

For purposes of the Nuremberg prosecutions, crimes against peace were defined as the planning and conduct of an aggressive war in violation of international agreements or understandings. The second category of crimes involved the violation of the customary laws of war, which included murder, deportation of slave labor, killing of hostages, plunder, and other acts beyond military necessity. Crimes against humanity were defined as murder, extermination, enslavement, and other inhumane acts against civilian populations or persecution for political, racial or religious reasons while carrying out war crimes (U.S. Army, n.d., pp. 7-8). Conspiracy involved participation in a common plan of aggression, beginning with deliberations in 1937 to annex Austria and Czechoslovakia (Biddiss, 1995, p. 43).

Senior Nazi leaders, including Foreign Minister Joachim von Ribbentrop; General Alfred Jodl, Chief of Operations of the German armed forces; and Hans Frank, dreaded Governor General of Poland, were accused by the International Tribunal of “crimes on a larger scale and more shocking than the world had ever had the misfortune to know” (Tusa and Tusa, 1984, p. 468). After a trial which lasted nearly one year, twelve defendants were sentenced on October 1, 1946 to death by hanging. Among them were Hermann Goering, commander of the German Air Force—the Luftwaffe—and one-time successor to Hitler, who committed suicide on the eve of the executions; and Martin Bormann, Hitler’s personal secretary and right-hand man, who was sentenced to death in absentia and later declared dead by West German courts. Three defendants were acquitted, three were sentenced to life in prison, and four received prison terms ranging from ten to
twenty years. The trial was expected to create the basis for a new order of international law which would hold officials individually responsible for the mass murder of innocent people (Tusa and Tusa, 1984, pp. 490-92). Because of ambiguities surrounding the West's just war tradition, and despite millions of subsequent deaths in Cambodia and elsewhere, this precedent is only now being pursued in relation to atrocities in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda.

The seven Nazi leaders sentenced to imprisonment remained in jail in Nuremberg until July 1947, when they were flown to Berlin for incarceration in what became known as Spandau Allied Prison. This 19th century red-brick penitentiary had a capacity of six hundred prisoners, and during World War II it had been used by the Nazis for hanging up to eight people at a time. At Spandau, military governors from Great Britain, France, the Soviet Union, and the United States supervised the facility while the personal security of the prisoners was provided by civilian warders from each nation, with the American warder provided by the U.S. Bureau of Prisons. Responsibility for external or perimeter security and food for prisoners and staff was rotated among the four powers monthly. The prison was watched over by six guard-towers with spotlights atop an outer wall approximately twenty feet high surrounded by an aging electric fence. Prison buildings within the wall were in disrepair except for the block where the prisoners were kept.

By 1966 two of the prisoners' terms had expired (Grand Admiral Karl Doenitz, commander of the German navy until 1943 and final Reich leader in the closing days of the war, sentenced to ten years; and Costantin von Neurath, Foreign Minister and then governor of Bohemia and Moravia, who received fifteen years). Two prisoners sentenced to life were released for health reasons (Grand Admiral Erich Raeder, one-time commander of the German navy, released in 1955; and Minister of Economics Walter Funk, released in 1957). The three who remained were Rudolph Hess, sentenced to life; Albert Speer, serving twenty years' imprisonment; and Baldur von Schirach, also sentenced to twenty years.
Hess had been deputy to the Fuhrer until May 1941, when he flew to Scotland under still-mysterious circumstances. Interned in England for the rest of the war, he claimed amnesia and at times acted mentally unbalanced, resulting in a long-term debate about his actual mental condition.

Baldur von Schirach was leader of Nazi youth programs, including the Hitlerjugend or Hitler Youth, which in 1939 had nearly nine million members and its own police force—a precursor to service in the SS (Davidson, 1966, p. 299). He also served as Gauleiter and Governor of Vienna, where he supervised the deportation of Jews from the city.

Albert Speer was Hitler's architect as well as Minister of Munitions and Armaments; the primary accusation against him was that he exploited forced labor which provided manpower for German war industry. By the end of the war, some six million foreign citizens were on German soil in an exceptionally cruel slave labor program which has been described as "the most grandiose scheme of its kind in history" (Bernstein, 1947, p. 210).

Of the three prisoners, Speer was often looked upon most sympathetically because while some renounced Hitler during the war crimes trials, he alone acknowledged his personal role for the tragedy in which so many had perished. In what is often considered to be the most moving testimony at Nuremberg, Speer said "it is my unquestionable duty to assume my share of responsibility for the disaster of the German people....I, as an important member of the leadership of the Reich, share in the total responsibility" (Persico, 1994, p. 353).

Albert Speer also revealed an alleged plan to assassinate Hitler and his efforts to resist Hitler's scorched earth decision upon Germany's impending defeat. Chief U.S. prosecutor Justice Robert H. Jackson, however, was unconvinced of his sincerity, asserting that Speer acknowledged responsibility for larger policies but not for the details of their execution. Rather remarkably, Jackson did not question Speer about visiting the Mauthausen death camp or his role in carrying out the Final Solution of the Jewish peoples (Persico, 1994, pp. 356-57).
Speer, in his memoirs (1970) written while in Spandau, depicted himself as a technocrat caught up in a world gone mad. He clearly sought to minimize any personal contamination from Nazi barbarity and genocide. Speer stressed his subordinate, supporting role rather than his major responsibilities for aiding military operations, including the brutal dimensions of forced labor used in his factories. In responding to an interrogator's questions before the trial, Speer maintained that he “acted rightly in offering no excuses and not sparing my own person” (p. 509). In April 1946 he told his parents in a letter that “One must bear one's responsibility here, not hope for favoring winds” (p. 510). He sought no benefits for himself; he proclaimed in a June 1946 letter to his wife, but sought “to speak the truth about the whole madness” (p. 517). Speer claimed that photographs and other evidence of Nazi atrocities introduced at Nuremberg shocked and horrified him (p. 513). This disposition earned him a cell at Spandau.

The enforced routine of the three former Nazis was a far cry from their previous existence. In 1966 I became a part of that routine as an Officer of the Guard since soldiers from my infantry company of the Berlin Brigade staffed the guardtowers and the front gate as part of the U.S. military contingent. I had keys to the prison yard and guardtowers, and when on duty at night I slept in the guardroom near the entrance should any problem arise. Guards were replaced every few hours, and I had to check on them frequently to insure that they were alert and awake. During this time of both the Cold War and its surrogate Vietnam war, an incident by one of the four powers then guarding the prison could become international in scope. Additionally, Spandau Prison had a special significance to the U.S.S.R. since it was one of only three sites in West Berlin at that time where Soviet officials had permanent access 24-hours a day (the others: the Soviet War Memorial near the Brandenberg Gate and the Berlin Air Safety Center).

