Public Voices

Public Voices

Servant Leadership

Symposium

Symposium Editor
Robert Cunningham
Department of Political Science
University of Tennessee

Editor-in-Chief
Marc Holzer
Graduate Department of Public Administration
Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey-Campus at Newark

Managing Editor
Willa Bruce
Doctor of Public Administration Program
University of Illinois at Springfield

Volume V   **Number 1-2**

Publisher

Cover Art

Subscriptions

Contents

Symposium: Servant Leadership

Editor: Robert Cunningham

The meaning of the term "servant leadership" is explained and put into a historical perspective.

The values, attitudes and behaviors of servant leadership are consistent with the public service ethic which values empowerment, justice and fairness in society, and community building achieved through participation; the attitude of stewardship; and the behaviors of compassion, love, sacrifice, and civic duty/service. We are beginning to see the application of servant leadership in public agencies and it may be out best hope to reengage citizens. Processes reflecting the values, attitudes, and behaviors of servant leadership enable public administrators to facilitate dialogue are available, such as Appreciative Inquiry and Open Space Technology.

While information technology makes it possible to involve citizens from across a state in dialogues via interactive TV, we find the authoritarian model of leadership hard to let go. But if we are to develop a servant-leadership model, new skills are needed. We will need to engage in authentic communication, to interact with others with positive regard and respect, and to collaborate in problem solving. Servant leadership offers individuals in public service who value empowerment, justice, community building and stewardship the tools to achieve these values.

In 1977 and 1979, Robert Greenleaf published two books on his concept of servant leadership; and since his death, his associates and friends have written a series of books on this same theme, which is important to public administration. In brief, the books argue for a style of leadership that stresses listening, empathy, healing, persuasion, awareness, foresight, conceptualization, commitment of growth to others, stewardship, and building community. In this article, we argue that the Information Age is

creating new organizations in which servant leadership is particularly salient as opposed to the traditional command and control leadership style of management. Although applauding this literature, we argue that it was very much based on the spiritual wisdom literature, which has existed since humankind recorded their thoughts. We further argue, that we, as scholars and professionals, can improve this very important and useful literature even more by tapping Greenleaf's original source of inspiration.

Relying on a survey of members of the American Society for Public Administration, servant leadership is examined through the lens of Christian spirituality. Findings indicate that citizens can have confidence in the dedication and commitment of public servants.

The servant leadership approach is worthy of examination for its potential benefits to a public administration in sore need of respite from the concerns of mere efficiency. Yet readers will find here an assertive critique of "servant leader" traits and visions. After an inquiry into the empathy often attributed to the practice of servant leadership, the essay will go on to deliver a hearty objection to the conceptual masking of hierarchies servant leadership pretends to undo. Finally, it will suggest the status of servant leadership as theology rather than theory. In the final analysis, readers will be cautioned away from seeing the "servant leader" as the personification of a useful or essential paradox. In the long run, servant leadership seems a management consulting and marketing slogan with the potential to make executives and would-be leaders feel nicer, accomplishing little else public administrators should esteem.

Servant leadership is a problematic concept--at worst, a coercive tool in the hands of sectarian groups or the politically powerful; at best, a condition of individual choice filled with uncertainty and perhaps pain. This essay elaborates and justifies the problems and paradoxes associated with the concept.

A Tale of Two Sisters represents an attempt to portray different approaches to organizational situations through story telling. A small but growing number of writers in the field of public administration have used creative writing to capture the interest of bureaucrats. Stories are powerful in that they can fire the imagination of the reader and provide an experience that is both enjoyable and meaningful. Acceptance of story telling and creative writing in public administration allows for new and different talent to participate in defining what it means to be a public administrator. Creative writing is also an excellent vehicle for connecting the teachings of different disciplines and belief systems in a metaphorical way. The ideals of servant leadership and the teachings of Buddhism come together in the following story as we witness a meeting between twin sisters.

Scholars and practitioners of public administration have been skeptical of new theories that seem long on rhetoric but short on practical application. This essay examines coupling the theory of servant leadership with the contemporary practice of community policing. Its purpose is to reveal points of linkage, highlight places of conflict and dissension, and illuminate the praxis dilemma that often accompanies the convergence of ideas with the professional practice of public administration.

Implications of servant leadership for public administration in general and for teaching public administration in particular are discussed.

Analysis and Commentary

Histories of public administration have tended to give minor attention to the Bible. This can partly be attributed to the Bible's unique role as a document revered as being of divine origin, which might discourage secular scholarly inquiry. Another explanation focuses on the lack of originality in Israelite bureaucracy compared to those of other sophisticated empires of that era, such as Egypt. The limited scholarship in the area focuses on the Bible's unique intellectual contributions, its timeless stories about ethical dilemmas and its interesting details about administrative structures and offices. This essay seeks to identify and summarize the major descriptions of public administration contained in the Hebrew Bible and to encourage additional inquiries in this subject area.

The hallmark (or it may just as well be called the stigmata) of the field of Public Administration is its complexity. It comprises far more than the study of management and organization and the technical processes that go with this.

Confronted with this degree of complexity, public administration has typically taken a catholic approach to its studies, drawing inspiration, concepts and research information from every corner of philosophy, social sciences, technical fields, and any other area of knowledge that seems to have relevance. It is in this light that I want to discuss some theoretical and practical considerations relating to the narrative aspects of literature (primarily novels), film, video, and painting. I wish to consider these as resources for both theory construction and research design and for introducing students to the realities that the field entails.

"Wycliffe Allen"

This article is a "public voice" from the past. "I Am a Bureaucrat" contributes a personal dimension to the perennial issues in public administration. It also reminds us that the more things change, the more they remain the same. The true name of its author will never be known as it appeared under the pseudonym "Wycliffe Allen," but the truths it speaks are timeless.

Book Reviews

Servant Leadership—
An Introduction

Robert Cunningham

"Servant leadership" is a paradox, a combination of opposites: the servant who leads; the leader who serves. The servant leadership concept, central to various religious traditions, traces its recent history in the US to essay collections by Robert Greenleaf, *Servant Leadership* (1977) and *Teacher as Servant* (1979). According to Greenleaf, a servant-leader first has a servant attitude of listening and encouraging, and then becomes a leader-- pointing a direction. Leadership success is judged by whether the one served grows as a person (Greenleaf 1977, Ch. 1). Leading emerges from the desire and practice of serving others. The servant leadership movement has flourished, with The Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership in Indianapolis becoming a central institution promoting servant leadership through publications, conferences, and the Internet.[1]

Both "servant" and "leader" imply relationship. The servant leadership concept derives from the honorable goal of assisting others to lead more satisfying, productive lives (Greenleaf, 1977).[2] Associating the financially advantaged with giving and the "less fortunate" with receiving is based on the false dichotomy between independent and dependent. From a psychological perspective, both independent and dependent are needy; striving for independence is fools gold. By viewing two people as interdependent, both can offer and receive gifts, as beautifully demonstrated in movies like "LAmerica" and "On the Eighth Day," where the poor in one case and disabled in another case rescue the economically advantaged from their insular, shallow lives.

Perhaps the servant-leadership concept, appropriate in the abstract, should communicate an expanded understanding of both "servant" and "leadership," emphasizing that serving, receiving, following, and leading are all intertwined. Implicit in this understanding are two assumptions:

1)   that one's life is more fulfilling if the roles of leading, following, serving, and receiving are integrated rather than segmented;

2)   that the spiritual journey is more important than a physical need.

An emphasis on sharing rather than instructing derives from the principle that decision-making about important personal issues should not be delegated; don't put someone else in charge of your spiritual journey. This special issue explores various interpretations of servant leadership as possible models for the public sector organization- -whether office, field site, or classroom.

---

[1] The web site is located at http://greenleaf.org/.
[2] For a historical review of the servant condition, see the article by Willa Bruce.

Foundations of Servant Leadership

The servant leads in order to assist individuals or communities to achieve or regain psychic/spiritual well-being. Effective leadership behaviors meet individual human needs and connect people to significant societal roles. Although human emotional needs probably have altered little throughout history, social and economic relationships have changed markedly. Servant leadership research faces the task of specifying and addressing human needs in a specific context.

In the pre-modern world, family network was the primary social and economic unit. People identified themselves by family or clan, which offered emotional and economic security. Loyalty to kin secured one's place. The environment external to the family unit was often chaotic and life-threatening, so obedience to the family or clan leader had a high priority. In the modern world, people identified by occupational role or by employer. One was a machinist, lawyer, accountant, or homemaker; one worked for Exxon, Stokely, Chrysler, or managed the household. Identity and emotional security lay in dependence on occupation, employer, or spouse. One's workplace was critical to self-identity. Openly giving primacy to other relationships risked one's social status.[3]

In 21st century Western society—and increasingly in urban centers throughout the world—both social and economic props have blown away.[4] Families are scattered as people move to obtain desired work, often single adults raise children, who are shuttled between families on weekends. Jobs—private or public—do not guarantee lifetime employment, therefore they no longer provide a dependable source of identity. The contemporary individual is economically, socially, and psychically alone--socialized to be self-reliant, independent, and with a gritty determination to succeed. Career options are many for those fortunate enough to be well-educated and to live in Western societies, and material wealth may grant rapid and broad geographical movement; however, material goods and a sense of independence do not nourish the spirit. Pre-moderns were dependent on family; moderns dependent on their place of employment. From conversations with people in the 20 to 40 age bracket, many appear to perceive themselves as independent, self-reliant, with security neither from family nor employer. This lack of connection, a sense of not belonging, gives rise to what Jerry Harvey (1999) calls the "anaclitic depression blues."

In reaction to this felt disconnectedness, an increasing search for spirit and meaning infuses organizational life. The idea of servant-leadership fits within this search to find new ways of engaging that are consciously interdependent. At its foundation, servant leadership concerns relationships important to psychic well-being. Robert Greenleaf articulated this idea of servant leadership. Greenleaf (1970) explained:

> becoming a servant-leader begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions (18-19).

Some psychological literature (Pingleton 1984; Clevans 1983; Kao 1976; Tjosvold and Fabrey 1980) states that both dependence and independence reflect relational immaturity. A recognition of and comfort with interdependence, reciprocal relationships, indicates maturity. The mutual respect emerging from an interdependent relationship inspires autonomy and self-determination (Kao 1976).[5] Being in relationship to

---

[3] Ewart Cousins (1999) categorizes history from an axiological reference point. We agree on the characteristics, and end in the same place, but associate different time spans with the first two periods.

[4] Tom and Cynthia Lynch describe this as the information age. See their article herein.

[5] Interdependence is not new. Traditional families, often on the edge of subsistence, relied upon each member to contribute so that all could survive. The emphasis on structure over the past hundred years has clouded our appreciation of multiple dependencies.

another has psychological, social, and economic implications. Realizing an interdependent relationship to another, as a servant-leader, can foster emotional growth. This collection of articles digs into the servant leadership concept by looking to its religious foundations, implicit value structures, linkage to current Public Administration theory, and possible application.

Soul, Spirit, and Servant Leadership

Soul and spirit are often associated with servant leadership. Soul is better described through story than enclosed by rigid definition. Briskin (1996, 11) offers four different ways to approach the understanding of soul: 1-as an underworld of depth and shadowy realities, 2-as a source of animation, essence, and renewal, 3-as a place where opposites unite, 4-as a spark of the divine. Peter Vaill (1998, 219) describes the spiritual as being in touch with the deeper things of life, which requires people to reach the deeper parts of themselves. Such people are "experienced by others as concerned with more than superficial and transitory things" (Vaill 1998, 219). From the soul/spirit perspective, closely associated with servant leadership, relationships to others are driven by spirit/soul issues.

Nor are such relationships always comfortable. The Lebanese poet Khalil Gibran said that we should be grateful when someone gives us scorpions; perhaps all they have to give is scorpions. As the Muslim mystic al-Hallaj was being crucified, his prayer ended with the words,

> *And these Thy servants who are gathered to slay me, in zeal for Thy religion and in desire to win Thy favors, forgive them, O Lord, and have mercy upon them; for verily if Thou hadst revealed to them that which Thou hast revealed to me, they would not have done what they have done; and if Thou hadst hidden from me that which thou hast hidden from them, I should not have suffered this tribulation. Glory unto Thee in whatsoever Thou doest, and glory unto Thee in whatsoever Thou willest* (Armstrong 229).

Ending one's life with the most toys may be a goal for many, but from the spiritual/emotional perspective, relationships assume priority. For current writers on spirit and soul in the workplace (Vaill, Pulley, Bolman and Deal, Briskin) servant leadership will not differ by organizational status. Whether unemployed, front-line worker, supervisor, manager, or CEO, the servant-leader approaches a relationship attentive to and respectful toward the other, assuming that each has a gift to give, and that each is open to receiving a gift.

A paradigm of interdependence is compatible with the contemporary organization: everyone is a learner, roles are open and flexible, everyone is vulnerable. Without honest communication and members present with body, mind, and spirit, the organization can fail. Sometimes, even with all necessary conditions met, an organization fails because mission and goals do not align with the demands of the marketplace (Briskin 1996). Perhaps our security (material as well as emotional) lies not in financial status--which can erode quickly, or in our skills--which a jealous or mean-spirited superior can rubbish, but in our relationships, which impact our self-concept or soul (Pulley 1997).

Contemporary Organization Theory and Servant-Leadership

A holistic epistemology is appropriate for addressing the task of understanding and applying servant leadership principles. Holism sees concepts as multi-faceted, each facet offering an important, unique, essential component with which to help build the concept (Diesing, Ch 11). Vaill (1998); Pulley (1997); Bolman and Deal (1995); Lynch and Lynch (1998); Briskin (1996) offer the following ideas on leadership, which can be used for describing and constructing the servant-leader concept. Perhaps the appearance of these themes in management

books, as well as in their more familiar settings of religion, ethics, and philosophy, signifies the relevance of servant leadership.

- Who I am as a person matters; viewing people as means rather than end diminishes both myself and others.
- To get in touch with our spirits, our gods, and our souls, look within ourselves (meditate, reflect, attempt to get a different perspective).
- Materialism is a poor way to conceptualize our world; our essence is spirit, not matter.
- Material things such as family or wealth can block us from getting in touch with our soul and spirit.
- Adversity offers a challenge, an opportunity for our spiritual growth and growth in relationships.
- While the world is becoming more technical, applying technique in human relations depersonalizes and rejects the opportunity to enter into relationship.
- Paradox—multiple truths that seem contradictory--is a useful way to view the world.

Religious writings have expressed many of these ideas, but now these notions are beginning to show up in discourses on management.

The advice implied directly counters the Weberian model upon which our management thinking has long been based. The new advice to managers:

- Be open; Experiment; Do things differently; Learn; See individuals as learners;
- See organizations as learning places.
- Become co-creators with others in the organization.
- In making decisions, consider soul and spirit as well as external constraints.
- We should base our organizations on people, and whole people build more effective organizations.
- Management is "being-in-the-world-with-responsibility" (Vaill 1998).

Perhaps servant leadership and leadership in the new management paradigm are the same, an idea argued herein by Johnson and Feldheim. Who you are is as important as what you do. Interdependencies rest upon trust. The process of group decision-making protects the quality of the leadership/management decision; for the people making the decision are mutually nurtured in their souls and spirits.

Three Tenuous Models

Three ideas emerging from the Greenleaf writings raise questions. The veiled leader, the steward, and the facilitator are all associated with servant leadership. Each idea has admirable qualities, but each has a flaw which prevents unqualified endorsement.

First, the servant as veiled leader. Leadership qualities are hidden until retroactively, in their absence, discovered. Robert Greenleaf (1977, 1979) drew this idea from reading Hermann Hesse's *Journey to the East,* an allegorical novel in which the servant is the leader, the person who holds the group together along its pilgrimage. The leadership role of the servant is recognized only after the servant disappears. In Hesse's story, absent the veiled leader's guidance, the trip degenerates into a shambles, breaks up, and the pilgrims fail to reach their destination.

The servant as secret leader does not make an attractive role model. To pretend to be a servant when one is really in charge does not teach healthy leadership, or indicate organizational health. But if the strong leader accepts only him- or herself in the leadership position, subversion may be the only way that the group can have leadership that gets them to their goal.

Second, the servant leader as steward. In business the steward serves as a fiduciary agent. After his early retirement from AT&T, Greenleaf modeled the steward leader by serving on the boards of not-for-profit organizations. He took an active role to ensure that the agency leaders operated an effective, efficient organization. Greenleaf railed against business leaders who, while sitting on NFP boards, acted irresponsibly by rubber stamping whatever activities the agency's operating officers proposed.

The servant as steward is an appropriate leadership role, and not-for-profit organizations will benefit from an involved board, which takes an active role in an agency's strategic decisions. The steward role, proposed by Greenleaf, fits private sector executives who serve not-for-profit organizations. However, public administrators generally lack the financial resources or community contacts to become attractive board candidates for not-for-profit managers.

Interpreting the public sector steward more broadly, as one who holds public trust and seeks to guard the public interest, may be a satisfactory interpretation of servant-leadership. This person fits the servant leadership idea if the public is led by a serious engagement through dialogue. On the other hand, if the public servant interprets the stewardship role as "trustee" in the Burkean sense of one who listens and makes authoritative decisions for the community based upon one's personal judgment, that interpretation of steward is less comfortable.

A third servant leader role is as facilitator. The facilitative leader envisions avenues of possible resolution, knows the location and has a strategy for assembling appropriate physical resources, and brings individuals with diverse skills to address problems. A significant flaw in the servant leader as facilitator is the possible absence of an ethical component. The facilitative leader may have the high moral standards of a Vaclav Havel, or the lack of moral fiber displayed by an Adolf Eichmann. The servant-leader needs an ethical core.

To lead while pretending to follow, to hold a controlling position which allows one to define the good, or to facilitate an outcome without regard for its consequences are ideas which embody only part of the servant leadership concept.

The Articles

The contributors to this symposium conceptualize, clarify, and operationalize servant leadership. Most, but not all, of the contributors are sympathetic to the concept. A reflective posture dominates; but at least two state or imply activism. Johnson and Feldheim open the symposium by showing the relevance of the servant leadership concept to current management issues. Cynthia and Tom Lynch then span the world's religious traditions, extracting core themes related to servant leadership. Willa Bruce reviews the Christian tradition and offers survey information on servant leadership and current organizational practices in the US. Patricia Patterson also emphasizes social justice issues, and argues that servant leadership does not provide satisfactory answers. Robert Zinke takes an approach that attempts to fold Patterson's argument inside the servant leader domain. Transitioning from social theory and Christianity, Nancy Murray offers a short story with a Buddhist theme. Lastly, Brian Williams discusses the implementation challenge for public administrators dedicated to servant leadership.

Gail Johnson and Mary Ann Feldheim outline the highlights of management theory, then suggest Robert Greenleaf's servant leadership concept as an ideal which can serve as a foundation for Public Administration. Feldheim and Johnson link servant-leadership to public service along the dimensions of values, attitudes, and

behaviors, then challenge managers to elevate their performance to the standard of servant leadership. Practicing servant leadership in the workplace strengthens civic values and a thriving polity. The authors recognize the difficulty of implementing servant-leadership principles—not only because leaders reluctantly sever themselves from power-dependency, but also because the public is reluctant to take responsibility for engaging public issues.

While Johnson and Feldheim suggest organizational change as problematic, Tom and Cynthia Lynch see new organizational forms as inevitable. The information age drives out hierarchy. What will succeed hierarchy? Will servant-leadership play a significant role? Feldheim and Johnson connect servant-leadership to contemporary public service; the Lynches link the ideas of servant leadership to the past--to Greenleaf's background, to his Quaker heritage, and continue on to show the lineage of the servant leader concept back to the ancient religious literature, to spiritual wisdom. They explore the central tenets of the sages, which they see as a long historical stream of "human aspiration and existence." We meet our basic needs by absorbing this wisdom, which we can find present in all long-standing religious traditions.

Willa Bruce focuses on Christian spirituality in the American context. Christianity and spirituality receive much attention in our culture. She first elucidates and distinguishes the concepts of "religion," "spirituality," and "servant;" then describes the hazards of the public workplace. We need servant leaders in the public workplace. Bruce then poses the question of how these spiritual values fare among ASPA members and in the work sites of these ASPA members. Bruce reports on a survey of spirituality and discusses how these public servants experience their work places.

Patricia Patterson thinks the idea of servant-leadership takes us down the wrong path. While the servant-leadership rhetoric suggests service, the practice emphasizes the dominant role of the high-status member of the dyad. The vagueness of the servant-leader concept inhibits transparency in the relationship, and the encounter does not include the goal of improving the socio-economic condition of marginalized people—collectively or individually. Gender and race issues intrude. Denying the hierarchy present in the servant-leader dyad strengthens the hierarchy present both in the dyad and in the larger society by rendering the concept more difficult to attack. The symbol protects the contrary reality, as Murray Edelman (1960) argued. Adopting and practicing the servant-leadership idea does not liberate the served, or change oppressive systems.

Robert Zinke responds indirectly to Patterson's attack on the concept. Implicitly acknowledging Patterson's argument, he grounds his discussion in Greenleaf and Hesse. Zinke contends that Christian servant-leadership is based upon faith, a paradoxical concept which incorporates both responsibility and passion. The servant-leader is a witness--not a teacher. Pain distinguishes the servant leader from the huckster. Zinke draws on the Biblical story of Abraham and Isaac. In the awesome decision of whether to disobey God or to follow God by sacrificing his son Isaac shows Abraham as a witness, did Abraham suffer the pain of choice? Are the present-day snake-handlers, who claim to follow Christ, better interpreted as witnesses or hucksters? The answer is not obvious. Do not lightly engage this essay. I find reading and re-reading it a challenge, and am rewarded for the effort. Summary points and firm conclusions do easily emerge from this dense, paradoxically-based argument.

Nancy Murray offers a fun piece, a different view--not only by showing how someone professing a Buddhist faith might relate to servant-leadership, but also by expressing her ideas via a short-story dialogue between two sisters. The easy flow captures important truths as her fiction communicates complicated arguments.

Johnson and Feldheim opened this symposium by pointing out the conceptual similarities between servant leadership and Public Administration. They called for Public Administration to embrace fully the servant leadership concept. Brian Williams concludes the issue by describing the difficulty in changing an organizational culture from a control mentality to a service mentality. Can community policing come to embody the principles of servant leadership? Greenleaf wrote primarily to convince leaders to involve themselves on the boards of voluntary and not-for-profit organizations to ensure that the ideals of the

organization were carried out. Williams argues that in police organizations, operationalizing servant leadership ideals may be problematic. Can uniformed officers contemplate goals of engendering democracy or having their spiritual needs met as they mediate domestic disputes, deal with intoxicated motorists, or chase robbery suspects fleeing a convenience store? Participatory and service ideals make good copy in headquarters, but, as the literature on street-level bureaucrats shows (Lipsky, 1980), front line service providers compromise their ideals in order to survive in their jobs. Greenleaf (1977, 1979) writes from a posture of faith in individuals; Williams concludes with doubt that a control organization can adapt its culture to accord with servant leader principles.

Special thanks go to Gordon Dehler and Lou Weschler, who reviewed and evaluated all submissions. Gordon is an organizational theorist in the Dayton University School of Business. He co-edited (with Judi Neal) the October 2000 special issue of the *Journal of Management Education* devoted to spirituality. Lou is well-known for his many years of working with students and practitioners, and for his scholarship across the gamut of public administration topics, most recently emphasizing environmental issues. Their thoughtful comments guided the authors' revisions.

References

Armstrong, Karen. (1993). *A History of God.* New York: Knopf.

Bolman, Lee and Terrence Deal. (1995). *Leading with Soul.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Briskin, Alan. (1996). *The Stirring of Soul in the Workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Buber, Martin. (1970). *I and Thou.* New York: Scribners.

Clevans, Ethel. (1983). On Maturity. *Modern Psychoanalysis*, 8(2), 131-133.

Conger, Jay and Associates. (1994). *Spirit at Work.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cousins, Ewart. (1999). Religions of the World: Facing Modernity Together. *Global Virtue Ethics Review*, 1(1), 8-20.

Diesing, Paul. (1971). *Patterns of Discovery in the Social Sciences.* Chicago: Aldine.

Edelman, Murray. (1960). *The Symbolic Uses of Politics.* Champaign, IL: Illini Books.

Greenleaf, Robert. (1977). *Servant Leadership.* New York: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, Robert. (1979). *Teacher as Servant.* New York: Paulist Press.

Harvey, Jerry. (1999). *How Come Every Time I Get Stabbed in the Back My Fingerprints Are on the Knife.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Johnson, Leonard and Alan Frohman. (1989). Identifying and Closing the Gap in the Middle of Organizations. *Academy of Management Executive*, 3(2), 107-114.

Kanter, R. (1989). The New Managerial Work. *Harvard Business Review*, 67(6), 85-92.

Kao, Charles. (1976). Maturity and Paternalism in Health Care. *Ethics in Science and Medicine*, 3(3), 179-186.

Light, Paul. (1998). *Sustaining Innovation.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lipsky, Michael (1980). *Street-Level Bureaucracy.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Lynch, Thomas and Cynthia Lynch. (1998). *The Word of the Light.* Baton Rouge, LA: Scott Balsdon.

Losoncy, Lewis. (1985). *The Motivating Leader.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Mason, Richard and Ian Mitroff. (1981). *Challenging Strategic Planning Assumptions.* New York: John Wiley.

Peck, M. Scott. (1993). *A World Waiting to be Born.* New York: Bantam.

Pingleton, Jared. (1985). An Integrated Model of Relational Maturity. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, 3(1), 57-66.

Pulley, Mary Lynn. (1997). *Losing Your Job--Reclaiming Your Soul.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Quinn, Robert. (1996). *Deep Change: Discovering the Leader Within.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tjosvold, Dean and Lawrence Fabrey. (1980). Motivation for Perspective Taking: Effects of Interdependence and Dependence on Interest in Learning Others' Intentions. *Psychological Reports*, 46(3), Pt. 1, 755-765.

Vaill, Peter. (1998). *Spirited Leading and Learning.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wheatley, Margaret and Kellner-Rogers, Myron. (1996). *A Simpler Way.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Serving the Public in the 21st Century

Gail Johnson and Mary Ann Feldheim

Introduction

As we begin the 21st century, many organizations continue to struggle to change the way work gets done. The challenge centers on how to connect people to the work of organizations so their creative spirit is liberated. Peter Block (1993) posed the issue this way:

> There is a longing in each of us to invest in things that matter, and to have the organization in which we work be successful. Our task is to live out democratic values, using the workplace as the focal point . . . [and] reforming our organizations so that our democracy thrives, our spirit is answered and our ability to serve customers in the broadest sense is guaranteed (p. 3).

While Block intended this for the private sector, public sector organizations are also struggling with similar issues in a different context. Public organizations face the triple challenge of liberating the talents of civil servants, engaging citizens in the work of public administration, and enabling civil servants and citizens to work together so democracy thrives. Given widespread civic disengagement, increased customer expectations and limited resources, public administrators must find ways of developing leadership at all levels and working within a web of multiple leadership.

While leadership alone will be insufficient to bring about the transformation required to serve the public in the 21st century, this transformation will not happen without a dramatic change in our approach to leadership. An essential change begins by adopting a different model of leadership. The great leader swooping in on his white horse will not be effective because leadership at all levels is necessary for democratic governance in the 21st century. We need more leaders who seek to serve and more servants who seek to lead, if we are to engage citizens and public servants in the work of democratic governance.

Robert K. Greenleaf's (1970) servant-leadership provides a model worthy of consideration for the 21st century public administrator. Servant-leadership does not rely on controlling or directing based on hierarchical positions. Instead, it depends on the collective initiative of individuals using empowerment as the key strategy.

It is our belief that the values of servant leadership are congruent with the public service ethic, an ethic we have too often been reticent in acknowledging. We have failed to adequately communicate this ethic and demonstrate it through our public behaviors. By explicitly embracing servant-leadership, we believe that public servants can serve as the catalyst for creating communities of empowered citizens and public employees. It is servant-leadership in relationship to citizens that may well be the hallmark of 21st century public administration.

What is Servant-Leadership?

The idea of servant-leadership is not new--leaders as servants can be found in eastern religions, the Bible and ancient Rome. The Roman saying *primus inter pares* or first among equals required leaders to perform their duties as a public service (Spears and Brody, 1993). Robert K. Greenleaf coined the term servant-leadership in his 1970 essay "The Servant as Leader" to describe a concept of leadership which focuses on the enhancement and personal growth of individuals while improving the quality and caring found within organizations. Instead of focusing on acquiring power or the symbols of success for oneself, the servant-leader seeks to serve. Greenleaf (1970) explained:

> becoming a servant-leader begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve, to serve first. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. That person is sharply different from one who is leader first, perhaps because of the need to assuage an unusual power drive or to acquire material possessions (18-19).

Servant-leadership is based on an inherent regard for people, anchoring it firmly within human relations theory. It emphasizes people, process, and relationship. Greenleaf (1988) believed that "*all* people are seen more as beings to be trusted, believed in, and loved and less as objects to be used, competed with, or judged. It is a shifting of the balance from use to esteem in *all* personal relationships" (75). This inherent regard for all people is the bedrock belief of servant-leadership.

It follows, therefore, that the measures of success are quite different for a servant-leader. Instead of measuring success by how much power one has acquired, the servant-leader measures success on whether those served "become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants" (Greenleaf, 1980, 9). The focus shifts from narrow self-interest to concern for those being served. The essential question becomes whether **others** are better off, not whether **I** am better off. This focus is consistent with Frederickson's (1997) view of public regard, which means a movement from self-interest to an understanding and concern for the interests of others, and the work of Rawls (1971), who defined justice in terms of making the least off better.

A test of servant-leadership within an organization is whether the members of the organization make it productive and successful. Greenleaf (1980) argued "that the strongest, most productive institution over a long period of time is one in which, other things being equal, there is the largest amount of voluntary action in support of the goals of the institution" (51). Organizational success depends upon having staff who do the right things without being instructed, who can do the right things even when it means doing more than their job description. It is service, genuinely offered, that calls forth the voluntary effort necessary for success.

Vision is the grounding and organizing principle, with the leader acting as the servant of the dream. It is this vision, rather than the leader, which unites people in a common effort. By articulating a liberating vision, servant-leaders create the situation that enables people with diverse perspectives to reach consensus. While initially believing that the hierarchical leader was to articulate the vision, Greenleaf later recognized that it the leader's role is to serve as mid-wife to the vision. A vision will not be accepted no matter how many posters adorn the workplace unless it resonates with the members of the group.

Servant-leadership is a holistic approach to life that uses a combination of teamwork and community, facilitated by ethical and caring behavior. Leadership is based on being authentic, demonstrated through active listening, attending behaviors, empathy, and being fully present (Rinehart, 1998). When an individual pays complete attention to another, a powerful form of communication takes place. When focused on the relationship, each person leads at different times and in different ways (Sutton, 1992).

The focus of a servant-leader is on process rather than on outcomes. Given the many wounds left by downsizing and fear-inducing leadership styles, a servant-leader may first need to engage in healing work. One process stressed in

interactions is that of healing, where an individual communicates the mutual need for wholeness and demonstrates a caring, nurturing attitude, affirming and encouraging the other person (Greenleaf, 1996a, Spears, 1995).

We are just beginning to see the emergence of servant-leadership in public administration. Staley (1995) wrote about servant-leadership in the fire service and turning the hierarchy upside down, while DeGraaf, Jordan and DeGraaf (1999) recommend a servant-leadership approach to programming for parks recreation, and leisure services. As we embrace servant-leadership as a model for the 21st century public administrator, we will discover more opportunities to apply this type of leadership.

The Public Service Ethic--Servant Leadership Connection

The idea of service is not new to public administrators. For those of us who have chosen public service as our life's work, the call to service over self-interest in an affirmation of our core value. The very word "public" connotes caring for the interests of others, moving beyond selfish concerns (Frederickson, 1997). This idea of service and care is captured in the theology of the public service ethic, which is a belief system centered around altruism, civic duty, morality, patriotism, benevolence and love (Staats, 1988; Downs 1967; Buchanan 1975; Frederickson and Hart 1985). The desire to express this ethic has come to be defined as public service motivation (Perry, 1996; Perry and Wise, 1990; Rainey, 1982; Romzek, 1990; Naff and Crum 1999). Public servants are motivated, according to Perry (1996), by an attraction to public policy making, a commitment to the public interest, compassion, and sacrifice. Similarly, Johnson (1991) found that the desire to make a contribution, to accomplish something worthwhile, and to influence policy decisions is a prime reason for choosing a public service career.

The values, attitudes and behaviors of servant-leadership are congruent with those of the public service ethic. Both servant-leadership and the public service ethic focus on the values of empowerment, justice, and community, lead with an attitude of stewardship, and demonstrate those values and attitudes through behaviors that demonstrate care, benevolence, and altruism (see Table 1). The congruence of values, attitudes and behaviors will be examined.

Table 1
Comparison of Servant-leadership and the Public Service Ethic

	Servant-leadership	Public Service
Values	Empowerment Justice/Fairness Building Community	Empowerment Social Justice Building Community
Attitudes	Stewardship	Commitment to Public Interest
Behaviors	Authenticity Listening and Empathy Healing Role Modeling	Integrity Compassion Sacrifice Civic Duty

Value Congruence: Empowerment, Justice, and Community

Servant-leadership and the public sector ethic share similar values: respect and empowerment, justice and social equity for all people, and community. Maybe Aretha Franklin's "Respect" should be the public service ethic's anthem. Respect, this inherent mutual regard and esteem for each person, is the bedrock of democratic governance. Respect is the basis for shared power, which Follett (1925) termed "power-with" and today's government reinventors call empowerment. In this context, empowerment refers to decision-making power that is shared by employees and citizens. Empowerment in the servant-leadership literature focuses on developing people in ways that empowers them to make their own decisions (Rinehart, 1998). While it is not easy to share power, give up power, or take on the responsibility of power, both servant-leadership and the public service ethic recognize its essentialness in democratic governance.

Social justice and equity are values of both servant-leadership and public service. A servant-leader challenges the pervasive injustice and seeks to create a more just society with the available resources and through the existing institutions that serve society. Glenn O. Stahl (1990) gave an impassioned speech arguing for such a role for public administrators, and John Rawls' (1971) theory of social justice is part of normative public administration theory. Social equity places the highest priority on the equitable provision of public services. These values are very much embedded in the public service ethic.

Community building is the final area where the values of servant-leadership and public administration converge. Servant-leadership frames this in terms of community responsibility and we frame it in terms of community building. The call for community building has been prominent since the 1960s. Whether it is called "maximum feasible participation", partnerships, collaboration, or empowerment, community building means involving both citizens and public administrators in decision-making and action. The public service ethic places value on the process of interaction between public servants and those who are served, sounding much like servant-leadership, in order to include and involve citizens in the work of governance. Democracy is more than voting; it is involvement in the many decisions that affect our communities. Not only is community building seen as essential in democratic governance, it also serves to achieve the just administration of public services (Frederickson, 1996). Both servant-leadership and public service ethic believe that the process of the interactions between people and groups is as important as the outcome.

The values of empowerment, social justice and equity, and community building form the foundation of servant-leadership and public administration for the 21st century. Both value the empowerment of individuals, the concept of social justice found in just actions that benefit those who have the least, and see community building as imperative to creating a civil society. A comparison of the attitudes found in servant-leadership and the public service ethic is also provided to further buttress our argument for incorporating the behaviors of servant-leadership into public administration.

Attitude Congruence: Stewardship

Stewardship, a major component of servant-leadership, means holding of something in trust for another in a responsible way. Block (1993) describes the connection between values and attitudes of stewardship: "Stewardship is the choice for service. We serve best through partnership, rather than patriarchy. Dependency is the antithesis of stewardship and so empowerment becomes essential" (6). It means letting go of control and pursuit of self-interest. It means changing relationships that are based on dependency to ones that are based on interdependency. These are not easy personal or institutional changes.

In regards to the attitude of stewardship, the public service ethic serves as a model for the private and nonprofit sectors. Public administrators know about stewardship. As stewards, public administrators hold their institutions in

In regards to the attitude of stewardship, the public service ethic serves as a model for the private and nonprofit sectors. Public administrators know about stewardship. As stewards, public administrators hold their institutions in trust for the greater good of society. From the progressive movement to the reinvention of government, the goal of public service has been seen as stewardship of the public interest.

Servant-leadership focuses on responsibility for the community under the umbrella of stewardship. Responsibility is an attitude or feeling where the quality of the lives of others becomes very important, and every action of the servant-leaders is directed toward improving that quality through actively seeking to involve people in the decision-making processes of organizations (Greenleaf, 1996a).

Behavior Congruence: Integrity, Compassion, Sacrifice, Duty

Since the values and attitudes of servant-leadership and the public service ethic are congruent, we would therefore expect to see similar congruence in behavior. We expect to see integrity (authenticity) of public administrators evidenced by the consistency of their behavior in words and deeds in accordance with their public service ethic. We would expect to see behaviors of compassion, love, and benevolence (Perry, 1996; Frederickson and Hart, 1985). We would expect to see service over self-interest demonstrated in the myriad of ways in which public servants sacrifice personal recognition, financial compensation personal health, and/or personal safety and have demonstrated both sacrifice and civic duty through large and small acts of heroism. Sacrifice and service establish authority and leadership in the servant-leader model (Hunter, 1998).

The area of behavior is very important to the concept of servant-leadership, because a servant-leader leads by example. Role modeling effective listening, attending behaviors, empathy, compassion, sacrifice, and authenticity or integrity has a very powerful effect on followers. Bandura (1977) in his model of social learning, places role modeling at the center of adult learning focusing on behaviors demonstrated by individuals in social settings. By identifying the behaviors of attentive listening, empathy, compassion, and positive regard or love when they are demonstrated allows others to learn how to demonstrate these behaviors. Only recently has the profession of public administration begun to pay attention to the behaviors of exemplars acting as role models handling the many difficult situations faced by public servants (Cooper and Wright, 1992). Public sector organizations and individuals performing in the public sector need to become increasingly aware of the importance of recognizing, appreciating, and emulating the positive behaviors already identified in the public service ethic.

Authenticity is essential and means that an individual must be empathetic toward others and to listen attentively, focusing on making people whole by attending to all an individual's legitimate needs (Hunter, 1998; Spears, 1995). Recently, King, Feltey, and Susel (1998) introduced authenticity in the form of authentic public participation, which is described as participation that stimulates interest and investment by all parties involved. The focus is on a commitment to open and honest communication, which builds trust between the parties. Process and outcome are equally important for authentic participation to be effective, as the decision emerges as a result of effective communication. We believe authentic public participation requires an administrator to engage in servant-leadership, role-modeling the behaviors of authenticity, empathy, effective communication, and healing to achieve a vibrant, democratic, community.

We believe that by focusing on the behaviors of servant-leadership (authenticity, listening, empathy, healing, role modeling), the values of empowerment, justice, and community building will be more likely to be enacted by the 21ˢᵗ century public administrator. The question then is how can public administrators apply the concepts of servant-leadership in the context of civic engagement?

Servant-Leadership: Strategies for Civic Engagement

Greenleaf
(1980) believed the big problems of society—poverty, destruction of the environment, and discrimination--represented individual and institutional failures. He believed that too many institutions were deficient in their service to society and lacked a vision that could inspire people to reach toward the future with hope and energy. Since the litmus test for servant-leaders, according to Greenleaf, was their impact on the least privileged in society, institutional servant-leadership should be held to the bottom line result: whether the least privileged people in our society are better off. He believed that by increasing institutions' performance as servants, a more just and caring society would emerge.

Clearly, public administrators working within government institutions have a role to play in bringing about a more just and caring society. Greenleaf (1980) believed that it is through the initiative of individuals that institutions become more serving. This suggests that the transformation of public servants to servant-leaders needs to focus on both the individual and institutional levels, recognizing that the individual and the institution are interconnected. It also means finding ways to engage citizens, recognizing the interconnection between citizens and public administrators in democratic governance. Follett (1920) states that "A democratic community is one in which the common will is being gradually created by the civic activity of its citizen. The test of democracy is the fullness with which this is being done" (p. 248). King and Stivers (1998) make a strong case that we have been running on empty. As a remedy, they suggest that public administrators engage in "active administration" which seeks ways of working collaboratively with "active citizens" (p. 203). Greenleaf might have suggested that public administrators, acting in their institutional roles, become servant-leaders in order to call forth the voluntary effort of citizens for our democracy to thrive.

The challenge is to find processes that lead to the integration of diverse viewpoints and that facilitates collaborative relationships between citizens, elected officials, and public administrators. Public servant-leaders can create opportunities to develop create shared visions. Equipped with adequate information and an open process, people will engage in dialogue to analyze their situation and to find the solutions that respond to the situation. Because of the participatory process, people volunteer to work as servant-leaders to achieve their shared vision. Several strategies consistent with the servant-leadership concept have been used to empower public servants and citizens in building community.

One example of civic involvement, servant-leadership style, is the Conversation with Oregon (Johnson and Johnson, 1996). Governor Barbara Roberts engaged the citizens in a conversation about the kind of community they wanted to create, focusing on the tough fiscal choices faced by the state. Their work resulted in draft legislation for reforming Oregon's tax system. This conversation was a radical departure from the old way of leading. Using technology, she launched a first-in-the-nation conversation with more that 10,000 citizens in a series of 26 dialogues across the state using interactive television. The Governor could have used the traditional approach to leadership and developed a "fix" to sell as "The Roberts' Reform Package." She acknowledged that "It would have looked like leadership" but she rejected the old way of doing things because she felt the citizens needed to be engaged in the process of finding a solution to this tough issue. Yet the old ways die hard, and in conducting the conversations she was criticized as showing a lack of leadership.

For the 21st century public administrator, a number of tools can be used to engage citizen. One is Future Search (Weisbord and Janoff 1995), where large groups engage in developing a shared vision. By identifying shared experiences from the past and present, the participants are able to move toward a common vision for the future. Recognizing their similarities creates a sense of connection. The "us" versus "them" mindset is replaced with the realization that "we" are in this together. Strategies for action are developed to achieve their common vision.

A second approach is Open Space Technology (Owen 1996). This is ideal in situations where the group is facing a real issue where a result is the goal, a solution is not known, and no one person or group is trying to control the

process or the outcome. This is a self-managed process with the facilitator playing a minimal role. The large group identifies the issues and concerns that they feel are important. These issues are posted and then participants self-select to work on issues they feel are most important to them. These are self-managed work groups. Participation in the work groups is based on whether a person feels he/she is are learning and contributing; if not, he/she is free to move to another group.

Another approach is Appreciative Inquiry (Cooperrider and Srivastva, 1987). Data is gathered through initial interviews between participants that focuses on developing a profound understanding about core values and what already works well in their organization or community. The shared vision is created through dialogue in small groups and validated by the larger group. Where the group has identified a gap between the vision and the current situation, participants self-select into small groups to identify strategies to move the current situation closer to their shared vision. By understanding what already works well, they can develop strategies to ensure things work well more consistently throughout all parts of the organization or community.

All of these approaches to civic involvement are consistent with the servant-leadership philosophy. In Future Search, Open Space Technology, and Appreciative Inquiry, participants both serve and lead. While there are facilitators to guide the process, the absence of formal leaders is notable. Power and information is shared. Each approach shares a commitment to full engagement and the egalitarian involvement of all members of the community in discussing complex issues and finding shared solutions. Each approach is action oriented. Any of these approaches could be used by public administrators to provide a way to engage citizens, elected officials and other public administrators to develop the vision to inspire action in tackling the big problems.

In our view, these approaches are ideally suited for the public administrators seeking to engage in servant-leadership. These approaches call forth the voluntary effort needed to resolve tough issues through consensus. Given that leadership is not fixed in any one person, position or group in democratic governance, these large group processes encourage the "multiple leadership" seen by Follett (1927, 216) as necessary in complex relationships. Also, this approach seems to come closest to what King and Stivers (1998) mean by "government of the people': the process of collaboration in which active citizens and administrators work together . . . in ways that allow new perspectives and approaches to emerge...." (p. 203).

Servant-Leadership as Strategy for Serving the Public in the 21st Century

In the beginning, Woodrow Wilson (1887) asked: "how shall our . . . governments be so administered that it shall always be to the interest of the public officer to serve, not his superior alone but the community also, with the best efforts of his talents and the soberest service of his conscience?" (p. 26). While it may not be applicable in every situation, we believe Greenleaf's concept of servant-leadership provides an answer to Wilson's question. It also serves as a way to meet the triple challenges facing public administrators in the 21st century: liberating the talents of civil servants, engaging citizens in the work of public administration, and enabling civil servants and citizens to work together so democracy thrives.

We believe that servant-leadership is consistent with the values, attitudes, and behaviors espoused in the public sector and can provide a unified framework for leadership. Both servant-leadership and the public administration literature focus on the values of empowerment, justice and fairness in society, and community building achieved through participation. The attitude of stewardship articulated as part of servant-leadership is inherent in the public sector's commitment to the public interest. The behaviors identified in the public service ethic of compassion, love, sacrifice, and civic duty/service are compatible with the empathy and healing behaviors of servant-leadership. Some are concerned that public servants should not lead, but in the context of servant-leadership, it is leading by serving. Public servants should model behavior that affirms the worth of all individuals and focus on the interaction process between people to achieve social justice and empowerment.

Public servants should model behavior that affirms the worth of all individuals and focus on the interaction process between people to achieve social justice and empowerment.

Given that the values of servant-leadership align with public service ethic, what explains the seeming reluctance of public administration to embrace the concept of servant-leadership? The old model of leadership, which relies on domination, has proven to hard to transform. Cynicism and skepticism also serve to maintain the old model of leadership. Those who have had damaging experiences with tyrannical leaders may find trust a difficult thing to develop. If you have never experienced caring and loving leaders who were servants, it may be hard to imagine the possibility.

Changing beliefs is often easier than changing behaviors. Not only do we need to change our ideas about leadership, we need to develop new skills. Servant-leadership focuses on the skills of authentic communication and positive regard. Instead of dwelling on conflict resolution and political decision making, servant-leadership requires developing the ability to use processes that focus on working with diverse groups to find areas of agreement. Approaches such as Future Search, Open Space Technology, and Appreciative Inquiry all hold great promise as strategies that use the behaviors of servant-leadership to serve the public interest. The call for authentic public participation echoes the "prime directive" of servant-leadership - to authentically serve the public based on the values of empowerment, social justice, and community building.

Servant-leadership is not necessarily easy to do, but it serves as a normative ideal. For 21st century public administrators, we believe that not only is servant-leadership essential to re-engaging the citizens, it also is an unashamed enactment of our core values. We are always serving the big dream of democratic governance. Our job as public administrators is less about policy particulars, and even less about the internal workings of our organizations, and more about engaging citizens in the work of democracy.

Ultimately, adopting servant-leadership means transforming our individual behavior. It is within the power of each individual to bring about this change to servant-leadership. People bring about change, in Greenleaf's view, by having the courage to care, take risks, serve, and lead. It means letting go of the many dysfunctional beliefs and behaviors that we have accumulated over time: striving for power and authority, competition, lack of faith in people, and cynicism. In the end, it comes back to us. Will we choose to develop our capacity for servant-leadership? The great Yoda said: "do or do not. There is no try." As public servants, we are at the threshold of that choice.

References

Bandura, Albert (1977). *Social Learning Theory.* Englewood Cliffs: NJ: Prentice- Hall.

Block, Peter (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing Service Over Self-interest.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Buchannan, Bruce (1975). "Red Tape and The Service Ethic: Some Unexpected Differences Between Public and Private Managers." *Administration and Society*, 4, 423-44.

Cooper, Terry L. and Wright, N. Dale (Ed). (1992). *Exemplary Public Administrators: Character and Leadership in Government.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cooperrider, David L. and Suresh Srivastva, (1987). "Appreciative Inquiry in Organizational Life", *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, Vol. 1, 129-169. http://www.appreciative-inquiry.org/AI-Life.htm

DeGraaf, Donald G., Jordan, Debra J., and DeGraaf, Kathy H. (1999). *Programming for Parks, Recreation, and Leisure Services: A Servant-Leadership Approach.* State College, PA: Venture Publishing, Inc.

Downs, Anthony (1967). *Inside Bureaucracy.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Frederickson, H. George. (1996). "Comparing the Reinventing Government Movement with the New Public Administration." *Public Administration Review*, 56 (3), 263-270.

Frederickson, H. George and Hart, David K. (1985). "The Public Service and The Patriotism Of Benevolence." *Public Administration Review*, 45, 547-553.

Follett, Mary Parker, (1920). "The Individual in Society" in Graham, Pauline (ed.). 1996. *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of Management*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Follett, Mary Parker, (1925). "Power" in Graham, Pauline (ed.). 1996. *Mary Parker Follett: Prophet of Management*, Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Follett, Mary Parker, (1927). "Leader and Expert" in Fox, E.M. and L.F. Urwick, Eds. 1973. *Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett*, NY: Pitman Publishing.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1970). "Servant Leadership" in Spears, Larry C. (Ed). 1998. *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership*. NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1978). "The Leadership Crisis" in Spears, Larry C. (Ed). 1998. *The Power of Servant Leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1980). "Servant: Retrospect and Prospect" in Spears, Larry C. (Ed). 1998. *The Power of Servant-leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1988). "Education and Maturity" in Spears, Larry C. (Ed). 1998. *The Power of Servant-leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1996a). *Seeker and Servant*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1996b). *On Becoming a Servant Leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

King, Cheryl Simrell, Feltey, Kathryn M. and Susel, Bridget O'Neil. (1998). "The Question of Participation: Toward Authentic Public Participation in Public Administration." *Public Administration Review*, 58 (4), 317-326.

King, Cheryl Simrell and Camilla Stivers and Collaborators, 1998. *Government is Us: Public Administration in an Anti-Government Era*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Knoke, David and Wright-Isak, Christine. (1982). "Individual Motives and Organizational Incentive Systems. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 1, 209-254.

Johnson, Neal and Gail Johnson. (September 1996). "Leading by Listening: Barbara Roberts' Conversation with Oregon." *Government Executive*. http://www.govexec.com/archdoc/0996/0996s4s2.htm

Johnson, Gail. (1991). *Recruiting, Retaining, and Motivating the Federal Workforce*. Westport, Ct: Quorum Books.

Owen, Harrison, (1997). *Open Space Technology: A Users Guide*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Naff, Katherine and John Crum (1999). "Working for America: Does Public Service Motivation Make a Difference." *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19 (4), 5-16.

Perry, James L. (1996). "Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 6 (1), 5-22.

Perry, James L. and Wise, Lois R. (1990). "The Motivational Bases of Public Service." *Public Administration Review*, 50, 367-373.

Rainey, Hal G. (1982). "Reward Preferences Among Public And Private Managers: In Search of The Service Ethic." *American Review of Public Administration*, 16, 288-302.

Rawls, John A. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Romzek, Barbara S. (1990). "Employee Investment and Commitment: The Ties That Bind." *Public Administration Review, 50*, 374-382.

Rinehart, Stacy T. (1998). *Upside Down: The Paradox of Servant-Leadership*. Colorado Springs: NavPress Publishing Group.

Spears, Larry (Ed). (1995). *Reflections on Leadership*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Spears, Larry C. (Ed). (1998a). *Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardship, Spirit, and Servant-Leadership*. NY: John Wiley and Sons.

Spears, Larry C. (Ed). (1998b). *The Power of Servant-leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Spears, Larry and Brody, Deborah (1993). "First Among Equals: Servant Leadership." *Communities: Journal of Cooperative Living, 81*, 53-55.

Staats, Elmer B. (1988). "Public Service and the Public Interest." *Public Administration Review, 48*, 601-605.

Spears, Larry and Brody, Deborah (1993). "First Among Equals: Servant Leadership." *Communities: Journal of Cooperative Living, 81, 53-55.*

Staats, Elmer B. (1988). "Public Service and the Public Interest." *Public Administration Review, 48,* 601-605.

Stahl, Glenn O., (1990). "The Changing Public Service." *Public Administration Review,* 50(2), 205-206.

Staley, Michael F. (1995). Servant Leadership in the Fire Service: It's Never Lonely at the Top when You're Leading from the Bottom. *Fire Engineering,* 148(8), 30-32.

Sutton, Beverly. (1992). "What Am I Doing Leading This Parade? I Didn't Even Plan To March!" in *With A Servant Heart.* Birmingham, AL: Woman's Missionary Union, SBC, pp. 23-41.

Weisbord, Marvin R. and Sandra Janoff, (1995). *Future Search: An Action Guide to Finding Common Ground in Organizations and Communities.* San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Wilson, Woodrow, (1887). The Study of Administration in Shafritz, Jay M. and Albert C. Hyde, *Classics of Public Administration (4th edition),* NY: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, 1997.

Websites:

The Greenleaf Center for Servant-leadership, http://www.greenleaf.org

***

Gail Johnson is from Old Dominion University, College of Business and Public Administration, Norfolk, VA. **Mary Ann Feldheim** is from the University of Central Florida.

Spiritual Wisdom in the "New" Leadership

Cynthia E. Lynch and Thomas D. Lynch

Introduction

Servant leadership is important to public administration, but there is definite work that both the academic and practitioner can do to improve the existing literature and its related concepts. In the first section, we argue that the Information Age is creating new organizations in which servant leadership is particularly salient, as opposed to the traditional command and control leadership style of management. In the second section, we present the fundamentals of the servant leadership concept by contrasting it with other styles. In the third section, we point out that the spiritual wisdom literature, which has existed since humankind recorded their thoughts, served as the inspiration for the servant leadership concepts articulated by its founder. We conclude by stressing that there is room for improvement in the existing literature and pointing to a source to inspire our thoughts.

Changing Organizations Need "New Leadership"

In the fast paced world of the Information Age, there is no room for pyramid-like hierarchies in which the top leadership makes most of an organization's decisions. The traditional command and control organization of the past age required a very large, stable, and highly directed workforce. As the new millennium approached, horizontal and dispersed organizations, which use a much smaller and less stable workforce, began to exploit the new technologies of the Information Age. Robert Reich (1992) uses the analogy of the spider web to describe the various new organizational relationships with their nodes, and relationships spinning outward in all directions from the nodes.

Innovative organizations have changed their workforce structures to a 20/80 mix, with only twenty percent being conventional full time workers. Efficiency and flexibility require organizations to have a smaller permanent work staff, with task restructuring and reassignment being done with outsourcing, sub-contractors, and joint ventures. Eighty percent of an organization's workforce consists of independent contractors, outside suppliers, part-time employees, and self-employed professionals working under contract (Handy, 1996).

These web-like organizational relationships change the nature of jobs and work functions. Most repetitive tasks are now automated and computerized, altering the nature of the work and requiring more knowledge to operate complex machinery and technology successfully. Employees now must work with their heads and much less with their brawn and their hands (Shoop, 1994). Knowledge creation is the key to the survival of any organization (von Krogh, 1998). Web-like organizations render the older command and control leadership style obsolete (Handy, 1996). The older, more physical nature of work commonly permitted neatly separated job tasks with reasonably clear and specific descriptions, including categories that accommodated logical salary and wage classifications. Organizational designers could sort jobs into clusters called departments or units with each unit operating with its own mini-hierarchy and its own management structure.

Knowledge and knowledge workers are more difficult to divide up, categorize, and pigeonhole. Knowledge is not a matter of actions and activities but rather interactions among individuals and data. In the new millennium, organizations must adapt quickly to the emerging needs of society with its new technologies. As they adapt to these changes, organizational structure, including the related job descriptions, becomes less distinct.

Web-like organizations require lower-level employees to be more self or inner directed, including being more ethical, than was necessary in command and control organizations because lower-level employees make more critical decisions with limited guidance from higher levels of management. Employee job descriptions become so broad and vague that their existence itself is dysfunctional to the mission of the group. The logic of classification and salary grade becomes obsolete. Employees see their "jobs" as short lived and unstable, making their "job" an unnecessary element for defining their careers and their lives. Job skills become a portable asset, i. e., the job becomes primarily an opportunity to acquire additional experience, knowledge, competencies, and contacts, which themselves are what are important to acquiring future employment. Acquiring greater marketability in the workplace rather than establishing a lasting employee to employer relationship becomes central to one's comprehension of a meaningful "job."

These changing circumstances in organization relationships require a new kind of leadership. In a speech at Georgetown University in March 1994, Vice President Gore presented a speech titled -- "The New Job of the Federal Executive." Gore outlined the difference between the old and the new style (we argue later it is more than a style) of leadership needed in the federal government. Using Mark Abramson's book *The New Leadership: Taking Charge of Change* (cited in Shoop, 1994), Gore labeled it "The New Leadership." Figure One below presents the contrast between the command and control leadership and the "new leadership."

Figure One
Contrasting the New and the Old

COMMAND AND CONTROL LEADERSHIP	THE NEW LEADERSHIP
Leaders know best and they define the organization mission; but they are isolated from their workforce top executives.	Leadership involves all employees in a shared sense of mission and purpose.
Executives tell subordinates the needs of the organization.	Leaders ask subordinates what they need to get the job done.
Leaders restrict the staff to work within organizational boundaries.	Staff crosses boundaries using team tasking of assignments.
Because they do not trust their employees, leaders use rules to limit employee discretion.	Leaders empower employees and require them to be more self-motivated by showing their initiative within the existing statutory constraints.
Leaders normally seek to protect and enlarge their operations.	Leaders and subordinates define work as public service to "customers."
Organizational communication flows one level down and one level up.	Communication flows within and outside the organization in every direction.

Source: Shoop,1994:24. *Government Executive.*

Leadership is no longer vested in the executive. The mission and circumstances of the organization determine leadership. Leadership emerges out of the natural course of completing tasks. According to Reich (1992: 8), "Creative teams solve and identify problems in much the same way, whether they are developing new software,

dreaming up a market strategy . . ." or administering a public program. In the new age, leaders know that they cannot define in advance problems and solutions. Instead, they know that problems and solutions emerge out of frequent and informal conversations among team members.

Thus, coordination and communication are multidirectional, just as the spider's web. As Reich (1992: 85) notes, "Mutual learning occurs within the team as insights, experiences, puzzles, and solutions are shared." According to business consultants Kouzes and Posner, "In democratic societies, people do not talk about themselves as being subordinate to their leaders. Why should it be different in our offices and factories?" (Shoop, 1994: 24). Self-managed teams are the logical extension of "The New Leadership" because leadership is simply what people do where and whenever the organization needs them to take responsibility and give direction to others. This approach to organizations and leadership has the potential to bring full democracy to the workplace (Shoop, 1994).

Literature Review of "New Leadership"

This section reviews the literature of "New Leadership" by discussing its three accumulative phases: transactional, transformational, and servant. "Transformational" includes "transactional," and "servant leadership" includes "transactional" and "transformational." The Information Age is fast changing our technological capabilities. Many administrators see only chaos in their struggle to keep up rather than seeing an enhanced means to defined objectives and goals. A front line administrator in this age must be able to align departmental mission and assignments consistent with the larger mission of their organization and carry out their tasks not as a traditional boss or supervisor but rather as a mentor, guide, and sometimes a sage (Reich, 1992). The current leadership literature describes three types of leadership.

Transactional

In his book *Leadership*, Burns (1978) describes transactional leadership as an exchange between leader and follower. Bass (1985) takes this concept further by noting that the exchange exists when the followers receive certain valued outcomes or rewards when they act according to their leader's wishes. The Bass view is similar to Kolberg's (1974) pre-conventional stage of moral development in that these less moral developed persons define a relationship as merely a mutually beneficial exchange without awareness of its implications to others, including the larger system that they are a part.

The general notion of transactional leadership theories is that when the job or the work environment fails the follower, the behavior of the leader will compensate for the deficiencies through an ability to motivate and guide (Den Hartog, Muijen and Koopman, 1997). The leader defines the criteria for the exchange, including what the leader expects of the subordinate and what the subordinate will give in the exchange with the leader (House, Woycke and Fodor, 1988).

Transactional leadership has three dimensions (Bass, 1990). The first is contingent reinforcement or contingent reward. The leader rewards the follower for achieving the specified performance standard. The reward to the follower is contingent on the follower both expending the necessary effort to accomplish the work and achieving the desired performance from the work (Den Hartog, Muijen and Koopman, 1997).

The second and third dimensions of transactional leadership are two types of leadership-by-exception. In this management style, a leader only takes action when things go wrong and standards are not met. (Hater and Bass, 1988; Bass and Avolio, 1989; Den Hartog, Muijen and Koopman, 1997). There are two ways to practice management-by-exception. The *passive* form characterizes a leader who only takes action after irregularities occurred and a definite problem has materialized. The *active* form actively seeks deviations from standard

procedures and takes action before there is a problem (Hater and Bass, 1988). Scholars have tested these transactional theories extensively (Indvik, 1986; House, 1971; and House and Mitchell, 1974).

Transformational

While transactional leadership motivates subordinates to do the expected, the transformational leader inspires followers to do more than the expected. Transformational leaders expand and elevate the interests of followers, generate awareness and acceptance of the group's purpose among followers, and motivate followers to go beyond their self-interest for the good of the group (Burns, 1978; Yammarino and Bass, 1990, Den Hartog, Muijen and Koopman, 1997). Again, there is a parallel with Kohlberg's (1976) Stages of Moral Development. As you move from the pre-conventional to the conventional, the morally more developed person sees himself or herself in terms of the system of which he or she is but a part, and acts accordingly. In the transformational level of leadership, the leader is able to move the follower into the conventional manner of moral thinking and behaving with his or her qualities of leadership.

Transformational leadership theories assume a causal relationship exists between the behavior of the leader and the motivations of the followers. For example, one of these theories says followers change their motivation as a direct result of their emotional attachment to the leader, which the leader's behavior directly creates (House, et. al., 1988; Hater and Bass, 1988; Yammarino and Bass, 1990: Den Hartog, Muijen, and Koopman, 1997). The nature and style of leadership ultimately affects the entire organization by transforming its climate (Tichy and Devanna, 1990).

Four dimensions characterize transformational leadership (Bass, 1985). The first is charisma. The charismatic leader has vision and a sense of mission. He or she instills in their followers a sense of pride, respect, and trust. An important characteristic of a charismatic leader is that he or she arouses deep feelings in the followers, which significantly inspires them to action (Bass and Avolio, 1989; Yammarino and Bass, 1990).

The second dimension of transformational leadership is inspiration. This dimension represents the capacity of the leader to act as a model for behavior and to communicate his or her ideas, often using symbols to focus the effort of the followers. This means of motivation differs from charisma because it does not require an emotional identification with the leader (Den Hartog, Muijen, Koopman, 1997; Behling and McFillen, 1996).

The third dimension of transformational leadership is individual consideration. While charisma may attract and motivate followers to a vision or mission, individual consideration of a leader to followers helps them achieve their fullest potential. Through continuous individual consideration, feedback occurs between the leader and the followers that forges a deep bond that can include achieving the organization's purpose (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1989; Yammarino and Bass, 1990; Bryman, 1992; Den Hartog, Muijen and Koopman, 1997).

The final characteristic of transformational leadership is intellectual stimulation. This provides subordinates a flow of challenging new ideas that cause the old ways of doing things to be re-thought by the followers. Intellectual stimulation arouses awareness for problem identification and recognition of personal beliefs and values, which instills thought and creativity functional for the entire organization (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1990; Yammarino and Bass, 1990; Den Hartog, Muijen and Koopman, 1997).

Servant Leadership

The concept of servant leadership began appearing in the 1970s with the publication of two books by Robert Greenleaf (1977, 1979). In the 1990s Greenleaf was rediscovered and leadership authors from Warren Bennis and Jim Kouzes, to management authorities like Peter Drucker, and to popular inspirational writers like Scott Peck and Steven Covey, explicitly or implicitly discuss the principles of servant leadership in their influential

writings (Spears, 1998). The ideas of Robert K. Greenleaf (1977, 1979, 1997) make up the center of the literature on servant leadership.

Greenleaf's servant leaders focus their actions on improving human, social, psychological, moral, and physical conditions. Their goal is to help others become whole, healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous and more likely to become servant leaders themselves. Spears (1998) argues that ten characteristics define a servant leader. They are presented in Figure Two.

Figure Two
Characteristics of Servant Leadership

VIRTUE	CHARACTERISTIC
Listening	The servant leader reinforces traditional communication skills with a focus on active listening and reflection on what others have to say in order to identify and clarify the will of the group.
Empathy	Servant leaders try to recognize and accept others for their unique gifts and qualities. They assume the good intentions of others' actions and strive to understand and empathize with them.
Healing	Part of the role of the servant leader is to recognize the opportunities to help make the people and organizations they are in contact with whole. The servant leader is a powerful transforming force.
Persuasion	The servant leader seeks to convince others rather than use their position of authority to coerce compliance. They are consensus builders.
Awareness	Awareness aids the servant leader in understanding issues involving ethics and values. With a heightened sense of awareness one is better able to approach situations in a more integrated and holistic way.
Foresight	The servant leader consciously works at developing the intuitive mind. The ability to project a likely outcome or consequence from a decision or action enables the servant leader to understand lessons from of the past, the realities of the present, and to foresee the range of likely events in the future.
Conceptualization	The servant leader nurtures their abilities to think in possibilities. They go beyond the day-to-day management realities of what "is" and try to imagine what "could be."
Commitment to Growth of Others	For the servant leader, life has value and meaning beyond the tangible contributions that people make as workers. Servant leaders are deeply committed to the personal, professional, and spiritual growth of everyone within their organization.
Stewardship	According to Greenleaf's view of organizations, all members, from the executive to the office staff, play a role in holding the organization "in trust" for the greater good of the society. It is everyone's responsibility to be a good steward.
Building Community	Servant leaders seek to build a sense of community among those within the organization.

Source: Larry Spears, 1998, 3.

Servant leadership embodies the characteristics of transactional leadership, but goes beyond those characteristics. For example, in servant leadership as advocated you also see followers participate in an exchange with the servant leader through their active listening, healing, and commitment to the growth of

others. However, servant leadership is more than a style of leadership. The servant leader has, and creates to some extent in others, a mind set which the leader lives at his or her own core of being rather than simply putting on a style in particular situations. Servant leadership is a fundamental change in the leader's values and how he or she lives his or her life. A style of leadership implies a person employs and puts on a particular formula or pattern of behavior for certain kind of occasions, but being a servant leader goes well beyond such a superficial approach to organizational life.

Servant leaders are transformational in that they arouse deep feelings in their followers through the leader's heightened awareness and empathy. Servant leaders inspire and intellectually stimulate followers by their conceptualization and foresight skills. They demonstrate individual consideration through expressions of empathy and awareness. These characteristics extend and permeate all aspects of the servant leader's life. They are their ingrained behavior responses to life, not just to work.

Servant leadership is similar to Kohlberg's (1976) post conventional moral development stage because of its principled living and decision-making. It goes beyond transformational leadership by expanding the conscious awareness of the importance of individual personal growth. It also expands consciousness with its imperative on building holistic moral communities with vision and possibility. Greenleaf's concept of leadership applies to community leadership, personal growth, and institutional philosophy, calling organizations back to a fundamental mission of service. This new area of leadership theory currently lacks a developed, substantial body of knowledge, but the academic and professional community may remedy that problem in time.

Nothing Is New: The Wisdom Literature

Robert K. Greenleaf was a Quaker, but also an admitted backslider of the Religious Society of Friends (Greenleaf, 1996:290). Nevertheless, his work clearly shows a Quaker spiritual orientation, as a reader can easily identify many themes in Greenleaf's thoughts from the spiritual wisdom literature of the current five most significant religious traditions in the world today. To make that point, we develop the following four themes in this section of the paper:

> ➢ Greenleaf (1990:9) tells us that a leader needs to create inner strength. In the spiritual wisdom literature of the ages, "inner strength" corresponds to the inner being an aspect of the "kingdom of God."

> ➢ For a leader to exhibit "inner strength," he or she must have a "right aim" (1990:27). In the spiritual wisdom literature, this is best articulated as the Buddhist eight-fold path and the Middle Way.

> ➢ To Greenleaf (1990:34) inner strength is a gift, but he does not state the source of that gift. Spiritual wisdom tells us that it is a gift from God.

> ➢ Greenleaf (1990:34) tells us the gift is simply there as we experience and observe our life, as long as we are willing to accept it. Spiritual wisdom literature also tells us that the gift is only for those who listen, avoid quick judgments, and increase their knowledge.

Greenleaf was a seeker of inner strength, and he addressed how to develop that inner strength (Frick and Spears, 1996). Developing inner strength is a major theme of the common spiritual wisdom literature in at least the current five major religious traditions in the world. For example, Luke 17: 20-21 says, "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees when the kingdom of God should come, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say, Lo here! or lo there! For behold, the kingdom of God is within you." In part, the kingdom of God is a process that must originate within each person. But to be complete, each person through his or her good actions must also manifest the gift of "inner strength."

Greenleaf takes the concept of kingdom of God, which is an ideal construct of the human mind as presented through out the spiritual wisdom literature, and calls it "inner strength." In Eastern thought, the Dhammapada (Lynch and Lynch, 1998:22) expresses the notion of "inner strength" this way, "If one practices equanimity even if adorned, if one is peaceful, restrained, disciplined, and chaste, that is the one who is priestly, the one who is religious, the one who is a mendicant." In other words, anyone can live the kingdom of God if that is his or her choice.

Greenleaf (1990:27) viewed the individual ethical dilemma of the leader as the need for strength, meaning "the ability to see enough choices of aim, to choose the *right aim*, and to pursue that aim responsibly over a long period of time." Greenleaf felt that *right aim* meant deciding what is right for a particular individual in a particular situation. His view was not as well developed as the Noble Eight fold Path of Buddha, but the parallel is clear. That eight fold path is right view, right thought, right speech, right action, right livelihood, right effort, right mindfulness, and right concentration.

Greenleaf expressed his concept as strength. According to the first sermon of the Buddha, this is the Middle Path, which gives vision, knowledge, calm, insight, and enlightenment. According to the Buddha, it helps the seeker to eventually reach Nirvana (Lynch and Lynch, 1998: 90). Like Greenleaf, the spiritual wisdom literature tells us that achieving this "inner strength" is not easy for anyone. It requires your active free choice to go down that path.

"Inner Strength," according to Greenleaf (1990:34) is not so much found through a determined searching, but is a gift that any willing person can receive. The search for Greenleaf is for self-knowledge, and the act of searching is as important as the discovery. Isaiah 55:3 says, "Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you." Although we search for "inner strength," it is a gift given to us as we move along the path of life. In addition, Greenleaf's words echo the poetry of the Koran when it says, "Do not be quick to cite the Koran before its revelation is completed, but rather say: 'Lord, increase my knowledge' " (cited in Lynch and Lynch, 1998:19).

How is this "inner strength" found? According to Greenleaf (1990:38), "Simply practice being aware. Look, and be still. Feel, and be still. Listen, and be still. Give the practice of awareness time, and time when you are alone." Part of the Greenleaf (1990:34) message is a call to become authentically human and not settle to remain in the animal consciousness, which we can easily do. The Gospel of Thomas quotes Jesus as follows: "Fortunate is the lion that the human will eat, so the lion becomes human. And foul is the human that the lion will eat, and the lion will become human" (Lynch and Lynch, 1998:32). Only the human intellect and reason through the spiritual heart can transcend these lower animals instincts. Psalms 73:22 says, "So foolish was I, and ignorant: I was as a beast before thee."

"Inner Strength" is available to all of us daily, but the responsibility remains within each of us individually to seek it, find it, practice it, and perfect it. Luke 8:17 says, "For there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; neither hid, that shall not be known." In a parallel quote, the Koran says, "Then say: 'Praise be to God! He will show you his signs and you will recognize them. Your Lord is never heedless of what you do' " (quoted in Lynch and Lynch, 1998:25).

The point of this section is to make two observations. First, Greenleaf reflects the spiritual wisdom literature of all the major world religious traditions. Second, his reflections are insightful, but are not as rich or properly reflective of the depth of the original spiritual wisdom literature. How Greenleaf came to his spiritual wisdom is not clear, but his spiritual depth is obvious. Thus, in spite of his corporate mantle, that gave him the respect of the American business community, his words reflect the wisdom of the ages. However, like a copy of a copy, the final copied version does not have the depth and clarity of the original message. Nevertheless, the Greenleaf literature and that of his followers does help us better understand the proper role of the servant-leader in a society, and thus does deserve our respect and admiration.

The 1990's advocates of servant leadership treat servant leadership as a *style* that a good trainer can instill in an elite body of leaders. This training focus on organization leadership elite improperly suggests that a separateness and exclusivity applies to servant leadership. Servant leadership should apply to the elite in an organization, but it also should apply to everyone in the organization, especially informal leaders. Associating Greenleaf with the elite improperly implies that such a group is more qualified or able to hold things of "value" in trust for everyone else. This immediately creates a power "we versus them" relationship that suggests that others are incapable or unworthy, which we find completely opposite to the real concept of service found in the spiritual wisdom literature. By adopting an elite perspective on leadership training, the Greenleaf "disciples" act antithetically to developing leaders who can be truly selfless as advocated by Greenleaf himself. As discussed in the spiritual wisdom literature, true selflessness requires abandoning the very concept of elite and viewing everyone as part of the larger oneness that we each define in terms of humankind and the universe (Lynch and Lynch, 1998).

Another problem with reducing Greenleaf's concept of spiritual wisdom to a *style* is the inference or implication that only ten characteristics can represent it. Like the spiritual wisdom literature that inspired Greenleaf, he noted that any list of leadership virtues was infinite in length, but his contemporary advocates imply by citing the character virtues listed in Figure Two that the list is finite. A common theme in the spiritual wisdom literature is that humankind tends to want to make finite the infinite nature of the universe (Lynch and Lynch, 1998). Instead, we need to recognize that the concept of the infinite permits us to recognize that there are features of ideal construct called servant leadership that we can describe, but its application is infinite in its variations. There is no one list or one set of virtues for all situations, but there is an ideal construct called servant leadership that human intelligence can understand and can use in organizations.

Conclusions

We argue that the servant leadership literature is a step forward in our joint understanding of leadership in both the public and private sectors. Clearly, as we move increasingly into the Information Age, the servant leader ideal construct is quite useful in organizations because often it is superior to other notions of leadership. However, we must not limit Greenleaf's contribution to only leadership in the formal sense in our organizations, because the concepts also apply to informal leaders and followers within our organizations. The spiritual wisdom literature tells us that all who are seekers need to develop their "inner strength," regardless of their organizational status (Lynch and Lynch, 1998).

The spiritual wisdom literature helps us realize that in public administration, as in life itself, that we must think on the macro and micro scales at the same time. All people in all aspects of life need to be servant leaders, regardless of their position in organizations, as the servant leader ideal construct is an important ideal for all of us. In addition, practitioners and academics alike can significantly enrich the servant leadership literature by going directly to the spiritual wisdom literature for inspiration. Important concepts behind Greenleaf's articulation get lost in trying to boil down his ideas to training modules. Thus, as we expand the depth of knowledge from the contributions of Greenleaf, we are wiser to go to the original source of his inspiration as we build and improve on the servant leader literature.

In our post-modern and secular world, many find offense in a literature grounded in scripture writings. In our minds, there is a significant difference between religious and spiritual writings, but we recognize that many others do not share our understanding. We merely say that the spiritual wisdom literature, which is faith based, does provide academics and professionals with remarkable insight not found in conventional or religious literature. One need only read Aristotle's writing on ethics to appreciate how spiritual wisdom inspired that great philosopher. If persons find the contemporary religious Holy Scriptures not acceptable sources of knowledge, then we recommend reading Hermetica, edited and translated by Walter Scott (first published in the second century and later in 1993) and written by Hermes Trismegistus. The spiritual wisdom literature is not limited to

one religion, one culture, or one era in world history, but represents the continuum of human aspiration and existence.

References

Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.

Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications*, 3rd ed. New York, Free Press.

Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1989). *Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologist Press.

Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1990). "The Implications of Transactional and Transformational Leadership for Individual, Team, and Organizational Development." *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4, 231 - 272.

Behling, Orlando and James M. McFillen (June 1966). "A Syncretical Model of Charismatic / Transformational Leadership." *Group and Organization Management,* 21(2), 163 - 192.

Bryman, A. (1992). *Charisma and Leadership in Organizations*. London: Sage.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

Den Hartog, Deanne N., Jaap J. Van Muijen and Paul L. Koopman. (March 1997). "Transactional Versus Transformational Leadership: An Analysis of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire." *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* 70(1), 19 - 37.

Frick, Don M. and Larry C. Spears (1996). *On Becoming a Servant Leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greenleaf, Robert (1997). *Seeker and Servant*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greenleaf, Robert (1977). *Servant Leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, Robert (1977). *Teacher as Servant*. New York: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, Robert (1996). *On becoming a Servant Leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Greenlead, Robert (1990). *Trustees as Servants*. Indianapolis: the Greenleaf Center.

Handy, Charles (1996). "The New Language of Organizing and its Implications for Leaders" In Frances Hesselbein, Marshell Goldsmith, and Richard Beckhard (Eds.), *The Leader of the Future: The Drucker Foundation Series*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hater, J. J. and Bass, B. M. (1988). "Superiors' Evaluations and Subordinates' Perceptions of Transformational and Transactional Leadership." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73, 695 - 702.

Hermes Trismegistus (first published in the second century and later in 1993). *Hermetica*. Edited and translated by Walter Scott. Boston: Shambhala.

House, R. J. and T. R. Mitchell. "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership." *Journal of Contemporary Business*, 5, 81 - 94.

House, R. J., Woycke, J. and Fodor, E. M. (1988). "Charismatic and Noncharismatic Leaders: Differences in Behavior and Effectiveness." In J. A. Conger and R. N. Kanungo (Eds.), *Charismatic Leadership: The Elusive Factor In Organizational Effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

House, R. J. (1971). "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership Effectiveness." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 16, 321 - 338.

Indvik, J. (1986). "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership: A Meta-Analysis." *Proceedings*. Chicago, IL: Academy of Management.