After several shifts in Spandau, I was a somewhat familiar sight to the prisoners. My diary reveals some details of those days:
On August 29, 1966, as I walked into the prison yard, Speer waved vigorously and said 'hello, how are you?,' and I said, 'fine and you?' He replied, 'good.' He was in excellent spirits. Two weeks earlier while at Spandau I talked with him for some time. He stated that in addition to his morning gardening he walks five miles every day within their restricted area. After talking for some time about the Berlin soil and the flowers bordered with bricks from the prison's crumbling facade, Speer remarked that the prison garden wasn't as good as his garden near Heidelberg. I told him not to worry, that he would soon be home. He smiled and shook his head affirmatively, in quiet anticipation.

When the three men were in the exercise area behind the main prison building, Speer appeared to be ignored by Hess and von Schirach, who engaged in lengthy, serious talks while walking along the exercise paths. My diary records that "Hess looks alternatively good/bad," with sunken eyes and a moody disposition. Hess would not speak to me when I greeted him in German. I had the distinct impression that he was still the Deputy Reichsfuhrer, resentful of his imprisonment and of me, a victors' representative.

Walking through the deserted buildings at Spandau produced yet another confrontation with history. Apart from the cellblock holding the three ex-Nazis, there were cells where death-row prisoners were confined during World War II, which looked as if they had just been abandoned. In one cell I found a Christmas card dated 1942 which said, "I hope you can return to us, your faithful son."

Other Spandau memories included the Thursday official luncheons of the military governors, where I spoke with a Soviet officer for the first time, as well as the occasion when I was Officer of the Guard and the Ministers of the four Allied powers toured Spandau to consider what to do with Rudolph Hess once von Schirach and Speer finished their twenty-year sentences. There was some discussion of a more comfortable living arrangement for Hess other than the old cell, and of releasing him altogether as his
family wished. Soviet intransigence, and the need to maintain their unrestricted access to West Berlin, kept Hess in Spandau.

Speer and von Schirach completed their sentences and were released from Spandau just after midnight on October 1, 1966. Hess remained there except for visits to the British military hospital to attend to his increasingly serious medical ailments. Following his death by suicide on August 17, 1987 at the age of ninety-three (see Le Tissier, 1994), the old prison was demolished and its bricks removed to forestall souvenir seekers from claiming a piece of the Nazi past.

Albert Speer died on September 1, 1981, yet he remains an enigmatic figure in death as in life. Indeed, he is more than a footnote to history, given the enormity of Nazi crimes. While Speer is considered to have largely rehabilitated himself before the general public in the remaining fifteen years of life following his release from Spandau (Conot, 1983, p. 519), he clarified his wartime role and Nazi involvement in the late-1970s in an interview with a visiting television producer. When asked, “You were the only person at Nuremberg to admit his guilt,” Speer interrupted and said, “I did not admit guilt—I said I was responsible.” This remark convinced the interviewer that Speer was never repentant for his wartime role, and that he was fully aware of both his actions and the answers the public had come to expect (London, 1981, E20, italics orig.; see also Schmidt, 1984).

Responsibility enabled the individuals comprising the Nazi death machine to operate effectively and efficiently, with the requisite orders given and carried out. Most did this in the name of “duty;” Albert Speer went beyond this pretext to openly acknowledge his personal role and accountability. Speer at Nuremberg said he was responsible for his actions and the harm they did; he never acknowledged guilt for the deaths of millions of human beings. According to Gitta Sereny (1995), Speer was privately haunted by the mass deaths following his release, but his sole public concession to posterity was an admission that he avoided any knowledge that the deaths were taking place.
Writing in his Spandau diary (1977), Speer reiterated his acceptance of general responsibility which, he cautioned, extended to basic matters but not to details of Nazi activities. Speer admitted that he sought architectural greatness, but he described the guilt he felt in terms of “responsibility for all the orders from Hitler which I had carried out.” He chided himself that he “bragged about it quite so much to the court,” but “In this world, adaptability and cunning carry you a lot farther.” Speer asserted that all Nazi leaders had a collective responsibility for Hitler’s acts, “not excluding the crimes” from 1942 on (p. 3). This acknowledgment of responsibility was not the same as publicly acknowledging guilt for the mass deaths.

Both responsibility and guilt have legal and moral forms, the distinction of which cannot be taken lightly. For criminal guilt, a person must violate an official ordinance or statute and, upon the presentation of evidence, be found by competent authority to have committed that offense and some penalty is imposed. In contrast, moral guilt is a basic component of the human condition like love, death, power, and self-identity. The concept assumes that people are not just utilitarian and instrumental beings, but also assess meaning in what is done, either individually or collectively (Smith, 1971, pp. 11; 17-18).

In examining moral guilt more closely, a narrow interpretation renders it useless to others, yet when viewed too broadly the concept is arbitrary and meaningless. Instead, guilt is best seen as a limit to the acceptable, a loosely defined boundary capable of being violated and in constant need of maintenance and restoration (Smith, 1971, pp. 18-20). Furthermore, “its anchor is deep within the human condition, tied always to the boundary and the overstepping of the boundary, with the consequent reactions” (Smith, 1971, p. 20).

Just as crime is related to punishment, the violation of boundaries, legal and moral, implies that offenders will be penalized in some way and efforts will be made to restore the status quo ante. Because the violation of boundaries separates individuals from society, entire societies, by their transgressions, can become separated from other societies. As Daniel Jonah Goldhagen
(1996) has asserted in the case of wartime Germany, a cognitive framework and prevailing values of antisemitism moved German society to embark upon mass killings of defenseless peoples.

Responsibility, guilt, and punishment are closely connected, but Albert Speer's acceptance of personal and collective responsibility was carefully crafted to exclude guilt for the Holocaust. An individual may be found guilty in a court of law without feeling guilty (Ross, 1975, pp. 1-3); such was the position Speer projected and maintained on this issue throughout his adjudication, imprisonment and subsequent release. Legal guilt was on trial at Nuremberg, yet moral guilt, which results from the violation of a larger value system and evokes guilty feelings or a guilty conscience (Ross, 1975, pp. 5-6), appeared to elude the defendants in varying degrees throughout the proceedings. For the ex-Nazi leaders and so many others, the responsibility-guilt-punishment linkage was severed because German society or parts thereof did not share the values of good and evil or right versus wrong which moral guilt usually represents. This breakdown and the tragic events following it led to the unprecedented trial in Nuremberg.

At the International Military Tribunal, Speer admitted that, in retrospect, what he did damaged Germany and injured the German people, representing a morally unjust act. Perhaps he should have known the error of his ways, but he said he did not, until Hitler assumed a manical mask and his grand vision for Germany was set aside for raw conquest. Speer's acceptance of moral responsibility extended to legal responsibility, where punishment was expected and deserved. His moral sense of right and wrong, of fundamental justice, however, never included the view that his actions were intentionally harmful or that he freely served Hitler in killing Jews and others.

Speer, by all evidence, felt that this delimitation of responsibility, by denying complicity in the mass deaths, did not subject him to punishment for these heinous acts. By avoiding this trap, Speer carefully cloaked himself in responsibility for his general deeds but was shielded from the legal consequences of mass murder—where punishment would surely follow. At Nuremberg Speer presented himself as the morally and legally responsible
supplicant for the horrors which befell Germany and the Germans, but without acknowledging legal responsibility for the mass deaths and the terrors of forced labor he believed he deserved immunity from legal guilt. Speer's view of justice, from which his personal sense of responsibility and guilt emanated, enabled him to dissemble and deny any direct involvement in the Holocaust crimes.

Germany's victors, for their part, were inflamed by the manifold evidence that supposedly universal values holding human life sacrosanct had been so egregiously violated. Justice Jackson, in his opening statement at Nuremberg, acknowledged the difficulties involved in applying the four powers' different legal systems, but he said there was a preponderance of evidence due to Nazi Germany's meticulous records and abundant photographs. The London Charter establishing the court provided for decisions by majority vote, firm actions against disturbances or unreasonable delays, and freedom from normal rules of evidence. Justice Jackson knew this was not the caliber of professional jurisprudence the prosecuting nations wanted, but it was more than the Nazi's victims had received (Jackson, 1946).

Justice Jackson also understood the trial's much larger purpose:

We charge guilt on planned and intended conduct that involves moral as well as legal wrong....It is not because they yielded to the normal frailties of human beings that we accuse them. It is their abnormal and inhuman conduct which brings them to this bar (p. 9).

At Nuremberg, Speer admitted responsibility, but his failure to admit guilt for the mass deaths meant that his conviction was based upon his actions and requisite mental state. This distinction between responsibility and guilt, and beyond it the inherently subjective boundaries of legal and moral culpability, provided the rationalization for the salient crime of recorded history—the Holocaust. For those who perished and to those who survived, such differentiations are vacuous, cowardly, and utterly immoral. To others, however, the ethical and moral miasma between responsibility and guilt is a frightening legacy of the Holocaust, be-
queathing a calculated excuse for destroying human beings as inanimate, soul-less, valueless objects readily sacrificed for the sake of some idealistic Nietzschean future.

This lesson applies not just to resourceful, calculating souls of the past such as Albert Speer, but to the future, to all of us. During and after the Holocaust, not only were moral standards and legal systems tested as never before, but “the exterminators were in almost every case nearer to our common mentality than we may care to think” (Manvell and Fraenkel, 1967, p. 105). Hannah Arendt (1994) warned that “once a specific crime has appeared for the first time, its reappearance is more likely than its initial emergence could ever have been” (p. 273). “The trouble with Eichmann,” she noted, “was precisely that so many were like him, and that the many were neither perverted nor sadistic, that they were, and still are, terribly and terrifyingly normal” (p. 276).

Albert Speer was such a person; like so many others he carried an internal circuit breaker disconnecting responsibility for his actions from guilt for the larger crimes they made possible. Speer was like the many who obediently performed the Nazi regime's grim tasks with callous disregard, but unlike other Nazi leaders he shrewdly exploited the quintessential difference between responsibility and guilt to deny any role in the deaths of Holocaust victims. This delineation of culpability relegated him to twenty years' of spartan imprisonment in Spandau Prison rather than the hangman's noose.

In assessing Albert Speer against the ragged tapestry of civilization, his legacy of measured moral ambiguity and the inherent weakness of people to exceed the boundaries of the right and the just with little concern for penalties raises a frightening yet realistic specter: standing in tomorrow's shadows will be more perpetrators and victims of mass murder.
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Dear Ma

Dont be so mad at me becaws I forgot Pa's boiday prezent wich I dint rilly. I wuz gonna by a prezent but I had to do home­work an I wuz short a dolar for the telscope for him. I'll by one later. Could ya len me a dolar?

Luv
Harry, Age 5 1/2

*****

Camp Leo
Kent, Connecticut
July 2, 1940

Dear Mom and Pop,

My counselor said we got to write home and I am the last kid not to do it in our bunkhouse, so here is a post card.

I have been too busy with exciting things to write. Yesterday I nearly fell off a cliff. But I am fine.

Love,

Harry

*****
October 8, 1946
Miss Roberta Hildebrand
Fairfax High School
Los Angeles, California
Dear Miss Hildebrand,

I am sorry I missed my French assignment a hier. My folks actually took me to a French movie s'appelle Pepe Le Moko avec Jean Gabin. I'll hand it in tomorrow, the assignment not the movie.

Toujours l'amour, toujours
Harry Birkin

P.S. I don't know how to write "yours truly" in French. H. B.

*****

April 3, 1950
Memo to Ernie Masters, Sports Editor, Daily Bruin, UCLA
From: Harry Birkin, Staff Sportswriter

I am leaving you a note instead of a story on the swim team. I know deadlines are sacred and I missed this one. No excuses, but let me tell you why.

I was on my way to the swim meet and my old Chevvy broke down on Sunset, right at Sunset and Fairfax. Could you believe it?

A cop pushed me over to the sidewalk and then cited me for obstructing traffic. That is when we both discovered I was out of gas. Shirley drove the car last and was supposed to put a couple of gallons in it.

Turns out our swim team lost anyhow. I can have a piece on the meet if you want it for tomorrow's edition. I interviewed a couple of the swimmers this morning just before they threw me into the pool, clothes and all, because I didn't show up for the meet. How was I to know they think I'm some sort of good luck piece? Moi?

*****
May 10, 1952
Director of Admissions
Graduate School
University of California at Los Angeles

Dear Sir:

Unfortunately, I missed the deadline for submission of my application for admission to the graduate program in Political Science.

If it will help I am submitting a note from my surgeon stating that I had to be hospitalized for the removal of a pilonidal cyst.

My recuperation has not been as rapid as I'd hoped.

I am submitting this application for next semester's consideration.

Yours truly,
Harry Birkin

********

June 25, 1954

Professor Richard T. Simmons
Department of Political Science
UCLA

Dear Professor Simmons,

I apologize for missing the charter flight to London on June 20th. Unfortunately, a domestic problem intervened. My wife of two years, Shirley, and I have separated and what with all of the legal and financial questions I did not recall the precise date and time of the departure. I misplaced my tickets, along with my passport, in the turmoil of domestic disequilibrium.

I tried to get a refund from the charter company, British Highlands Airways, or have them place me on a later charter flight. But they were not at all accommodating. Do you think you can contact them on my behalf? I can ill afford the money they required in advance.
I wish you and the group a great summer.

Yours truly,

Harry Birkin

March 8, 1960

Professor Mark Edelman
Editor
Gentry Series in Political Science

Dear Mark:

Sorry I couldn't get the draft of this mss, *The Craft of Public Administration*, to you sooner. I know we'll miss the textbook market for next year. Ironically, I have a highly original section in the text on "The Importance of Timing and Timeliness in Public Management."