Kohlberg, Lawrence, (1976). "Moral Stages and Moralization: The Cognitive Development Approach." In *Moral Development and Behavior Theory Research and Social Issues*. Thomas Lickona (ed). N.Y.: Holt Rinhard and Winston.

Lynch, Thomas D. and Cynthia E. Lynch (1998). *Word of the Light*. Seattle, Washington: Hara Publishing.

Reich, Robert (1992). *The Work of Nations*. New York: Vintage Books.

Shoop, Tom (July 1994). "Brave New Leadership." *Government Executive*, 26(7), 23 -30.

Spears, Larry (1998). *Insights on Leadership*. New York: John Wiley.

Tichy, N M. and Devanna, M. A. (1990). *The Transformational Leader*, revised edition. (1st edition, 1986). New York: Wiley.

Von Krogh, Georg (1998). "Care in Knowledge Creation." *California Management Review*, 40(3), 133 - 154.

Yammarino, F. J. and Bass, B. M. (1990). "Long-term Forecasting of Transformational Leadership and Its Effects Among Naval Officers: Some Preliminary Findings." In K. E. Clark and M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership*, West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.

***

Cynthia E. Lynch is a Ph.D. student at Southern University and **Thomas D. Lynch** is a professor of public administration at Louisiana State University.

Servant Leaders in Public Service: Christian Spirituality in Practice

Willa Bruce

A deep vein of Christian spirituality runs throughout the practice of servant leadership in public service, for at the heart of both is a strong belief in caring for others. Christianity is not the only source for understanding servant leadership. Other religious traditions can be seen in it as well. This paper, however, is focused only on Christian implications and understandings.

In his book, *Servant Leadership*, Greenleaf (1977) describes servant leaders as people who are

> a saving remnant of those who care for both persons and institutions, and who are determined to make their caring count—*wherever they are involved.* This brings them, as individuals, constantly to examine the assumptions they live by (p. 330).

In this passage Greenleaf portrays servant leaders as spiritual people who are living out the Christian commandments to "love one another" (John 13:35) and "be kind to one another" (Ephesians 4:32). Greenleaf depicts servant leaders as people who follow Jesus' request that they "let the greatest among you be as the youngest, and the leader as the servant" (Luke 22:26). Such advice flies in the face of conventional leadership theory. It is the antithesis of today's cultural norms that seem to define success as "what one gets" rather than by "who one is."

To examine the relevance of Christian spirituality to servant leadership, data from a 1998 survey of a random sample of members of the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) are utilized. The next section of this paper reports on the current interest in spirituality. Christian spirituality is described and the history of thinking about servants is summarized. A description of conditions in today's public sector workplace that shows the need for servant leadership is provided. Then a brief description of the ASPA member survey is presented and relevant results discussed. The paper concludes with a summary and implications for future research.

Current Interest in Spirituality

Americans in this millennium era are mightily interested in spirituality. A recent Gallup Poll found that 95 percent of Americans believe in some form of higher power, and more than ever are feeling the need for spiritual help (Eyre, 1997). A *Self* magazine survey found that, of the nearly 2,100 respondents, 70 percent described themselves as "spiritual" and an additional 27 percent referred to themselves as "somewhat spiritual." A great number of web sites are devoted to the issue of spirituality and work, as well. On June 10, 1999, the web search engine, "Altavista," identified 527,730 web pages devoted to "spirituality." By July 2 that number had increased to 616,840.

Christian web sites are even more numerous. On July 2, 1999, 618,440 web sites addressed the topic of "Christian." Christian people today are reporting that they feel a sense of "call" to the work they are doing. In 1994, 46 percent of those who attend church regularly said they consider themselves "called" to their work, as did 40 percent of church members (Wuthnow, 1994, p. 69). The idea of work as calling has been explained by Robert Bellah (1985, p.66):

> In the strongest sense of a calling, work constitutes a practical ideal of activity and character that makes a person's work morally inseparable from his or her life. It subsumes the self into a community of disciplined practice and sound judgment whose activity has meaning and value in itself, not just in the output or profit that results from it. But the calling not only links a person to his or her fellow workers. A calling links a person to the larger community, a whole in which the calling of each is a contribution to the good of all.

Spirituality is an awareness of one's interconnectivity with the divine, humankind, and all of creation, and a perception that one is "called" to love and to serve as one searches for meaning in diverse life events. *Religion*, on the other hand, has been defined as "an explanation of the ultimate meaning of life and how to live accordingly." It typically includes a creed, a code of behavior, a cult with ritualistic activities, a community and organizational structure, a sense of the "Transcendent," and a spiritual prodigy such as the Buddha, Moses, or Jesus. (Swidler, 1997, pp. 1-2).

Thus, a great number of Christians in the workplace think of themselves as "spiritual" and about half of them believe they have been "called" to their work. Greenleaf (1977, p. 329) writes that "servant leaders differ from other persons of goodwill because they act on what they believe." In Christian spiritual lore such action is thought to be a response to a "Call." The next section explains Christian spirituality.

Christian Spirituality

Christian Spirituality can be described in a variety of ways. Spirituality is the often unexpected surge of energy aroused from the deepest core of an individual that seems to be pushing one in a particular direction, or encouraging a set of actions that bring good outcomes, termed "gifts of the spirit" (Galatians 5:22). Spirituality has been described as "the way we orient ourselves toward the divine" (Pierce, 1991, p. 16) and "that which gives meaning to life" (Puchalski, 1999).

Many non-Christian writers on spirituality see it as "an individual search for meaning, purpose and values which may or may not include the concept of a God or transcendent being" (Sheridan et al, 1992). Christians, however, believe that spirituality includes relationship with a transcendent and loving God. They also generally believe that their relationship "calls" them to "live their faith in the world" (West, 1997, p. 35).

The deep vein of Christian spirituality that runs through servant leadership is not a kind of religion, however. People often confuse the terms "spirituality" and "religion." They are similar, but not the same; and the differences are important as we explore Christian spirituality in servant leadership. Spirituality includes a search for ultimate meaning in life events, and religion provides an explanation. Spirituality is personal; religion is institutional.

Christianity is, of course, a religion. Christian spirituality is not. Christian spirituality describes a personal response to that unexpected source of internal energy that is called *Spirit*. The more aware Christians become of that presence, the more they feel called to deepening their understanding and knowledge of it. The more they want to strive for

> integration and wholeness through a connectivity with all of creation – what many Christians

call the "Communion of Saints." This connectivity is what brings peace, joy, and deep satisfaction. It does not bring control over life's events, nor over other people. It is a striving to let go of control and take on openness and compassion (Bruce and Plocha, 1999).

Spiritual persons in the workplace can often be identified by their actions, for they have been described as:

> visionaries with their feet on the ground. They celebrate the oneness of everything, yet at the same time they are able to focus on details. They look at a mountain peak and a spreadsheet with the same eyes. They treat the janitor and their biggest client with the same attitude" (Hendricks and Ludeman, 1996, p. xxi).

Christian spirituality, simply put, is an awareness that we live in the presence of a God who calls us to holiness and service. Spiritual persons, however, are as human as everyone else. They are far from perfect. Good and bad things happen to them just like random events happen to everyone. A Christian's spirituality helps that person find meaning and gives the individual courage in difficult times. Because of this spiritual attitude a spiritual Christian is often able to transform troublesome situations into edifying, life-changing experiences that serve as witness to co-workers.

And ironically, as spiritual persons encounter difficulty after difficulty, they not only do not crack, they become stronger. Perhaps that is because spirituality arises from an internal well-spring of joy. It is not a perspective that arises from anger, compulsion, frustration, competitiveness, fear and control (Bruce and Plocha, 1999).

In *Artful Work*, Richards (1995) argues that all work is spiritual work, for, as we consistently and consciously invest ourselves in work, we both create and are created. Christian spirituality is about using the gifts one has in that endeavor. The New Testament teaches that *"As each one has received a gift, use it to serve one another as good stewards of God's varied grace"* (I Peter 4:10). In other words, the New Testament calls Christians to use their talents and abilities to be servants. In these United States, that is counter-cultural. The next section discusses what it means to be a servant and gives an historical perspective that explains why being a servant leader seems to be a radical departure from conventional thought.

Servants

The word "servant" is defined in Webster's dictionary as "one who works for another." It is also a legal term describing the employment relationship of "Master-servant." Historically, the word "servant" had strongly negative connotations, for the relationship it defines is one in which one person (the servant) gives up rights to a master who not only has power over the servant in most areas of life, but has "no duty to act fairly."

The legal right of employers to control employees was evident in medieval times in feudal England. Prior to the 1215 signing of the Magna Charta, the people who lived and worked on the king's property were, by law, the king's chattels -- personal possessions, to do with as the king chose. The Magna Charta constrained the king's control, first of the Lords, then of common persons. By the time of the industrial revolution, the common people's status had improved. They were no longer chattels of the king, but, during working hours, they were by law, "servants," who were effectively controlled by the "master" of the workplace.

In the early days of this country, indentured servants were only slightly above slaves. The main difference seems to be that one was a servant for a limited, agreed upon period of time, while a slave was a slave for life, bought and sold at the whim of a master. Servants did not have the same rights as their masters -- only the free landholders could vote and hold office. A servant was dependent, humbled, and a person whose lot was not to be envied. A servant was never on an equal footing with those being served. Being a personal servant was not a desirable position.

Prior to the mid-nineteenth century, the culture of production was one of self-employed craftsman, farmers, and the servants or slaves who worked for them. "As late as 1850, perhaps nine in ten white male citizens worked for themselves as farmers, merchants, or craftsmen. Even 'manufacturers', as the census labeled them, averaged only three to four workers each" (Jacques, 1996, p. 25). There were no "employers" as we think of them today. There were those with servants and those with slaves.

With the advent of industrialization, large, mechanized workplaces became the source of production. Many former craftsmen and farmers, along with their servants, became workers in large factories. Those in charge of that workplace were not advised to be "servant leaders." Rather, a 1909 book called *Social Engineering* (Tolman, 1909) told managers to get and retain power. "Do not bend when you can demand. Do not say 'trust me' when you can insist. Do not ask for loyalty when you can require subordination" (Briskin, 1996, p. 107). This mindset fostered a struggle between the tyranny of workplace bosses and the personhood of the workers. Workplaces were places of violence (Jacques, 1977), which have been called "hell" (Briskin, 1996, p. 20).

Today, the master-servant relationship has evolved to one of "employer-employee" and the phenomenon of unfettered power and control has become a "right to control." Today's workplace

> has an obsession with speed, is infused with surveillance, controls all behaviors, and distorts emotions. The shadow of a fantasized perfect workplace is the curtailment of all individual fantasy, where individuals must make themselves over into mechanisms of production. (Briskin, 1996, p. 120).

The obvious brute force has been tempered into subtlety, where social chasms and workplace control are enhanced by polite words and superficial attentiveness. This is the workplace into which servant leaders are called. Their challenges fly in the face of convention, for they are asked to relinquish their right to control and to offer, instead, an unvarnished willingness to serve.

The implications of being a "personal servant," however, are still not desirable to most. Historically, a servant was one who made no personal decisions, but remained at the beck and call of others to whom one had some kind of forced allegiance. A servant is not thought of as free, but in a relationship of bondage, in which the servant is somehow lesser than the person served, and is powerless to change that relationship.

In Christian tradition, however, all persons have worth and dignity that emanates from their souls—who they are, not what they have or the roles they play. Qualities typically associated with the soul are "meaning, memory, beauty, fragility, divinity, wildness, union (Briskin, 1996, p. xiv). In the traditional master-servant relationship, those qualities were mostly thought to exist only in the master, if at all.

Servant leadership, like Christian spirituality, is counter-cultural; for the servant leader must see all persons in the workplace as also possessing the worth and dignity to lead and to serve. Holding that vision is difficult, as can be seen in the next section.

Today's Public Sector Workplace

The workplace at the end of the twentieth century is not always a pleasant place to work. According to Bureau of Justice Statistics collected between 1987 and 1992 and published in 1997, almost one million reported crimes occur in the workplace each year. Women are disproportionately victimized. Forty percent of women who die from a job related injury die of murder (Littler, 1994, p. 5), and 58 percent of the nonfatal assaults are inflicted upon women (US Bureau of Labor Standards, "Study on Injuries," 1997).

Violence in the public workplace is more prevalent than in the private sector. Although government workers are only about 18 percent of the total United States workforce, they constitute 30 percent of all workplace victims of physical violence (U.S. Dept of Justice, 1997). Public employees receive only 10 percent of the fatal occupational injuries, however, so are not as likely to get killed at work as are their private sector counterparts (U.S. Bureau of Labor Standards, "Safety and Health Statistics," 1997).

Many blame public employees for social and economic problems completely beyond their control. The tension between public attitudes demeaning government while at the same time being dependent on it has been called "an intimate, perhaps suicidal, wilding dance between leaders and voters" (Derber, 1996, p. 120). Since public employees are the representatives of government to the ordinary citizen, they are powerfully affected by the "wilding dance."

The public employee union, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), has pointed out that "public sector employees, especially those who deliver social services in this era of fiscal restraint, are quite vulnerable to outbursts of anger." This vulnerability is due, in part, to the fact that "more depressed, unstable, and desperate people are waiting in longer lines to talk to fewer workers who have less time to dispense dwindling services and reduced benefits" (Denenberg, 1996, p. 10).

In addition, some public employees are doing violence to one another. Between 1983 and 1993, for example, "ten postal employees went on homicidal rampages, murdering thirty-four supervisors and co-workers" (Hornstein, 1996, p! 81). Hornstein believes that the work itself is not capable of generating such violence. Based on interviews with postal employees, he suggests that it is the way that post office work is managed that "caused such horrific explosions."

The reported acts of workplace violence are atrocious and appalling. Just as tragic, however, are the insidious acts of covert personal violence that occur when one person threatens, manipulates, harasses, or otherwise causes psychological or emotional damage to another. These acts do not get reported in any centralized place, yet evidence exists to suggest that they are widespread.

A striking difference exists between the nineteenth century workplace and that of today. In the 1800s supervisors maintained their power with real or threatened physical violence. Today's supervisors often use psychological or systemic violence. An estimated 90 percent of workers will suffer "boss abuse" at some point in their career, and as many as one out of five workers report to bosses from whom they expect harmful mistreatment (Hornstein, 1996, p. xiii).

Servant leaders are urgently needed in this workplace. They are being challenged to create a haven that contains "more justice, dignity, service, trustworthiness, and love" (Marcic, 1997, pp. 113.) They are being challenged to bring about "systemic changes in values and spirit... and love" (Marcic, 1997, p. 114).

The wisdom of Christian spirituality calls for honesty, service, and care; instead of selfishness, violence, and strife. In the words of early labor activist, Dorothy Day, "The greatest challenge of the day is to bring about a revolution of the heart, a revolution which has to start with each one of us" (Schmidt, 1995, p. i). Greenleaf (1977) offers servant leadership as a response to that challenge when he says, "This is my thesis: caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is the rock upon which a good society is built" (p.49).

Is such love and caring possible within the public service? Are people employed there interested in and able to care for one another as a part of their daily work? Survey research of a random sample of members of the American Society for Public Administration indicates some cause for optimism.

Research

My study of spirituality in the government workplace was conducted in the spring of 1998. The data were collected using a survey developed from a review of the literature on spirituality and work, and a review of four questionnaires used by researchers in other professions. The survey was mailed to 1,044 randomly selected ASPA members, which represents 10 percent of the membership at the time the mailing list was generated. Usable responses were received from 391 ASPA members (64 percent male, 36 percent female) for a response rate of 37.5 percent. Within the first week after mailing, over 100 questionnaires had been returned, and within three weeks 391 had been returned.

The survey instrument contained 77 questions. It began with the following statements:

> *For purposes of this questionnaire, I have defined spirituality and religion as follows:*
> **Spirituality** *is the experientially based belief in a transcendent dimension to life which has inspired a personal search for meaning and values, a sense of vocation, awe and wonder, altruism, and commitment to bettering the world.*
> **Religion** *refers to formal institutional contexts for spiritual beliefs and practices.*
> ****There are no right or wrong answers in this survey.****

The survey asked for identification of personal ideological positions people take in relation to religion and spiritual issues, plus demographic information. Answers to ideological questions were located on a 6 point Likert scale (very strongly agree, strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, very strongly disagree).

Findings

Of the 391 ASPA members who responded to the survey, sixty-four percent are male. The typical respondent is age 41-50, white, Protestant, has a master's degree, and has been in the current position from 1 to 5 years. Respondents' ages are normally distributed and the largest proportion (32 percent) describes themselves as "professional staff;" an additional twelve percent are "academics," 14 percent are "department heads," and 22 percent are "executives." Eighty-six percent are Christian; and 52 percent believe "There is a God who is involved in our lives, calling us to serve and love."

The data were examined with 3 questions in mind:

1. **Do public employees feel a sense of "call" to their work?**
2. **Do public employees have qualities necessary for servant leadership?**
3. **Are public sector working conditions conducive to servant leadership?**

A Sense of Calling

The results of this research suggest a deep interest in the subject of spirituality and work, and they enrich our understanding about the public sector workplace. To determine if public employees experience a sense of "call" to their work, three questionnaire items were identified. The first asked respondents to choose their own ideological position in relation to religion and spiritual issues. The next asked if their spirituality was an influential force that guided them toward a career in public service; and the third asked them in they "feel called to a career in public service."

Fifty-two percent of respondents believe that there is a God calling them to serve and to love. A striking gender difference occurs here, with 61 percent of the women and 47 percent of the men expressing the belief that they

are called "to serve and to love." No significant difference was evident by gender among the 44 percent who believe their spirituality guided them toward a career in public service or among the 60 percent who believe they have been "called" to the public service.

Thus, ASPA members report a greater frequency of "call" to their work than does the public at large or than do the "churchgoers" in the Wuthnow study (1994) described earlier. One definition (source unknown) suggests that the place to which one is called is where "your deep joy meets the world's deep need." Christians generally agree that a "call" is a prompting from God to serve in a specific way. One might argue that how one responds to this issue depends on how one defines "call."

Qualities of Servant Leadership

While the specific question, "Are you or could you be a servant leader?" was not asked; qualities of servant leadership were implied in several survey items. Respondents were asked to "agree" or "disagree" with each of the following:

- "Being in a community with others at work is important;"
- "I believe that all of humankind and all of nature are interconnected;"
- "I would rather cooperate than compete at work;"
- "I have good relations with my co-workers;"
- "I believe America has a social obligation to care for those who cannot care for themselves."

Responses of ASPA members to these questions indicate that most have the mind set necessary for a life of service. For 68 percent, being part of a community at work is important; perhaps because of the belief in the interconnectedness of all humankind and all of nature expressed by 86 percent. This kind of belief system implies the acceptance of equality, dignity, and worth so necessary to the leader who also serves. Perhaps, because of their belief in the worth of others, 93 percent report having good relationships with fellow workers, and 84 percent believe that America does, indeed, have a social obligation to care for those in need. These statistics are cause for optimism about the service orientation of an important segment of government workers.

A significant difference between the responses of men and women occurs, see Table 1.

Table 1. Servant Leader Qualities, gender differences		
ITEM	Percentage Agreement	
	Males	Females
Being in a community with others at work is important.	38%	71%
I believe that all of humankind and all of nature are interconnected.	84%	89%

Being in community is much more important for women respondents than for men, and women more often believe that humankind and all of nature are interconnected. These patterns support recent scholarship on gender differences. Thus, it appears that most ASPA members describe themselves as having the propensity to be the kind of servant leaders portrayed by Greenleaf. They are spiritual people who are living out the Christian commandments to "love one another" (John 13:35) and "be kind to one another" (Ephesians 4:32).

The gender differences regarding beliefs about being called to serve and to love, desiring community, and seeing interconnectedness appear to reflect the kinds of gender differences that feminist scholars have long suggested; see, e.g. Belinky, et al, 1986; Gilligan, 1993; Gilligan & Attanucci, 1988; Stivers, 1993. They may also have other profound implications, however. Scholarship directed toward discerning more basic differences between

male and female public administrators based on Gilligan's typology have found no significant differences between men and women (See, e.g., Bruce, 1994; Stewart & Sprinthall, 1991 and 1994). Perhaps the gender difference only occurs when one looks at some of the characteristics of servant leaders.

Conducive Working Conditions

ASPA members were asked their perceptions of public service and whether their workplaces could be characterized as hospitable to them and their values. Respondents were asked to "agree" or "disagree" with the following statements.

> "A recent book is titled *Go to Work and Take your Faith too*. I don't believe that's possible."
> "In the book *To Work and to Love*," workers in bureaucracy are portrayed as tortured and trapped on a treadmill of despair. I sometimes feel like that at work."
> "The government workplace is without core human values about collective purpose and individual meaning."

Seventy-seven percent of the respondents to this survey do believe it's possible to take their faith to work and 69 percent do not feel "trapped on a treadmill of despair," while 74 percent believe the government workplace does, indeed, incorporate "core human values about collective purpose and meaning." While responses to these statements are encouraging, they do not paint a wholly rosy picture of the public sector workplace. One has to wonder and worry about the 23 to 31 percent of responses telling us that all is far from well in government work. The 31 percent who do feel "trapped on a treadmill of despair" and the 26 percent who believe their workplace is "without core human values" would surely wish to have a servant leader who will "act on what they believe" and be "a saving remnant of those who care for both persons and institutions, and who are determined to make their caring count..."(Greenleaf, 1977, 329-30).

Summary and Conclusions

This paper has found that Christian spirituality is an integral part of servant leadership as conceptualized by Greenleaf (1977). Both incorporate the values of caring, service, and community. While Christian spirituality emphasizes that people are "called" by a Higher Power to serve one another, Greenleaf, himself, offers that "call" to all those who are in responsible positions in all types of organizations.

Three questions related to Christian spirituality and servant leadership were asked ASPA members as a representative group of public administrators.

1. **Do public employees feel a sense of "call" to their work?**
2. **Do public employees have qualities necessary for servant leadership?**
3. **Are public sector working conditions conducive to servant leadership?**

The responses indicate that a substantially higher proportion of public employees feel a sense of call to the work they do than does the general public. This "call" is a spiritual sense that what one does can bring about some higher good that is greater than one's self interest alone. Respondents on three different items affirmed a sense of a "call to service," suggesting that most ASPA members can identify with and become the servant leaders that Greenleaf believes are necessary for today's world. This encouraging pattern supports the thesis of Charles Goodsell's work in *The Case for Bureaucracy* (1994). We can have greater confidence in the dedication and commitment of our public servants than popular mythology suggests.

Many of the respondents in this research describe themselves as Christian and as spiritual people. The gender

differences regarding beliefs about being called to serve and to love, desiring community, and seeing interconnectedness suggest a fertile area for research on servant leadership. One might ask if women, with their proclivity toward connection and caring (Gilligan, 1993), are more likely to develop the capacity for servant leadership. A good deal has been written about women's ways of leading -- what Helgesen (1992) calls *The Female Advantage*. Research that relates gender to servant leadership could be very valuable.

The finding that almost one-third of the respondents describe the government workplace as one in which they are "trapped on a treadmill of despair" is discouraging. This is a workplace crying for understanding and intervention. Research is needed to look at ways to improve the work situation of these public employees. The "reinvention" movement has been about fiscal and equity changes. It is time to also "reinvent" the workplace so working conditions encourage the human interactions of the workplace to reflect the attitudes values of the employees.

To call for servant leaders who will transform the government workplace is essential. But even those who feel called and have the courage of that calling will not always know how to serve nor how to meet the competing demands of workers, clients, and programs. To the need for research on the work situation of government employees must be added at least two agendas: government employees must be taught more about 1-how to love and 2-how to serve.

It is hoped that this exploratory study looking at servant leadership through the lens of Christian spirituality will stimulate new ways of thinking and new research agendas for those who struggle to improve the public service.

References

Belinky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N. & Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's' Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Bellah, Robert (1985). *Habits of the Heart. Individualism and Commitment in American Life.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Briskin, Alan (1996). *The Stirring of Soul in the Workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bruce, Willa (1994). "Feminist Ethics in City Government: Radical or Routine?" *Public Productivity and Management Review.*

Bruce, Willa and Plocha, Ed. (1999), "Reflections on Maintaining a Spirituality in the Government Workplace," *International Journal of Organization Behavior.*

Denenberg, Tia, Denenberg, richard, Braverman, Mark, and Braverman, Susan. (Jan/March, 1996). "Dispute Resolution and Workplace Violence," *Dispute Resolution Journal,* 6-16.

Derber, Charles (1996). *The Wilding of America.* N.Y.: St. Martin's Press.

Eyre, Richard (1997). *Spiritual Serendipity. N.Y.: Simon & Schuster.*

Gilligan, C. (1982 & 1993). *In a Different Voice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. & Attanucci, J. (1988). Two moral orientations, in C. Gilligan, J.V. Ward, and J.M. Taylor, (Eds.), *Mapping the Moral Domain.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 73-86.

Goodsell, Charles (1994). *The Case for Bureaucracy.* (Mahwah, N.J.: Chatham House).

Greenleaf, Robert (1977). *Servant Leadership.* Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press.

Grey, M. (1991, Spring). Claiming power in connection: Exploring the ethics of connection, *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion,* 7, (1), 7ff.

Helgesen, Sally (1995). *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership.* N.Y.: Currency/Doubleday.

Hendricks, Gay and Ludeman, Kate (1996). *The Corporate Mystic.* N.Y.: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Co.

Hornstein, Harvey. (1996). *Brutal Bosses.* N.Y.: Riverhead Books, G.P. Putnam's Sons.

Jacques, Roy. *Manufacturing the Employee.* (1996) Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.

Littler, Mendelson, Fastiff, Tichy & Mathiason: A Professional Corporation (1994). *Terror and Violence in the*

Workplace. Orange County, CA: National Employer.

Marcic, Dorothy (1997). *Managing with the Wisdom of Love: Uncovering Virtue in People and Organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Pierce, Gregory, ed. (1991). *Of Human Hands: A Reader in the Spirituality of Work.* Minneapolis: Augsberg Press.

Puchalski, Christina (1999). "The Role of Spirituality in End of Life Care," *Proceedings,* Conference on Spirituality and Health Care, Harvard Medical School.

Richards, Dick (1995). *Artful Work: Awakening, Joy, Meaning, and Commitment in the Workplace.* N.Y.: Berkley.

Schmidt, K. Louise. (1995). *Transforming Abuse: Nonviolent Resistance and Recovery.* Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.

Sheridan, M.J.; Bullis, R.K.; Adcock, C.R.; Berlin, S.D.; & Miller, P.C. (1992), "Practitioner's Personal and Professional Attitudes and Behaviors toward Religion and Spirituality: Issues for Education and Practice," *Journal of Social Work Education* 28, (2), 190-203.

Stewart, D. & Sprinthall, N. (1991). Strengthening ethical judgment in public administration, in J. Bowman, (Ed.), *Ethical Frontiers in Public Management.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 243-60.

Stewart, D. & Sprinthall, N. (1994). Moral development in public administration," in T. Cooper, (Ed.), *Handbook of Administrative Ethics.* (New York: Marcel Dekker, pp. 325-348.

Stivers, C. (1993). *Gender Images in Public Administration.* Newberry Park, Calif: Sage.

Swidler, Leonard (1997). "The Dialogue Decalogue: Ground Rules for Interreligious, Intercultural Dialogue, pp. 9-12 in L.S. Bale, ed. *Envisioning a Global Ethic.* Philadelphia: Global Dialogue Institute.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Standards (1997), "Safety & Health Statistics," Table 3. Washington, DC. BLS and web page: http://stats.bls.gov/news.release/cfoi.t03.htm.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Standards (1997), "Study on Injuries," Table C. USDL - 96-163, Washington, DC. BLS and web page: http://ohr.systoc.com/docs/blsstats.htm

U.S. Dept of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration, (1996). *Guidelines for Preventing Workplace Violence for Health Care and Social Service Workers.* Pub. No. OSHA 3148. Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (1994), "Workplace Violence," BJS 202-307-0784. Washington, DC: US GPO and web page: http://ncjrs.org:71/0/4/3/2/swrkplce.txt

West, Ross (1997). *Go to Work and Take your Faith too.* Macon, GA: Peake Road.

Wuthnow, Robert (1994). *God and Mammon in America.* N.Y.: Free Press.

***

Willa Bruce is Professor and Director of Doctor of Public Administration Program at the University of Illinois at Springfield.

Serving for Fun and Profit:
A Critique of Servant Leadership

Patricia M. Patterson

The character of *the servant leader* developed in Robert Greenleaf's lectures at Dartmouth and his ensuing book, *Becoming a Servant Leader* (1977). Loosely based on Greenleaf's somewhat unique reading of Herman Hesse's *Journey to the East*, the servant leader concept has morphed into a wider approach to the practices of leadership. These practices are called "servant leadership" because the adherent is thought to best put his[1] visions and dreams to work when he is "the servant of his followers" (Greenleaf, 334).

The servant leadership approach is worthy of examination for its potential benefits to a public administration in sore need of respite from the concerns of mere efficiency. Resonant imageries, a potential for drawing attention to the health and growth of the least privileged, and a focus on path over destination all imbue servant leadership with significant appeal. The draw seems especially strong for a post-counterculture boom generation steeped in the languages and traditions of public service and religious good works.

Greenleaf's book, the attendant concepts, and their uses, are well intentioned and sincere. It is with some trepidation then, that I put forward an essay some may regard as an unduly harsh rejection of cherishable ideals. Good and thoughtful people find something good and thoughtful in servant leadership. Yet readers will find here an assertive critique of "servant leader" traits and visions. After an inquiry into the empathy often attributed to the practice of servant leadership, the essay will go on to deliver a hearty objection to the conceptual masking of hierarchies servant leadership pretends to undo. Finally, I will suggest the status of servant leadership as theology rather than theory. Readers will find the essay organized by these concerns and objections, distilled into exactly those categories and subheadings. (If the subheadings that act as guideposts are expressed with the familiar fervor and flavor of government reinvention and self help guides, the author must plead the Fifth).

In the final analysis, readers will be cautioned away from seeing the "servant leader" as the personification of a useful or essential paradox. Neither does the concept of servant leadership capture inextricably opposed forces locked in an important tension heretofore unappreciated in the public sector. Instead, the concept -- though mighty well meant -- reduces to an attention getting oxymoron. In the long run, servant leadership seems a management consulting and marketing slogan with the potential to make executives and would-be leaders feel nicer, accomplishing little else public administrators should esteem.

---

[1] I will use the masculine pronoun in this manuscript because Greenleaf's prototypical servant leader is male. As the manuscript moves beyond Greenleaf, the servant leader's masculinity remains unmistakable, however popular its elements of self-effacement are as a social prescription for women.

Great Men and The Vision Thing

In Greenleaf's conceptualization, servant leadership has three important elements: some individual's possession of the "essential leadership qualities"; a central focus on "the" leader's persuasively articulated foresight; and a (consequent) leadership "chosen by" followers. Greenleaf identifies as "essential leadership qualities" the presence of *"values, goals, competence, and spirit"* (Greenleaf 1996, 295). Apart from a tendency toward bromides about "being your own person" and thereby a "natural" man or woman on the path of "personal growth" (*ibid*, 309), Greenleaf's works and words seem reflective and sincere. His is a cadre of *values* to which one is hard put to object: commitment to human growth, building community, listening, empathy, healing, awareness, and so forth. *Competence* refers to technical competence, as well as to the sum of various and sundry abilities, termed "strength" (*ibid*, 170-171). *Goals* feature prominently, and are much intertwined with the ability to set and articulate goals for others, a gift termed "foresight." Finally, in addition to values, a sustaining quality of leaders and their leadership is *spirit*. Greenleaf is content to call spirit a mystery, but he appears to be alluding to some source of trust, intuition, and inspiration.

In servant leadership practice, goals are not mutually determined between leader and follower. Rather, leaders simply know stuff that others do not, and this must be accepted. The dynamic is called "servant leadership" because leaders know more than followers and when they articulate goals, people follow, despite leader humility. Although the precise process of leader selection is unspecified, servant leaders are somehow "chosen" by followers, or they self-select, believing they have been so chosen.

Though this may sound a bit New Age for many intellectual tastes, in some respects, servant leadership is not unlike strategic planning. Visions, missions, and goals are established by leaders, giving purpose and integrating structure to people, organizations, and the use of resources. What could be more familiar? What distinguishes strategic and servant leader goal setting is the source of the information on which goals are predicated, and the fact that servant leader goal setting is not necessarily based in organizational position. Strategic leaders consider ample but finite information, from rational, political, and social analyses. They aim to set goals in the face of time limits and uncertainties. By contrast, servant leaders set goals and guide others on the basis of a capacity "to know the unknowable to foresee the unforeseeable" (Greenleaf 1996, 313). Such gifts are not clearly attributable to supernatural sources, as it is "at least possible to speculate about them within a framework of natural law" (*ibid*, 313). Neither, however, is an attribution of divine or supernatural instruction discouraged. Finally, in further contrast from strategic leadership, where leaders are not bashful about the relations of position and power, servant leaders are "chosen by" followers through follower submission to goals that have been persuasively articulated.

With so much talk of "natural" laws of "natural" qualities, of selection and submission, we are right to wonder if a revival of trait theories of leadership is afoot. On the one hand, though leaders do not appear to have been born, with the right "natural" materials (and sufficient resources for Institute training), they can be made. Perhaps most interesting to scholars and teachers, intellectual acumen and learning need not be among those native or acquired traits. On the other hand, an important feature of servant leadership seems to be possession of innate charisma.

Greenleaf's work bears the mark of a "great man" view of history and leadership. The great leader trumps all, for "[I]n the end, it is the *person*, the leader as an individual, who counts. Systems, theories, organization structures are secondary" (Greenleaf 1996, 334, emphasis in original). To the student or practitioner of law or administration, this must strike the ear as a remarkably innocent view of the power of social, political, economic and linguistic patterns of recurrent human relationship. Nevertheless, it would be premature to dismiss Greenleaf's servant leadership on those grounds. After all, the textual products of management consulting are full of such individualist cheerleading, fueling a lucrative bibliophilic economy with important symbolic functions. Additionally, the traits under discussion attain at least cultural importance if they become widely perceived as markers of the chosen. Moreover, when such traits are subsidized, they become increasingly evident in sought after and applauded performances.

Though the would-be servant leader's latent traits seem crucial, note that Greenleaf means for him to be active with

his gifts. Significantly, however, the leader does not appear to have a great deal to do, apart from dreaming, reflecting, and listening. Though all of these "actions" have their place, they also have their limits, and generally can be done from the seated position. Moreover, they do not substantially redefine traditional executive and managerial responsibilities. They merely limit and mystify them.

I'd Walk A Mile in Your Guccis

Servant leadership is rooted in the idea that the executive or manager can, by means of superior vision and verbal skill, walk among common folk, feel their pain, and pep them up. Accordingly, the organizational fruits of such empathic serving will lead all in the direction of excellence. Once again a critic is tempted to back away, for fear of seeming crotchety about well intentioned gestures. Yet questions should be raised: Is this the version of empathy to which we aspire? Can this or any other version of empathy be achieved so easily?[2] Who decides who needs serving, and how and under what circumstances that service is to be rendered?

Much of the writing built around the organizational servant leadership frame is directed toward executives and trustees (See Carver 1997, Hesselbein 1996, Spears 1996, and Greenleaf 1996, 1998). At least for such figures, empathy appears to entail active listening skills attached to a willingness to "walk a mile in another's shoes." This cultural refrain is so familiar as to be considered a proverb of many more endeavors than administration, and it is thought to be more than sufficient.

Though the impulse is generous, walking a mile in another's shoes requires that feet, and not only shoes, be interchangeable. Yet feet are formed by miles already walked in our own historical footwear, and thus are not identical. Whatever shoes we try on in a given moment, when we travel it is always us that goes along. To appreciate this point more fully, consider the "traveling self" derived from Arendt (Bickford 1995). With effort, we can "position ourselves differently in order to do justice to the presence of others, not in a way that assumes identity, but in a way that gives voice to difference" (*ibid*, 321). In view of human uniqueness, I can appreciate your shoes, but I cannot be you in them. Even if mine are Guccis and yours are not, I can listen and imagine what it is like to be in your shoes. But life experience is no mere costume; I still walk in mine. I cannot imitate you and thereby know your experience, nor need I be a selfless mime.

Arendt's traveler grasps yet another crucial point, missed by the shoe switching servant executive. Social distance, money, power and hierarchical privilege are powerful insurance policies against even knowing what others' experiences are (Spelman 1997; Tronto 1993). Such features of the social landscape insure precisely against my ever having to walk in your shoes, or even knowing much about them, and I may be glad of it. We are not all equally vulnerable to all forms of suffering. Facile forms of empathy, "tried on" despite social distance and ignorance of the complexities of peoples' vastly different lives will not take us far in understanding, even when a bout of close listening precedes.

Rather than consider us interchangeable, Arendt's notion of the traveling self offers an optimistic and realistic account of empathy. In her view we can appreciate another's experiences and understand some extent of mutual vulnerability, but cannot take another's place without slippage. Our experiences are simply not the same, even if they could be communicated transparently. If the traveling self, rather than the mimic, offers the type of empathy to which servant leaders might aspire, is such informed empathy readily achieved? Do leaders with special gifts of vision have special capacities for Arendtian travel as well as for shoe leather? If the servant literature directed at "top management thinkers" (Spears, Hesselbein, Carver, Pollard) is any guide, it seems that the obstacles are great.

---

[2] The reader should note that Greenleaf is not overly inclined to use the term "empathy." This is my best attempt to distill a familiar and single secular term from a rather lengthy treatise.

In contrast to Arendt's traveling self, the "servant leadership" concept bears all the markers of what Spelman calls the "spiritual bellhop" (1997, 119). This figure wants the appearance of having suffered or lived another's experience, without the trouble of actually having to do so. He is only temporarily and electively performing the role of the empathetic "servant" and go-fer; at the end of the day, he is likely still boss. He will still be on top in his shoes, wherever you may end up in yours. In an earlier time we called this "slumming", and before that, *noblesse oblige.*

Noblesse oblige is an aging concept, and critiquing it is a dusty matter. Though it may say something significant about the vulgarity of a culture if *noblesse oblige* compares favorably to the alternatives, in essence, the point is this: In recognition of his privilege, the noble converts himself into a point of light, beaming down among the rabble. He voluntarily soils his noble garment among workers in field, firm or agency in order to bring them alms or vision. In this spectacle of self-abnegation and understatement, he performs subtle service of his own choosing. In so doing, he shows his status, and thereby earns the right to keep it.

One need not go far in search of examples in the servant leadership literature. For the reader's examination, I offer two cases of the type of empathic service that results from the servant leadership concept in use (among those who have published on the subject). While not "representative" in any scientific sense, they are hardly obscure straw men. One illustration is prominently featured in a book well read in public administration (The Drucker Foundation's *Leader of the Future*). The other illustration comes from an easily accessible volume geared to boards and executives of non-profit and public organizations. This guide, and the series of which it is part, is published by a house prominent on the subject of leadership. The illustrations that follow are examples of which adherents speak proudly, meant to illustrate the compassion of prominent executive servants.