But the delay was unavoidable. My mother passed away. I was given an extra class to teach that involved a whole new preparation. I got married again and two small children came along with this wonderful person. Furthermore, I was induced to run for a place on the Water and Electric Board in Eugene. As you know, I'm a great believer in public participation for scholars. The scholar as citizen has been a noble cornerstone of our profession since its very beginnings.

This campaign was very time consuming. Unfortunately, we didn't win. My supporters claim it was in part due to my late filing for the position. But I came close and I shall run again, and again if necessary.

Any chance of expediting publication of this work?

Best regards.

Yours,

Harry Birkin

Assistant Professor
Card to Hilda Samuels-Birkin accompanying orchids and roses wired to St. Joseph’s Hospital in Eugene, Oregon, from O’Hare Airport, Chicago, Illinois:

To my darling Hilda on the Great Occasion of the birth of our son, Michael.

I want so much to be with you.

The weather at O’Hare kept us on the ground in Chicago all night.

Damn and Love, Harry.

January 14, 1970

Professor Mark Edelman
Editor
Gentry Series in Political Science
Dear Mark,

The mss of the second edition of the text will be late. Actually, it won't be late, but I will.

My wife Hilda left me. She ran off with a Frenchman who teaches here. She left our six year old son Michael and her two daughters in my charge.

You can imagine the problems all this has caused me.

The mss will be delayed several months I'm afraid. I recall that the first edition was late in coming because of the domestic travails of my previous marriage. I hope I can break the cycle next time. Very sorry indeed.

As ever,
Harry Birkin
Associate Professor
University of Oregon Memorandum  
To: Professor Bertram Spector, Chair, Political Science  
From: Harry Birkin, Professor  

June 10, 1975

Sorry I didn't get my grades in on time this semester. All of my kids came down with chicken pox and then, as you know, I caught a bad case from them. I am finally able to swallow without feeling excruciating pain.

I'm especially sorry for those seniors who need their grades to graduate.

I'll get the grades in as soon as I am physically able to.

*****

Harry's Bar

Florence, Italy  
June 19, 1976

Dr. Margaret Eillison Aintree  
1220 Ellen Street  
Eugene, Oregon 97405, USA  

My Darling Peggy,

I am alone in Florence with so much great art all around me, wanting so much to be with you, to experience this together. And you are not here.

I am sorry we had words on the phone. We were both upset and we both had good reason to be so. I feel I must write to tell you that I love you, I love you, I love you! No matter how many times I say or write the three little words, they are never enough to plumb the depths of my feeling and passion.

How could we have miscommunicated so, my love?

I realize we were both a little tipsy when we planned our rendezvous. Obviously, Florence, Oregon, exists and can be a wonderful, romantic place.
Public Voices

But really, Peggy, it is not Florence, Italy!

How I wish you were here,
All my love,
Harry

*****

January 10, 1982

University of Oregon Memorandum
To: Dean Harlan Franklin Stone, III
College of Arts and Letters
From: Harry Birkin, Chair
Department of Political Science

It is grossly unfair that the whole of the Department should be punitively penalized simply because we were a few days late in submitting our budget. Your decision to use our current expenditures without any increment is wrong headed to say the least. Even if I agree that I “deserve” to be taught a lesson for my “chronic” tardiness in administrative matters, I don't see why my colleagues and this fine Department should be made to suffer.

I wish to remind you that I am a well published and highly regarded authority on public management. No one understands our state university management system better than I. My tardiness, sir, was well within the bounds of academic propriety.

As I have told you repeatedly, my colleagues and I have strong disagreements concerning our preferences, or priorities as you put it. I am aware that you feel I should be more assertive and insist that my vision, assuming I have one, should prevail. But, as you well know, I am committed to the democratic process. It is indeed worth a few days to try to get my fellow scholars finally to agree. Our last faculty discussion, unfortunately, did end in fisticuffs as attested by the lawsuit one of my colleagues filed against me and the University. I am not ready to give up, however.

And while we're on the subject of lawsuits, I hope you understand that as Chairman of the Eugene Water and Electricity Board I had absolutely nothing to do with cutting off the power in your
home last August. I am persuaded that the unfortunate incident was due to human error. Alas, because of your legal action, it will now be up to the courts to decide.

September 9, 1988

University of Oregon Memorandum
To: President Alfred P. Upshaw
From: Harry Birkin, Dean
College Arts and Letters

I do not appreciate your reference to me as Dean of Procrastination and No Show which is rapidly becoming my apposition on this campus. As you know better than anyone, I have done more to improve the quality of our faculty than most of my predecessors. A bit of absent-mindedness does not make an idiot or an incompetent.

I had every intention of attending the Board of Deans' retreat last week. I had reservations on the Concord from Paris to Washington and from there non-stop to Portland that would have had me here in plenty of time. Unfortunately, the SST developed a mechanical problem, at least that's what they called it. The flight was delayed, then canceled. Sorry about that.

London, England
June 21, 1993

President Alfred P. Upshaw
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon, USA
My Dear Alfred,

I want to apologize for my absence at the reception in my honor you so graciously held last Friday. I am chagrined at my failure to note the date. I wondered early in the week why my colleagues kept winking and telling me they'd see me soon—"at the party" was the phrase most often used.
Thursday evening I took off for London and a summer in the United Kingdom. Only this morning, after I received your sharply worded cable did I realize this oversight. A number of our colleagues have phoned at all hours to chastise me as well.

Perhaps you were right, after all, to label me Dean of Procrastination and No Show. At least the latter seems to fit, annoying as I find it.

I am pleased that everyone had a fine time, anyhow, and that the “roast” was more pointed than it would otherwise have been.

I don’t know what I shall do to make amends. Probably I shall hold a social hour especially for those who attended on Friday, sometime next autumn.

At any rate England is especially beautiful.

Embarrassedly yours,
Harry Birkin
Professor and Dean Emeritus

P.S. This is the first time I’ve used the “emeritus” title. Would you call it an auspicious beginning?

****

Geneva, Switzerland
June 20, 1996

President Alfred P. Upshaw
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon, USA
My dear Alfred,

From what you write the State Board of Higher Education and the University are indeed suggesting that I receive the highest honor I can think of by designating the new Political Science Building as Birkin Hall. I should be pleased to accept this accolade if it is not too late. I had every intention of responding to your letter of January 12th but I’ve been bombarded with distractions.
My son Michael and I have finally been hiking in the Mont Blanc area. I say finally because our train from Paris was derailed. Fortunately, no one was hurt. However, our reservations were lost at the chalet where we had planned to stay. We did a lot more camping out than we had intended. The weather was singularly inhospitable and I caught a dreadful cold further setting back our tour of Europe.

It is unfortunate indeed that construction is delayed by budgetary shortfalls. But when have we not had such complications in this business?

You know, Alfred, I have been reflecting on my own career. I think about missed opportunities and occasional problems caused by my own delays invariably attributable to externalities though perhaps once or twice by internal travail. I still feel most strongly that what I have accomplished substantively for my profession and this university far outweighs my occasional lapses. In fact, when I find the time, I shall revise, the section of my text, now in its eighth edition, on timing in public management to consider the impediments to action caused by a variety of factors, some of them generic to the managerial environment.

Do let me know the decision in bestowing upon me this singular honor.

With admiration and affection,
Harry

*****

September 15, 1996

Office of the President
University of Oregon
The Faculty, Department of Political Science
Dear Colleagues:

I am very sorry to tell you that I received word this morning from Venice, Italy, of the death of our beloved and distinguished colleague, Professor Emeritus Harry Birkin. We shall all miss him and I hope this tragic news will motivate the regents at long last to designate your building as Birkin Hall.
As I have been given to understand by his son Michael who was with him at the time, Harry, tardy as usual, was racing to catch a departing vaporetto (a kind of canal waterbus) when he slipped from the dock, hit his head on a piling as he fell into the water. He was pronounced dead at a local hospital.

In view of Harry’s endearing traits will you all forgive me if I note that at last we can, with loving and perpetual justification, refer to our friend as the Late Harry Birkin?

Sincerely,
Alfred P. Upshaw
President

Morton Kroll is Professor Emeritus in the Graduate School of Public Affairs at the University of Washington, has published numerous articles and conducted seminars on politics and public administration in literature, and vice versa. He has recently written on “the Administrator-Viewer Reviewed Through Film” in Public Administration Illuminated and Inspired by the Arts, edited by Charles T. Goodsell and Nancy Murray. Currently he is writing fiction, most of it reflecting his life in academia, public administration and politics.
Call for Books to Review and Book Review Essays

Suggestions for books to review, particularly fictional works, and book review essays about fictional literature regarding organizational life and bureaucracies, are requested for future issues of *Public Voices*. Books being suggested for review should have complete citations, including title, author(s), publisher and date. A brief explanation of why the book is an important contribution and should be reviewed would be helpful. Books and book reviews selected should conform to the mission of *Public Voices* and the ASPA Section on Humanistic, Artistic and Reflective Expression, which include unorthodox and controversial perspectives on bureaucracy; explanations of how novels, short stories, poetry and other genre contribute to our understandings of society; and how society is reflected in the creative writings of novelists and others.

Please send your suggestions for books to review or completed book review essays to Willa M. Bruce, Book Review Editor, *Public Voices*, Department of Public Administration, University of Nebraska at Omaha, Annex 27, Omaha, NE 68182.
Book Review

The Money Order (With White Genesis)


The Money-Order: Ibrahima Dieng's Encounter with Government Agencies and Employees

Reviewed by Samuel N. Woode

Having become convinced that the novel—particularly that which passes as an administrative novel—has a contribution to make to our understanding of public administration, I have gone back to a re-reading of some African novels. In this effort, one of the novels I have been re-reading is The Money Order, written by the Senegalese writer Sembene Ousmane. Published in 1972, the novel deals with bureaucratic rigidity and the rude behavior of government employees—issues of current relevance and significance.

The main character in the short novel is Ibrahima Dieng. Ibrahima Dieng receives a letter from his nephew, Abdou, living in Paris. In the letter was a money-order for 25,000 CFA francs. Dieng was to give 3,000 francs to Abdou's mother—Dieng's sister; he was to take for himself 2,000 francs and keep 20,000 francs for Abdou. He is an ordinary member of the public who, having received a letter from his nephew, comes into contact with government agencies and employees.

Given the situation of families in Africa with relatives living abroad, the beginning of the novel will remind several people of the occasions when they may have been in Dieng's position. And in some cases, the money-order may have come, as it did in the
case of Dieng, at a time when most needed. In fact, the money-order came when Dieng, with two wives and out of a job, was owing money to shopkeepers, mainly for food taken on credit. To the family, the money could not have come at a more appropriate time, restoring hope.

**At the Post Office**

In following Dieng as he attempts to convert the money-order into cash, Sembene Ousmane helps us to get to see a picture of how ordinary men and women get treated by minor public officials. To get the money-order cashed, Dieng went to the Post Office. At the window marked Money-Order, Dieng found a queue—a long queue. It must have been a slow-moving, long queue for the author tells us that at the end of the queue was a fat woman who, “probably because she was tired and at the end of her patience, had sat down on the floor, indifferent to all that was going on around her” (p. 85).

Having to sit on the floor as one waits to be served at a public office is not, in the least, a dignified way of getting service. It is no wonder that people who go through such a humiliating experience to get served hardly show appreciation. Consequently, the fat woman left “muttering about wasting her time ....” (p. 87).

It was now Dieng’s turn to be served. At the counter, the clerk compared the slip with the advice note to satisfy himself about the authenticity of Dieng’s claim. He then proceeded to ask Dieng to prove that he was in fact, Dieng, and not impersonating him. He demanded:

“Ibrahima Dieng, your identity card.”

“Man, I haven’t got an identity card. I have my tax receipt and my voter’s card.”

“Is there a photo?”

“No...No.”

“Give me something with a photo on it. Driving license, military service certificate.”
"I have nothing like that."

"Well, go and get an identity card, then" (p. 87).

Up to this point in the exchanges between the clerk and Dieng, one will say that the clerk was at his bureaucratic best: He had been taught to take people through this kind of drill. But, one may ask: Isn't there room, even in bureaucratic settings, for officials to be helpful?

The test of whether or not a public official will, while adhering to the rules, be helpful came when Dieng asked the clerk where he could go for the identity card. At the question, the clerk looked up at Dieng, and Ousmane tells us: "It was a closed face (the clerk's)....all severity” (p. 88). It was enough, we are told, to get Dieng "cowed"—hardly what would be described as "service with a smile."

Accompanying Dieng to the post office was a friend, Gorgui Maissa. Sensing the discomfort and helplessness of Dieng, Maissa wondered if his identity card would help. Of course, identity cards are not transferable, but the clerk's way of communicating this point was to shout at Maissa "Get away from here!"—not a polite and gentle way of educating a member of the public on the non-transferability of identity cards.

The effect of the clerk's behavior on Dieng was that he was cowed and, in a quavering voice, repeated himself:

"Man, I have no card."

"Go and get one," the clerk ordered.

"Where from?" Dieng asked for a second time (p. 88).

They were looking at each other during these exchanges. Ousmane tells us that as they looked at each other "Dieng thought he saw a look of contempt appear in the civil servant's eyes. He (Dieng) suffered. He came out in a cold sweat of humiliation. He felt as if a painful bite had been taken out of his flesh. He said nothing. There came into his mind the saying that circulated among all the ordinary people of Dakar: "Never upset a civil servant. He has great power" (p. 88).
When he had succeeded in reducing Dieng to a point where he felt lost, confused and not knowing what to do or say, almost as if doing him a favor, the clerk gave him the advice and information he should have given earlier on:

"Go and ask the police in your quarter," adding that "the money-order will remain in the post office for two weeks," at the end of which it would be sent back to Paris.