Examine, then, the deployment of servant leadership principles at the hands of William Pollard. Pollard is Chair of the Fortune 500's interestingly named "Service-Master" corporation, and a trustee of the Drucker Foundation and other high profile institutions. Pollard tells the story of "Olga", whose floor at home is cleaner than her floor at work. This state of affairs has resulted because no one has conveyed to her the dignity of the work by "teaching" her or "caring about" her (1996, 246-7). He goes on to contrast Olga's priorities with those of the (oddly nameless) housekeeper who is "thankful", who hugs him on his rounds, and who can give "a detailed 'before and after' Service-Master description" of her sanitary accomplishments (*ibid*, 247). Perhaps it is unkind to register that Olga's floor at home is a curious subject of corporate concern, or to note that the apparent service (and hugging) is coming Mr. Pollard's way, rather than the reverse. It might be extreme to expect his servant rounds to include getting down on his knees to clean along side of or as "servant" to either of these women. But it is worth recalling that the servers of food and the cleaners of homes and buildings in the United States are women of all colors, and men of color. This type of labor is predominately female, as are the caring professions without stature. The prototypical *servant executive*, however, is white and male. Note what servant leadership leaves in place; it appears to change nothing about the condition of the actual subordinate.

Nonetheless, it is clear in the story that the storyteller's beliefs are heartfelt. He believes that by directly and institutionally sharing his vision about the preferred priority of work, ranked above home, he has been of service. In his own eyes, by bothering to elicit an enthusiastic rendition of the language of "before and after" performance measurement, he will have sufficed to make of himself a leader more servant than the actual domestic workers.

Examine instead, a Board of Director level application of servant leader precepts. The Carver guide means to underline the servant leader's unenviable balancing act. In the name of servant leadership, and without a trace of Herbert Simon's irony, Carver exhorts Board Chairs to both nurture and crack the whip. Carver's chipper proverbs require the servant leader to both deliberate thoroughly and be decisive, and to both stimulate diversity and reach a single decision. "Your job", he says, "is to encourage, cajole, pressure, and cheerlead your board to be all it can be" (1997, 14). Though a military marketing slogan is clearly in use, serious doubts must be raised about uncritical public sector acceptance of such contradictory proverbs.

Who is that Masked Man?

Even if were to be more convincingly rendered, the adoption of servant demeanor lacks appeal on other grounds. It is not only a matter of the facile quality of the empathetic service proposed. It is also a matter of enlivening the master/ slave binary, and the master/servant "will to system" (Honig 1993, 67). Servant leadership magnifies and emphasizes both social and institutional hierarchies, at the same time as it masks them under a front that is difficult to challenge.

Adherents of servant leadership do distinguish between servants and slaves, seeking to transform leaders into the former and not the latter. Fair enough; sharecropping and paid domestic service are qualitatively, and not merely incrementally, different than slavery. But the retention of the language of "masters" in this work is quite striking, whatever forays masters make into leadership by serving. It does not take much talk of "natural servants" and "natural leaders" to make one's post-colonial consciousness uneasy about casual revivals of essentialism, even if the virtues switch places.

For the sake of argument, let us leave the matter of terminology aside. Instead, focus on the good will and good works of those who hope to be "chosen" on the basis of special gifts and training to make their special serving-leading efforts. Unfortunately, we will still discover that a master/leader is assumed to have a relation of equality with the person being served, simply by having declared that intention. Further, his service will be assumed to be necessary and welcome.

In reference to the first assumption, the naivete with which adherents absorb the master's view and presume equality with, and enthusiasm among, the lowly is simply breathtaking.[3] A passage from Spears[4] betrays these errors better than any scholar's critique could:

> Servant is now a degraded term, but it once had potent meaning. The servant had a special place in society and a special relationship with the master in early Biblical history. The servant was not exactly family, nor was he or she a hired hand or --most assuredly--a slave. A servant under some circumstances could even inherit the master's property. In Leviticus, you will find the rights and duties of both parties spelled out. At the jubilee year, servants' contracts were considered to have been worked out and the servant was free. *The master was enjoined to give them a start in the world and to treat them like a friend. Trust and mutuality are inherent in the relationship.* (Spears 1995, 55, emphasis added).

A feeble moral and intellectual edifice is constructed on a foundation so redolent of happy and trusting slaves.

On the matter of the second assumption, adherents make another fundamental error. They confuse the imposition of "helping" with a responsive competence to offer aid in the form most helpful to those with particular, considered, needs. Joan Tronto has made this point most eloquently in her articulation of the care process. According to Tronto, the "four moral elements of care, attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness" must be "integrated into an appropriate whole. Such an integration...is not simple. Care involves conflict...Care as a practice involves more than simply good intentions" (1993, 136).

---

[3] I leave it to others to discuss the dynamics and likelihood of presumptions of equality by those who exercise servant leadership from the bottom. Such servant leadership is at least a logical possibility, and, for some populations, at least the servant part seems familiar.

[4] It may be argued that these are not Greenleaf's words, but Spears'. This seems a thin defense of an edited volume of some 25 high profile essays examining the influence of servant leadership on "top management thinkers" today.

The drive to impose one's own view of service as definitive is not openness in decision making, is not democratic, and is not egalitarian. It is hierarchy in denial, predicated on values that ring with "for your own good", superior wisdom, and condescension. The infantilizing of the served is not imagined; Greenleaf likens the leader's relation to employees as one of mother to child (1996, 295). Though politely executed and well intended, servant leadership is paternalism with a creepy happy face.

Whatever his disciples have done with his concepts, Greenleaf seems to have meant his servant leader to serve as a steward or guardian. Here again, though intentions are good, the presumption is a hierarchical one. Those served are in need of protection from themselves, or from others they are incompetent to defend against. Stivers has brilliantly critiqued the guardian role in precisely these terms, and has pointed out another elephant in the room: "The ... work of statesmanship [is] a masculine effort to tame *fortuna*...Guardians are paternal figures — heads of the public household — who tell other members, perhaps gently but certainly firmly, what is best for them...[L]ong-standing expectations about the private nature of women's proper role and sphere are inconsistent with the image of public guardian" (1993, 82-83).

Servant leadership undoes no hierarchy. Prevailing imageries, conditions, and practices remain, and reversal or elimination of roles is linguistic only. How could it be otherwise, if leaders are "natural"? What this language seems to do is take some of the "warrior" (Stivers 1993; King 1998) edge off the leader, but to substitute "daddy" instead. This daddy provides for his metaphorical family, but stays firmly in charge. Many will remember the 1998 embrace of servant leadership by the Southern Baptist convention. It is a favored approach for reasserting masculine and male authority over women and children in the home, and is well suited for that purpose.

Beyond their status as targets of male servant leadership, women's own engagement in the practice of servant leadership seems doubly risky. Servant leadership hierarchies are not redeemed by feminine expertise in self effacement, though some variants of "cultural feminism" have sought validation for that style and language. Efforts to make a revisionist virtue of restrictive historical necessity are doomed to fail. For women, self effacement tracks with cultural expectation so thoroughly and well that genuine servant opportunities continue to be secured at the cost of leadership chances. Though someone profits and someone leads, it is likely neither the intended served nor the would-be servant comes out ahead. Servant leadership seems to pose particular dangers to women.

In further assessing the potential of servant leadership for those not already at the top of the corporate heap, it may be argued that servant leadership is less problematic in the public lives of the managerial classes. It is worth noting that contemporary modes of noblesse oblige may operate differently among the non-noble, non-executive, striving classes. Rather than quietly serving and thereby displaying his secure fortune, today's social climber may serve transparently, in order to earn that fortune. Gaining the right leadership opportunities in service organizations and being seen making contributions to the right boards is good "networking", not a fortuitous by-product of good works. This is serving for fun and profit.

So too, many are cheered at the prospects of youthful points of light engaged in "service learning" in college, expecting good results after rough beginnings. Without wishing to criticize individual volunteerism and community service, Mattson (1999) notes the disdain of younger people for politics. He finds in the new service thrust a substitute of "immediate action and hands-on service" for the "slow and conflictual world of political change" (1999, 60), though he acknowledges that these are not necessarily mutually exclusive enterprises. Mattson also laments the apparent unity of self-celebration and self-promotion in contemporary acts of devoted self-lessness. His critique of youthful forms of generosity underlines a cultural shift toward feeling good about doing good while building the resume (or beauty contestant profile). In this world view, Mattson claims, one does well by doing good if one deserves to. This too seems to be serving for fun, yielding profits for the deserving.

Plainly, then, servant leaders do not undo Gulick's hierarchy of authority, nor mean to, nor even disguise it especially

well. Rather, they augment it or substitute it with potent **social** rankings—vision, gender, class, race, and the like.[5] This is a seriously regressive administrative stance. Moreover, the "quality of mercy" remains "mightiest in the mightiest", a means of demonstrating through service one's own saving grace. Though listening is part of the deal, it appears to be elective, and likely to sustain one way communication across social domains. Servant leading requires no appreciable learning of those who remain firmly in charge.

In the halls of administration, Greenleaf (1996, 330, 334) appears to see servant leadership as an antidote to bureaucracy. Whereas bureaucracy allegedly takes shape as a rigid top down hierarchy whose denizens lack initiative in their dependence on precedent, such hierarchy is upended if the leader is the "servant of his followers" (*ibid*, 334). This assertion of reversal cannot withstand close examination. Greenleaf means to suggest that those "above" in the hierarchy can serve those "below", and that this is best accomplished by pretending the authority relation is other than it is. It seems that the way to pull individuals into the authority relations of the bureau is to sneak up on them with a serving tray.

Theology, Not Theory

Upon approaching the servant leadership literature, one's antennae are quick to discern a theology. If great and visionary leaders and their natural, structure trumping charisma do not tune us to its melody, Greenleaf's great trumpeters will. Spears gives us an early and clear alert, admitting: "Greenleaf has introduced — maybe 'smuggled' is the right word — a spiritual element into the managerial function" (Spears 1995, 56). Spirit is the source of trust, in a mystery Greenleaf admits he does not examine (1996, 326). The smuggling of spirit into management may cause no alarm for those with confidence that Greenleaf's concept of "spirit"(or anyone else's for that matter) has a discernable referent. But for those of us who are less certain of the coherence or public relevance of the spirit world, or those less comfortable with casual mixtures and conflations of ecclesiastical and administrative language, red flags are raised.

Servant leadership rings with a curious mix of Christian asceticism and "the aristocracy of salvation" (Weber/Gerth and Mills 1946), of "grace" and of "works", of Sheep who Follow Servants, chosen for Mysterious and Intuitive Masculine Pizzaz. Following in harmonic consistency the precepts of servant leadership, such an aristocracy vivifies Weber's "Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism". This is particularly clear in Mr. Pollard's "Service-Master" vignette. He sees as Service-Master's objective: "to honor God in all we do, to help people develop, to pursue excellence, and to grow profitably" (1996, 244). He quotes the Bible, speaks of covenants and commitments and the reliance of people on their leaders, and remarks on servant leaders who are "givers, not takers." Presumably, the gifts sown are spiritual, as financial profits are clearly to be reaped.

The business writing that feeds off the servant leader concept is imbued with Christian religiosity. A public sector executive of equal height and weight would not be as free as Pollard to promulgate his religious commitments among his flock. However, the danger here is not limited to the possibility that some in the upper reaches of the public realm might emulate, and others in the lower reaches be hard put to decline, these Christian enthusiasms. The danger is also to Olga, whose family priorities are to be re-educated with religious fervor until she is "thankful" (1996, 247). And the danger is to students, who might be encouraged to mistake this theology for organization theory.

The point is not to isolate or ignore human religious motivations and rhetoric, but rather to take encroachments on religious freedoms seriously enough to give them close consideration. Smuggling aside, when it comes to importing ideas into PA, some of us are more curious to find what will maximize the peoples' wills, and content to leave the

---

[5] When I delivered these remarks at a PA conference, a senior scholar asked what was wrong with, and then defended, such social hierarchies. I will let that challenge speak for itself, and merely record it here for the reader's consideration.

people to maximize God's on their own.

Holy or Muddy Waters? Servants, Public Servants, and Public Service

Holzer refers to public service as a calling (1999), Mintzberg as a "noble calling" (1996, 83). I have borrowed such richly religious terms myself, referring elsewhere to public service as a "higher calling" (Patterson, 1998). Do we refer to some fantastic heavenly telephone call, ringing on the democratic calling card?

Though "spirit" is a vague (but fashionable) construct, what is meant by the word "servant" is terribly clear. The noun suggests a person, a status, and a position in a hierarchy. It also suggests the language of timidity. Promoting the servant role over all of those objections, and even accepting the word servant as an adjective, we would still have to wonder who the servant leader serves, and what is being served up to whom.

Once "servant" is modified by the adjective "public", rather than operating as adjective for the word "leader", the term "public servant" summons recognizable historical figures. The public servant, whose services are paid for with public largesse, variously serves "the public interest", the Constitution, the Chief Executive, or the public (Wamsley et al 1990). Possibly, we literally mean servant by "public servant" too, wishing for public employees to follow the "Jeeves" model, as reckoned by David Farmer. By performing as the people's butler, and in doing whatever is asked without delay or exercise of independent judgement, the servant is limited indeed (Farmer 1999).

The word *service*, by contrast, suggests an activity, and public service, an activity with a *raison d'etre*. The term is flexible enough to offer conceptual opportunity, and the subject of continued serious intellectual effort. Rainey asks if we mean by "service" some reference to motivations -- a desire to engage in "meaningful public service" and "work that is helpful to other people", for instance (Rainey 1982). Or, he asks, do we mean by service the adoption of a norm, a service ethic? In accounting for "public service" motives, an empirical or normative dedication to unidentified parties (clients? customers? citizens? society at large?) is frequently juxtaposed to some more self-serving extrinsic motivator, like "making a good deal of money", or even some overblown hygiene factor, like "higher pay than you now make" (Rainey 1982).[6] Important works by Wittmer (1991), Cacioppe and Mock (1984), Jurkeiwicz et al (1998), and Holzer 1999 explore and extend these questions about public service, and seem better uses of public administration's resources and intentions than the oxymoronic servant leadership.

Paradox or Orthodox?

Carver exhorts Board Chair "servants" to crack the whip as they "serve" their followers into being led. Do Carver's examples, and the term "servant leader" itself, capture something important about paradoxes of leadership? If paradox is "an irresolvable proposition that is true and false at the same time...a sign of the capacity to balance complexly contrary thoughts and feelings..." (Minow 1997, 168, n. 66, quoting Joan Scott), what does the title "servant leader" have to offer us?

At this point, a distinction might be made between paradoxical and oxymoronic statements and situations. In the case of paradox, contradictory premises may nonetheless be acceptable; while difficult to grasp in relation to one another, we have to grapple with them in the same picture, at once. In the case of oxymoron, the picture may not add up; the premises may be unacceptable in and of themselves, or absurdly claimed as linked to one another. Not all contradictory ideas are caught in irresolvable tension; some ideas just sound clever. They make interesting claims and slogans, but they don't belong in the same embrace. I think I have hinted why "servant leadership" might be one of

---

[6] For public workers, this might simply bring an approximation of decent pay, in no way at odds with decent service.

them.

In sum, one can hear the powerful resonances of this term and understand its popularity. It seems to offer both the hierarchy of Weber's legal rational bureaucratic authority, traditional social structures of power, and some of the characteristics of charismatic authority. Goals are not mutually determined; folks followed by people in distress become self-appointed leaders; and, the basis of leadership is intuition and prophecy. The approach also resonates with familiar traditions of philanthropy (rather than charity) – *noblesse oblige*, the duties of privilege, and grace and works. It resonates with appealing "world upside down" imageries and carnival like "role reversals" in literature and story telling. But here, the master becomes the servant via a quick linguistic mask. Though the concept, servant leadership, misuses these powerful imageries and in so doing, dilutes them, it does get attention by evoking them. Finally, it speaks in familiar theological terms, at least to Christians, yet retains the oxymoronic power of a good marketing slogan.

The authors in the servant literature tradition say it presents "a path, not a destination", but the servant leadership path takes us past no new scenery at all. At best, like empowerment and other enticing and well intentioned linguistic predecessors, it may be expected to take its place among those managerial quick fixes that have cost much and changed little. At worst, its potent cocktail of paternalism, religion and *noblesse oblige* may make current conditions far worse.

Greenleaf's book was written in 1977. What does it tell us about our field, or about our times, that public administration now finds such anachronism appealing?

References

Bickford, Susan (1995). "In the Presence of Others: Arendt and Anzaldua on the Paradox of Public Appearance." In Bonnie Honig, ed., *Feminist Interpretations of Hannah Arendt*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press.

Carver, John (1997). *The Chairperson's Role as Servant Leader to the Board*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Cacioppe, Ron and Philip Mock (1984). "A Comparison of the Quality of Work Experience in Government and Private Organizations." *Human Relations*, 37 (11), 923-40.

Cooper, Terry L. (1991). *An Ethic of Citizenship for Public Administration*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Cunningham, Robert (1999). "Thoughts on the Concept of Servant-Leadership." Annual Conference of SECOPA, Pensacola, FL.

Farmer, David John (1995). *The Language of Public Administration: Bureaucracy, Modernity, and Postmodernity*. Tuscaloosa and London: University of Alabama Press.

Farmer, David John (1999). "Public Administration Discourse: A Matter of Style?" *Administration and Society*, 31 (3), July 1999, 299-320.

Gerth, H. H. and C.W. Mills (1946). *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1946.

Goffman, Erving (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Doubleday.

Goodsell, Charles T. (1994). *The Case For Bureaucracy*. 3rd ed. Chatham, N.J.: Chatham House.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1998/1977). "Servant Leadership in Business." In Gill R. Hickman, ed., *Leading Organizations: Perspectives for a New Era*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1998.

Greenleaf, Robert K. (1996). *On Becoming a Servant Leader*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Harmon, Michael. (1995). *Responsibility As Paradox: A Critique of Rational Discourse on Government*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Hesselbein, Frances et al (1996). *The Leader of the Future: New Visions, Strategies, and Practices for a New Era*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Holzer, Marc (1999). "Communicating Commitment: Public Administration as a Calling." Proceedings, PA 2000: *The Future of Public Administration*. Pensacola, FL.

Honig, Bonnie (1993). *Political Theory and the Displacement of Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y. Cornell University Press.

Jurkiewicz, Carole L., T. Massey, and R. Brown (1998). "Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study." *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 21 (3), 230-250.

King, Cheryl Simrell (1998). "Talking Beyond the Rational." Manuscript, Annual Conference of the Public Administration Theory Network, Colorado Springs, CO.

Mattson, Kevin (1999). "Talking about My Generation (and the Left)." *Dissent*, Fall, 58-63.

Minow, Martha (1997). *Not Only For Myself*. New York: The New Press.

Mintzberg, Henry (1996). "Managing Government, Governing Management." *Harvard Business Review*, 74, May/June, 75-83.

Patterson, Patricia M. (1998). "Market Metaphors and Political Vocabularies: The Case of the Marginalized Citizen." *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 22 (2), 220-231.

Paulos, John Allen (1995). *A Mathematician Reads the Newspaper*. New York: Basic Books.

Pollard, William. (1996). "The Leader Who Serves." In Frances Hesselbein et al, *The Leader of the Future: New Visions, Strategies, and Practices for a New Era*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Rainey, Hal (1982). "Reward Preferences Among Public and Private Managers: In Search of the Service Ethic." *American Review of Public Administration*, 16 (4), Winter, 288-302.

Rusaw, A. Carol (1998). "Skills of Servant Leadership in Transforming Government." *PA Times*, June, 21 (6), 1-2.

Spears, Larry (1995). *Reflections on Leadership: How Robert K. Greenleaf's Theory of Servant-Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers*. New York: John Wiley.

Spelman, Elizabeth V. (1997). *Fruits of Sorrow: Framing Our Attention to Suffering*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Stivers, Camilla (1993). *Gender Images in Public Administration*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Sullivan, Andrew (1998). "What We Look Up to Now." *The New York Times Magazine*, Sunday, November 15, 59-68.

Tronto, Joan T. (1993). *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethic of Care*. New York: Routledge.

Walmsley, Gary L, R.N. Bacher, C.T. Goodsell, P.S. Kronenberg, J.A. Rohr, C.M. Stivers, O.F. White, and J..F. Wolf (1990). *Refounding Public Administration*. Newbury Park, Sage Publications.

Wittmer, Dennis (1991). "Serving the People or Serving for Pay: Reward Preferences Among Government, Hybrid Sector, and Business Managers." *Public Productivity and Management Review*, XIV (4), Summer, 369-383.

***

Patricia M. Patterson is a professor at the School of Public Administration, Florida Atlantic University.

Suffer the Servants

Robert C. Zinke

Jesus called the disciples together and said: "You know that those foreigners who call themselves kings like to order people around. And their great leaders have full power over the people they rule. But don't act like them. If you want to be great, you must be the servant of all the others. And if you want to be first, you must be everyone's slave. The Son of Man did not come to be a slave master, but a slave who will give his life to rescue many people."

Mark 10: 42-45
(Contemporary English Version)

So we are happy, as we look forward to sharing in the glory of God. But that's not all! We gladly suffer, because we know that suffering helps us to endure. And endurance builds character, which gives us a hope that will never disappoint us. All of this happens because God has given us the Holy Spirit, who fills our hearts with his love.

Christ died for us at a time when we were helpless and sinful. No one is really willing to die for an honest person, though someone might be willing to die for a truly good person. But God showed how much he loved us by having Christ die for us, even though we were sinful.

Romans 5:2b-5
(Contemporary English Version)

Perhaps the time has come to admit that the spiritless, 'iron cage' of 'service without meaning' that Weber identified in his classic work on the Protestant Ethic (1958) no longer exists, long ago rusted and crumbled. To replace it, the fundamentalist urge in postmodern society has sought to construct a newer, even tighter, 'psychic prison,' or 'matrix,' that denies to individuals even the inmost secret thoughts of escape because of its invisibility. In this vein, much of the activity that goes under the rubric of 'service' involves the attempt to create artificial worlds--economic, technological, political, and religious--where pain and suffering do not exist. This view of service represents an attitudinal legacy leftover from the modernist age. Human beings at the beginning of the 21st century, however, confront a question of *spiritual freedom and responsibility*: Can we live in painless artificial worlds and still acknowledge inner spiritual calls from the mysterious Other that beckon us to recognize and witness actual human suffering and misery in the world--poverty, starvation, despair? In the postmodernist dawning of a new age, this paper argues, 'service' sometimes looks like avoidance and manipulation to those who suffer. Any discussion regarding 'servant leadership' in contemporary organizations, therefore, must necessarily address the issue of suffering as it relates to service.

As idealizations, 'Service' and 'servanthood' run deep in Western culture, especially Christian culture, stemming in part from the words of Jesus of Nazareth, quoted above. Indeed, today, such notions as 'call to service' and 'servant leadership' abound. (Coles, 1993, Greenleaf, 1977, 1979, 1996, and Spears, 1995). Hardly an article on

organizational leadership is written that does not include 'servant' on the list of required traits that would-be leaders must possess. (See Berry, 1994, Dering, 1998, Kiechel, 1992, and Rouse, 1998) Yet, an irony attaches to this glorification of service-oriented leadership. At the same time that contemporary organizational theorists hold up 'service' as a high ideal, the term itself also carries connotations of class and social standing. Historically, those considered 'servants' have held the least power to control resources and have carried the least amount of social status in Western culture. Thus, 'servanthood' has recently come under attack as a term that masks or perpetuates individual suffering and group oppression and furthers class exploitation. (Brown and Bohn, 1989, and Townes, 1996) Any discussion regarding 'servant leadership' in contemporary organizations, therefore, must necessarily address the issue of suffering as it relates to service.

Servant Leadership and the Ambiguities of Contemporary Organizational Life

Given the cultural and religious contexts in which 'servant leadership' is encouraged as a trait of leadership, proponents often assume that organizational executives have no choice but to serve since 'service' represents a duty and the alternative to service is madness. In addition, they assume that if an executive voluntarily chooses to accept her or his duty and become servant leaders, then other members of the organization will recognize and appreciate her or his choice to serve. What proponents seem to miss, however, is that actions performed by corporate leaders under the rubric of 'service' may not be intended as such by the leaders themselves, nor perceived as such by subordinates. These leaders may be acting or be perceived as acting for egoistic reasons.

A Servant by Nature

At the outset, it deserves note that the decision to become a 'servant leader' might just as easily represent an attitude of pure morality--an uncompelled act of *individual gift giving* that entertains no reward or expectation of remuneration. However, Robert Greenleaf's (1977) account of servant leadership, inspired by Herman Hesse's story, *The Journey to the East* (1956), suggests that 'servant leadership' in contemporary organizations constitutes a duty to be performed not a gift to be given. As Greenleaf explains, Hesse's story involves "a band of men on a mythical journey, probably also Hesse's own journey:"

> The central figure of the story is Leo who accompanies the party as the *servant* who does their menial chores, but who also sustains them with his spirit and his song. He is a person of extraordinary presence. All goes well until Leo disappears. Then the group falls into disarray and the journey is abandoned. They cannot make it without the servant Leo. The narrator, one of the party, after some years of wandering finds Leo and is taken into the Order that had sponsored the journey. There he discovers that Leo, whom he had known first as *servant*, was in fact the titular head of the Order, its guiding spirit, a great and noble *leader*. [Italics his](p. 7)

About this story and about Hesse the man, Greenleaf notes that *Journey to the East* was probably autobiographical since Hesse "led a tortured life" and that the story "suggests a turn toward the serenity he achieved in his old age." Despite some controversy surrounding the critics' interpretation of Hesse's life and work, Greenleaf argues, the meaning of the story is clear: "*the great leader is seen as servant first*, and that simple fact is the key to his greatness." [Italics his](Ibid.) As Greenleaf interprets the story, Leo was a servant, "*deep down inside*:" [Italics his]

> Leadership was bestowed upon a man who was by nature a servant. It [leadership] was something given, or assumed, that could be taken away. His servant nature was the real man, not bestowed, not assumed, and not to be taken away. He was servant first. (p.8)

Two episodes in Hesse's story support Greenleaf's interpretation. The first episode occurs when the narrator, H.H., comes before the Order and discovers that Leo is really the spiritual leader. Chagrined, H.H. learns that he has violated various rules and vows of the Order, but to his relief, the High Council of the order dismisses the charges against him. As Leo explains: "We do not want to count up all the defendant's errors. He is not going to be judged according to the letter, and we know that it only needed our reminder to awaken the defendant's conscience and make him a repentant self-accuser." (p. 103) However, Leo then goes on to recount other, more serious charges, for which H.H. must judge himself. Since the end of the journey, 10 years before, H.H. had abandoned his music, and had led a "dreadful, stupid, narrow, and suicidal life." Hearing all of this H.H. passes a negative judgment on himself. At this admission, Leo addresses the High Council:

> "I now turn to you, my officials. You have heard and know how things have been with League brother H. It is a lot that is not unfamiliar to you; many of you have had to experience it yourselves. The defendant did not know until this hour, or could not really believe, that his apostasy and aberration were a test. For a long time he did not give in. He endured it for many years, knowing nothing about the League, remaining alone, and seeing everything in which he believed in ruins. Finally, he could no longer hide and contain himself. His suffering became too great, and you know that as soon as suffering becomes acute enough, one goes forward. (p. 106)

The second episode supporting Greenleaf's interpretation of Hesse takes place at the end of the story. Here, the narrator, H.H., remembers a conversation he had had with Leo while they were still on the journey. They had remarked to one another that the "creations of poetry" often become "more vivid and real than the poets themselves." (Hesse, 1956, 118) H.H. had asked Leo "why it was that artists sometimes appeared to be only half-alive, while their creations seemed so irrefutably alive." In response to this question, Leo had answered: "It is just the same with mothers. When they have borne their children and given them their milk and beauty and strength, they themselves become invisible, and no one asks about them any more."(pp. 33-34)

H.H. had become sad when he heard Leo's response, and Leo, noticing H.H.'s sadness commented that "it is sad and yet also beautiful," that "the law ordains that it shall be so." "The law," H.H. had asked, "What law is that, Leo?"

> "The law of service. He who wishes to live long must serve, but he who wishes to rule does not live long."

> "Then why do so many strive to rule?"

> "Because they do not understand. There are few who are born to be masters; they remain happy and healthy. But all the others who have only become masters through endeavor, end in nothing."

> "In what nothing, Leo?"

> "For example, in the sanitoria." (pp. 34-35)

In these two episodes, Hesse seems to be saying that the alternative to a life of service is a life of madness. The *Journey to the East* is a story about the need for individuals--expressed as the 'law of service'--to psychologically integrate their inner nature as 'servants' with their outward egos, thus opening themselves to the larger surrounding world. Hesse suggests that each human being must face the fact that the world is larger than any one person, and thus, an individual must learn to accept the world on its terms and to begin serving that world. Eventually, men and women learn that they cannot project onto others or onto the world what they want others or want the world to be. Situations inevitably emerge that require all individuals to choose between their ego-driven desires and their outward duties to the world. Moreover, individuals begin to suffer pain as they become aware that the sane, conscious choice favors submission and service. Based on this view, Greenleaf

(1977) takes the next step to argue that if human nature involves service, then those who are truest to their nature should lead. He contends:

> A new moral principle is emerging which holds that the only authority deserving one's allegiance is that which is freely and knowingly granted by the led to the leader in response to, and in proportion to, the clearly evident servant stature of the leader. Those who choose to follow this principle will not casually accept the authority of existing institutions. *Rather, they will freely respond only to individuals who are chosen as leaders because they are proven and trusted as servants.* To the extent that this principle prevails in the future, the only truly viable institutions will be those that are predominantly servant-led. (p. 10)

A Feeling of Responsibility

In posthumously published essays, Greenleaf (1996) wrote about the need for fully developed servant leaders to possess what he termed, 'an adequate sense of *responsibility*.' [Italics his] (p. 41) The requirements of responsibility," he wrote, "are internal rather than external:" "Responsibility is not tested by a formula, a code, or a set of rules. A sense of responsibility is an attitude, a feeling. It is an overriding point of view, the color of the glasses through which one sees the world, the frame of reference within which one's philosophy of life evolves. (p. 42)

Greenleaf's comments seem to reflect basic concerns about the need for individual responsibility and choice to be inner directed. Yet, as one delves deeper into Greenleaf's definition of responsibility and examines his conception of the role of responsibility in society, another picture begins to emerge. The motivation for an individual's actions and feelings are seen to come from the outside, not from the individual's inner psyche. As Greenleaf uses the term, 'responsibility' "requires that a person think, speak, and act as if personally accountable to all who may be affected by his or her thoughts, words, and deeds." Since, "[p]eople are affected by his or her thoughts, words, and deeds," "responsibility is affirmative and imposes obligations that one might not choose." In addition, "[I]t is negative in that it restrains or modifies what one might choose to think, say, or do."(all quotes, p. 41)

Greenleaf argues that the strong servant leader accepts "a feeling of total responsibility for the wider community of which he or she is a part." This feeling does not always entail that an individual "*act* totally responsible." Instead, it implies that he or she "*feels* totally responsible," such that the "things that are good for the society please this person, and the things that harm it cause pain--deep down inside."(p. 42) He explains that the feeling of total responsibility most often comes into play in a familial setting. One feels totally responsible for his or her family. However, this sense of responsibility diminishes, Greenleaf argues, as one becomes involved in the larger community. For Greenleaf, the diminution of feelings of total responsibility as one progresses from familial to larger community dealings represents a major concern: "The wider community requires more of this familial feeling than it usually gets. If it is seriously lacking for long, there will be no community, no civilization, and in the end, no family." (p. 42)

Overall, Greenleaf presents a picture of organizational leadership that finds its focus in responsible service: service to others, service to one's family, and service to one's society and nation. In addition, he sees a tight integration among these three forms of service as individuals 'lose themselves' in their concern for the larger world. This account of servant leadership in organizations, however, raises at least three sets of issues that involve: 1) the motivations underlying individual moral choice, 2) the context of 'service' in contemporary Christian societies, and 3) the problem of 'suffering service' in the 20th century. Each of these concerns deserves consideration.

Servant Leadership and Individual Moral Choice

Greenleaf's account of servant leadership raises basic issues regarding individual motivation: how can an individual really know for certain what has motivated a particular action he or she has initiated? When the behavior of a Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of a private or public organization seems to reflect the principles of servant leadership, are this individual's actions motivated by a free desire to serve? Or, discerning the type of leadership traits demanded by the public, is this individual manipulating his or her public image to reflect what the public demands, only to change images when public tastes in leadership change? At a deeper level, is this individual consciously aware of his or her service-oriented actions? Or, is he or she unconsciously adopting an attitude of 'servanthood,' because it was ingrained at an early age? Only the individual CEO, grappling with his or her individual conscience, can even begin to answer these questions, and even then, he or she may only get a glimpse into their own inner motivations. The concern about inner motivation points to a fundamental blind spot in Greenleaf's account of servant leadership: individuals experience moral tensions and inner conflicts when they make the decision to serve.

Greenleaf's account of servant leadership seems to deny that there exist any inner tensions or *conflicts of responsibilities* between one's ultimate spiritual and religious responsibility to the Other and one's responsibility to one's society, culture, family, and place of employment. In addition, it denies that individuals may experience legitimate doubts and anxieties when called upon to render service in particular circumstances. By ignoring or downplaying these inner conflicts, the concept of servant leadership denies individuals the right to choose whom to serve, where and when. It denies individuals the right to make *moral and spiritual choices* in organizational life.

In his book, *The Gift of Death* (1995a), Derrida—drawing his inspiration from the theologian and philosopher, Kierkegaard (1985)—refers back to the story of Abraham and Isaac. In secret, Abraham goes to the mountain to sacrifice Isaac, his only son. He does this because of his duty to God, and his belief that God has called for this sacrifice. Isaac is Abraham's only beloved son, for whom he will do most anything. Isaac's sacrifice is Abraham's ultimate gift to God: offered as "a 'pure gift' (not an exchange), without hope of return, a gift of death, of Isaac who has no price, who is of incalculable worth." (Caputo, 1997, p. 213) This 'gift' includes not only Isaac's death, however, but Abraham's death as well, for Abraham will surely lose his family when the sacrifice has been made, and he will lose all stakes in the future. Abraham will violate the laws of family, and friends. Once committed, his action will violate all laws of human decency and morality. All those who will hear about what Abraham has done will see it as an atrocity. Indeed, as a murderer, Abraham might be killed for having killed. Essentially, Abraham will die both inwardly and outwardly when he sacrifices his son.

At the very last moment, however, in the instant that Abraham was about to swing his knife down to kill Isaac, God's messenger halted Abraham's hand and spared Isaac's life. This was a gift of life to both Abraham and Isaac, a gift which was totally unexpected by Abraham. God waited until the last second before stopping Abraham, for God had to determine how serious Abraham was in his decision to make of Isaac an ultimate gift of sacrifice. God had to be assured that Abraham's decision was uncalculated, made 'without hope of return.' Elsewhere, in his essay, *On the Name* (1995b), Derrida notes that "[p]ure morality must exceed all calculation, conscious or unconscious, of restitution or reappropriation," and any gesture of pure morality must give "affirmation, unlimited, incalculable, or uncalculating, with any possible reappropriation." Indeed, "a gesture remains *a-moral*," Derrida argues, "if it was accomplished out of *duty* in the sense of 'duty of restitution,' out of a duty which would come down to the discharge of a debt, out of such a duty as having to return what has been lent or borrowed." (pp. 132-133)

Abraham has gone beyond duty in the sense of 'restitution or reappropriation.' Commenting on Derrida's account and interpretation of the story, Caputo (1997) notes that Abraham "has stopped quarreling with God over prices:" "He does not enter into negotiations with God, as he had haggled over the price of Sodom and

Gomorrah in Genesis 18. Instead of giving God trouble over what looks like an unreasonable demand, he just says *me voici*." (p. 213)

In silence, Abraham was forced to confront the divine Other, and suffer the paradox inherent in this situation. He could either disobey God's call, refuse to sacrifice his son, and suffer the consequences for having disobeyed God, or he could maintain his ties with God and break the ties to his family, his culture, and conventional human morality. In this sense, Abraham's decision to sacrifice Isaac was both responsible and irresponsible. (Derrida, 1995a) His decision was "absolutely responsible because it answers for itself before the absolute other," but simultaneously, "irresponsible because it [was] guided neither by reason nor by an ethics justifiable before men or before the law of some universal tribunal." (p. 77) Here, Derrida suggests, the actions of others were as inaccessible to Abraham's understanding as his inaccessibility to God. Abraham had as little understanding of how his family and society would react to his sacrifice of Isaac as he did of God's reaction. In his secrecy, Abraham was totally cut off from both God and his fellow human beings. For Derrida, this aloneness signifies a universal human condition.

There exists an ultimate barrier of solitude and inaccessibility between each individual and God, and between each individual and all other individuals. Human beings, Derrida suggests, are unable "to be responsible at the same time before the other and before others, before the others of the other." In addition, "each of us, everyone else, each other is infinitely other in its absolute singularity, inaccessible, solitary, transcendent, nonmanifest, originally nonpresent to my *ego.*" Thus, for each of us, it can be said that our loved ones and our neighbors are as inaccessible to us, as Jahweh was to Abraham, "as secret and transcendent." (pp. 77-78)

Genuine Servant or Tragic Hero

Insofar as each human being receives a call from God that is shrouded in secrecy, then "there is no longer any ethical generality that does not fall prey to the paradox of Abraham." "At the instant of every decision and through the relation to *every other (one) as every (bit) other,*" Derrida argues, "everyone else asks us at every moment to behave like knights of faith." (pp. 78-79) Yet, it is unclear how each individual will react in response to God's call. Of Kierkegaard's attitude toward Abraham, Derrida writes that "Kierkegaard keeps coming back to this, recalling that he doesn't understand Abraham, that he wouldn't be capable of doing what he did." (pp. 79-80) Kierkegaard (1985) says, of the 'knight of faith:'

> Whether the individual is now really in a state of temptation or a knight of faith, only the individual can decide . . . The true knight of faith is always absolute isolation, the false knight is sectarian. The latter involves an attempt to leap off the narrow path of the paradox in order to become a tragic hero on the cheap. . . (p. 106)

The knight of faith "has the pain of being unable to make himself intelligible to others but feels no vain desire to show others the way." Here, "the pain is the assurance, vain desires are unknown to him, his mind is too serious for that." (p. 107.) In contrast, "the false knight readily betrays himself by this instantly acquired proficiency:"

> . . . he just doesn't grasp the point that if another individual is to walk the same path he has to be just as much the individual and is therefore in no need of guidance, least of all from one anxious to press his services on others. Here again, people unable to bear the martyrdom of unintelligibility jump off the path, and choose instead, conveniently enough, the world's admiration of their proficiency. The true knight of faith is a witness, never a teacher, and in this lies the deep humanity in him which is more worth than this foolish concern for others' weal and woe which is honored under the name of sympathy, but which is really nothing but vanity. (Ibid.)