"Never upset a civil servant. He has great power." Ousmane succeeds in this "scene" to get us to learn about how ordinary people get treated by government employees. The picture of the public service provider we get is one of a person who holds in contempt ordinary men and women he is paid to serve. He enjoys humiliating and making them nervous. He is not friendly, at best patronizing. For the ordinary people, encountering public service providers is full of pain, suffering and humiliation.

**At the Police Station**

Dieng arrived at the police station exhausted and sweating—from a long walk. At the entrance, he inquired where he could go for an identity card, to which a policeman in a "weary voice" replied: "Identity cards? Over there..."

"Over there..." as a way of indicating direction to an ordinary person who cannot read, is not really helpful. And so, following that vague direction, Dieng got into trouble. He found himself in an area which was designated as a prohibited zone. How could he know that it was a prohibited area! He was in a corridor when he was startled by a voice ringing out:

"Eye! Where are you going?" (p. 90)

At this voice, he took a few faltering steps, and again a voice, now a cavernous one, came back:

"Eye! It's you I'm talking to. Where are you going?" This was followed by a firm grip that "shook him roughly." (p. 90)

Ousmane at this point lets us into the emotional state of Dieng at this reception. We are told this state was a mixture of "a spasm
of rage," "repressed anger," "momentarily paralyzing his tongue and his reflexes." It was in this nervous, disoriented state that Dieng replied:

"That man over there told me this way for identity cards."

"Get out!" bellowed the man. (p. 90)

After this rough welcome at the police station, Dieng joined a queue—another queue! As at the post office, this queue was also long and slow moving, so slow moving that Dieng could go out of the queue to have his "tacouban prayer" and come back to find that it had not made any significant progress.

Finally, Dieng found himself at the head of the queue, faced with the question:

"What can I do for you?"

"I want an identity card." (p. 91)

The clerk, the bureaucrat that he is, came out with a list of things Dieng must provide. They were:

"Birth certificate, three photos and a fifty-franc stamp." (p. 91)

Dieng did not understand what the whole thing was about. Overcome with anxiety, and needing empathy, Dieng responded,

"Look son, I have a money order to cash, and if I don't have an identity card ...."

The clerk cut him short, giving a response which was typically bureaucratic, detached and impersonal:

"It is true, but there is nothing I can to do. Go and fetch your birth certificate, the photos and the stamp, old man." (p. 92)

Still pressing, and hoping for a sympathetic hearing and understanding, Dieng tried to argue: [If] "you want a piece of paper to prove what I am, I have my last tax receipt and voter's card" (p. 92)—documents which to an ordinary citizen and common sense would appear to be sufficient for identification.
But then, in bureaucratic settings, rules are made for man and not man for rules and the application of common sense. And so, indifferent to the plight of Dieng, the clerk dismissed him with:

"It is no use, old man. Without photos, birth certificate and stamps, there is nothing I can do. Make way for the next person." (p. 92).

At the end of this encounter, Ousmane tells us that Dieng felt "dizzy." And, who will not feel dizzy in the face of such insensitivity? Talking to the clerk (to Dieng) was like hitting your head against a stone—a heart of stone.

At the Town Hall

The search for a birth certificate took Dieng to the Town Hall. His request, at the entrance, for directions to where he could go for service was met with the typical "over there..." response. One begins to wonder if the taxpayer gets value for his money by paying orderlies, most often able-bodied persons, to man reception desks simply to say "over there" to members of the public who go to offices for service.

Following the direction, he came upon a queue—another queue, typically a long one. His conversation with the man in front of him, a bricklayer, did not give him much hope: He learned that it was the third time the bricklayer was coming for the same thing. When Dieng, out of anxiety, pressed for how long it would take to get a birth certificate, he was told:

"That depends on whether they know you or you have contacts. If you don't, all you can do is try not to get discouraged. But if you have money, well, then, things go quickly." (p.96)

The bricklayer's statement is a fact of life which many will confirm; if you have no "connections," will not or cannot give a bribe, you cannot get anything done.

Conversation in the queue did throw some light on certain aspects of the behavior of public servants. The members of public in the queue complained about "officials (who) do not care and [that they] lacked a sense of duty towards the public." (p. 96) This
observation was soon proved right when at the turn of Dieng, the clerk, lighting a Camel (cigarette) began a conversation with a colleague at the other end of the office. He was taking time to "breathe a little," he said, because he was tired.

When the people complained about his behavior, he rudely shouted back:

"Stop grumbling," and turning to Dieng demanded, "You! What do you want?"

"Me?" a confused Dieng asked.

"It's your turn, isn't it? What do you want?"

"...A birth certificate," Dieng whispered. (pp. 96-97)

The clerk then asked what must be a bureaucratically correct question:

"Where were you born, and what was the date?" (p. 97)

These are simple questions, which experience teaches cannot be easily answered by most people in Africa born before the 1960's to illiterate, peasant parents. And so, naturally, Dieng did what he thought could help solve the puzzle. He offered the papers in his hand—"Here are my papers"—in the hope that the clerk would be kind enough to review and get the answer. But no, that is not how administrators work.

"I don't need your papers. Your date of birth, and place?" (p. 97)

Dieng at this stage, Ousmane tells us, had an expression of fear on his face—fright resulting from the harshness in the clerk's voice. But the clerk must have been enjoying himself, for puffing at his cigarette, he looked at Dieng and said:

"I am waiting, man." (p. 97)

Now, there was a certain man in the queue who felt compassion for Dieng and came to his assistance. To this good Samaritan, the clerk shouted:

"Go back to your place." (p. 97)
In this man, the clerk met a member of the public who knew how to handle rude public servants. He did not shout back; he pleaded for politeness in behavior and went on to review Dieng’s paper, at the end of which he informed the clerk:

“Tibrahima Dieng, born in Dakar about 1900.” (p.97)

The detail about the month in which Dieng was born was missing, and so the information was not complete.

“The month, I need to know the month.”

“I tell you, about 1900.” (p. 97)

Unhelpful, as he was determined to be, the clerk sat back saying:

“And you think I am going to hunt for it? I am not an archivist.” (p. 97)

Incensed by this rude behavior, a quarrel broke out between the two clerks and the public, with the public making remarks about “the lack of civic sense and professional conscience” on the part of civil servants. A contribution of a woman in the queue extended further the point made earlier by the bricklayer that the only things which get service are connection and/or bribes. Like the bricklayer, the woman had for more than a week been coming, morning and afternoon, and her significant contribution was “if anyone thought she was going to pay a bribe or open her legs, he was mistaken.” (p. 98)

When calm was finally restored, the clerk began his...“Your date of birth.”

“Ibrahima Dieng, born in Dakar about 1900,” same as before.