Regarding this view of Kierkegaard's, Derrida (1995a) comments that "our faith is not assured, because faith can never be, it must never be a certainty." The "secret truth of faith" involves "absolute responsibility and absolute passion," "a passion that, sworn to secrecy, cannot be transmitted from generation to generation." Indeed, "the normal condition of a faith which is thus bound to secrecy, nevertheless dictates to us the following: we must always start over." Faith must be rediscovered and invented anew by each new generation. "Each generation," Derrida argues, "must begin again to involve itself in it without counting on the generation before." (p. 80) One could add that only the openness of 'starting over' allows each generation to conceive 'service' as a *purely moral act*, performed not for calculated past or future duty, but for awe-filled love of God and one another.

If one renders service because of one's outward legal, economic, organizational or religious duties or responsibilities, can such service still be regarded, also, as a 'pure sacrificial gift,' made without inner calculation or expectation of reward? The ambiguities inherent in this question, for the individual, belie the ambiguities of servant leadership as an organizational doctrine. Neither men nor women can be certain, in an absolute sense, what they will do when confronted with inward calls to make sacrificial gifts such as acts of service or of self-sacrifice.

To assume, with the proponents of servant leadership, that human beings already know what they must do when faced with the call to serve, denies that individuals have a right to make moral and spiritual choices within contemporary organizations. The assumption also denies any sense that individuals might have which connects the right *not* to render service in contemporary organizations when such service violates higher moral principles. More importantly, it removes from each individual, and from each successive generation, the ability to partake of God's spontaneous, unexpected gift giving in the world.

The Christian Context that Surrounds Servant Leadership

A second set of issues surrounding Greenleaf's account of servant leadership concerns the appropriate context in which servant leadership 'makes sense' and is understood by those who observe individual acts of service. Do other members of organizations and societies really know when their leaders have acted out of the pure motive of service, as opposed to personal gain and power? Moreover, does service to an organization also constitute service to society? To the nation? To God? Only in 'conservative' and 'fundamentalist' Christian societies, where individuals are seen as 'servants' or 'slaves' to God, can one assume that servant leadership in organizations makes sense and that service at one level constitutes service at higher levels.

In the context of late 20th century religious currents, Greenleaf's 'servant leadership,' with its notion of service as a duty, and its denial of individual moral and spiritual choice, represents an attempt to introduce Christian fundamentalist principles into organizational life. Just as Christian fundamentalism arose as an attempt to deal with the ambiguities of post-modern life, so 'servant leadership' represents a parallel effort in contemporary organizations.

Traditional, conservative Christian theology interprets 'service' to God and to the Church in the context of a hierarchical ascension of functions, loyalties and responsibilities. A structural 'hierarchy of service in faith' is envisioned whereby children must submit to their mother, the mother to her husband, the husband to the Church, the Church to Christ, and Christ to God. Paul combines what Gareth Morgan (1986) terms the 'machine' and the 'organic' metaphors to describe the Christian order:

> The body of Christ has many different parts, just as any other body does. Some of us are Jews, and others are Gentiles. Some of us are slaves, and others are free. But God's Spirit baptized each of us and made us part of the body of Christ. Now we each drink from that same Spirit.

Our bodies don't have just one part. They have many parts. Suppose a foot says, "I'm not a hand, and so I'm not part of the body." Wouldn't the foot still belong to the body? Or suppose an ear says, "I'm not an eye, and so I'm not part of the body." Wouldn't the ear still belong to the body? If our bodies were only an eye, we couldn't hear a thing. And if they were only an ear, we couldn't smell a thing. But God has put all parts of our body together in the way that he decided is best.

A body isn't really a body, unless there is more than one part. It takes many parts to make a single body. That's why the eyes cannot say they don't need the hands. That's also why the head cannot say it doesn't need the feet. In fact, we cannot get along without the parts of the body that seem to be the weakest. We take special care to dress up some parts of our bodies. We are modest about our personal parts, but we don't have to be modest about other parts.

God put our bodies together in such a way that even the parts that seem the least important are valuable. He did this to make all parts of the body work together smoothly, with each part caring about the others. If one part of our body hurts, we hurt all over. If one part of our body is honored, the whole body will be happy.

Together you are the body of Christ. Each one of you is part of his body. (American Bible Society, 1995, p. 1199)

The 'part' of the body to which one gets assigned depends upon what 'gifts' God has given one. Whether one is a prophet, a teacher, an apostle, a healer, or an interpreter in the Church depends upon what talents and abilities God has handed out. (Ibid.) What Paul suggests, here, is a functional hierarchy, with 'higher' functioning parts and 'lower' parts. Each part may act as 'leader' in his or her individual sphere of activity. Just as a brain and foot may be said to 'lead off' in thinking and walking, so bishops and husbands each 'lead off' in their own respective, but increasingly limited, spheres of activity. In this vein, contemporary Calvinists sometimes speak of the "sovereignty of social spheres" where each sphere "has been authorized and commissioned by God," and each possesses "sovereign rights within its own domain." (Meeter, 1990, p. 127) (In many ways, these descriptions resembles Max Weber's (1978, Vol. II, pp. 956-1003) account of bureaucracy, where experts take charge in their authoritatively delimited offices and spheres of duties and activities.)

In addition to assumptions about the existence of a hierarchical chain of being, there also exist implicit assumptions about salvation and rewards in heaven. The promise of salvation has provided the primary justification of service in Christian theology. Throughout Christian history, this promise has encouraged believers to assume that there exists something like an "economy of salvation," or "economy of sacrifice," where one calculatingly makes sacrifices in this life to gain promised rewards and salvation in the afterlife. (See Caputo, 1997; Derrida, 1995a) Here, 'service' takes on connotations of divine economic sanction. One performs acts of service as a Christian duty, hoping to gain eternal life.

One may or may not agree with the characterization, above, of traditional Christian doctrine as it relates to one's individual faith, spirituality, and expectation of salvation. In addition, to be fair, one must hasten to add that from this view, individual 'parts' of the body serve out of a love for God and for one another. Yet, institutionally, all talk of 'leaders' implies a need by other individuals to be 'led,' and talk of 'servants' implies the existence of one or more who are 'served.'

Law of Service

In the context of traditional Christian theology, therefore, 'servant leadership' takes on certain functional roles. Christian doctrine readily supports Greenleaf's and Hesse's notions of the 'law of service.' Christian beliefs about the existence of a hierarchical chain of being provide ready meaning to Greenleaf's views on families and on responsibility in organizations, discussed earlier. One 'serves' as a leader in one's own sphere of authority and

responsibility—as a teacher, a prophet, a husband, a wife, etc.—while keeping in mind that the actual and final 'recipient' of the service is God. Recall that Greenleaf's comments on responsibility imply that the social arrangements and organizations of the 'wider community' represent 'families;' at the least, individuals should bring to their work and civic lives the same attitudes they bring to their family lives. Finally, Christian assumptions about a post-death, sacrificial economy of salvation provide a concrete rationale for notions such as servant leadership. Indeed, such notions help keep traditional, Christian social structures intact, as each individual strives to achieve his or her ultimate, after-death reward for faithful services rendered to God while in life. Ultimately, in the context of traditional Christianity, servant leadership represents a means of attaining and realizing salvation.

Servant leadership also fits with the larger, more contemporary fundamentalist religious urge. Throughout the early 20th century, many philosophers and theologians argued, generally, that the move toward social and economic modernization entailed a move away from religion and spirituality. They argued that with its emphasis on scientific rationalism and objective empiricism, modernism was essentially anti-religious in tone. Such arguments gave rise to later discussions in the 1950's and 1960's regarding the emergence of the 'secular city' (Cox, 1965), as well as the essential tension between science and religion (Barbour, 1966). By the 1970's, opposition to the anti-religious impulses of modernism intensified and coalesced around the formation of new, 'fundamentalist' currents among Christians, Jews, and Muslims. By the end of the 20th century, religious fundamentalism had become a permanent fixture in the cultural and political landscapes of various industrial and post-industrial societies. What went unnoticed, or ignored was the simultaneous rise of religious fundamentalism and of postmodernist philosophy and culture. Only now, at the beginning of the 21st century, has the meaning of the fundamentalist urge in postmodern society become more apparent: religious fundamentalism represents "a specifically postmodern form of religion, born of the internal contradictions of postmodern life." (Bauman, 1997, p. 182)

Bauman has recently argued that as a religious form, fundamentalism combines traditional notions regarding the "insufficiency of man" with the modernist "vanity of dreams to take human fate under human control." (Ibid.) The emergence of fundamentalism, he suggests, "is not a hiccup of ostensibly long chased away yet not fully suppressed mystical cravings, not a manifestation of eternal human irrationality, immune to all healing and domesticating efforts, and not a form of escape back into the pre-modern past" (Ibid.). Rather:

> Fundamentalism is a thoroughly contemporary, postmodern phenomenon, embracing fully the 'rationalizing' reforms and technological developments of modernity, and attempting not so much to 'roll back' modern departures, as to 'have one's cake and eat it' -- make possible a full enjoyment of modern attractions without paying the price they demand. *The price in question is the agony of the individual condemned to self-sufficiency, self-reliance and the life of never fully satisfying and trustworthy choice* [Italics mine] (Ibid.).

Power of the Group

Fundamentalism promises 'salvation' from the suffering entailed in the "experience of freedom," where one must make "risky choices" and suffer the loss of forfeited chances and possibilities entailed in every choice, and suffer the unknown consequences of choices made. It promises salvation from "the nightmare of being not up to the new and improved formulae of life which the notoriously capricious future may bring." Fundamentalism sends the message, to believers, that in the experience of freedom, "the human *individual* [italics his] is not self-sufficient and cannot be self-reliant." Thus, an individual "cannot go by one's own judgement; one needs to be guided, and directed, and told what to do."(p. 183) As Bauman points out, here, "unlike the message carried by pre-modern religion" concerning human insufficiency, this is "not the message of the weakness of the human *species* -- but of the irreparable weakness of the human *individual*, compared to the human species' omnipotence." [Italics his] (Ibid.) Ultimately, "[f]undamentalism "promises to develop all the infinite powers of the group which -- when deployed in full -- would compensate for the incurable insufficiency of its individual

members, and therefore justify the unquestionable subordination of individual choices to the rules proclaimed in the group's name." (p. 184) Greenleaf's notion of 'servant leadership' complements this fundamentalist notion of salvation through the 'infinite powers of the group.'

The Pain of Service

Implicitly justified as Christian service and sacrifice, servant leadership promises organizational leaders salvation from the individual suffering and pain entailed in making human choices and suffering the consequences of wrong choices. Instead of acknowledging the suffering inherent in the human freedom to make uncertain choices, concepts such as 'servant leadership' and 'servanthood' in organizations can effect a fraud. By cloaking organizational decision making as 'service,' sanctified by higher religious purpose, those with power can use the concept of servant leadership to curtail all debate and discussion about the hidden motives and intentions of those who lead. If accepted as true by those who are lead or being served, the concept can divert attention away from certain basic questions: Am I being led/served as the result of the leader servant's love for me, and his or her faith and spiritual orientation toward God, or does such leading and serving come as part of a larger political, cultural, and/or economic agenda, for which service toward me is only a means to achieve a material end? Either way, am I merely an instrument or tool, through which another attains salvation or material gain, without assurance of my own salvation or material reward? What is the meaning of the sacrifices and pain that I am asked to endure on behalf of others?

At a deep personal and spiritual level, servant leadership allows politically and economically powerful individuals and groups to deny that the pain suffered by those who *involuntarily* serve has any theological standing or significance. It denies that the 'God of Hope who hears the cries of God's people' (See Bruggerman, 1988)--sometimes touted by fundamentalist Christians--has anything to do with those who suffer because of economic repression and injustice or because of oppressive and abusive patriarchal systems.

Worse still, the notion of servant leadership seems to make a mockery of those who willingly, and *without compulsion* serve others and sacrifice their own interests for another's. If applied in the public realm, the notion of servant leadership completely blinds one as to who is doing the service, for whom and why, and at what cost or sacrifice. In this context, the notion of 'public service' loses its sense of willing sacrifice and of unselfishly putting the nation's and society's interests ahead of one's own.

Sacrifice and Suffering

A final set of issues surrounding Greenleaf's account of servant leadership concerns the way in which 'sacrifice' and 'suffering service' have lost their meaning in contemporary life. Traditionally, Christian cultures have taken statements such as those made by Paul in the book of Romans, quoted at the beginning of this article, to legitimate various forms of service that entail suffering. Indeed, a hallmark of traditional Christian doctrine glorifies the willingness of Jesus of Nazareth to suffer death to insure the salvation of believers. In this sense, the doctrine goes, Jesus made the ultimate sacrifice and thereby rendered the ultimate service to mankind. Thus, Jesus' action as a 'suffering servant' has been taken as a model of what service should be and what kind of suffering and sacrifices one should expect under the worst of circumstances when one endeavors to serve. This model, explicitly or implicitly, underlies Greenleaf's notion of servant leadership as an organizational style. In the wake of the 20th century, however, one of the bloodiest centuries in human history, this traditional model of service has become problematic.

First, traditional notions of 'suffering service' entail the idea of voluntary suffering and sacrifice. What becomes immediately apparent in contemporary life is that the line between voluntary and involuntary sacrifice has blurred, if indeed that line could ever be clearly drawn. If due to circumstances or poor education, one has limited skills and limited prospects, and one's job entails suffering and physical danger--say coal mining, can it

legitimately be assumed that the sacrifice made to bring food to that individual's family is fully voluntary? Or, to take another case, it could and has been said that ultimately, the citizens of Hiroshima and Nagasaki made the ultimate sacrifice by becoming symbols--in death--of what a nuclear holocaust would mean for the future of humanity. By the example of their 'sacrifice,' the world may have been 'saved' from an unimaginable catastrophe. To say, by any stretch of the imagination, however, that these victims of war took on this 'service' of suffering and sacrifice 'willingly' seems grotesque and distorted. Moreover, looking at these deaths as some ultimate means for achieving world peace reflects the rampant instrumentalism of contemporary society in the late 20th century. These considerations lead to a second problem.

The possible scales of suffering and sacrifice increased dramatically in the 20th century. Perhaps, one can look back with awe at the few thousand saints who, for the sake of the early Christian Church and its survival, willingly sacrificed themselves and suffered in the Roman coliseum over the period of several centuries. In the 20th century, however, millions of people lost their lives, in part, for the sake of religious survival during the holocaust-- Jews and Christians. Later, during the Cold War, whole societies expressed an official willingness to undergo complete annihilation to maintain the continuity of their religious principles. One wonders who would have been around to appreciate the 'suffering service' of these latter, would-be late-20th century 'saints.' Surely such views completely contradict the sayings of Jesus of Nazareth about the sacredness of life, they grossly distort the meaning of Jesus' death, which occurred when Jesus spoke out against the social oppression and political injustices of his day.

Finally, it has become apparent to many that the willingness to undergo suffering service can itself represent a sinful act. Jacquelyn Grant (1996) persuasively argues that in societies and cultures where 'servanthood' becomes associated with a victimized class--i.e. Women and minorities--concepts of servanthood become sinful since such concepts lead to the continuation of oppression and abuse. Grant notes that terms such as 'servant' and 'servanthood' "are customarily used to relegate certain victimized people--those on the underside of history-- to the lower rung of society." In addition, such terms perpetuate the perception that "politically disenfranchised peoples" represent "the servant class for the politically powerful." Thus, many white people once believed (unfortunately, some still believe) that non-white people "were created for the primary purpose of providing service for white people." Similarly, "in patriarchal societies, the notions of service and servant were often used to describe the role that women played in relation to men and children." In Grant's mind, all of this calls for a reconsideration of the notion of 'servanthood:'

> The hierarchy of the church claims to be servants of God and the people, yet they are likewise most often of the dominant culture--white and/or male. Generally and relatively speaking, they are economically well-off, or at the least adequately provided for. This is not often true for service/servants on the lower rung of society. Why are the real servants overwhelmingly poor, Black, and Third World? Why is their service status always controlled by the upholders of the status quo? (pp. 200-201)

Grant goes on to say that the language of servanthood represents a problem since that language "has undergirded much of the human structures causing pain and suffering for many oppressed peoples," and "[t]he conditions created were nothing short of injustice and, in fact, sin" (pp. 200-201). In this same vein, Brown and Parker (1989) call for a reassessment of the traditional emphasis of Christianity on the notion of the 'suffering servant.' They note that "Christianity has been a primary--in many women's lives *the* [italics theirs] primary--force in shaping [women's] acceptance of abuse." Indeed, "the central image of Christ on the cross as the savior of the world communicates the message that suffering is redemptive." Quoting Mary Daly (1972), they argue that exhortations to imitate Jesus have furthered the abuse of women by idealizing the very qualities that have come to characterize victims: "sacrificial love, passive acceptance of suffering, humility, meekness, etc." (Brown & Parker, 1989, pp. 2-3; Daly, p. 72).

The Christian tradition of "sacrifice and obedience" and its "promise of resurrection," Brown and Parker suggest, has persuaded countless numbers and generations of women "to endure pain, humiliation, and violation of our sacred rights to self-determination, wholeness, and freedom." (Ibid.) In this context, the attempt to adopt the concept of servant leadership as an organizational principle looks more like an attempt to secure traditional, patriarchal structures of manipulation and abuse.

Ultimately, any discussion about organizational service or servanthood must come to terms with the role that leadership--legitimated as service--has played and now plays in the perpetuation or continuation of suffering and oppression in the modern and post-modern Christian orders.

Conclusion

From the perspective of social, economic, and political history, 'servant leadership' has at best, the feel of an oxymoron, and at worst, the look of a hypocritical stance that masks oppression and abuse. In the contemporary world, 'Leadership' and 'service' have become almost contradictory notions. Unless one fails as a leader and faces the consequences of that failure, leadership rarely connotes sacrifice and suffering. More often, sacrifice and suffering are left to those who serve. The notion of 'being lonely at the top,' often touted as a 'sacrifice' by servant leadership proponents, rarely entails anything other than a willingness to be the lone recipient of wealth and/or of social and political recognition when things go well. This becomes immediately apparent in this era where corporate downsizing and skyrocketing executive salaries have gone hand in hand. If service has historically connoted sacrifice and suffering, leadership has too often connoted privilege and self-serving.

What Greenleaf and Hesse assumed about their cultures and societies has become questionable in the postmodern world. Their assumptions about service, duty and responsibility tied to a world where formal, traditional religious doctrine founded economic and social relationships. At the turn of the century, Max Weber (1958, 1978) sought to explain Hesse's and Greenleaf's world as he explored the interrelations between religion and economics. However, the vision of a society of individuals, motivated by a desire to gain heavenly reward through terrestrial sacrifices, no longer holds the imagination of most people in the contemporary world. Indeed, even Hesse and Greenleaf seem to reflect Weber's argument that this vision had all but vanished from the modern world by the early 20th century (1958, pp. 181-183). Greenleaf and Hesse talk about 'service,' but their discussions seem to imply that one either serves for the sake of service, or one serves to develop one's own personal, individual potential, or both. Either way, Weber's (1958) lament seems true that "[t]he modern man is in general, even with the best will, unable to give religious ideas significance for culture and national character which they deserve." (p. 183)

References

American Bible Society, (1995). *Holy Bible*. Contemporary English Version. New York.

Bauman, Zygmunt. (1997). *Postmodernity and its Discontents*. New York: New York University Press.

Barbour, I., Editor. (1966). *Issues in Science and Religion*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Berry, Leonard L; Parasuraman, A; Zeithaml, Valarie; Adsit, Dennis; et al; (1994). "Improving service quality in America: Lessons Learned" *The Academy of Management Executive*. May.

Brown, Joanne Carlson, and Bohn, Carole R., Editors, (1989). *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique*. Cleveland, OH: The Pilgrim Press.

Brown, J. C., & Parker, Rebecca (1989). For God So Loved the World?. In Brown and Bohn, editors, *Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse* (p. 1). Cleveland, OH: The Pilgrim Press.

Brueggemann, W. (1988). *Israel's Prasie: Doxology against Idolatry and Ideology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Caputo, J. D. (1997). *The Prayers and Tears of Jacques Derrida: Religion without Religion*. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Cox, Harvey Gallagher, (1965). *The Secular City: Secularization and Urbanization in Theological Perspective*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Coles, Robert, (1993). *The Call of Service: A Witness to Idealism*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Dering, Nancy Z, (1998). Leadership in quality organizations. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*. Cincinnati, Jan/Feb.

Derrida, J. (1995a). *The Gift of Death* (Translated, David Wills). Chicago: The University of Chigaco Press.

Derrida, J. (1995b). *On the Name* (Edited, Thomas Dutoit, Translated, David Wood, John P. Leavey, Jr., and Ian McLeod). Stanford: Standford University Press.

Grant, J. (1996). The Sin of Servanthood and the Deliverance of Discipleship. In Townes, Emilie M., *A Troubling in My Soul: Womanist Perspecives on Evil & Suffering* (199). MaryKnoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Greenleaf, Robert K., (1977). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of legitimate Power and Greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.

-----------------------, (1996). *On Becoming a Servant-Leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hesse, H. (1956). *The Journey to the East* (Translated, Hilda Rosner). New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kierkegaard, S. (1985). *Fear and Trembling* (Transalated, Alastair Hannay). London: Penguin Books.

Kiechel, Walter, III, (1992). "The Leader as Servant." *Fortune*. Chicago, May 4.

Meeter, H. Henry, (1990). The Basic Ideas of Calvinism. 6th Edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of Organization*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Rouse, David, (1998) "The Power of Servant-Leadership." *The Booklist*. Chicago, Aug.

Spears, Larry C., Editor, (1995). *Reflections on Leadership*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Townes, Emilie M., Editor, (1996). *A Troubling In My Soul: Womanist Perspectves on Evil & Suffering*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

Weber, M. (1958). *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (Translated, Talcott Parsons). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

---------------- (1978). *Economy and Society (2 Volumes)* (Edited, Guenter Roth and Claus Wittich, and translated, Ephraim Fischoff, et. al.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wyschogrod, E., & Caputo, J. (1998 Fall). Postmodernism and the desire for God: An E-mail exchange. *Cross Currents, 48*(3), 298-310.

***

Robert C. Zinke is an associate professor of public administration at Eastern Washington University.

A Tale of Two Sisters

Nancy Murray

Once upon a time there were twin sisters who each achieved high administrative positions in government. One was an executive in the Department of the Interior. Her name was Servana and she worked closely with the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Land and Water Resources. The other sister was an executive in the Department of Agriculture. Her name was Imana and she worked closely with the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Natural Resources and Environment. Both sisters lived and worked in Washington, D. C., and being identical twins they were naturally close. They often met to discuss their respective jobs among other common interests.

On an unusually cold afternoon in February, the sisters agreed to meet for coffee at their favorite rendezvous - a chic cafe near the Watergate complex. As Servana watched out the window for her sister, she noticed that a light snow was beginning to fall. The misty flakes filled the air outside the cafe window reminding Servana of the fascination she felt as a child watching her Aunt Helen carefully open the compact that held the secret to her beautiful complexion. Fine puffs of pale ochre powdered the room delighting the young girl and bringing a smile to the lovely face of her aunt. Servana often engaged in moments of private reverie. As a practicing Buddhist, she was accoustomed to meditating morning and evening. Perhaps this was why she appreciated the rare moments in the day when she was alone with her thoughts and her memories. Servana had a natural bent toward contemplation and enjoyed just sitting quietly pondering whatever crossed her mind.

On this particular afternoon, Servana was thinking about how she became interested in studying Buddhism. Surely it had something to do with her membership in the discussion group she had joined when she first moved to the city. The group was made up of people who found eastern ideas fascinating and who needed to share their perceptions with others like themselves. However, she speculated that there must be something deep inside her that responded to the ideals of Buddhism. Servana tried to live according to these beliefs and used every day as an opportunity to practice them. For example, she took seriously the precepts of the Eightfold Path outlined by Siddhartha Guatama, who was the Buddha.

Servana fully accepted the first path, "Right Views" which teaches that the search for private satisfaction causes untold suffering in the world. She remembered the time that she acted hastily and lashed out at her deputy, Sam, because he had implemented a conservation policy that had been rescinded by executive order. Servana was consumed with her own reputation as a manager. She worried that she would be criticized for failing to supervise the actions of her subordinate. Consequently, she alienated Sam instead of listening to him and learning why he had failed to respond appropriately to the change order. Her own image in the eyes of her supervisors took precedence over her responsibility to foster the development of her employee.

Servana learned from that experience the value of "Right Intent", the second precept of the Eightfold Path, and vowed to make up her mind as to what she really wanted to accomplish as a career civil servant. She thought long and hard on this issue and determined that her professional career would be dedicated to freeing herself from the prison of her

own desires. She would strive to overcome her strong ego which demanded that she stand out from the crowd and use every opportunity to overshadow her fellow managers. This was not an easy goal for Servana to pursue due to her burning ambition to shine above the others. She experienced much unhappiness as a result of her need to excel. Servana also intended to build a strong sense of community among her employees. Since she was responsible for the decisions of twenty professional administrators this was no small feat to accomplish.

Servana found it particularly challenging to focus on the third precept of the Eightfold Path, "Right Speech" when dealing with a conflict. She knew that her words should be truthful but free from harsh judgment. She made a special effort to express herself in a charitable manner aware of the negative effect that over reaction can have on employees. Sam still appeared nervous whenever he made an error in judgment, even though much time had lapsed since Servana lost her cool and lashed out at him. How powerful our choice of words can be, she thought.

As she gazed at the white encrusted street outside the café window, Servana saw Sam's distraught face, in her mind's eye. He seemed embarrassed at the magnitude of her anger. She fell far short of the fourth precept of the Eightfold Path, "Right Conduct," when she hurt Sam. Had she followed the teaching, she would have reflected on her personal motivation before taking action. Had she stopped to consider why she was upset, she may have spared herself and Sam the compromised relationship they both faced as a result of her mistaken reaction to the unfortunate situation.

Servana lifted the cup to her lips enjoying the sweet taste of the warm cappuccino, a favorite of the civil servants who frequented the café. Her mood lifted as she pondered her chosen profession and realized that she was indeed involved in what the Buddha would define as "Right Livelihood", the fifth precept of the Eightfold Path. Public administration is a profession that is devoted to the promotion of life, not to its destruction. The impact of such dedication permeates all aspects of the field, from the citizens who are served to the administrators who serve them. Servana vowed not to use her role as a civil servant as an end in itself, but as a means to serve others and to attain personal growth. She had chosen a worthy profession and tried to measure up to its demands.

The sixth precept of the Eightfold Path, "Right Effort", teaches that one can cultivate virtue and control destructive states of mind through an act of will. Possessed of strong mind and daunting conscience, Servana found this teaching a challenge that she could master. Compassion for those who are served, employees and citizens, became her overriding concern. She focused on meeting these ideals by detaching herself as much as possible from her own self interest. As high minded as her aspirations were, Servana learned not to take herself and her attempts to follow the Eightfold Path too seriously. She gave herself great latitude and cultivated patience and a sense of humor. With an inward chuckle, Servana compared herself to a turtle ambling slowly on the road toward enlightenment, often stumbling, but always moving ahead.

In the distance, Servana recognized the bright red of her sister's cashmere coat blowing wildly in the snowy wind. Still lost in reverie, she found herself reflecting on the concept of "Right Mindfulness" the seventh precept of the Eightfold Path. Like most Buddhists, Servana saw the mind as having the greatest influence over human life. She was acutely aware of the impact of her thoughts and believed that ignorance is the culprit of all our problems. The way out of ignorance and toward an understanding of our real nature is self reflection. Servana spent many hours in quiet contemplation examining her thoughts, feeling, and actions.

Self reflection, especially at the end of the day, became as necessary for Servana as eating and drinking. Through self examination, she became aware of the impact of her actions. Sometimes, as in the case with Sam, this was a painful exercise. Eventually, she came to realize how easy it is simply to react to situations out of habit with little or no awareness of what is being done. The insights she gained through meditation taught Servana the importance of being aware of every thought, every image, every sensation, and every action. Had she been more mindful she may have acted in a more caring and effective way with Sam.

Just as Imana was entering the café, Servana was contemplating her progress on the path toward true fullfillment. She was far from attaining what the Buddha called enlightenment. However, she was making some headway. Through

"Right Concentration,", the final precept of the Eightfold Path, she managed to see through many of the delusions she previously harbored. Servana no longer used her individuality to separate her from others. She recognized individual differences, but saw them as superficial characteristics rather than using them as value judgments against those who did not measure up to preconceived norms.

Servana still made many errors and often acted contrary to the precepts of the Eightfold Path. But she was as compassionate toward herself as she tried to be toward everyone else. Relatively free from uncontrollable desires, Servana was a happy person with a good sense of humor who enjoyed the small everyday pleasures of work and play. She was intelligent, strong, and well liked. Although she had many friends, few were practicing Buddhists.

Servana tended to gravitate toward people like herself who were positive and interested in many things. As she grew in her spiritual practice, she became more tolerant of the foibles of others and more inclined toward helping her friends and co-workers. Both Servana and her twin sister, Imana, were dedicated public servants who managed their respective departments in different ways.

As she entered the café, Imana glanced at herself in the mirror next to the coat rack, "Oh Damn", she thought, "Look at my hair. As usual, I bit off more than I could chew - left my umbrella in the office because I was late - and didn't think. And now, my hair looks like hell." Imana took off her coat and as she reached for a hangar, she caught a glimpse of her sister sitting next to the snow encrusted window deep in thought. Imana smiled to herself, "Thank God she never gets mad when I keep her waiting. It's almost as if she enjoys the wait. " She reflected for a brief moment on how different she and Servana were in their approach to everything. She would have been a wreck waiting a half hour for anyone, let alone her sister. "It's really very funny," she mused, " that we can look so much alike and yet be so different."

After visiting the ladies room and making a feeble and unsuccessful attempt to vitalize her sopping wet hair, Imana shrugged her shoulders and left, eager to join her sister. "Hey, you didn't give up on me did ya." Startled, Servana looked up to see her limp haired twin sporting a lame grin. "Oh, Hi. Of course I didn't give up. What happened to your hair? It's plastered to your head. I didn't realize it was snowing that hard. That's really weird."

"Yeah, and my hair looks like shit, while you sit here like the queen bee." Servana waved her hand theatrically in a mocking gesture. "Well, as Mother would say, 'Miss High and Mighty, I'm just more efficient in my office than you are, and I was early.' So, what do you think of that." Appreciatively, Imana pulled her chair closer to the table, and leaning toward her sister said in a stage whisper, "What a day. And if you value your life, don't ask." "Poor baby", Servana answered. The two twins smiled at each other. Their pleasure in being together was obvious to the sensitive young waiter who came to take Imana's order for a double espresso with whipped cream and a canoli.

"Wow, calories galore, It must have been a wham doozie of a day for you to eat all that sugar. I value my life, but I'll take a risk. What the hell happened," Servana responded. Imana told her sister about the training session she had attended that morning on a concept the Department was intent on introducing throughout the ranks of the civil service. It was called Servant Leadership and it caused quite a stir among her employees. It seems as though some of the more senior members felt that they were being proselytzed and forced to adapt to what they perceived to be weak kneed techniques reminiscent of the touch-feely stuff of the 1970's.

Servana asked her sister to explain what the concept was and why her employees were so adamant against it. "Let me pull out a list of characteristics they gave us and you can see why they were so upset." Imana reached deep into her leather briefcase and pulled out a thick wad of loose leaf paper littered with penciled doodles along the margins - indicative of an active mind that was bored and restless. As she was retrieving the list, the waiter returned with steaming cups of fresh coffee and a plate of canoli. Imana relished her sweet repast, while Servana examined the items on the list.

Servana learned that the servant-leader is one who listens attentively to what others have to say and is actively receptive to their ideas; accepts others and shows empathy for them and their problems; cultivates foresight and intuition; develops his or her own awareness so that each situation is clearly perceived; takes the time to persuade others rather than imposing his or her own will; spends time communicating concepts; is committed to engage in healing whenever a rift occurs among individuals or within the institution; places great value on building community and trust among employees; engages in self reflection through contemplative practice, such as meditation; is actively engaged in the process of changing himself or herself.

As she read, Servana felt vindicated. Her long and arduous attempts to incorporate the teachings of the Eightfold Path into her management style took on a new dimension. She found herself responding emotionally to every word she read. She could hardly contain her joy as she read on and on. Finally, Servana carefully laid the list on the formica table, took a long sip of her fresh coffee and studied the tired face of her twin. "Imana," she said slowly, "we need to have a long serious talk."

References

Evans-Wentz, W.Y. *The Tibetan Book of the Great Liberation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

Goleman, Daniel, and Robert A. F. Thurman. *Mind Science*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1991.

Greenleaf, Robert K. *On Becoming A Servant Leader*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1996.

_____. *Servant Leadership*. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.

_____. *http:greenleaf.org/carelead.html*.

_____. *http:greenleaf.org/fortune 5.html*.

_____. *http://greenleaf.org/spears.html*.

Guenther, Herbert V., and Leslie S. Kawamura. *Mind in Buddhist Psychology*. Emeryville, California: Dharma Publishing, 1975.

Hamilton, Clarence H. ed. *Buddhism: A Religion of Infinite Compassion*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1952.

Jinpa, Geshe Thupten. Trans., ed. *The World of Tibetan Buddhism*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1995.

Revel, Jean-Francois, and Matthieu Ricard. *The Monk and the Philosopher*. New York: Schocken Books, 1998.

Rinpoche, Sogyal. *The Tibetan Book of Living and Dying*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993.

Rinpoche, Tulku Thondup. *Hidden Teachings of Tibet*. Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1997.

Smith, Huston. *The World's Great Religions*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.

Thurman, Robert. *Inner Revolution*. New York: Riverhead, 1998.

Waddell, L. Austin. *Tubetan Buddhism*. New York: Dover Publications, 1972.

*** *

Nancy Murray is a professor at the Department of Public Administration, Pace University.

Linking Theory with Practice:
Examining the Case of Servant Leadership & Community Policing

Brian N. Williams

Introduction

The emergence of the post-bureaucratic era has facilitated a transition from government (i.e., "government for the people") to public governance (i.e., "government by the people"). To buttress this transition and usher in and reinforce its practice, a new view of leadership is necessary. The old view of leadership, with its notions of power and authority, has been discussed and criticized because of its self-seeking and self-serving nature at the expense of those being "served." To engender public trust and advance public governance in the post-bureaucratic era requires a shift in the philosophy and practice of public organizations and how we define, view, and practice leadership.

Numerous theories have been advanced to facilitate necessary change and improve the pre-existing conditions affecting the public and public organizations and institutions. However, history reveals that many of those theories have been long on rhetoric but short on practical application in real world settings.

The practical applicability of servant leadership to the public sector has yet to be explored. Questions remain concerning whether the sacred principle of selfless service is compatible with the real world and the secular practices of public organizations and institutions. One possible application of servant leadership rests with the current practice of community policing. This essay examines an integration of theory into practice by probing the potential fusion of servant leadership with community policing.

An overview follows that summarizes the guiding philosophy, characteristics, principles and dimensions of this contemporary police practice.

Overview of Community Policing

Community policing has emerged as a strategy to combat the societal issues of crime and fear of crime that are plaguing communities across the nation. Often described as a "new" law enforcement strategy, the roots of community oriented policing extend back to the community relations programs of the 1950s and 1960s. Nonetheless, community policing is the hottest trend in law enforcement and has benefited from presidential backing, congressional funding, and public support. As recently as 1992-1993, a national survey to gauge the prevalence of the practice of community policing revealed that 76.17% of all law enforcement agencies have either implemented community oriented policing, made plans to implement it, or considered implementing this new approach to law enforcement (Annan, 1995). As a result, police and sheriff departments in a variety of settings, from rural and urban areas to university campuses and Native American tribal communities, are engaging in this "new" philosophical and organizational approach to policing.

Guiding Philosophy of Community Policing

The Community Policing Consortium (1994) defines community policing as consisting of two complementary components: community partnership and problem solving. At its core, the community policing philosophy and its approach is an attempt to improve police operations, management and relations with the public (Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994). Hence, community policing sets out to reshape the notions of power, trust, and control in police community relations by (1) adapting a hierarchical, paramilitary structure to include widespread participation and decentralized democratic styles within departments and communities to improve problem solving and (2) creating new partnerships to deal with issues affecting public safety and public order. In essence, community policing represents a model of law enforcement that seeks to integrate Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's (1994) big six - the police department, the community, elected civic officials, the business community, other public and non-profit agencies, and the media - in the co-production of public safety and public order. Consequently, a wide array of formal and informal approaches to this practice is used to counter community problems ranging from violations of building codes to child abuse to illegal drug use to domestic violence.

Community Policing Characteristics, Principles, Dimensions, & Functions

With the widespread implementation of community policing in various jurisdictions with different community characteristics and dynamics, its practice has often been misunderstood. Nonetheless, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) have attempted to clarify its application and have noted several essential principles. They include:

- Community policing is not a panacea
- Community policing is not new, but its roots extend to traditional policing
- Community policing is not soft on crime
- Community policing lends itself to various applications and isn't clearly defined
- Community policing is not a top down approach to public safety and public order
- Community policing is not elitist, nor is it designed to favor the rich and powerful
- Community policing is not paternalistic, hence police officers aren't viewed as the experts but as partners in creating and sustaining safer communities.

Similar to the principles and characteristics identified by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994), Cordner (1999) has noted four dimensions that describe the breadth of community policing -- the philosophical, the strategic, the tactical, and the organizational dimensions. These dimensions seek to increase citizen involvement and input; expand the role of law enforcement from crime fighting to include a much broader role or function; to reintroduce personal service policing and not bureaucratic behavior; to reorient operations and emphasize preventive or pro-active policing as well as a geographic focus, often in terms of permanent beat assignments with mini- or sub-stations; to foster positive police-citizen interactions and experiences; to build and facilitate active partnerships between the police and other members of the big six; and to adopt a problem solving orientation toward policing by restructuring police agencies. These dimensions reflect the full-service approach to policing that is synonymous with community policing. Moreover, these dimensions have ushered in an evolution of the police role and function and have transformed the more traditional reactive (i.e., responding to citizen requests for service) and proactive (i.e., police-initiated activities) functions into a more "coactive" function that facilitates the partnering or integration of the police with the community in the co-production of public safety and order (Ottemeier, 1992; Ottemeier and Wycoff, 1994; Ottemeier and Wycoff, 1997).

Leadership and Community Policing Success

Community policing success is dependent upon styles of leadership, management, and supervision to facilitate the integration of the community with law enforcement agencies in the co-production of public safety and public

order. This style of leadership must be amenable to the post-modern realities of our society, institutions, and organizations and must foster the construction and organization of communities. Servant leadership theory may represent a guiding theoretical framework to foster the efforts of community policing officers and further facilitate the integration of law enforcement and the community in the co-production of public safety and public order. Nonetheless, a question remains: Can the sacred principles of servant leadership be grafted onto the secular and often political realities of public organizations? This question must be deliberated and resolved to determine how servant leadership concepts link to the practice of community oriented policing.

Servant Leadership and Community Policing: Points of Linkage

The concept of servant leadership and the practice of community policing reveal certain points of linkage. In general, servant leadership and community policing seek to encourage trust, listening, the integration of diverse groups, and the ethical use of power and empowerment while reshaping the notions of leadership. Community policing shares many of the servant leadership qualities and characteristics as outlined by Spears (1994) – lifelong learning and reflection, healing, persuasion, visioning, communicating that vision, stewardship, building trust/hope, and building community.

Shared Vision of Distributed, Decentralized and Democratized Leadership

Community policing and servant leadership share the vision of distributed and decentralized leadership. Synonymous with community policing is the use of community policing areas, beats, or zones and their respective "mini-chiefs" or commanding officers. Within these zones or areas the commanding sergeants and/or lieutenants, and their subordinate officers, are often given the necessary authority and discretion to enforce the law and maintain public order. Hence, community policing, like servant leadership, represents more of a democratized, bottom-up, or grass roots approach to law enforcement and order maintenance as opposed to the autocratic, traditional top-down orientation. This philosophy is reflected in its tactical and organizational dimensions and its reorientation of police operations.

Servant leadership appears joined to the practice of community policing. However, an examination to explore potential places of conflict and tension is required to fully endorse this merger. Inquiry is needed to determine if the sacred principles of servant leadership can be grafted with the secular and often political practice of community policing.

Servant Leadership and Community Policing: Places of Conflict and Tension

The preceding analysis of servant leadership and community policing reveals numerous points of linkage, yet, disjointed places, full of conflict and tension, are just as visible. The initial place of tension is the local police academy, where law enforcement officers train.

Initial Tension – Training at Local Police Academies

Even though community policing dominates the professional practice of local law enforcement agencies (Annan, 1995), its philosophy and its practice of transforming policing to a more decentralized form of law enforcement has yet to be fully embraced and supported by "traditional" officers, especially those in middle management ranks (Bayley, 1988; Greene, Bergman and McLaughlin, 1994). One contributing factor that may serve as a source of tension with this paradigm shift along the blue line is the training that officers receive at the local police academies.

The philosophy of community policing has yet to dominate the training curriculum of local police academies. Police officers are stilled trained to be reactive to crime and proactive through such strategies of problem identification, problem solving and surveillance. However, officers are not trained to be co-active with citizens who are not members of the criminal justice "fraternity" (Ottemeier, 1992; Ottemeier and Wycoff, 1994; Ottemeier and Wycoff, 1997). Consequently, training reinforces the power differential between officers and citizens and buttresses an "us versus them" mentality. The training that officers receive emphasizes chain of command, a centralized organization, and the traditional view of leadership. Even with the advent of "service oriented policing," the proverbial law enforcement leopard is still bound by its elitist and hierarchical orientation and has yet to truly change its spots. This reality illuminates hidden tensions that further disconnect servant leadership from community policing practice. These tensions are most visible by reexamining Spears' (1994) characteristics of a servant leader.

Coercion, Corruption, and Misguided Intentions

Of the ten characteristics that Spears (1994) identifies, three seem most problematic in linking servant leadership with community policing. The ability to build consensus through persuasion, the ability to practice stewardship and the ability to build community are points of conflict. As noted by Spears (1994), the ability to build consensus must be achieved by way of persuasion, not coercion. However, when considering the inherently coercive nature of policing in its order maintenance and law enforcement functions, and the professional training that reinforces coercive behavior and engenders an elitist attitude, the temptation to coerce and manipulate citizens that they have been entrusted to serve and protect may be too great for officers to disregard. Likewise, the ability to practice stewardship, or the ability to hold something in trust for another, is problematic. Stewardship implies a power differential where those who hold something in trust are superior to those that actually own that particular object. Less problematic for the law enforcement community is the practice of "servantship," the ability to minister or attend to the needs of others, instead of stewardship. The decentralized nature of community policing coupled with officer discretion and authority may increase corruption and the misuse of power by officers. These tensions may also affect the motives and/or behaviors of officers as they build communities.

Would an officer engage in community building and community organizing to benefit the community itself, or to benefit his or her status or standing in the community, within the police department, or within the larger political environment? The likelihood of the officers engaging in a selfish service exercise at the expense of selfless service cannot be assessed. Nonetheless, the temptation to take part in the former -- community building and community organizing exercise to benefit the officers standing or status -- is tremendous.

Judas Opportunities and Judas Possibilities

These places of tension and conflict bring back into focus the praxis dilemma by highlighting the areas of dissension and disruption, and tempering the perceived possible relationship between community policing and servant leadership. Currently, the training that officers receive is not consonant with the inculcation of service leadership. The temptations for officer abuse and misuse of power and authority create "Judas opportunities" and "Judas possibilities." To mitigate these Judas opportunities and possibilities, safeguards must be developed and put in place to protect the public.

Conclusion

Greenleaf noted that assessing servant leadership required measuring its impact on the least privileged in our society and the amount of growth (i.e., healthier, wiser, freer) by persons being served and ultimately proselytized to this philosophy. Additionally, we must examine if the sacred principles of servant leadership are compatible to and can be grafted with the secular and often political reality of public organizations. Similarly,

we must address practical, professional and ethical questions regarding the merger of servant leadership and community policing:

- To whom should the (community policing) servant leader be accountable?
- Is servant leadership an innate quality or characteristic?
- If not, can it be learned?
- Can servant leadership be captured in a professional training curriculum?
- Can servant leadership be measured? How?
- Who and what should be used to evaluate the performance of servant leaders?
- How can public organizations prevent the "Judas opportunities and possibilities?"

These questions raise two vital points concerning what constitutes effective training for service leadership and what forms of secular performance monitoring, auditing, and surveillance are appropriate to detect the emerging "Judases" before the harm the public and the concept of servant leadership itself. The failure to address these, especially in the context of public governance and community oriented policing, and the harm that these Judas possibilities and opportunities can do, might be the single greatest weakness of the proposed nexus of servant leadership and community policing.

If government were of "angels" there would be no need for the checks and balances of our constitutional form of government or for asking these questions and proposing the development of certain safeguards. However, servant leadership is sought among humans and not angels. Hence, it is imperative that we temper our expectations for the application of servant leadership. Rooted in the spiritual world and embraced by the major religions, servant leadership represents a sacred vision of leadership that contrasts to the secular and carnal practice of community policing and public administration. This distinction is echoed in the 55th chapter and the 8th and 9th verses of the Book of Isaiah: "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts." Any attempt to apply the sacred to the secular is problematic.

It is premature to assess the impact of coupling servant leadership with community policing. Yet, this essay has brought attention to its fit by disclosing points of linkage and places of conflict and tension. It is clear that servant leadership is compatible with community policing, even though servant leadership is not restricted to community policing, and community policing is compatible with other approaches to leadership. However, the coercive nature of some aspects of policing (i.e., law enforcement and order maintenance) and the training that officers receive create an obstacle to linking servant leadership and community policing. If police organizations, which must be coercive in some things that they do, can embrace servant leadership, then servant leadership can almost certainly be embraced by other public organizations that exercise the "power of the state." Consequently, we must continue to ponder whether public (secular) organizations should and can advance the sacred practice of servant leadership by considering their points of linkage and places of conflict and tension.

References

Annan, S.O. 1995. *National Survey of Community Policing Strategies*, 1992-1993. Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation.

Bayley, D.H. 1988. "Community Policing: A Report from the Devil's Advocate." In J. R. Green and S. D. Mastrofski, eds. *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?* New York: Praeger.

Bennis, W. and B. Nanus. 1985. *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper& Row, Publishers.

Community Policing Consortium. 1994. *Understanding Community Policing: A Framework for Action*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Cordner, G. 1999. "Elements of Community Policing." In L. Gaines and G. Cordner, eds. *Policing Perspectives: An Anthology*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing.

Eck, J. and D. Rosenbaum. 1994. "The New Police Order: Effectiveness, Equity, and Efficiency in Community Policing." In D.P. Rosenbaum, ed., *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greene, J., W. Bergman and E. McLaughlin. 1994. "Implementing Community Policing: Cultural and Structural Change in Police Organizations." In D. P. Rosenbaum, ed., *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greenleaf, Robert. 1977. *Servant Leadership*. New York: Paulist Press.

Greenleaf, Robert. 1979. *Teacher as Servant*. New York: Paulist Press.

Lynch, Thomas and Cynthia Lynch. 1998. *The Word of Light*. Baton Rouge, LA: Scott Baldson.

Ottemeier, Timothy and Mary Ann Wycoff. 1997. *Personnel Performance Evaluation in the Community Policing Context*. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Ottemeier, Timothy. 1992. "Matching Structure to Objectives." In *Police Management: Issues and Perspectives*, edited by Larry T. Hoover. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Ottemeier, Timothy and Mary Ann Wycoff. 1994. Police Performance in the Nineties: Practitioner Perspectives. *American Journal of Police*, 8, 2.

Spears, Larry C. 1994. "Servant Leadership: Quest for Caring Leadership." *Inner Quest* 2.

Trojanowicz, Robert. and Bonnie. Bucqueroux. 1994. *Community Policing: How to Get Started*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

***

Brian N. Williams is assistant professor at the Askew School of Public Administration and Policy, Florida State University.

Conclusion

Robert Cunningham

The articles herein spur our thinking on the servant leadership concept. From Johnson and Feldheim, one might inquire as to the differences between servant leadership and public management. Current management writing emphasizes that human relationships in work organizations have both intrinsic value and a positive impact on the bottom line. Servant leadership shown on the Greenleaf website resembles current "best practices" in work organizations. Can servant leadership be distinguished from recommended practices of management scholars and practitioners writing in *Harvard Business Review,* or from the books and articles by Peter Vaill, Robert Quinn, Margaret Wheatley, Paul Light, or Bolman and Deal?[1]

Does the wisdom literature provide a singular view of servant leadership, as argued by Tom and Cynthia Lynch; or do, say, Christian and Buddhist interpretations of servant leadership have discordant tones? Despite the common threads present in their wisdom books, Eastern cultures and traditions differ from Western cultures and traditions. Do different answers emerge about servant leadership in these traditions from the philosophers than from the anthropologists? Are philosophical/cultural differences being eroded by today's instant world-wide communication, or are the world-wide similarities in economic systems and mass entertainment only a veneer masking differences between cultures? Whether cultures become increasingly similar or diverge along different lines, what are the implications for servant leadership?

Is servant leadership applicable universally, or limited to our historical time period in the Western world where servant leadership seems particularly compatible with contemporary leadership theory? Bruce has drawn a sharp picture of the slave/servant role of 150 years ago, which contrasts with that of the servant in an economy where the human component is often the most costly aspect of producing a good or delivering a service. How culture-bound are our conceptualizations? Can survey research effectively tap these subtle, interconnected dimensions of service orientation?

If servant leadership becomes the accepted norm for relationships, as is argued by Johnson and Feldheim, and public servants become servant leaders, does such a value system of the public service, strengthened by a moral certainty, lock people who are outside the economic mainstream into permanently deprived status, as Patterson fears?

Does viewing "need" in individual, economic terms divert people from recognizing interdependence as both a goal and an aspect of the human condition? Does equating material prosperity with moral eminence, so that we see the donor of time or money as exemplary, cause us to equate economic need with emotional or spiritual need? Writings on servant leadership from a business administration perspective are burgeoning. Will servant leadership serve as an apologetic for capitalism, or alternatively, challenge and convert capitalists into servants

---

[1] This perspective is reflected in the Johnson and Feldheim article.

of their fellow human beings with a global value perspective? Are public organizations moving toward the service ideal? Can the efficiency/effectiveness ethos generate servant leadership?

Does a mind-set where the donor is independent and the receiver is dependent, with the receiver aspiring to become a donor, lead to independence-dependence becoming institutionalized as the appropriate relationship for the servant-leadership concept? Do our attempts at servant leadership:

1) make the economically **advantaged** feel better by acknowledging the primacy of their value system,
2) maintain the barrier to and isolation of people the economically advantaged see as dependent or weak?

If so, then servant leadership has been severed from its conceptual roots in spirit, ethics, and religion.

There are operational issues. In the 21st century, the traditional notion of servant-leadership rings quaint. The spiritual foundation for servant-leadership is solid at the highest level of abstraction, but the manifestation of sharing our soul and spirit by "doing for" doesn't work. Our good intentions may not address effectively the needs of organizations or society. In following a simple-minded directive of "serving" we may exacerbate problems by elevating dependence levels and accepting or rewarding defensive responses among those we attempt to serve. Many individuals demonstrate acts of selfless behavior in service to others. The cement truck driver volunteers to lead a Habitat for Humanity work crew on Saturday morning; the retired school teacher three days a week assists a third grade student in learning to read. President Bush collected such stories in his thousand points of light. What are appropriate servant-leadership models for our current situation?

The above examples may reflect servant-leadership at the micro-level. Is servant leadership a concept that makes sense also at the macro level? Or does trying to stretch the concept convert servant-leadership into a vague symbol to which all show deference, but which fails to provide sufficient distinctive meaning for the researcher? Can Martin L. King, Jr. be a servant leader, or does the public nature of that highly visible role call for a different concept and set of behaviors? Can the servant leadership concept be captured and embodied in a system which effectively meets the material and spiritual needs of a heterogeneous community? Or, stated another way, can servant leadership be reflected in the everyday behaviors of public service agencies such as police, schools, and public assistance?

We like standing on the moral high ground while remaining within our public administration profession. Theory questioning practice, and practice clarifying theory are the twin strategies for addressing these issues of servant-leadership with the intent of converting theology into theory, and service into practice. The usefulness of the servant leadership concept as ideal or analytic tool remains problematic as both theory and practice.

The contributors to this forum teach public **service** to students intending to become public "servants." As faculty, we teach techniques; we also teach history or appreciation of organizations, the public service, and ethics. I am not convinced that I/we teach people how to serve or to lead, or that we model servant-leadership in our classrooms. What servant leadership behaviors should we be modeling for entry level or middle level managers?

Another symposium on Servant Leadership is planned for the peer-reviewed electronic journal *Global Virtue Ethics Review*.[2] Please offer your academic paper, short story, poem, essay, art, or other creative piece for consideration by peer review to the address below by December, 2001, in either hard copy or as an e-mail attachment. If you have questions, please communicate with the journal editor or the issue editor.

---

[2] A description of the journal can be found on the web at www.spaef.com.

Thomas Lynch, journal editor
tlynch@unix1.sncc.lsu.edu
225-766-3248

Bob Cunningham, issue editor
Rcunning@utk.edu
865-974-7050

***

Robert Cunningham is a professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Tennessee.

Robert K. Greenleaf: A Biographical Sketch

Robert K. Greenleaf was an American original, an essayist in the tradition of Emerson. Back in 1970, he wrote a small essay called *The Servant As Leader*, which introduced the term "servant-leadership." That and other writings have influenced an entire generation of management experts and institutional leaders.

Bob Greenleaf (1904-1990) spent his first career in management research, development and education at AT&T. After retirement, he began a second career teaching and consulting at institutions ranging from Harvard Business School to the Ford Foundation to scores of churches and not-for-profit institutions. During the tumultuous 1960s, Greenleaf tried to understand why so many young people were in rebellion against America's institutions, especially universities. He concluded that the fault lay with the institutions: they weren't doing a good job of serving, therefore, they were doing a poor job of leading.

In 1970, Greenleaf wrote *The Servant as Leader*, a powerful little essay that continues to gain influence today. In it, Greenleaf described some of the characteristics and activities of servant-leaders, providing examples that show that individual efforts, inspired by vision and a servant ethic, can make a substantial difference in the quality of society. Greenleaf said, true leaders are chosen by their followers. He discussed the skills necessary to be a servant-leader; the importance of awareness, foresight and listening; and the contrasts between coercive, manipulative, and persuasive power.

A few years later, (1972) Greenleaf published a second essay, *The Institution As Servant*, which was based on the idea that institutions could also be servants. Greenleaf argued that much of the caring for persons in today's society is mediated by large, complex institutions. *The Institution As Servant* challenges conventional wisdom about hierarchical organization and the use of power in our major institutions.

As he continued to reflect on the way organizations operate, Greenleaf realized that institutions were controlled by trustees. This reflection prompted a third essay in 1974, *Trustees As Servants*. The essay seeks to address the needs of senior executives for sustained, caring (but demanding) assistance from able trustees. Drawing on a lifetime of experience in institutions, Greenleaf addressed the ambiguity of the trustee role and offered ideas on how each trustee group can claim its rightful functions.

Until his death in 1990, Robert Greenleaf kept writing on the themes of management, servanthood, organizations, power and spirituality.

Robert Greenleaf's ideas go against the grain of common wisdom about organizations and power. But after reading him you will realize that in addition to being a pragmatist--he said "management is the study of how things get done"—Bob Greenleaf was also a man of great spirit. He believed that spirit was a practical thing, and that belief shone through in all of his writing.

Reprinted from http://greenleaf.org with the permission of the Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, 921 East 86th Street, Suite 200, Indianapolis, IN 46240.

Bureaucracy in the Hebrew Bible:
A Neglected Source of Public Administration History

Mordecai Lee

The Bible and the Study of Government

The Bible is much more than the world's best selling and most widely distributed book (Kynaston, 2000, 290). It is probably the single most influential book regarding the culture and religious values of Western civilization.

For students of government, "the Bible is a rich text that has always inspired interpretation" (Cochran, 1988, 226). From the perspective of public administration, the Bible contains many descriptions of government and bureaucracy. Heady considered the Bible as important to public administration because of its influence on "Western development after the Christianization of the Roman Empire" (1991, 165).

Gladden reviewed the role of Biblical public administration within the overall history of public administration in his seminal 2-volume study. In his view, the Bible contained "a good deal about government...although administration is not prominently featured." He suggested that public administration in the Hebrew Bible "surely is a theme for a whole book." However, Gladden neither reviewed the subject in detail nor summarized all major manifestations of public administration in the Bible. To meet space limitations, he limited his discussion to "one or two administrative incidents" (1972, 36).

Recent scholarship, revised analyses and new archeological data have yielded contemporary insights into the topic of public administration in the Hebrew Testament since Gladden's review, now nearly 30 years ago. This article seeks to expand on the limited discussion contained in Gladden as well as integrating scholarship not covered by Gladden or that has appeared since then.

In order to meet the limitations of this format, this article does not focus on judicial policy and administration. The latter is dealt with extensively in the Bible as a religious practice, since the application of the Law revealed by God at Sinai is integral to Jewish theology. Instead, this article will focus on the highlights of administration of the civil states in the Hebrew Bible, what would contemporarily be considered executive branch administration.

Secular Studies and Sacred Texts

Scholars of government have not dedicated significant attention to the Bible. Schnall observed that contemporary public administration limited its attention to the Bible (and other Jewish religious sources) to an "occasional reference to Old Testament heroes as precursors to modern leadership" (1997, 3). After reviewing the literature, Cochran concluded that the Bible was a "recently unplowed field for scholarly analysis within political science" (1988, 226). For example, an index search by this author of *Sage Public Administration Abstracts* from 1980 to 1998 revealed no articles under the terms 'Bible' or 'Biblical.'

Recent attention to the Bible has been partly stimulated by the broader interest in spirituality in public administration (Bruce and Novinson, 1999). Lynch, Omdal and Cruise (1997) suggested that the renewed focus on values and ethics must not ignore the Bible and Holy Scriptures of other religions. They argued that public administration has been inappropriately secularized, thus marginalizing sacred sources of values. Their solution to the problem of religion in a governmental activity constitutionally separated from religion was to focus on those values that are common to all religious traditions.

Cochran suggested that the avoidance of Biblical topics was caused in part by the difficulty of pursuing secular scholarship in a fundamentally religious document, which is revered by believers as divinely inspired and written:

> How can a political scientist interpret the actions of God and still remain faithful to the canons
> of secular, academic scholarship? I suspect that this dilemma has played a large role in the
> neglect of the Bible by recent political theory. (1988, 229)

He answers his own question with an approach that promotes study of the Bible in a manner that is compatible with contemporary social science scholarship. In an academic version of separation of church and state, Cochran separates existential from doctrinal interpretations of the Bible. "Doctrinal truth of a text and its experiential truth are not the same. Lack of neutrality on doctrinal truth cuts off the interpreter from the discipline and vitiates the effort to discover experiential truth" (1988, 230).

Gladden's solution to the problem of using sacred texts in secular studies was to focus on the Bible as history. "The Bible has always been of great interest to historians, even when many of its chronicles have appeared to be concerned more with the legendary than with the factual" (1972, 35-6). He noted that archeological discoveries provided corroboration to many Biblical events.

This article will follow in Gladden's and Cochran's approaches by focusing on the sections of the Old Testament that detail administrative practices and structures. An administrative historian need not be drawn into the eternal argument between believers and secularists whether certain Biblical stories are fact or myth, divinely revealed or ancient oral folktales. For example, whether Joseph was an historical character or not, the ethical dilemmas he faced are timeless and relevant to the study of administrative ethics. Similarly, whether Daniel actually was governor of Babylon and was thrown to the Lion's Den or not, the administrative historian in any case can take note of the descriptions of the administrative organization of the Persian empire in the Book of Daniel. Such background details were unlikely to be invented.

The focus on details of administrative arrangements is equally amenable to scholars irrespective of their personal beliefs or non-beliefs. To both, the close analysis of the text regarding specifics of public administration violates neither religious precepts nor secular scholarly standards.

However, the personal motivation and background of an investigator should not be obliterated in a quest for 'objective' truth. Cochran noted that the modest renewed interest by scholars of government in the Bible focused mostly on the Old Testament (usually referred to as the Hebrew Testament by Jewish scholars). This, he surmised, was partly due to the Jewish background of many of the writers publishing in this area (1988, 225). This article, too, was prepared by an academic of Jewish background and therefore focuses on public administration contained in the Hebrew Testament. Cochran also pointed out that the Hebrew Bible is of greater interest to students of government because it contains much more historical narrative and discussion about the details of administration, compared to gospel orientation of the Christian Bible (1988, 233).

All translations used here are from a modern Jewish-sponsored translation from the original Hebrew (Tanakh, 1985) in order to provide titles for public officers and descriptions of government agencies which are translated as literally as possible from the original text.

Public Administration Approaches to Biblical Inquiry: Intellectual Contributions, Ethical Contributions or Interesting History

Scholars appear to be unanimous about the lack of originality in Hebraic public administration. Weber, the preeminent student of bureaucracy, suggested that the structure of bureaucracy in ancient Israel was imported from neighboring kingdoms, especially Phoenicia (1952, 303). Finer wrote, "the state was a copy of adjoining palace-regimes...There is nothing here to catch the eye" (1997, 256). Heady viewed it as "relatively insignificant" in relation to other more administratively sophisticated empires (1991, 165). Nash (1969) omitted any reference to the Bible in his summary of the history of public administration.

Nonetheless, a modest amount of scholarly attention in public administration has been devoted to the Bible. Cochran noted that there had recently been a "burst of interest in biblical political themes" (p. 220). Two approaches are most prominent. The first focuses on the unique intellectual contributions of the Israelite state. The second approach focuses on the universal and timeless relevance of the ethical lessons of the widely known administrative stories in the Bible.

Despite the lack of originality in Hebraic bureaucracy, many scholars point to several unique contributions to modern government originating in the Old Testament. For Weber, the uniqueness of Israel's bureaucracy was not in its structure but because the rulers and their bureaucracies were controlled by the "claim on charity" articulated by prophets speaking in God's name (1952, 303-305). Silver argued slightly with Weber, suggesting that the prophets, acting as social reformers, created a public demand for a welfare state, which then lead to the emergence of a bureaucratic apparatus (1983, 131).

For Finer, the innovative contribution by the Old Testament to public administration was the limits it put on the power and role of the ruler:

> "the people *and the king* must obey God's law: in short, a monarch whose powers were simply administrative and instrumental to the Law: *a limited monarchy.*" (1997, 254, emphasis in original)

Before this change, rulers had absolute power and were not limited by any external force.

Landes suggested a different original contribution by the Hebraic approach to government which eventually influenced western political structures. The conventional monarchy in ancient times was of a ruler whose power over his subjects was that he "could do as he pleased with their lives and things, which they held at his pleasure" (1998, p. 31). Large and invasive bureaucracies were needed to implement this doctrine. On the other hand, the Hebraic tradition had a strong concept of individual property rights, "which set the Israelites apart from any of the kingdoms around" (p. 34). Biblical bureaucracies were, consequently, on a smaller scale than neighboring ones. Smaller, in this case, tended not to be innovative. The value of this model, in his view, was that it significantly influenced the Western concept of monarchies limited by individual property rights, a premise essential for the emergence of modern free-market economic systems.

Gawthrop has been the most prolific scholar recently focusing on the moral imperatives of public service that are described in the Hebrew Testament (1998a; 1998b, 1999). He suggested that the origins of civil service come from early history such as Biblical times and that its lessons continue to be relevant in contemporary context:

> Biblical, ancient, and medieval history record numerous examples of what we would refer to today as 'civil' service -- service in the company of an emperor, pharaoh, king, or pope. The titles of those individuals who serviced in this capacity may sound obscure, quaint, or prosaic to

our contemporary ears...Nevertheless, the organizational, psychological, and existential demands – obedience, loyalty, trustworthiness and optimistic courage – imposed on the individuals who held these positions are no less meaningful today. (1998b, 80-81)

Gawthrop was especially interested in the role of the prophet Jeremiah, an outsider who preached truth to power. Jeremiah urged public servants to restore administration to the ethical standards and practices set by their religion and was persecuted by the state for his unpopular preaching (1998b, 84-85).

The annual John Gaus lecture sponsored by the Public Administration Section of the American Political Science Association "recognizes and encourages scholarship in public administration" (APSA Public Administration Section, 1999). Two recent honorees included ethical aspects of the Bible in their lectures. As the 1998 honoree, Gawthrop noted, in discussing a broader subject, the different Jewish approaches to the administration of Biblical law as an ancient example of the need to accomplish a humane approach to administration (1998a). Similarly, the 1989 honoree, Aaron Wildavsky, urged scholars of public administration to review the Bible for lessons, stories, ethics and morals (1989).

A third focus for administrative studies of the Old Testament is less prevalent. Raadschelders (1998) wrote that the justification for the study of the distant past of administrative history "rests on its enrichment of our understanding, not the discovery of lessons for present and future practice" (p. 12). Hence, he argues that there is neither a need for modern relevance nor for practical benefit when studying administrative history. History can be investigated for its own sake, simply because it is interesting.

The main representative of this approach is Gladden. He highlighted what he defined as "the first recorded lesson in the 'science' of administration," (1972, 38) namely the advice that Moses received from Jethro, his father-in-law, on delegating and structuring the administration of justice (Exodus 18:13-26). He dedicated most of his summary to the story of Joseph as a public administrator in Egypt (Genesis 40-41) and to the first Biblical census. Gladden concluded his summary with a two-paragraph allusion to the "interesting administrative aspects" of King David's rule and of the deportation to Babylon, but with scant discussion (pp. 41-42). This article seeks primarily to update this approach to public administration in the Hebrew Testament.

Pre-Kingdom Bureaucracy

Egyptian bureaucracy was already a well-developed institution by the time of the Biblical era. Gladden (1972) chose to focus on the story of Joseph as one of the two most important examples of public administration in the Bible (pp. 36-38). Following Joseph's persuasive interpretation of the administrative implications of Pharaoh's dreams (Genesis 41:1-32), he was appointed to an administrative post called second-in-command with full authority for the administration of the Royal Court, the direction of the entire population and generally "in charge of all the land of Egypt" (Genesis 41:40-43).

Wildavsky (1989) suggested that the story of Joseph the Administrator needed to be explored for its ethical implications for all public managers:

> For public administrators, the second question is how well you accomplish objectives; the first is which objectives it is right to try to accomplish. Answers to the second question matter, but only after the first is settled. Better an administrator who has to struggle for the support of his own people, like Moses, than an administrator who takes for granted the benevolence of a temporarily benign dictator. (p. 787)

This Biblical story contains the classic lesson in ethics for public administrator, namely that the means don't justify the ends and that just-following-orders is not an acceptable moral position.

The subsequent settlement of the Hebrews in Canaan was primarily a tribal-centered activity located in the hill country with an economy that was agricultural and rural. The social and political system was based on consanguinity, which determined local decision-making. Information from the Bible and from archeological digs is sketchy regarding the existence, scope and sophistication at this time of hierarchical organizations, their powers and authority (Frick, 1985, 203). Based on military and security needs, major leaders called judges arose from time to time, some of them even achieving pan-Israelite status. The office of 'judge' appears to be primarily one of temporary military leadership (Isserlin, 1998) and administration of the law (Buccellati, 1967, 123). However, it also must have included elementary aspects of civil government (Ahlstrom, 1993, 426). Different governmental entities arose at this time, called chiefdoms, principalities and even kingdoms. However the distinctions between them are unclear and "we do not know anything about the administrative organization" (Ahlstrom, 1993, 421n). Isserlin concluded that "in peacetime, much common governance is doubtful" (1998, 67).

Local administration was conducted by elders (Judges 21:16) who drew their authority from the people, not from judges or other central government (Buccellati, 1967, 124).

Royal Bureaucracy

The continuation of military threats, along with long-term trends of population increases, intensification of agriculture, and specialization of labor created both the need and capacity for the emergence of a more sophisticated civil state. This entity featured a stratified society and administrative elite with centralized powers of taxation and control (Frick, 1985, 195-203).

The roots of Israelite public administration were military ones. The need to protect the population from the well-organized Philistinian army prompted recognition by the Hebrew tribes of the need to band together to field a military force that could match and overcome the Philistines. This unprecedented all-tribes army created concomitant needs for centralized institutions to conscript, command, supply and finance this military force. As such, military administration is the origin of other forms of public administration that emerged with the establishment of kings to replace judges (Mathews, 1993, 160-162).

The monarchy evolved from the rudimentary stage involving few specialist officials to the 'mature state' with a fully elaborated bureaucracy and tax system (Isserlin, 1997, 105). The Bible provides little information about the administrative organization of Saul's kingdom "because the narrators were not interested in how the country was administered" (Ahlstrom, 1982, 27). The eighty years of David and Solomon's reigns were the high point of the Jewish political state (Sharkansky, 1991, 36) notwithstanding ongoing anti-monarchical political movements (Sharkansky, 1996, 207ff). Once fully evolved, the bureaucracy in David and Solomon's time was sophisticated and complex. According to Mathews, anthropologists have identified as many as ten different kinds of bureaucracies during this era (1993, 161). However, most modern scholarship has focused on the king's military, judicial and religious roles with little attention to civil administration (Whitelam, 1989, 131).

The key hurdle of this new form of governance was to overcome the population's orientation and loyalty to tribal structures. The authority of a public official who belonged to one tribe to issue orders compelling members of other tribes would be essential, but difficult, to accomplish. The emergence of a royal bureaucracy that was not identified with any specific tribe was a key element in the successful establishment of an effective centralized monarchy. For example, some of the senior members of the new civil administrative government were not members of any tribe and instead were of non-Israelite origin (II Samuel 8: 16-17).

The administrative apparatus of the kingdom was divided into two major groups: the royal court and the bureaucracy (Elazar and Cohen, 1985, 76). The three highest-ranking civil servants in the royal court were the Steward, the Scribe and the Recorder. While scholars agree about the importance of this triumvirate, they disagree about their ranking.

The Royal Scribe (II Kings 12:11): performed both as the king's private secretary and as secretary of state (in the British, not US, meaning). According to Heaton (1975), he was the "first civil official of the kingdom" (p. 48). He was responsible for all internal and external correspondence, relations with the Temple, finance, administration and policy. Alter was less sure, suggesting simply that the Scribe's role was "more than those of an amanuensis" (1999, 239). Vaux (1961) suggested that he ranked immediately below the Stewart of the Palace (p. 131). His office, the chamber of the Scribe (Jeremiah 36:12) apparently served as a kind of cabinet room for meetings of the high administrative officials.

The Steward of the Palace (I Kings 18:3) or the person called In Charge of the Palace (I Kings 16:9) was more than the administrator of the royal palace, and instead served in a broader capacity similar to the Egyptian office of vizier, or "first minister" (Vauz, 1961, 130-131). Heaton (1975) disagreed, suggesting that the Steward "occupies a very modest position" and placing him in third rank (p. 50).

The Recorder (II Kings 18:18) was the man "who calls, names, reminds, reports…He reported to the king on what concerned the people and the country, but also passed on to the people the commands of their sovereign" (Vaux, 1961, 132). Alter, again, is more conservative. He could only conclude that from the text the Recorder's specific duties were not clear, "though they obviously went far beyond being a mere clerk" (1999, 239). According to Vaux, the recorder was the third highest official in the court, while Heaton placed him in second only to the Scribe.

According to Elazar and Cohen (1985, 76) the royal bureaucracy ("workers of the King") included a royal treasurer, a treasurer responsible for the treasuries "in the country – in the towns, the hamlets, and the citadels" (I Chronicles 27:25), public works officials, officials of the royal demesne and commercial officials called the "King's dealers" (I Kings 10:28). It also included highly specialized officials supervising the royal farms, such as men "over the field laborers in agricultural work…over the vineyards…over the olive trees…over the cattle" (I Chronicles 27:26-31). In all, David and Solomon created a new class of educated civil servants to administer their kingdom (Heaton, 1975, 60).

Other evidence of the sophistication of public administration in this era comes from the structure and scale of Solomon's public works projects. He created a new post, the Superintendent of the Forced Levy, who oversaw a workforce of 30,000 laborers. The description of the King's Works reflects a classic hierarchical structure of organization, entailing "550 officers in charge of the 3,300 foreman who superintended the 70,000 haulers and 80,000 quarrymen" (Heaton, 1975, 59).

A key royal administrative policy aimed at weakening tribal loyalties and strengthening the power of the central government was through geographical means (Heaton, 1975, 53). First, Jerusalem, a Canaanite town outside the boundaries of any of the 12 tribes, was conquered and established as the seat of secular government. This gave added symbolic neutrality to the pan-tribal authority of the royal bureaucracy. (As a separate act, David and Solomon also established Jerusalem as the religious center of the kingdom.)

Second, the state was redivided into new administrative districts that superceded the old tribal boundaries. (I Kings 4:7-19). These 12 regions were governed by officials appointed by the King, and titled prefects (I Kings 4:7). Governors (I Kings 20:14) headed smaller geographic units, known as provinces. The responsibilities of these officials included underwriting part of the expenses of the court, taxation, defense and – possibly – judicial administration (Buccellati, 1967, 133). Ahlstrom also suggests that there was not a great distinction between the civil and religious personnel of the kingdom who were posted in the regions and provinces (1993, 479).

Due to their role as the capitol cities of the two monarchies, the local administration of Jerusalem (and Samaria, after the division of the kingdom) was closely tied to the royal court. Administrators, who were appointed by the kings, governed them. The special administrative status of the capitol cities is a pattern closely followed to modern times, including the control of the US Congress over the District of Columbia. The titles for these officials included governor of the city (I Kings 22:26) or city prefect (II Kings 23:8).

With the exception of the capitol cities, municipal and local administration did not change significantly from tribal times to the era of the kings. It does not appear that royally appointed governors administered small towns and rural villages. Rather, local civil administration remained in the hands of the traditional sources of power, the 'elders' (I Samuel 30:26-31). They formed a kind of municipal council with only the modest administrative functions necessitated by life in rural areas and small towns (Vaux, 1961, 137-138). Alter captures their minor role by describing them as "sundry leaders" (1999, 188). The administrative power of the elders was limited to local matters pertaining to self government, while issues of taxation and defense were handled by central royal bureaucracies (Fritz, 1995, 162).

The death of Solomon led to a division of the united kingdom into two: a northern kingdom called Israel and a southern kingdom called Judah. King Hezekiah reorganized the administrative districts of Judah, from twelve down to four (Finer, 1997, 255). The Bible does not provide a formal list of state officials for this era as it had for the reigns of David and Solomon. It appears that the basic bureaucratic structures created in David's and Solomon's time continued to exist in the two kingdoms (Ahlstrom, 1993, 551), but both went into a period of decline in power, sophistication and resources (Heaton, 1975, 47-8).

Babylonian and Persian Imperial Bureaucracies

The empire of Babylon, which conquered the Kingdom of Judah and destroyed the holy temple in Jerusalem, was managed by a sophisticated bureaucracy which included satraps, prefects, governors, counselors, treasurers, judges, officers and provincial officials (Daniel 3:2). The Biblical references to this administrative apparatus were recounted in relation the interactions of the empire with the Judeans.

Immediately after conquering Judah, the Babylonians exiled a major portion of the population. The person appointed to govern the remnant of the population left in Judah was called "in charge of the people" (II Kings 25:22)

About 50 years later, the Persian Empire defeated the Babylonian Empire. It, too, had an extensive imperial bureaucracy which included "satraps, governors of every province, officials of every people" (Esther 3:12). The empire was divided into 127 provinces (Esther 1:1).

When the Judean exiles were given permission to return to their homeland, the Persians established Judah as an independent province within the Satrapy of Beyond the River (Williamson, 1987, 48-50). The head of a province was described as governor (Nehemiah 5:14) or Tirshatha (Nehemiah 8:9), a term which is probably of Persian derivation and of unclear meaning in the original Hebrew and to translators. The most prominent governor in the Bible was Nehemiah.

The civil government was a separate entity from the Jewish religious hierarchy that dominated the life of the populace. The province was administered through a hierarchy of chiefs of districts and half-districts (Nehemiah 3:9-19). There were also two separate categories of officials, called prefects (Nehemiah 13:11) and officers (Nehemiah 2:9), but "the distinction...is not entirely clear" (Blenkinsopp, 1988, 68). Generally, the details in the text about the powers, structure and operation of the civil government under Nehemiah are scarce. Scholars suggest that the Bible "probably underplayed his role" for theological reasons (Elazar and Cohen, 1985, 100).

His major administrative action was in the area of public works, with the rebuilding of the walls and gates protecting Jerusalem (Nehemiah 6:15).

Several interesting details about the specifics of the Persian bureaucracy emerge in the story of Queen Esther and her uncle, Mordecai. An enemy of the empire's Jewish constituents, Haman, was described as holding an office "higher than any of his fellow officials" (Esther 3:1) and of all courtiers (Esther 5:11). After the defeat of Haman, Mordecai was appointed to an untitled position, which "ranked next to the King" (Esther 10:3) and which was apparently the highest administrative position in the empire. The story also provides an early definition of the public interest when it describes Mordecai as having "sought the good of his people and interceded for the welfare of all his kindred" (Esther 10:3).

Summary and Conclusions

The intent of this article was a limited one, to update and expand Gladden's survey of some of the highlights of the interesting administrative aspects of the Old Testament. This brief overview is intended to demonstrate that the Bible can be an interesting source of information about the history of public administration.

The high point of Biblical bureaucracy occurred during the reigns of Kings David and Solomon. The establishment of a centralized state, superceding the earlier tribal allegiances, entailed the establishment of elaborate bureaucracies to manage the military and civil affairs of the kingdom. The creation of highly specialized administrative structures demonstrates a sophistication of public management similar to other empires and nation-states of that region and era.

However, there are many other worthwhile ways that the Bible can be studied by public administration. Some of them would include broad subjects, such as public administration in the Christian Testament, the role of charity and social justice as the underlying missions for all biblical governments, and the theological context of biblical administration with religious law controlling civil government. Those intriguing subjects were beyond the purpose of this article and instead are topics for other inquiries. It is hoped that additional research into these related, but distinct subjects, will be catalyzed.