With irony at the corners of his mouth, the clerk asked: “How many months are there in the year?” (P. 98)

By now it was clear that someone would have to go into the archives to search for an answer. And that was what was suggested. The answer which came from the clerk is a refrain which is heard in many places:
"Do you want to teach us our job? If we did what you say, he'd wait more than two months." (p. 99)

Some of the alternatives suggested to Dieng were "Find someone whose date of birth is the same as yours; or else find someone with influence." (p. 99) These alternatives operate in the real world, making people live lives of lies with others making a living out of forging certificates and operating as contact men.

And poor Dieng; what was he to do? Listen to his soliloquy?

"Who can I go and see? The imam at the mosque? No. He doesn't know anyone. He says so often enough. In this country you get nowhere if you don't know anyone with influence. The proof! Since I've been out of work, I have been promised I'd be taken back. All the other men I worked with have been taken back." (p. 99)

So, there he stood. After his encounter with the government agencies of the post office, police station and the Town Hall, Dieng stood powerless, helpless, jobless, hopeless, penniless—alienated before public agencies peopled by rude, callously indifferent, insensitive public employees.

As suggested, Dieng enlisted a connection—Mbaye who, we are told, "belonged to the 'New Africa' generation, as it was called in some circles; men who combined Cartesian logic with the influence of Islam and the atrophied energy of the Negro. He was a businessman, always ready to do a deal, asking a percentage of each commission according to its value. It is said of him that there was no difficulty he could not resolve. With a villa on the far side of the southern sector, he also had two wives, one a Christian and the other a Muslim, and a 403 [Peugeot]. He had reached the top." (p. 127).

Mbaye, Dieng's connection, was clearly a "Mr. Fix-It"—a con and contact man. Armed with a power-of-attorney and acting as Dieng's proxy, he got the money. But before Dieng could see him for the money, he, according to his own account, fell among "crooks" who took away everything.

Dieng did not see a cent of the 25,000 francs.
Sembene Ousmane does an excellent job in helping us come to learn something about government agencies and employees. To be sure, the novel is about administrative inflexibility and rude public employees—themes written about in regular books on administration. However, seen from the viewpoint of Dieng—a person at the receiving end of bureaucratic rigidity and human callousness, we get a deeper understanding of the tragic, human consequences of what we learn from textbooks.

Indeed, against the background of our common humanity, we come, as we read the novel, to have a sympathetic identification with Dieng; and therefore, through vicarious experience, share in his pain. We, therefore, do not have to have actual experiences in order to understand the dehumanizing impact of bureaucratic inflexibility and human callousness.

The reader who happens to be a public employee stands to gain from a reading of the novel. Granting that not all public employees behave like those encountered by Dieng, the novel, nonetheless, helps in bringing out the dilemma that must confront most public agencies and employees: First, where to draw the line between adhering to agency rules and what exceptions to make in accommodating unique, individual human problems, and second being able (as human beings) to help those of the public seen as “difficult.” For in the final analysis, it is the ability of agencies to meet the needs of “all sorts and conditions” and how far public employees are willing to go to serve with a smile which bring out the difference between a public service that is responsive and friendly and that which is not.

Perhaps, an observation of greater significance is that Sembene Ousmane does not allow his novel to end, resting on the corrupt nature of man and man-made institutions. The novel started on a note of hope for one family when Bah, the hard-working, incorruptible mail man, delivered Abdou’s letter. It ends on a note of hope for society with the re-appearance of Bah.

Shattered by his encounter and experience, Dieng is about deciding to become a hyena—he was going to become one of the predators in the jungle called society. It is at this point that Bah reappears to argue that a change for a better tomorrow can be ef-
fected by ordinary people like Ibrahima Dieng. This is how Bah argued his case:

"Things will change"

"Who will change them?... Only cheating pays."

"Tomorrow, we will change all that."

"Who is "we"?

"You."

"Me?"

"Yes, you Ibrahima Dieng."

"Me? (pp. 136-137)

Dieng was still not convinced; to him, corruption was a reality. Bah did not discount Dieng's viewpoint. However, believing that not "everyone is corrupt," Bah affirms his optimism about human nature. It is on the basis of this optimism that he argues that when ordinary men and women decide to be "kind and generous" to each other, tomorrow will be well. A contribution to that change will be a commitment on the part of public and civil servants to civility—to treat members of the public with respect, decency and courtesy.

**Samuel N. Woode** is a senior lecturer in Public Administration at the School of Administration, University of Ghana, Lejou. At the time of this study (Fall 1996) he was a visiting fellow at the John W. McCormack Institute of Public Affairs, University of Massachusetts Boston.
Novelist Tom Clancy lives in a pretty uncomplicated world when it comes to how government should work, whether his protagonist Jack Ryan is helping acquire Soviet submarines, fighting Colombian drug cartels, waging war on Irish terrorists or thwarting Japanese and Indian aggression. The world is an evil place with evil people and, within the limits of the Constitution as defined by Clancy, the United States must take action necessary to protect American interests. His view is somewhat reminiscent of Reinhold Niebuhr's *Children of Light and Children of Darkness*. The failure of American foreign and military policy running throughout his novels is the failure to understand the Children of Darkness and to prepare for combat with them.

While Mr. Clancy has always disdained politics and bureaucracy in his novels, his latest book, *Executive Orders* expands on these themes. For those who are unfamiliar with Mr. Clancy's alter ego, Jack Ryan, suffice it to say that he represents America's best: a military hero, a consummate husband and father, a successful investor in the stock market and a Ph.D. who loves to teach history. In recent novels, however, Ryan has moved his way serendipitously up through the ranks to become Vice President of the United States (trust me—it's too complicated to explain).

*As Executive Orders* opens, a terrorist kamikaze attack on the U.S. Capital has resulted in the death of most members of Congress, The Supreme Court and The President. Dr. Ryan ascends to
the Presidency and now has an opportunity to help reshape all three branches of the U.S. Government. How many of us wouldn't relish such an opportunity? Within its exhausting 874 pages, Mr. Clancy deals with his traditional foils, including India, Iraq and Iran, while welcoming support from old nemeses such as Russia and Japan.

What is most enlightening is the author's focus—albeit limited—on domestic affairs and the workings of government. For public administrators there is plenty to digest. Like Ayn Rand in her objectivist manifesto, *Atlas Shrugged* (1957), Mr. Clancy uses his novel to rail against government inefficiency, the disloyalty of the press, the disgusting behavior of politicians and the threat of the capital gains tax to free enterprise. You can do a lot in 874 pages.

A few examples of the gospel according to Dr. Ryan and his compatriots help convey Clancy's themes:

On the need to return the Congress to a citizen legislature, Ryan makes the following plea to governors who are about to appoint replacements to the U.S. Congress:

I need people who do real things in the real world. I need people who do not want to live in Washington. I need people who will not try to work the system. I need people who will come here at great personal sacrifice to do an important job, and then return to their normal lives....I want people who know they're working for you and not themselves (p. 165).

On the value of politics, ideology and ethics in government:

Washington had long since lost the capacity for objectivity. Everything was about politics, and politics was ideology, and ideology came down to personal prejudices rather than the quest for truth. Where had all these people been educated that the truth didn't matter to them (p. 268)?

On managing government:
I want your department (Treasury) cleaned up, streamlined, and run like you want to make a profit someday....The biggest problem over there is administrative (Defense). I need somebody who can run a business and make a profit to cull the bureaucracy out. That's the biggest problem of all, for all the agencies (p. 152);

and,

The laws of our country are not supposed to be a jobs program for accountants and lawyers in the private sector, and bureaucrats in the public sector... efficiency is not a word that government knows how to spell, much less implement (p. 362).

On politics:

Politics had to be the only arena known to man in which people took great action without caring much for real-world consequences, and to which the real world was far less important than whatever fantasy, right, left, or center, they'd brought to this city (Washington) of marble and lawyers (p. 268).

On Staff/Line Relationships:

...What I need at Defense is a chance to reconfigure our forces so that the shooters are the most important, and the rest of the outfit supports them, not the other way around... The Pentagon isn't a jobs program (p. 273).

On the Function of Government:

The government doesn't provide productive jobs. That's not what we're supposed to do....The job of government is to protect the people, to enforce the law, and to make sure people play by the rules... It's not supposed to be our job (p. 366).

On the Tax Code:

Taxes are by their very nature a negative influence... at least structure the tax system in such a way that it does minimum harm... (p. 366);
Fairness in the tax code has come to mean that we take all the money we can from successful people and dole it back. We end up with a jobs program for bureaucrats, and accountants, and lawyers, and lobbyists... (p. 367).

Mr. Clancy uses his novels as a way to advocate for his view of government’s role in society, a government that is limited in nature, that operates on the business principle of efficiency, that uses a flat tax to raise revenue, that focuses on line functions and that lessens the role of interest groups and the press to influence honest citizen-elected officials who serve a term or two, then return to productive jobs in the private sector. I suppose if we eliminated freedom of the press, took pains to restrict all elected offices to one term, required government to use only market-based economic efficiency measures in providing goods and services, and eliminated most staff and administrative functions within government, we could reach his ideal. Unfortunately, Mr. Clancy ignores the reality of how democracy works.

I really do like to read Mr. Clancy’s work—if you get beyond the diatribes and get into the basic story elements. His simplistic view of government only helps to reinforce the public’s negative attitude toward public service. If you are a fighter pilot or tank commander, you are not really a public employee but a defender of democracy. If, on the other hand, you manage personnel systems or work as a Congressional aide you are part of the evil public bureaucracy. Such images are powerful and, in conjunction with other popular fiction, help to create a on-going disdain for the those who serve in government.

B.J. Reed is a Professor and Chair of the Department of Public Administration at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Dr. Reed has published widely in journals and has co-authored several books. His most recent publication is the Second Edition of Public Finance Administration for Sage.
Call for Manuscripts

*Public Voices* hopes to provide a more emotive approach to public management than the traditional forms of analysis presented by many professional journals. As such, *Public Voices* focuses on humanistic, artistic and reflective expression concerning public administrators and the people they serve. Unlike traditional social science journals, *Public Voices* publishes unorthodox, controversial perspectives on bureaucracy by students of organization, broadly defined as public servants, the public, writers, and artists, as well as academics from all fields. That dialogue is aimed to:

—explore conflicts between efficiency and ethics in organizational life, including ethical dilemmas faced by bureaucrats;
—examine the consequences of a bureaucratic environment for employees and clients, including ways in which clients are assisted by individual public servants or abused by large systems; and
—generate new ideas for improving organizations.

Manuscripts and proposals for featured topics (i.e. symposia) are welcome on a wide variety of artistic and humanistic perspectives relevant to the public sector. Original fiction, including creative writing, poetry, and plays, will be featured in each issue. Reviews of novels, cinema, art and other related forms of expression may comment upon life within bureaucracies. Artistic works may include such material as photographs, sketches, and cartoons, and such work may be featured on the cover of each issue. Personal essays by public servants and clients are also welcome. All submissions will be evaluated on a blind, peer reviewed basis.

Manuscripts should be submitted with two cover pages: the first with the author’s name and full contact information, the second with only the title. Five copies of each manuscript should be sent to:

Prof. Marc Holzer, Editor-in-Chief, *Public Voices*
Graduate Department of Public Administration, 701 Hill Hall,
360 King Blvd., Rutgers University, Newark, N.J. 07102
Movie Reviews Invited

The movies contain a vast wealth of information about and illustrative of management and public administration. Unfortunately much of this is “hidden” in war films, westerns, prison dramas and other genres that do not immediately appear to be relevant. Fortunately, now that most films are readily available on tape, it is easier than ever to find and use this treasure trove of light and sound that so often illuminates the administrative world far better than any text. Thus Public Voices encourages and invites reviews and analyses of pertinent films. Many films stand by themselves; but it is often useful to consider several films by a single actor. For example, consider Gregory Peck. In Gentleman’s Agreement (1949) he demonstrated the subtlety of racism in the corporate world. In Twelve O’Clock High (1950) he illustrated the life cycle theory of leadership behavior. In The Man in the Grey Flannel Suit (1956) he coped with the ethical dilemmas of the modern organization man. And in To Kill a Mockingbird (1963) he showed how one person of unstinting integrity could make a difference.

Gary Cooper was more than just a lanky cowboy. In The Fountainhead (1949) he was a premature supply-side philosopher. In High Noon (1952) he offered a case study of the need for more effective pre-retirement planning. In Vera Cruz (1954) he dealt with the problems of Americans offering technical assistance to the Third World. And in The Court-Martial of Billy Mitchell (1955) he portrayed a martyred organizational dissident. And Clark Gable was more than Rhett Butler, the war profiteer in Gone With the Wind (1939). In Mutiny on the Bounty (1935) he rebelled against a famous practitioner of the Theory X management style. In The Hucksters (1947) he led a revolution against an organizational tyrant and transformed the company. In Command Decision (1949) he coped with the myriad political and administrative factors that so often frustrate public policymakers.

Similar summaries apply to the work of many other leading actors. The point is that we have within our collective memories hundreds of films that bear upon public policy and administration, but that have never been looked at in this light. So please accept the invitation of Public Voices and consider contributing your reviews of specific films or specific actors. Films are like great literature or history itself in that each new generation offers its own interpretations. The enormous backlist of U.S. and foreign film has hardly been interpreted at all by the public affairs community.

Reviews of 500-750 words should be submitted to:
Jay M. Shafritz, Movie Reviews Editor, Public Voices
Graduate School of Public and International Affairs
Forbes Quadrangle, University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
Fax: 412-648-2605
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