Other more narrow topics for additional Biblical research could beneficially focus on the following areas:

- Comparisons of Israelite public administration with that of neighboring nation-states
- Public administration during specific biblical eras, such as during the time of Ezra and Nehemiah or the Kingdoms of Judah and Israel
- Sub-fields of Biblical public administration, such as military administration, public works administration and the administration of justice
- The accountability of the administrative apparatus to the community-at-large
- Additional case studies focusing on timeless ethical issues in public administration, such as Gawthrop's comparison of Job to the contemporary public manager (1999) or Lynch, Omdal and Cruise's effort to define the value of common good according to Psalms and other religious sacred writings (1997, 485).

While the Bible may not present us with any original or novel manifestations of ancient bureaucracy, it certainly recognizes the importance of public administration and provides a wealth of interesting detail about it. The Bible's significance to public management is not comparable to its signal and unique impact on contemporary religion and culture. Nonetheless, it deserves a greater attention for its relevance to public administration, if only because the Bible is part of the universal language of Western culture. It needs to be restored to its proper place in studies of historical public administration.

References

Ahlstrom, G. W. (1993). *The History of Ancient Palestine from the Palaeolithic Period to Alexander's Conquest*. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press.

Ahlstrom, G. W. (1982). *Royal Administration and National Religion in Ancient Palestine*. Leiden, The Netherlands: E. J. Brill.

Alter, Robert (1999). *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel*. New York: W. W. Norton.

APSA Public Administration Section (1999). *Call for John Gaus Distinguished Lecturer Award Nominations*. Available: http://www.apsanet.org/~pubadmin/gausnom.html [1999, January 10].

Blenkinsopp, Joseph (1988). *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminister.

Bruce, Willa and Novinson, John (1999). "Spirituality in Public Service: A Dialogue." *Public Administration Review, 59*, 163-169.

Buccellati, Giorgio (1967). *Cities and Nations of Ancient Syria: An Essay on Political Institutions with Special Reference to the Israelite Kingdoms*. Rome, Italy: Istituto Di Studi Del Vicino Oriente, Unversita Di Roma.

Cochran, Clarke E. (1988). "Political Science Confronts the Book: Recent Work on Scripture and Politics." *Journal of Politics, 50*, 219-234.

Elazar, Daniel J. and Stuart A. Cohen (1985). *The Jewish Polity: Jewish Political Organization from Biblical Times to the Present*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Finer, S. E. (1997). *The History of Government From the Earliest Times: Ancient Monarchies and Empires (Volume I)*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Frick, Frank S. (1985). *The Formation of the State in Ancient Israel: A Survey of Models and Theories*. Decatur, GA: Almond.

Fritz, Volkmar (1995). *The City in Ancient Israel*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press.

Gawthrop, Louis C. (1998a). "The Human Side of Public Administration." *PS: Political Science and Politics, 31*, 763-769.

Gawthrop, Louis C. (1998b). *Public Service and Democracy: Ethical Imperatives for the 21st Century*. New York: Chatham House.

Gawthrop, Louis C. (1999). "Public Entrepreneurship in the Lands of Oz and Uz." *Public Integrity, 1*, 75-86.

Gladden, Edgar Norman (1972). *A History of Public Administration* (2 vol.). London, UK: Cass.

Heady, Ferrel (1991). *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*, 4th ed. New York: Marcel Dekker.

Heaton, E. W. (1975). *Solomon's New Men: The Emergence of Ancient Israel as a National State*. New York: Pica.

Isserlin, B. S. J. (1998). *The Israelites*. London, UK: Thames and Hudson.

Nic Kynaston (ed.) (2000). *Guinness World Records 2000 – Millennium Edition*. New York, NY: Bantam.

Landes, David S. (1998). *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Lynch, Thomas D., Omdal, Richard and Cruise, Peter L. (1997). "Secularization of Public Administration." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7*, 473-487.

Matthews, Victor Harold and Donald C. Benjamin (1993). *Social World of Ancient Israel, 1250-587 BCE*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Nash, Gerald D. (1969). *Perspectives on Administration: The Vistas of History*. Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies, University of California.

Raadschelders, J. C. N. (1998). *Handbook of Administrative History*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Schnall, David J. (1997) "An Alternative Source for Contemporary Public Administration: Aspects of Public Service Employment in Classic Jewish Tradition." *Administration & Society, 29*, 3-17.

Sharkansky, Ira (1991). *Ancient and Modern Israel: An Exploration of Political Parallels*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Sharkansky, Ira (1996). *Israel and its Bible: A Political Analysis*. New York: Garland.

Silver, Morris (1983). *Prophets and Markets: The Political Economy of Ancient Israel.* Boston, MA: Klewer-Nijhoff.

Tanakh: A New Translation of the Holy Scriptures According to the Traditional Hebrew Text (1985). Philadelphia, PA: Jewish Publication Society.

Vaux, Roland de (1961). *Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Weber, Max (1952). *Ancient Judaism.* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Whitelam, Keith W. (1989). "Israelite Kingship: The Royal Ideology and Its Opponents." In R. E. Clements, Ed., *The World of Ancient Israel: Sociological, Anthropological and Political Perspectives.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wildavsky, Aaron (1989). "What is Permissible So that This People May Survive? Joseph the Administrator." *PS: Political Science and Politics,* 22, 779-788.

Williamson, H. G. M. (1987). *Ezra and Nehemiah.* Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press.

***

Mordecai Lee is Assistant Professor of Governmental Affairs at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee with an interest in Jewish Studies.

Narrative in Literature, Film, Video, & Painting:

Theoretical and Practical Considerations of Their Relevance to Public Administration

O.C. McSwite

Introduction

The hallmark (or it may just as well be called the stigmata) of the field of Public Administration is its complexity. It comprises far more than the study of management and organization and the technical processes that go with this. Indeed, the truly exciting thing about the field is that for all intents and purposes it is a preeminent laboratory for understanding social phenomena and for the creation and application of social theory. It is "preeminent" because the action demands of public administration cannot afford a solely critical perspective, but, by the same token, public administration must also refuse technical lines of work that are entirely conventional—or at least it should. Rather, public administration has the difficult task of understanding how societies can be governed from the apex all the way down to the level of the street. This task renders insufficient the easier answers given by the study of politics, which need only work out how social order can be achieved through a form of domination, for example, that produced by democratic voting processes.

Confronted with this degree of complexity, public administration has typically taken a catholic approach to its studies, drawing inspiration, concepts and research information from every corner of philosophy, social sciences, technical fields, and any other area of knowledge that seems to have relevance. It is in this light that I want to discuss some theoretical and practical considerations relating to the narrative aspects of literature (primarily novels), film, video, and painting. I wish to consider these as resources for both theory construction and research design and for introducing students to the realities that the field entails.

The plan of the essay is to address these considerations from three perspectives. First, I will discuss each of these forms of narrative as media – as devices or venues through which narrative is presented. The idea will be to explore the message that the medium itself carries to the receiver. Second, I will discuss narrative itself as "material for thought" in the field – material for teaching, for inspiring theory, and for informing research. Third, I will suggest a few practical considerations that these unconventional venues have for shaping the field of public administration as it moves into what I see to be an uncertain future.

The Devices of Narrative:
The Message in the Media of Novels, Film, Video and Painting

Novels

The primary fact of reading (especially novels) is the passivity that it evokes. Print as a medium subordinates the person to a definite and highly structured, linear world. It cuts the reader off from all contexts save the one it sets. In the world of print, the word gains a power that it does not have in oral communication (Ong, 1982). The design of print is important because the details of it literally work to control the eye of the reader, either holding

or retarding it or moving it in a smooth glide back and forth across the page. Print constellates a world of the left brain, Aristotelian logic, and objects delineated. T.S. Eliot remarked that the text properly seduces the reader, takes the reader under its control and demands emotional and intellectual submission to the structure of the world it configures. The process of reading, he said, must be one of entering into such seductions and then recovering from them.

At the same time, though, reading entails a deeper, unconscious, fantasy dimension. Further, texts, especially narratives, are not written by the conscious mind of the author. Writers consistently report that their writing is a process of listening to what many refer to as their alter ego (the "Borges," in Borges' famous essay "Borges and I," or "Updike," in John Updike's essay modeled off of Borges') or their "subconscious." At this level what the reader encounters is the *style* of the author, the unique, unconsciously generated finger- print word patterns that make the science of stylology possible. The meanings established at this level evoke the reader's fantasy stream, which provides the venue for the author's taking the reader into the world that he or she creates using the devices of the text. Reading is something like participating in a séance, where a medium (the author) conjures up images and voices from "another world" that are then perceived through the reader's own unconscious process. While it is happening, the reader is taken over and immobilized. In fact, in reading, though we do not consciously realize it, our eyes focus just in front of the page rather than on it, indicative of the séance-like nature of the activity.

The narratives of the novel operate at this level. What they, distinctively, are able to provide us is a convincing sense of the shape and reality of what Carl Jung called *archetypal patterns*, the large and small forms through which human life is lived. As a result, the medium of the novel is one of the best methods for revealing and understanding the archetypes that bear on public administration. Melville's novella *Billy Budd* is a fine illustration of this. One might have difficulty rationally and directly explaining how it is that those who are truly virtuous (like Billy Budd in this case) must be sacrificed by leaders for the overall "good of the ship" or system. In the novel, however, this message and the issues attaching to it are presented clearly and with compelling force. Likewise, the confused insanity that inevitably afflicts huge organizational systems under stress, like the military in wartime, could probably never be adequately communicated through social science description. Joseph Heller's novel, *Catch-22,* achieves this powerfully and convincingly. Novels are an excellent device for giving the large structures of life, and the dynamics that they impel, full description and force.

Film

The relationship established between cinema and the viewer is significantly different from that between the novel and the reader. Whereas the novel requires one to "be silent, sit still, and put your hands on the table" (in the style of the psychic medium) in order to conjure the images and voices it wishes to create, the technique of film directly hypnotizes the viewer. Film creates a fantasy experience through its technical device (Giannetti, 1972; Monaco, 1981; Lapsley and Westlake, 1988; Stam, Burgoyne & Flitterman-Lewis, 1992; Silverman, 1996). Films are actually a series of still pictures strung together. Seeing these pictures as a continuous stream is enabled by the physiology of seeing; the eye retains the illusion of an image for a moment after it disappears. When subsequent images supplant each other at a rate faster than the earlier images can fade, the pictures appear to present a continuous flow of "reality." In fact, the representation is highly partial and incomplete. This process requires certain collusion on the part of the viewer in order to achieve its effect, in the same way that hypnosis does. It is analogous to the brain's filling in the blind spot in human vision that is created where the optic nerve connects to the eyeball. Each of us perceives a seamless field of vision, unaware of our brain's role in accomplishing this. Similarly, the viewer of a film must be a willing, albeit unaware, collaborator in creating a fantasy representation that is then accepted as reality.

The most powerful theory available for explaining how film as device works to produce the viewing subject is taken from the field of psychoanalysis and is referred to as "suture theory" (Miller, Winter 1977-78; Silverman, 1983). It is far too complex to describe here, but its core emphasis is on how the camera is used to set the

perspective and control the attention of the viewer. The forced "looking at" that the camera imposes on the viewer creates an anxiety that connects at the level of the unconscious to the castration fears invoked by the oedipal passage. Just at the point that the oedipal wound is opened by the camera, a shift of perspective is taken that justifies the prior viewpoint and the threatened wound is closed or "sutured" over. Some theorists consider that all shots of film, indeed, all its aspects such as cuts, perspectives, and transitions, work on this principle. The most visible of such devices is the 180 degree "shot reverse shot" maneuver. Constant oscillation between threat and relief has the effect, finally, of suturing or stitching the viewer into the narrative of the film, in the way that we experience ourselves as participants in dreams. The structure of the narrative carries us along and does our thinking for us while at the same time we experience ourselves as independent viewing subjects. The result is to provide us with a sense of subjectivity that, while it is illusory, is also experienced as powerfully real.

Given this, film is especially powerful for creating learning encounters at the level of personal character, probably especially so with historical figures. Films, like *Patton* and *Man For All Seasons*, illustrate this point. They are able to create identifications such that viewers participate in the personal encounters of the narrative. One gains a direct sense of General Patton, if not by identifying with him in the film, then by identifying with another character who encounters him. The same is true for fictional characters who fit roles that one might want to illustrate and discuss. A particularly good film for illustrating this point in the context of contemporary governmental institutions is *Clear and Present Danger*, starring Harrison Ford. In this film, at least four common role stances that people take toward public service are illustrated elaborately. Viewers tend to identify with various aspects of these role models and experience them quite directly. There is perhaps no better method of representation than film for gaining this kind of understanding.

Video

If films hypnotize and create identifications, what does the medium of video do? The key distinction is the technical difference between film and video, the contrast in how each delivers the image (Hanson, 1987). As discussed earlier, film images result from the rapid display of a series of separate, still photographic images that are cut off from one another by a frame. The video image is produced by a continuous line or wave of electrons being sprayed onto the screen, somewhat in the manner of a person hosing down a window side-to-side, starting at the top and going to the bottom. The image is continuously coming into existence as it is moving out of existence. Further, the image is low resolution and approximate. This demands, as Marshall McLuhan so thoroughly pointed out, that the viewer actively participate in the construction of the image (McLuhan, 1964; McLuhan and Fiore, 1967). Video stands in stark contrast to reading books – the one pacifies, the other activates, but it is also distinct from film in the degree to which is demands active engagement.

This is so because, from the point of view of the brain, watching a video presentation is more like listening to someone talk than it is like seeing an image, whether of print or of fixed frame film. This is perhaps why computer word processing (a video-like technology) "solved" so many people's writers' block. It is much easier to write when it seems, at the level of unconscious process, that one is engaged in a conversation with the machine.

The consequence of this for the presentation of narrative through the medium of video is that the effect of the narrative will be paradoxically enhanced and "lightened" in just the way that hearing a story is different from reading a story. Video *tells* the story, and in so doing excites the *listener* and invites a response in a way that film and books do not. Rather than pacify and overwhelm, video *engages*. It provides the best method for an encounter with the narrative content and for subsequent discussion of it. Video produces an excitation; the viewer is present in the narrative in a distinctive way. Correspondingly, however, the consciousness of the viewer is not suspended or seduced with video technology as it is in encounters with novels or films. The curious effect of this is that the content of the video narrative is leavened by what the viewer is able to process consciously.

Sometimes this can be disconcerting. When I have shown video versions of films that I consider to be quite grave in their import, the result is typically that the issues they deal with are significantly discounted in the subsequent discussion. This suggests that the emotional and intellectual impact of the narrative is diminished in the video form. Such a phenomenon is most evident in television, the exemplar of video technology. Television narrative is most often "narrative lite." (Some theorists believe the differences in the viewing situation presented respectively by movies and television contribute to this effect, and I tend to agree.)

Painting

As subtle as the technical differences I have been discussing might seem, they hardly compare in degree or kind to the nuances of effect created by painting as an art form. These can only be suggested in the broadest terms here. As with the other media, the essence of art lies at the technical level. I start from the almost vulgar fact that painting is nothing more than "color" smeared on a surface. Its connection to reality, which is to say its status as a medium of representation, is placed in fundamental question by this fact. When painting functions as representation, it is because the categories of the symbolic order surrounding it are able to impose themselves on it in such a way as to structure perception of the image being presented and make it seem to be something real.

The issue of representation is the least of the matter. When the human subject looks at anything – person or object – the act of seeing is always mediated through the question of what the object is making of the viewer (Lacan, 1981). Seeing puts the ego up front and poses the question "What is this thing I am looking at making of me?" Put otherwise, *"How is this thing I am looking at seeing me?"* The easiest way to get a sense of this is to think of moments when we view an image that repulses us, as perhaps with images of violence or pornography. We turn away because looking at the image constitutes us, makes us into a kind of person that we do not want to be. This effect holds with anything at which we look, even the furniture in a room. Part of why we do not like it (when we don't) is that it is implying, as it "looks" at us, an identity for us that we wish to resist.

In the case of viewing a painting, the dynamic of looking becomes much more complex. To begin, the painting, since it has been produced by another person, *ipso facto,* possesses a point of view with which it confronts us. We presume the artist had an intention, and this intention implicates us, attempts to define us. At the same time, though, the artist is not present to insist on this implicit perspective, and the viewer can easily disregard it. Thus, the artist, as an ego, is absent from the viewing scene and thereby becomes present, perversely, in a more real way. The artist has placed himself or herself at the mercy of the viewer, open to any interpretation or judgment. This is true in painting to a degree that is qualitatively different from other forms of narrative art. Painting tends to be rather entirely personal and relies to a minimal degree on the conventions of social context which writers can manipulate and hide behind in order to protect themselves from exposure.

In a painting that explicitly employs the geometrical device of perspectival representation, for example, the work demands that the viewer take up the specific position which properly sets the relation of the objects being represented in the scene. A viewer can easily refuse to assume this position, thereby exposing the artifice by which the image is created. The viewer, in doing this, takes the encounter with the painting and the artist to the level of the real.

At the same time, though, the artist accomplishes precisely the same thing by the very act of making it possible for the viewer to reject the painting in this manner. The artist is in the position, in other words, of the one being gazed at, who acknowledges the gaze and the questions involved in it, and then takes the encounter to an entirely different level by refusing to be anything more than he or she is. The painting does not provide the viewer a "feel good" satisfaction, since if it does offer one, there is no guarantee that it will work.

One illustration by analogy of this effect is to consider a bra-less woman (here in the position of the artist) in a short tight skirt and a thin, low blouse who is regarded by a male with a steady stare (in the position of the viewer of the painting). The man can continue to stare, knowing that as the woman (in the position of the

painting) looks back at him he is being constituted in the exchange as rude, perhaps prurient, etc., or he can turn away, refusing the scene because he does not like the way the "gaze of the woman" is making him out to be. Suppose upon being looked at though, the woman declares, "You want to look at something, well look at this!" and rips off all her clothing to leave herself naked. Now the encounter has moved beyond the ego identifications of the two involved, and they are engaged in an encounter as two embodied subjects, at the level of the real, which is to say, without the mediation of their imaginary, ego identities. This is the kind of encounter that the artist—as the naked woman--and art, have the potential to accomplish. The painter is more naked before the audience than any other maker of art. A painting can only say, in the end, "I am what I am."

This helps explain why paintings, so often the objects of ridicule in mass culture as useless and even silly fetishes of pretentious cognoscenti, are as valued as they are. Artists, when they are able to engage honestly the artistic task, create a venue through which they can express themselves as whole, embodied beings. Van Gogh is, no doubt (ironically perhaps), the exemplar of this, as well as the most commercially valued artist (McQuillan, 1989). When we regard the objects they produce, we have the opportunity to experience ourselves, however quietly or implicitly, in the same manner. Art, when it works, evokes our human subjectivity in a way not available to any of the other media I am discussing.

Narrative Versus Social Science Content

The foregoing analysis suggests that the devices of narrative offer rich potential for evoking different forms of human subjectivity. Now I want to compare narrative as narrative—i.e., as a mode of content—with social scientific knowledge. My purpose is to reveal the limitations of the scientific model of knowing for a field like public administration. The objects and situations dealt with in public administration are, of course, from the "real world." As a result they are not only relentlessly complex, but overdetermined and impossible to study and learn about in anything but the most approximately controlled manner.

A good place to start in my exploration is the aphorism, "Science abstracts, poetry concretizes"—where poetry is a metaphor for narrative. Though Karl Popper's philosophy of science has forever modified the possibility of calling science a purely inductive enterprise, it is, nonetheless, accurate to characterize it as seeking to construct generalizations grounded in experiences of the particular. Scientific method requires segmentation and ever more specific examination, to lay the groundwork for its abstractions. This methodological schema works well enough in the realm of the physical; nonetheless, the prototypical error of scientific analysis when taken to the level of application is to have failed to predict the consequences of interaction effects or context.

The limitations and intrinsic tensions of the scientific method when applied to the social world quickly become obvious. I am speaking here of such matters as the problem of how to "create explanation adequate at the level of the actor" to use Weber's formulation of the issue, and the issue of "identifiability" (the "old maids and cats" problem of *Administration and Behavior, i.e.,* how to limit analysis to only the most relevant variables) that Herbert Simon first posed to the field (Gerth and Mills, 1948; Simon, 1976). In the social sciences, it is the particular (the context) that gives any meaning to the general.

The result of these and other such intrinsic problems is that the more "rigorous" social science research becomes, the more it tends to prove the obvious. Likewise, the more it seeks to define the variables it explores tightly, and to examine the dynamics of causal effects in clearly delineated arenas of action so as to produce applicable knowledge, the more remote and inapplicable the results become. In a word, the slices of life served up by social science are so thin as to appear lifeless, unreal, and difficult or impossible to relate to actual experience.

The discipline of sociology is instructive on this point, since it, perhaps more than any other field, has sought to apply science directly to the social world. The results are helpful, and sometimes fascinating, but limited.

Sociological accounts of social phenomena, cast in the venue of scientific reporting, too often strike us as dim approximations of the reality they seek to describe. This has led to the accusation that sociologists go to great lengths to discover and document the obvious. There is a famous true story about an incident at a sociology conference involving an audience member who had just heard a research paper reporting a funded study documenting the factors related to the location of houses of prostitution in urban areas. The audience member stood up and commented: "So now I know what a sociologist is—a man who has to spend forty thousand dollars to find a whorehouse" (Homans, 1950).

If we consider scientific explanation as a form of narrative, we can see that its plausibility (not truth) value depends upon its audience's accepting the context that its truth claims assume. Therefore, it would seem that science is most compatible to the venue of the printed page, which as we have seen, powerfully draws the reader into the context that it sets, in the process cutting the reader off from alternative contexts. In a sense, of course, this is true. The other devices are much less acceptable as venues of scientific knowledge. (Film caused much excitement among scientists studying motion until they realized the implication of the fact that film actually was a moving series of still pictures.) Indeed, film, video, and paintings are much less convincing than are written reports as modes for presenting scientific information.

But what about the novel? It is also a narrative form that depends upon the printed page. Curiously, it is in **denying** its likeness to the novel as a narrative form that science reveals its greatest limitations. Traditional science denies that it sets a specialized, specific context. It claims rather that it works from an objective, context-free position. Its success ironically depends upon legitimating the context it sets among the readers of its research, and part of its strategy is to either vehemently deny this or quietly ignore it, depending upon the situation (Hacking, 1999). The historical fate of sociologists of knowledge is testimony to the power of this rejection. The novel, on the other hand, celebrates its ability to create a compelling context in which the richness of the particular can be experienced. In exposing its main rhetorical manipulation in this way, the novel can help heal the distorted sense of objectivity that science tends to induce. That is, objectivity begins with the realization that there is no truly neutral objective position from which to understand things. The only true objectivity, then, is the one that, like the novel, exposes the context of the account that it gives so that its influences can be taken into consideration as understanding is formed.

Overall, what the narrative media I have been describing are good for is to reattach what the scientific approach cuts out. For public administration this is crucial since, as I noted earlier, ours is a discipline of practice – at all levels of lived experience. We cannot afford to base our plans and actions on only the abstractions of the scientific world. In this sense, narrative offers the possibility of healing the wound between theory and practice. It accomplishes this in two ways. First, narrative gives public administration the possibility of developing a literature of administrative folk stories for study and education, stories that provide a far truer, especially in the sense of fuller, account of the realities of public agencies. Narrative, both when it is true, as in folk stories, and when it is fiction, can capture the full scope of human situations and sagas to a degree not possible in any other way (McSwite in Farmer, 1998). Earlier in this essay, I argued that each medium for narrative highlights a different aspect of this reality and works on the person experiencing it to constitute her or him in differing ways. Still, though, narrative in all venues provides a full sense of events: archetypal structure, character, story, and subjectivity.

Second, because narrative sets its own context, it can create a more complete encounter with the material it presents. Social science texts and university classrooms create powerfully controlling contexts with ("middle class," if you will) norms that can severely limit the range of what can be produced for presentation in them. An implicit norm of education is that students must not be shocked by the material they study.

On this point, I often cite the true anecdote of a literature professor friend of mine who was hired by a medical school to teach a novels course to psychiatry interns. The course was designed to address the fact that the interns, coming from primarily middle class backgrounds, had not developed sufficient range in their senses of

life to be able to relate to, understand, and professionally cope with their patients' situations. Public administration has a similar kind of problem, and it is not confined to what we teach but affects the range of what we research and write about as well.

Implications of the Analysis

As noted at the outset of this essay, public administration is an exciting and demanding field precisely because it is as broad as it is in both scope and application. It requires those who involve themselves with it to employ the highest levels of their intellectual capabilities and to make practical connections between these and the mundane but supremely important tasks of governance. As such it offers, I believe, the greatest potential of any socially-related practice for making a linkage between effective professional action and personal, individual development.

This potential – to constantly develop the high craft of governance by linking it to the personal actualization of those who practice it – can only be realized, though, if we in the field take on the realities of the social world as fully as possible (Denhardt, 1981). The use of narrative – as research product, as inspiration for research, as venue for teaching and study of public administration – is one way that the project of attaining this kind of engagement could be furthered.

Making and acting on such a commitment might well have two important results. The most obvious one would be to improve our understanding of social and organizational life and the problems that must be faced in carrying out governance in the midst of such realities. A less obvious, but I think more important, one has to do with the personal effects that might accrue from involving ourselves with narrative. Each of the narrative devices I surveyed in this essay produces a different form of human subject: in the case of reading novels, the passive receiver who gains insight into archetypal pattern; with film, the vicariously involved dreamer who engages and understands the dynamics of character structure and the interplay of character in the social construction of the subject; with video, the hearer of the story, the one who uses insight to seek morals and judges appropriate actions; and with painting, the pure and creative subject, the source of the fundamentally new that is exempt from all determination.

The effective public administrator must develop all these aspects of self and have them ready to deploy in the form of such mundane skills and capacities as listening and understanding, appreciating and coming to terms with the "otherness" of the other, deciding and responsibly acting in situations that, inevitably, are morally unclear and causally uncertain, and creating and applying the truly innovative. Such development is the kind of potential that narrative offers in even the few forms I have discussed.

Conclusion

Some readers of this essay will, no doubt, recognize that the message it urges is not original but emanates from a venerable public administration tradition. I have labeled the scholars who founded this tradition, the "Traditionalists." Their main literature was a set of narrative case studies. They were purely descriptive historical stories offered without analysis, but with the belief that they contained material that could help those who were preparing to practice administrative governance.

This essay is, at bottom, urging that we in public administration reconsider our present feverish effort to use social science methodology to generate broadly applicable generalizations about how to run governments efficiently. My own sense is that this effort can never attain more than the appearance of success because it does not sufficiently acknowledge the extent to which our political process is inconsistent with the goals of the enterprise.

There is another way to attain as much efficiency and as much effectiveness and justice as is ever going to be possible in our system of governance. The core of this way involves producing and beginning to tell each other stories of the world of public administration, and using whatever stories we can find that relate to our world to inspire our studies of it and to teach our students. Narrative will bring us closer to the world we want to understand and act in, and in the process we will get more in touch with ourselves and with each other as a community of people who are still concerned about the essential collective order within which our lives must be lived.

References

Denhardt, R.B. (1981). *In the shadow of organization.* Lawrence: Regents Press of Kansas.

Farmer, D.J., ed. (1998). *Papers on the art of anti-administration.* Burke, VA: Chatelaine Press.

Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C.W., eds. (1948), *From Max Weber.* London: Cambridge University Press.

Giannetti, L. (1972). 4th ed. *Understanding movies.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Hacking, I. (1999). *Mad travelers: Reflections on the reality of transient mental illnesses.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Hanson, J. (1987). *Understanding video.* Newbury Park: Sage.

Homans, G.C. (1950). *The human group.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovitch.

Lacan, J. (1981). *The four fundamental concepts of psycho-analysis.* (Edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, trans. By Alan Sheridan). New York: W.W. Norton.

Lapsley, R. & Westlake, M. (1988). *Film theory: An introduction.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

McLuhan, M. & Fiore, Q. (1967). *The medium is the message.* New York: Bantam Books.

McQuillan, M. (1989). *Van Gogh.* London: Thames and Hudson.

Miller, J.A. (Winter, 1977/78). *Suture (elements of the logic of the Signifier.* Screen 18, No. 4. 24-34.

Monaco, J. (1981) rev. *How to read a film.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Ong, W. (1982). *Orality and literacy.* London: Routledge.

Silverman, K. (1983). *The subject of semiotics.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Silverman, K. 1(1996). *The threshold of the visible world.* New York: Routledge.

Simon, H.A. (1976). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision making processes in administrative organizations* (3rd ed., rev.). New York: Free Press.

Stam, R., Burgoyne, R. & Flitterman-Lewis, S. (1992). *New vocabularies in film semiotics.* London: Routledge.

***

O.C. McSwite is the pseudonym for **Orion White**, Virginia Tech University, and **Cynthia McSwain**, the George Washington University.

I Am a Bureaucrat

"Wycliffe Allen"

This article is a "public voice" from the past. "I Am a Bureaucrat" contributes a personal dimension to the perennial issues in public administration. It also reminds us that the more things change, the more they remain the same. The true name of its author will never be known as it appeared under the pseudonym "Wycliffe Allen," but the truths it speaks are timeless. It was discovered by Willa Bruce, University of Illinois at Springfield, while searching old issues of ASPA sponsored journals, looking for classic articles in administrative ethics. The article appeared in Public Administration Review v. XI, no. 2 (Spring, 1951), pp. 116-118. It had been reprinted from The Pacific Spectator (Autumn, 1950), pp. 440-445, by permission of The Pacific Spectator, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California.

According to both the press and the *Congressional Record*, I am one who gormandizes at the public trough. I am the incarnation of all the sloths through all the ages. I live off the hard-earned salaries of neighbors and the profits of tax-paying industries.

For this parasitical existence, I give, apparently, little value. I am supposed to put in, each day, eight hours of cat naps intermingled with pen-pushing; I am believed to manufacture red tape in amazing quantities and to protect myself from reformers by means of the greatest lobby in Washington. The movie industry, like the cartoonists, finds me a fit subject for ridicule.

Still, be what I may, I am a good portion of the brain, arms, and legs by which our national hopes and aspirations are brought to their fruition. During war and in all peacetime emergencies, the administrative machinery of which I am a part is an essential ingredient in whatever is the country's formula for winning through. And yet, in spite of whatever may be my successes, as a bureaucrat my loyalty to the government for which I work is questioned indiscriminately and constantly.

For years, standard federal practice has required the finger-printing of all new or transferred employees, with copies to the FBI. Yet recently congress appropriated 20,000,000 to investigate me all over again. That I survived is a minor matter.

So now, investigated, fingerprinted, reinvestigated, I am a proudly loyal federal bureaucrat – an office holder. How did I get that way? Well, public belief to the contrary notwithstanding – I worked for it.

In the beginning, a careless college question, tossed during a swimming pool chat, cast the die. "Ever think of public service?" I thought of city, county, state, and federal government. County governments I discarded; they were, it seemed to me, "the black continent of American government." That left cities, states, or the federal government. Each of these offered a challenge. In varying degrees they faced the problem of maintaining

political decisions as the essence of democracy, while improving efficiency of operations and decisiveness of action.

After a graduate year of intensive scholastic effort, I gained employment with an industrial engineering organization which devoted its full activities to city, county, state, and national governmental organization and techniques. Subsequently, for the greater part of a decade, I hit the sawdust trail of improved local government administration. World War II tossed me into administrative military service. When World II was over, I competed for, and won, what is considered a well-paying job in a federal agency – well-paying, of course, by public employment standards, not by others.

Thus you, the tax public, have paid my salary, directly or indirectly, for over fifteen civilian and military years. What has my work meant to you? With many other bureaucrats I have played a small part in improving the level of service you receive from government for the price you pay. Many cities and some states can now make numbers of so-called business-managed industries look a ledgerly red by comparison. In the past twenty years interest in effective operations has mushroomed among public officials. In addition to the usual night school and correspondence efforts of ambitious clerks, key administrators -- city, state, and federal -- have been willing to study specialized college courses on their own time and out of their own pockets. City managers travel at night halfway across a Midwestern state to hold weekly seminars on management techniques, with a managers' correspondence course as text. Finance officers, assessors, personnel men, public works officials avidly complete correspondence courses from the Institute for Training in Municipal Administration, and study at the extension courses in their city as they work toward a graduate college degree. Their annual standard of comparison is not the personal profit sheet but improved effectiveness of service. Many operations, in government as elsewhere, are susceptible of cost analysis; it has been applied with zest. Yes, you'll find cost accountants, systems accountants, industrial engineers in the public service, though without the titles or salaries of their industry counterparts. They are all bureaucrats – like me.

Occasionally I read with envy of some of the administrative practices in industry. An industry may rely almost completely on sales to the federal government for its balance sheet profit, but the "protectionist," red-tape-creating devices you have forced on me are not extended to it. Pounds of regulations, inspections, internal audits, and post audits, the General Accounting Office and the Civil Service Commission – all of these were created by *you* in laws so written that the conclusion to be drawn from them is inescapable. You do not trust me to do a job without circumscribing restrictions, not unless it is a job in private employment!

So you protect the purity of public business by legal red tape. I have seen competent staffs struggling for several years to try to cut away needless and costly strictures in administrative channels. For the most part these were created by four fear of me and fellow bureaucrats, a fear extended through your legislative representatives.

Absconders shun the federal service, with its still bonds for certifying officers, its General Accounting office audits, and its various investigatory agents, including Treasury agents and the FBI. Nevertheless, you load federal employees down with triple procedure checks and minutiae. Our accounts are not designed primarily to serve useful administrative purposes. The design is that they shall be kept in such manner as to allow the General Accounting Office an easier audit, and also to permit Congressional inquiries to be answered rapidly.

You make us hire employees in 1950 by methods prescribed as an aftermath of a disappointed job-seeker's assassination of President Garfield in the 1880's. You make us discipline employees by means of a letter-writing etiquette reminiscent of Victorian parlors. You make us fire them by legal document. When your Congressional representatives cut appropriations, the resulting layoffs are carried out by regulations operating in such a way that Master Mechanics or Naval Gun Foremen with twenty years of experience are laid off while a war veteran with one year of service remains, secure as long as he earns a good" efficiency rating. ""Good" represents far less than a numerical average. Career service? What happens to the twenty years of training and

skilled experience the federal government loses? You concede this to be a waste of money and men? And yet you do not correct it -- you, working through your representatives.

There are not only wastes to be corrected, there are basic inequalities, too. Assuming your desire for improved governmental service, bureaucrats can see but three reasons why you do not make your views known to your legislators.

First, you don't really care. Government exists only as a whipping post for after-dinner bull sessions. It effects no other part of your life.

Second, you think in terms of programs and ideas, but not of the details required to carry them out. Perhaps your Congressman thinks the same way. An "economy" committee of the House or Senate might, if it meant business, call upon the General Accounting Office, the Civil Service Commission, and the Bureau of the budget to assist it in saving federal funds by pointing out to the committee administrative anachronisms or needless details required by Congressional legislation. But does it?

Third, you are doubtless a member of one or more organized pressure-groups acting on your Congressman to secure favorable legislation, or to lay before Congressmen sentiments "accurately reflecting public opinion." Your group may concentrate on the federal government for direct economic gain, as have the labor unions or the National Association of Manufactures. Or it may expect the federal government to salve its individual consciences for its having failed to do, as private individuals, what the government is requested to do. In this connection, the privileges legislated for veterans in the federal service are of interest when compared with industry practices toward veterans. Or, finally, your pressure group may concentrate on the federal government as a sounding board for broad ethical, theological, economic, or social convictions affecting a way of life. As such it may be responsible for a new basic law. Laws have to be administered.

Federal agencies are thus created to meet needs. Generally speaking, those needs are impressed on Congress by constituents. If you care to review events leading up to the creation of "one more" federal agency, you may find its ghosts in your pressure closet. When a Presidential reorganization or Hoover Commission report threatens your independent agency, your anguished cries bear no relation to the improved services that might result. When economy is called for, you demand cuts in all appropriations except those for your pressurized baby. Initial cuts in the budge recommend by the appropriation committees of the House and Senate disappear, and the budget as passed may be "as large as" or "larger than," that submitted by the Chief Executive. So I, the bureaucrat, catch the hot potato -- and hold it. There is no other receiver. Provided with an appropriation to carry out a given program, I hire employees to do the job. Immediately arise the cries, "Too many employees," bureaucratic waste," "empire building."

Yes, I *am* a bureaucrat, a public officeholder. I am proud of that fact, proud that I serve with other bureaucrats dedicated to performing the work of the federal government as effectively as you permit us to do. Naturally there are a few drones among us bureaucrats, but surprisingly few. You will find their counterparts in industry in as great or in greater numbers.

Partisan politics is no problem in the federal administrative service. As in industry, it is office politics which causes the havoc, office politics based on cliques, personalities, and ambitions. Even so, we have no sixth vice-presidents, in charge of the executive lunchroom, who are related to the board chairman.

Your federal government is the largest corporation on earth. Many of its administrative ills are common to any organization plagued with bigness, private or public. Many, too, will be corrected only when individuals and groups look beyond their special interests and accept an occasional "Bureaucratic" recommendation in the interests of all. Your federal government has become big because the fancied or real needs of people were translated by their representatives into law. The only possible profit sheet for government must be in terms of

services rendered now or human and physical resources developed for posterity. Working for such a corporation is a challenge which requires considerably more than eight hours of my day, bureaucrat though I be. You would be *shocked* at the pleasure I get from snipping red tape here and improving a process there. For I am a taxpayer, too.

Book Review

Mary Baker Eddy

Kit Cole

> "When we do not know a person – and also when we do -- we have to judge the size and nature
> of his achievement as compared with the achievements of others in his special line of business –
> there is no other way. Measured by this standard, it is thirteen hundred years since the world
> has produced anyone who could reach up to Mrs. Eddy's waistbelt.
>
> In several ways she is the most interesting woman that ever lived, and the most extraordinary" –
> Mark Twain (from Gill, xi).

Mary Baker Eddy, the founder of Christian Science, was a highly controversial figure in her time; her character
and religion continue to arouse strong feelings in Christian Scientists, nonbelievers and critics today. While her
biography has been written numerous times, by both friendly and hostile authors, it took until 1998, more than
70 years after her death, that an "objective" biography was produced which also incorporates previously
inaccessible documentation related to her life and work. Gillian Gill, PhD, the author of *Mary Baker Eddy*, one
in a series of biographies produced by Radcliffe College, spent more than two years negotiating in person and
via legal counsel with Christian Science officers at The Mother Church for access to their archival holdings.

In the opening of her book, Gill explains her interest in pursuing a biography about the religious leader: "It is
because Mrs. Eddy was so unlikely a saint and prophet, so flawed, so unexpected, so achieving, that she is so
interesting from a nonecclesiastical, noninstitutional point of view. She transcends the boundaries not only of
her historical period but of the religious movement she founded, and in some measure appreciation of her as a
historical figure has been severely hampered by the controversies generated by her church" (Gill, xvii).
Posthumously, Eddy has received numerous accolades, including being honored by the National Women's Hall
of Fame, the Women's National Book Association and PBS's Religion and Ethics Newsweekly.

Additionally, Gill's biography focuses on the personality behind Eddy's role as a religious leader and on her life
prior to founding Christian Science: "In terms of its organization and emphasis, this biography differs from
previous ones in that it gives much more careful attention to Mrs. Eddy's first sixty years, before Christian
Science became a national force. This is where earlier biographies tend to be most inaccurate, and where the
record therefore needs to be set straight most carefully" (Gill, xix).
Had she lived through the end of the 20th century, Mary Baker Eddy's photograph would have been an
appropriate cover for *Composing a Life*, published in 1989 and written by Mary Catherine Bateson, which
chronicles the lives of five women and debunks the myth that contemporary successful women lead lives which
are largely preordained to success. Each of the women in the book, a college president, artist, electrical
engineer, psychiatrist and writer, all share firsthand accounts of how the competing priorities and focuses in
their lives resulted in improvisation and reinvention of the definition of success. Bateson states: "Fluidity and
discontinuity are central to the reality in which we live. Historically, even women who devoted themselves to
homemaking and childcare have had to put together a mosaic of activities and resolve conflicting demands on

their time and attention" (Bateson, 13). Eddy's circuitous paths to founding and running a large religious organization are strikingly similar to the pattern of those modern women's lives discussed by Bateson.

Additionally, Eddy is notable for being on the leading edge of a movement towards more female-oriented religion, which has manifested itself in many faith trends evident in the late 21st century. Gill states: "Mrs. Eddy played a unique part not only in the history of American Protestantism but in the movement toward a woman-inclusive theology and church governance" (Gill, xv). Eddy was not quiet about women's "appropriate" role and included many references to it in her religious writings: "In the natural law and in religion the right of woman to fill the highest measure of enlightened understanding and the highest places in government is inalienable, and these rights are ably vindicated by the noblest of both sexes. This is woman's hour, with all the sweet amenities and its moral and religious reforms" (Eddy, *No and Yes*, 45).

As Bateson opens her book, she discusses the pitfalls of viewing successful men and women from this one-dimensional lens: "There is a pattern deeply rooted in myth and folklore that recurs in biography and may create inappropriate expectations and blur our ability to see the actual shape of lives. Much biography of exceptional people is built around the image of a quest, a journey through a timeless landscape toward an end that is specific, even though it is not fully known" (Bateson, 6). Bateson believes that the assumptions surrounding the quests implied or overtly described in biographies of the famous "have not been valid for many of history's most creative people, and they are increasingly inappropriate today. The landscape through which we move is in constant flux" (Bateson, 6).

Eddy not only provides a powerful role model for those of us in public administration as she was the founder and leader of a large organization, but she defines Bateson's thesis that lives, especially those of women, are more an improvisation than a carefully scripted work which contains a discrete beginning, middle and end. While Eddy died decades before Bateson's book was published, Bateson's book is as applicable to Eddy's life as it is to the lives of today's women. While Eddy was a deeply religious young girl and woman, similar to many of her peers at the time, Gill's recounting of her life gives no clue in Eddy's early years as to the woman she was to become. In fact, many Christian Scientists are quick to point out that Eddy was sickly and emotionally wrought during her earlier years.

Eddy, born in 1821, was an anomaly in her time – not only a woman leader but the leader of a religious organization. Gill sums up Eddy's main challenge as the fact "that she had an extraordinary talent for life in the public sphere but was barred from entering it" (Gill, xxii). Characterized by Gill, these talents included: "inspirational leadership and religious doctrine, organizational planning and structure, law and finance, propaganda and public relations" (Gill, xxii). Further, Eddy's founding of the Christian Science Church and her talents for organizing and financing did not manifest themselves until her fifties and sixties, again consistent with Bateson's thesis: "Conventional in her twenties, weak in her thirties, struggling in her forties, a social outcast in her fifties, indefatigably working in her sixties, famous in her eighties, Mrs. Eddy rewrites the female plot and offers new ways to strive and achieve" (Gill, xvii).

Eddy's personal characteristics as described by Gill include: "qualities traditionally associated with the male: originality, ambition, drive, ruthlessness, self-confidence, business acumen, a willingness to take risks and break new ground, single-minded devotion to a cause, choosing intimates from outside the family circle and, above all, a prophetic belief that she was the chosen vessel for God's purpose and the exponent of a new Revelation" (Gill, xxiii).

Eddy was, and continues to be, practically the lone woman among leaders of major religions. However, the validity of Christian Science, the often controversial religion that Eddy founded in the last decades of her life, is not the subject of this essay. Rather, it is the actions and characteristics of Eddy as a person and, most importantly, as a leader of a large organization, which are particularly relevant to women in public administration. Furthermore, the pattern of Eddy's life is similar to those of the five modern women described

in Bateson's work, including continual reinvention and composition, as opposed to life-long devotion to achievement of a single goal. Bateson states: "In many ways, constancy is an illusion. After all, our ancestors were immigrants, many of them moving on every few years; today we are migrants in time...Of any stopping place in life, it is good to ask whether it will be a good place from which to go on as well as a good place to remain" (Bateson, 14).

The youngest of five children, raised in a strongly Christian household, Eddy struggled during the early part of her life, although, as Gill states: "Public records, family letters, account books, and town chronicles offer a skeleton of Mary Baker's childhood years...but we have little to put flesh on bones. Mary Baker Eddy was in her sixties before she became a subject of public interest, and by then most of her parental generation had passed on" (Gill, 8).

Eddy's first husband died six months after their marriage and Eddy found herself pregnant and essentially penniless at the age of 23. She attempted to support herself and her child through writing and depending on the kindness of family and family friends for monetary and emotional support. However, Gill characterizes Eddy's early years as difficult, as she moved from household to household and gave her child up for foster care. According to Gill, "...throughout the pre-Christian Science period of her life, there is abundance of evidence of her unhappiness, her frustration, her square-peg inability to fit comfortable into the round hold allotted her" (Gill, xxiii).

In her forties, after marrying again (and later divorcing), Eddy slipped on some ice and was, by all accounts, close to death. The founding of Christian Science is dated to February 3, 1866, when Eddy was reportedly healed of the injury resulting from the fall through a reading of the Bible and revelations she had related to Jesus' healings in the New Testament. Eddy's fifties and sixties were devoted to nurturing the fledgling religion through gaining converts and fending off numerous public attacks on her and Christian Science which appeared in newspapers and magazines; additionally, there were numerous lawsuits filed against her during these decades and well into her final years, by former students, her son and critics.

It is difficult to measure the extent of the church and its membership as it existed during Eddy's lifetime as these statistics are not available from the church. However, according to Gill, "In terms of sheer numbers, no single church group outnumbered...[the] First Church of Christ, Scientist, in New York City" (Gill, 535). Also, we know that *Science and Health*, the Christian Science textbook written by Eddy and revised by her more than 50 times during her lifetime, has sold more than 9 million copies since its publication and has been translated into more than 17 languages.

The breadth and depth of her administrative talents can be viewed through some of the major achievements of the church under her guidance. The Mother Church in Boston was built in less than a year and was open for services by the day decreed by Eddy, despite significant logistical challenges including delivery of lumber, iron and tiles, as described in detail by Gill: "When the wooden pews, ordered from Michigan and completed as a rush order...arrived at the site...the installer was outraged. The whole space as crowded with workers, scaffolding was everywhere, the floors were filthy and unfinished...The next day, when the Michigan man returned, he was amazed. All the staging was down, all the workmen...had left, the floor was uncovered and clean" (Gill, 365).

Eddy lead the effort to build the Mother Church from her home in New Hampshire, a strategy that is best described by Gill's own words:

> "Throughout this crucial period in church history Mrs. Eddy maintained a brilliant strategy whose daring can only be appreciated once it is understood that most of the actual building work was completed in eight months. Remaining resolutely aloof at Pleasant View, she resisted all attempts to draw her into the day-to-day drama of the work site. She laid down the schedule,

approved the architectural plans, eagerly worked on details of design…but she refused to hear about problems with workmen or fears that the building would remain incomplete for lack of fund. By placing her prestige on the line, by refusing even to contemplate failure, in fact by setting the stakes of success extraordinarily high, but at the same time giving her chosen lieutenants a large amount of discretion and keeping a close watch on them, Mrs. Eddy inspired her troops to victories they themselves thought impossible" (Gill, 359).

Eddy mobilized church membership behind the building of the Mother Church by raising donations from members and requiring that certain prominent church members act as day-to-day construction foremen. According to Gill: "Mrs. Eddy's radical new concept of fund-raising now went into effect, and the results amazed even the most sanguine. Once the church building was defined as a national, not a local institution, it became clear to those Christian Scientists who lived outside the Boston area, now in the majority, that their task was to provide the money for their Mother Church" (Gill, 358).

Eddy also used the church construction as an opportunity to put in place the administrative framework for the organization: "The projected Mother Church as envisaged by Eddy would serve and belong to the whole membership of Christian Science. The Boston congregation which would principally attend this church would have neither title to nor direction over Church matters since Mrs. Eddy had managed to finesse the whole issue of church institionalization by putting in place a preselected and then self perpetuating board" (Gill, 358).

Her leadership of the church organization, as well as construction, from her home in New Hampshire was, essentially, telecommuting in the 19th century, as described by Gill: "During the more than eighteen years Mrs. Eddy lived in New Hampshire, Church officials traveled daily between Boston and Concord, her household members often acted as couriers between Pleasant View and the Mother Church, visitors and new staff members, summoned by telegram, flowed in at a few days' notice from all over the country, and handling the mail became the work of several full-time secretaries" (Gill, 384). Furthermore: "Officials from the Mother Church were in and out of Pleasant View constantly, and as the household staff grew and filled every available cranny, the directors and trustees were forced at times to spend the night on cots in the parlor downstairs" (Gill, 395).

Eddy had a firm grasp of public relations and understood the impact that the printed word had on church members and potential members. In the numerous publications she founded during her life, she protested the conditions under which women found themselves while also laying out beliefs critical to Christian Science: "Civil law establishes very unfair differences between the rights of the two sexes. Our laws are not impartial, to say the least, in their discrimination as to the person, property, and parental claims of the two sexes" (Eddy, *Science and Health*, 63). Two years before her death she founded the *Christian Science Monitor* newspaper, which has won numerous awards, including six Pulitzer prizes, circulates in more than 100 countries and maintains 12 overseas news bureaus and 13 U.S. bureaus.

While Eddy's prominence on the East Coast and nationally rose steadily in her later years, her relationship with her son was tumultuous throughout her lifetime. Indeed, if Eddy were alive today, she would likely fall into the stereotype of the wildly successful executive with a tragically unsuccessful home life. It is comforting to note that the pressure on modern women to maintain peaceful homes and families while also being ambitious professionally is not new. Gill summarizes the challenges specific to Eddy:

> "Particularly during her lifetime, the criteria applied to Mary Baker Eddy have been notably different from those applied to famous men in general, and to religious leaders – who have been male almost by definition – in particular. Interestingly, both Mary Baker Eddy's apologists and her detractors share the view that a woman who is not happy and successful as a wife, mother and homemaker cannot be admired. Whereas the serious deficiencies of Charles Dickens or Mark Twain or Leo Tolstoy as husbands and fathers are considered to be irrelevant to their

achievement or even seen as the sad but inevitable result of their genius, Mary Baker Eddy has consistently been held to a different standard: expected to fulfill all the tasks an roles of a 'normal' wife and mother of her period as well as found a new denomination." (Gill, xxiii).

Bateson believes that we must broaden our view of the "successful" life. Based upon Gill's book, we can apply these new criteria to our reading of the lives of historical women, including Mary Baker Eddy, as well: "It is time now to explore the creative potential of interrupted and conflicted lives, where energies are not narrowly focused or permanently pointed toward a single ambition. These are not lives without commitment, but rather lives in which commitments are continually refocused and redefined" (Bateson, 9). Eddy not only chose to shun traditional expectations of women and move into what was then a "man's arena" but her leadership and governance style were innovative. In drawing similarities between Eddy and today's women, we may take a line from Bateson: "On the whole, women today follow their interest into more formal careers, but there remain unexpected similarities between the multiple commitments and discontinuities they face" (Bateson, 12).

References

Eddy, Mary Baker. *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*, Christian Science Publishing Society, 2000.
Eddy, Mary Baker. *No and Yes*, Christian Science Publishing Society.
Gill, Gillian. *Mary Baker Eddy*, Perseus Books, 1998.
Bateson, Mary Catherine. *Composing a Life*, The Penguin Group, 1989.

***

Kit Cole is Policy Advisor to Board Member Michael Paparian at the California Integrated Waste Management Board, a division of the California Environmental Protection Agency. She received her Masters in Public Administration from the University of Southern California.

Challenging the Public/Private Divide:
Feminism, Law, and Public Policy

by Susan B. Boyd, ed., Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Inc., 1997.

Reviewed by *Linda deLeon*

Some things are public, some are private. On the one hand, public can mean government, while private means the market. On the other, public can mean things that happen in the outer social world – whether market or government – while private refers to that which happens inside the household, curtained from public view. Over time, the boundaries between public and private, construed in either of the senses described above, has shifted. In this volume of essays, a group of Canadian feminist scholars argue that recent policies there have shifted the public/private line in the direction of moving more responsibility for social problem-solving onto the private sector, and this movement has worked to the detriment of women.

The fourteen essays collected in *Challenging the Public/Private Divide* offer a careful and critical examination of the roles that state, law and public policy play in regulating women's lives and in restructuring the constraints within which they organize their lives. After a summarizing introduction by editor Susan B. Boyd, the various authors address the role of the state; the organization of family, home and work; the legal regulation of motherhood; and the challenges of privatization and globalization. In developing the major theme, the effects of privatization on women, the authors frequently sound a subtheme concerning the differences in the way it affects diverse groups of women – the poor, ethnic and racial minorities, women with disabilities, and lesbians.

Readers in the United States should not be deterred by the fact that the analysis looks at policies and events from north of the border. It is clear in every essay that much of the social and political context in Canada is similar to that in the U.S. Two features of this context are particularly important. One is the developments over recent decades that have sought to open opportunities to women and minorities; to ensure that the protections of the law benefit these groups as well as white males; and to reach into the domestic sphere, the household, to protect individuals from violence perpetrated by intimates.

A second feature of the context that has characterized recent policy changes in Canada, and in the U.S. as well, is a movement toward shifting responsibility for some social welfare issues to the private sector or private individuals. The Canadian debate over whether government should undertake responsibility for providing child care ultimately resulted in leaving this function in private hands, welfare-to-work policies and the use of faith-based organization to deliver welfare services are examples of similar trends in the U.S.

From a variety of perspectives, the authors of the essays in this volume point out how women can be disadvantaged by privatization (although, too, at times they fail to receive the protections that the curtain of privacy affords to individuals). Katherine Teghtsoonian, noting that in Canada, as in the U.S., women are the primary providers of elder care and care of sick relatives (as well as child care), makes the well-known point that work done at home is invisible because it is not compensated financially nor accounted for in economic statistics. But she also points out that tasks that are done in private – housework, reproductive labor, or emotional labor – are all "tasks that have no definite conclusion or "final product" that can be displayed to attest to the performance of the work. Furthermore, these are tasks that are conceptualized as consonant with

women's "nature" as caregivers and nurturers. Such attitudes, however, are based on inaccurate foundations: women *learn* to be nurturing and caregiving. Oddly, though, it seems easier for most people to consider dog training to be skilled, effortful, often tiresome work, than to acknowledge the labor and stress involved in household work.

The conservative presumption that the care of the sick, elderly and young are *best* done at home is shown throughout many of these essays to be one that serves the interests of business while imposing burdens (even if these obligations are in some sense desired) upon women. Anyone who has been faced with the decision whether to care for a frail or ill parent in one's home knows that doing so is not simply a problem of providing skilled nursing or practical assistance: because of the emotional and psychological elements in the situation, the parent may feel a loss of independence and dignity; the adult children may feel uncomfortable with the complications of the reversed roles. Clearly, if professional care is affordable and available, it has many advantages over home care for both the parents and the adult children. Equally clearly, the private market will provide such professional care for those who can pay for it; the needier segments of society would naturally look to government for assistance. Insisting that child care, elder care, and care of the sick should be done at home amounts to a preference that women remain segregated in the domestic sphere, or that they undertake a double workload by holding down a job and doing all these uncompensated tasks too.

One of the pleasures of this volume is the fact that many of the analyses lead to conclusions that are not at all obvious. For example, in "A Re-examination of Maternity Benefits," Nitya Iyer shows that maternal and family leave policies, while devised with the best of intentions toward women, actually work against their desire to participate fully in economic and political life. Since most maternity benefits are sited in unemployment-insurance schemes, eligibility is based upon (among other criteria) length of service. This means that the women most in need of these benefits – young women in their prime child-bearing years – are least likely to receive them. Furthermore, the benefits are so inadequate that poor women, or women without partners whose incomes can cover most expenses of the family and the new baby, usually cannot afford to take advantage of them.

In addition, the policies do not even work to the benefit of the women who *can* avail themselves of the maternity benefit. The women who use it are cut off from contact with their place of employment, being encouraged to think of mothering as a full-time job (which, for women who do it without assistance, it certainly is). At home with the new baby, they assume all the responsibilities of its care and nurturing. Thus, when the time comes to make the decision to return to full-time work, they are faced with an awkward situation. If they cannot afford full-time infant care (which is particularly expensive and hard to find), they must transfer responsibility to a husband or relative, or they must undertake their former employment, plus the *second* full-time job, the one they were doing while on leave, baby care. In this way (among others that Iyer describes persuasively), maternal leave policies actually tend to push mothers who use them away from the public world of work and back into the home.

While it is a virtue of the book that it speaks to a mainstream audience with persuasively well-evidence argument, there were some moments when I wished it had pursued some additional avenues of radical critique. For example, in Jennifer Koshan's illuminating discussion of the situation of Aboriginal women, the contrast between their culture and the dominant one fleetingly suggests that the roots of women's condition may lie in industrial capitalism, and perhaps its interactive relationship with individualism, rather than flowing purely from patriarchal family structures. Certainly feminists should explore further the question whether the status of women is the result of one cause, or of many, working in complex and variable ways.

In sum, those who are hope to see continued and increased participation by women (and minorities, persons with disabilities, gays and lesbians, and the poor) in the full scope of economic, political and social life, and should enjoy the provocative and insightful essays in this excellent work.

***

Linda deLeon is associate professor at the Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Colorado at Denver.

Taxing Women

by Edward J. McCaffery, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press,
1997, 310pp., $29.95, hardcover

Reviewed by *Richard Swayze*

While gender bias has a long history in our society, its present pervasiveness is forcefully underscored in Edward J. McCaffery's begins with "accounting tales" of two women: Elizabeth and Susan. Both married with children, Elizabeth earns $18,500 a year as a magazine editor, while Susan earns a comfortable salary in the $35,000 - $40,000 range working in the community relations department of a public utility. After meeting with accountants, Elizabeth realizes she is actually losing money while Susan realizes she nets very little. Both women decide to leave their jobs. When Susan reenters the workforce, it is in a lower paying part time job. Sounds unreasonable? McCaffery's analysis of the situation women find themselves in reveals that it is not only commonplace, but that the design of our tax system virtually ensures the marginalization of women's work in our society.

McCaffery's book is carefully organized to present a comprehensive picture of the gender bias in our society. The first section begins with an explanation of basic tax concepts and the vocabulary used throughout the book. McCaffery then provides a history of federal income tax, highlighting the gendered nature of the system. Section two outlines a broader perspective of the tax treatment of women by considering the effects of the social security system, state and local taxes, child care costs, work-related expenses, and the tax treatment of children and fringe benefits. Section three presents social and economic theories of tax, and examines contemporary rhetoric and politics. Chapter seven and eight summarize optimal tax theory; chapter nine critiques current conservative tax proposals and the flat tax. Section four explains the effects of the tax system on labor markets, ending with McCaffery's final observations and suggestions for tax reform.

The core of McCaffery's book is an analysis of how the federal income tax system affects women. Drawing on court cases, legislative records, and academic literature of the times, McCaffery presents the history of tax reform as one in which rich men attempted to avoid taxes. A byproduct of reform efforts, one that McCaffery's evidence indicates was not necessarily unintended, was the creation of significant disincentives for married women to work.

To comprehend these disincentives, one must have a basic understanding of how the tax system works. Two aspects of the tax code are particularly relevant to understanding the gendered nature of the system: marginal tax rates and filing status. Marginal tax rates are the increasing proportions at which taxes are levied on additional amounts of income. Filing status determines the incremental levels, or brackets, at which different marginal tax rates apply. As a result of the evolution of tax policy, current levels differ based on marital status.

Table 1 provides an illustration of how the tax structure works. A single individual earning $60,000, would pay $12,000 in taxes; 0% on the first $10,000, 15% on the next $20,000, and 30% on the last $30,000. On the other hand, a married couple in which the husband makes $40,000 and the wife makes $20,000 would pay $8,400; 0% on the first $16,000, 15% on the next $32,000, and 30% on the last $12,000.

Table 1
Modern Style Rate Schedules

Individual Rate Schedule:		Married Rate Schedule:	
Taxable Income	**Marginal Tax Rate**	**Taxable Income**	**Marginal Tax Rate**
$0-$10,000	0%	$0-$16,000	0%
$10,001-$30,000	15%	$16,001-$48,000	15%
$30,001-$60,000	30%	$48,001-$96,000	30%
$60,000+	40%	$96,000+	40%

Source: McCaffery, p. 64.

Although some discrimination is based on marital status, from a gender perspective the system appears to be neutral. The income tax, the traditional argument states, is just that—a tax on income, not gender. In accessing the history and current state of the tax code, McCaffery states:

> This logic has undeniable appeal. Far from denying its force, I want to suggest that the power of this perspective turns out to be a large part of the problem: it provides an attractive cover for what turns out to be a bad set of rules. (p. 24)

On its face this argument is true. In the above example, the earnings of males and females could be switched to create a situation where men pay higher marginal tax rates. The problem is that this argument ignores the role of primary and secondary earners in the tax system. In reality, McCaffery points out, women are classified as secondary earners far more often than men. McCaffery provides a deeper analysis of the system by addressing how the designation of primary and secondary earners affects married couples.

When married couples file a tax return they must designate a primary and secondary earner. In essence, it identifies which of the couple's earnings gets taxed first. Since men generally earn more than women, they are designated the primary earner. This puts women "on the margin" when evaluating their income. To illustrate, recall the example of the married couple above with a combined income of $60,000. By designating the man earning $40,000 the primary earner his taxes are as follows: 0% on his first $16,000 and 15% on the remaining $24,000, for a total of #3,600, or 6% of his earnings. In contrast, the wife's earnings are added on top of his, and are immediately taxed at 15%. Her bill: 15% of $8,000 and 30% of $12,000, totaling to $4,800, or 24% of her earnings. The immediate effect is obvious—married women who earn less than their spouse are taxed disproportionately higher than men.

A critique's response to this line of reasoning is obvious: the designation of the man as the primary earner and the woman as the secondary earner is not gender bias, but a simple choice made by each couple. The man making $40,000 could be designated the secondary earner. The catch is that he can rarely "work less" to avoid taxes. The man usually must work full time and earn $40,000, or not work and receive zero income. The gender-neutral choices are as follows:

- ❏ Both the man and woman continue to work even though she only nets $2,700.
- ❏ The man continues to work and the woman stays home, lowering their total income from $59,100 to $56,400.
- ❏ The woman continues to work while the man stays at home, lowering their total income from $59,100 to $19,400.

Ironically, the choice is simple: couples may either take a substantial reduction in income or choose an option that marginalizes the woman.

Federal income tax, however, is only part of the complete picture. In the second section of the book McCaffery turns to the additional issues of state and local taxes, social security, child care, and other expenses that affect women's income. Although taxes vary by state and locality, McCaffery estimates that state and local taxes take another 10% of a woman's income (p.132). Social security taxes, regressive by nature, immediately add another 7.65% tax onto the first $60,000 of earnings for all individuals (p. 91). Keeping score, the married woman making $20,000 is now losing approximately $8,300 to taxes; 41.5% of her total earnings.

In addition to this, many families incur child costs and other work related expenses. McCaffery estimates child care costs at $100 per week for middle income families (p. 110). Assuming a 50 week work year, this adds another $5,000 to the women's cost of working. The family, however, may take a $1,000 child care credit that reduces this cost to $4,000. McCaffery then estimates another $100 per week for miscellaneous expenses: dry-cleaning, convenience foods, commuting, more restaurant meals, and housekeeping—adding $5,000 more.

The grand total? $17,300 is deducted because of taxes, child care, and additional expenses. In this example, the woman who earns $20,000 is only netting $2,700—less than 15% of her earnings. The accountant's story about Susan and Elizabeth no longer looks unreasonable. If Susan were married to a man whose earnings reached into the top tax bracket, her effective federal tax rate would be pushed from 24% to 40%, adding $3,200 more to the bill; she would lose money just like Elizabeth. McCaffery points out that this discrimination cuts two ways: not only does the tax system prevent married women from working, it also provides significant economic incentives for poor women not to get married.

The last piece of the tax puzzle involves placing the role of taxes within the larger context of the labor market. In essence, McCaffery argues, the distortions created by the tax system interact with imperfect labor markets to produce severe gender discrimination. In classical economic theory, individuals would freely contract with other individuals. They would be free to work doing whatever they wanted, whenever they wanted; it is a highly flexible situation. In reality, however, people work for firms, signing contracts which spell out their specific rights and responsibilities and limit their flexibility.

The problem McCaffery presents here is one of statistical discrimination. When hiring workers firms incur two main types of costs. Search costs to advertise and interview new workers, and training costs. In general, the higher the skill level of the position, the higher the search costs. To keep these costs down, firms naturally place importance on the expected tenure of a given individual. Since firms cannot rely on individuals themselves for an accurate assessment of how long they will stay, the firms turn to statistics. Of course, McCaffery states, these statistics work against women:

> About 90 percent of all women marry at least once in their lives, and some 85% of women bear at least one child. A good many mothers take at least some time off after childbirth; even today, 40 percent of married mothers of young children stay home full time. Meanwhile, back to the men, the statistics suggest an opposite story: married fathers are less likely to move or take time off. They are the most committed of all employees. (p. 243)

For some very rational reasons then, firms prefer to hire men, especially for the highly skilled (and highly paid) jobs that have high search costs.

McCaffery's completed picture then, places married women in a conundrum. To earn a significant amount of money married women must find well paying jobs. Firms want to give jobs to those who will stay the longest, limiting search costs. Women are often left with a choice between not working, or making very little money if they do. From McCaffery's perspective, it is no wonder that the wage gap and the glass ceiling still exist.

While McCaffery "never intended this book to be a specific, practical program for change," he offers up a provocative suggestion to relieve the bind married women find themselves in—tax married men more. Couched

in gender-neutral terms, this means taxing primary earners more and secondary earners less (p. 277). While this seems like blatant social engineering, McCaffery points out that   taxation is on his side. McCaffery states:

> My principal point …is that an ostensibly neutral objective, quasi-scientific economic theory precisely agrees with the long-standing feminist critique and the general lesson we've learned thus far: society is taxing women far too much, in exactly the wrong ways (p. 169).

To understand optimal tax theory, one must have a basic understanding of the economic concept elasticity. Elasticity is a measure of the percentage change in one variable relative to the percentage change in another. For our purposes, we are concerned with the percentage change in women's and men's labor participation rate relative to a percentage change in taxes. Men tend to have low elasticities, meaning that great changes in tax rates do not affect their labor participation rates. Women have high elasticities, meaning that even small changes in tax rates can have significant effects upon their labor participation rates (p. 179). Simply stated, if taxes go up, men work about the same number of hours while women work less.

For purposes of efficiency and wealth maximization, which McCaffery explains rather well, economic principles dictate that taxes be levied based on the inverse elasticity rule; this is known as "Ramsey" taxation. Stated simply, taxes should be placed on items for which there is an inelastic demand, or else consumption of that item will drop substantially and put down tax revenue with it. It is the concept behind the famous Laffer curve. For example, demand for cigarettes and alcohol is very inelastic. Taxes have very little effect on demand, making these "sin" taxes a very stable revenue source.

The connection is simple. The government is doing exactly the opposite of what economic principles suggest. Since men have an inelastic demand for jobs they should be taxed more than women who have an elastic demand. McCaffery knows this is politically impossible, however, so he makes a more conservative argument. If the government will not tax married men more, then the least they can do is move toward a system of separate filing that puts women on an equal footing with men. In addition, he argues for a more generous child care allowance and a secondary earner exemption level from regressive social security taxes. Optimal tax theory, McCaffery states, "supports these commonsensical recommendations, which seem independently just and fair anyway…" (p. 278).

In sum, McCaffery effectively paints federal tax policy as a provocative picture of deeply generated social engineering. McCaffery succeeds for two reasons. First, he recognizes that tax law is complex and difficult to understand. Accordingly, McCaffery provides simple examples the meanings of abstract concepts such as marginal tax rates and optimal taxation. The clarity of his writing provides a wide audience access to the practical consequences of our tax system. Second, McCaffery recognizes that "tax is political in spades" (p. 2). A variety of perspectives are presented to avoid having the book dismissed as a narrowly "liberal feminist" perspective: the accountant, the historian, the academic, the economist, and the politician. The liberal feminist is but one voice among many. As a result, McCaffery's position is well researched and effectively argued. In the end, it is difficult to deny that the tax system contributes to the marginalization of women's work in our society.

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

Richard Swayze is from University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Putting the Brakes on an Ethics Meltdown

J. Patrick Dobel, *Public Integrity* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1999), 260 pp.
The Dalai Lama, *Ethics for the New Millennium* (New York: Riverhead Books, 1999). 237 pp.
Banks McDowell, *Ethics and Excuses: The Crisis in Professional Responsibility* (Westport, Connecticut: Quorum Books, 2000). 169 pp.

Reviewed by *Donald C. Menzel*

Is anyone out there? This familiar cyberspace refrain is appearing with increasing frequency in the ethics literature. Ethics scholars and leaders worldwide often follow with the question: "does anyone care?" The authors whose books are reviewed here are, like many of us, troubled by these worrisome questions. Despite an outpouring of writing and research on the subject of ethics over the past two decades, particularly public service ethics, there is scant evidence that anyone is listening or, worse, anyone cares that anyone is listening. Perhaps even more bothersome is the growing belief that the best and wisest ethics advice and counsel finding its way into print or voice is not making any difference in the real world of ethical action. And, as Carol Lewis so aptly reminds us *The Ethics Challenge in Public Service*: ethics is not a "spectator" sport; it is a contact sport from start to finish! Are we as a nation and across the world experiencing an ethics meltdown?

Banks McDowell in *Ethics and Excuses* thinks so. "There is a feeling today," he says, "that the ethical practices of professionals, and of everybody else, have gotten worse" (p. 5). The Dalai Lama's call for an "ethical revolution" in the new millennium certainly suggests that an ethics meltdown is occurring and can be stopped only by taking radical measures. And J. Patrick Dobel in *Public Integrity* finds that good people trapped in bad webs of governance are not and should not be immunized from an ethics meltdown. Although these authors share common ground, each has a different message for those who would stand shoulder-to-shoulder to prevent a complete meltdown of ethical practices and behaviors in the 21st Century.

I Did What I Had to Do

This familiar excuse, McDowell contends, takes its place alongside a dozen or more excuses that professionals routinely and, perhaps sadly, unwittingly employ to justify or defend why they failed to live up to an acceptable ethical standard or practice. His many years as a law professor left him dismayed and bewildered that so many future lawyers would embrace a culture of excuses when faced with an ethical dilemma. Other excuses that make up this culture include: "I didn't know what the ethical obligations were"—otherwise known as the claim of ignorance; "it was not my responsibility"—otherwise known as passing the buck; "the competition made me do it"—otherwise known as the need to survive; "there was a technological failure"-- otherwise known as it was beyond my control; "it was legal"-otherwise known as if it's legal it's ethical.

McDowell's well-written book takes the reader beyond a careful exposition of excuses widely used in the legal profession to a thoughtful analysis of how law and ethics mesh and how they collide from time-to-time. In a chapter devoted to "Law and Ethics: The Different Systems" he begins by noting that "law and ethics are both normative systems prescribing guidelines on how people ought to live their lives," (p.47) but he goes on to assert that law is more modest in its reach. That is, unlike norms established in law, "the form of the ethical norm cannot be primarily black-and-white rules, but principles, guidelines, priority processes in choosing

between options, and so on" (p.59). The "long arm of the law," so it would seem, is shorter than the "long arm of ethics."

McDowell's message also challenges, properly so in this reviewer's mind, an increasingly dysfunctional myth in professional ethics-namely, the myth of infallibility. Both professionals and those who benefit from professional services have fanned the myth that unethical practices can always be avoided. McDowell thinks such a myth is dangerous to both the professional and the potential victim. The professional can suffer from an unrealistic need to be "perfect" or an abiding sense of guilt when near perfect is not good enough. The potential victim can suffer by having expectations that are unrealistic and, when not realized, engaging in retribution. What is needed, McDowell claims, is the establishment of a "zone for tolerance." There needs to be an area where we will be tolerant of human error-that is, good intentions gone wrong. But, as he acknowledges, "how should we demarcate that zone?" (p.89) The answer to this question is much too complicated for one person to develop, although McDowell gives it his best try by drawing some comparisons with law breaking. In his words, "the irony is that the law, which is supposed to be more rigid and punitive, is actually much more tolerant of human frailty than ethics" (p.94). He is, of course, referring to the well established principle in law that the punishment should fit the crime.

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of *Ethics and Excuses* is the call to reformulate ethical expectations. Here is what he means by this. The culture of excuses is so prevalent that the only way to break it is to narrow the gap (where excuses fill in) between actual behavior and our expectations of appropriate behavior. The traditional approach is to narrow the gap by changing behavior, not changing expectations. But why should we want to do this? His answer (although quite truncated in this review) is five-fold: (1) expectations need to be better clarified for practitioners, (2) expectations need to fit better the contemporary world in which professionals practice as members of complex organizations, (3) unethical activity would be minimized (arguable), (4) potential victims would be better protected, and (5) excessive and unnecessary guilt felt by practitioners would be eliminated (pp.112-113).

McDowell's call for reformulating expectations can be viewed as tantamount to lowering standards, although he never suggests such. Rather, he suggests that public expectations of professional practice and behavior have leaped far ahead of acceptable standards of practice in nearly every profession. Thus, there are exaggerated expectations regarding how well and in what manner professionals-lawyers, doctors, accountants, financial advisors-can perform. The result has been a galloping growth in the public's distrust of professionals, a growing number of lawsuits filed by would-be victims, and an escalating cost for professional liability insurance with costs typically passed on to the consuming public.

Ethics and Excuses is an excellent book that every public service ethicist and practitioner should have in his or her personal library. It is also well suited for the ethics classroom. While approaching the subject of ethics from a legal perspective, it is not done in a legalistic manner.

Integrity and Morality in Public Life

J. Patrick Dobel in *Public Integrity* is unafraid to take on the big questions and does so with aplomb. Power, politics, and public office-holding inevitably lead in the minds of many to control, dominance, and exploitation. Can one climb the ladder of public office-holding and maintain one's ethical balance? Is there an iron law of power and politics that condemns persons of integrity to a much lesser being? Stephen K. Baily remarked some time ago, "the higher a person goes on the rungs of power and authority, the more wobbly the ethical ladder." Is there nothing one can do to steady the ladder? Yes, says Dobel, in a measured but confident voice.

The journey or climbing the ladder begins and ends with integrity, a "state in which people hold multiple domains of judgment in tension while keeping some coherence in their actions and lives" (p.3). Easier said than

done? Without question. Personal integrity, the ability to maintain wholeness in relation to competing values and commitments, cannot and should not be stripped away when one assumes public office. Rather, the values and commitments that accompany public office-holding have to be melded with those that contribute to the wholeness or integrity of the officeholder.

Dobel's approach to explicating the promise of a public integrity framework or model, as he labels it, for making judgments and hard decisions in the world of politics and governance is a potent mix of analysis, logical argument, contemporary events, and literature. The analysis begins with an assessment of three models: the legal-institutional which emphasizes "the public official's subordination to legal and institutional authority," the personal-responsibility model which "argues that personal responsibility should be incorporated in judgments of public officials," and the effectiveness or implementation model which emphasizes that discretion is inescapable in the judgments of all office-holders from those at the very top of the political edifice to those on the street (p.2). Each model, he asserts, "accentuates one set of standards at the expense of others" and is therefore inadequate.

As the chapters unfold, it becomes clear to the reader that Dobel's impressive command of the literature is the principal tool for constructing the case for the public integrity model. For example, the second chapter "The Temptations of Power" leads off with biblical accounts of David using his office to gain the wife, Bathsheba, of one of his warriors. The chapter continues with accounts of Lyndon Johnson's reputation for power wielding and Bill Clinton's betrayal (at least to liberals) of ending welfare as we know it. Other historical and contemporary figures tempted by power who, one might say fell on their own sword, included Robert Moses, Newt Gingrich, and John Dean of Watergate fame.

In other chapters, Dobel draws on political fiction to make the case for a public integrity model. The reader is introduced to Sir Thomas More in Robert Bolt's play *A Man for All Seasons* to illustrate how a person of integrity, as much as he or she might wish, cannot escape unwanted and undesirable outcomes. Sir Thomas More, it might be recalled, was the chancellor when Henry VIII broke from the Roman Catholic church to divorce his wife and marry his mistress. Sir Thomas More could not support the King's actions. In the end, he was tried and beheaded for trumped up acts of disloyalty to the King. Other fictional accounts are drawn from John LeCarre's novels *The Secret Pilgrim, The Spy Who Came in from the Cold,* and *Honorable Men,* Herman Melville's *Billy Budd,* C. P. Snow's *Homecomings,* and more.

In his exposition on "Character and Moral Attrition," Dobel pokes sharply inside the life of the bureaucratic careerist with LeCarre's novels of spymasters. How do agents, Dobel asks, "accept and tolerate the squalor of espionage?" Not easily and, in many instances, they don't and resign. But in too many other instances, they turn to bureaucratic careerism to fill the vacuum of disillusioned idealism. Self-serving interests take control and displace the real goals of the organization. "Organizational survival," Dobel writes, "is shown as the norm of life in institutions under stress" (p.79).

Dobel concludes his very thoughtful and thought-provoking book by contending that integrity correctly understood, to borrow Alexis deToqueville's famous phraseology, is the only defense one has against becoming a lesser person in public office. Integrity does not mean an adherence to rigid and uncompromising standards of right and wrong. Rather, a person of integrity is someone who can strike a balance between "personal moral commitments and capacity, obligations of office, and political prudence" (p.213). Political prudence is especially significant because without being judicious or wise in practical affairs one is vulnerable to the temptations of power and self-aggrandizement. But it is the ability to balance these three domains that produces a public integrity necessary and desirable for sustaining public trust in democratic institutions.

Public Integrity is a high-quality book but it is likely to be challenging reading for those who are unfamiliar with much of the literature that Dobel draws on to make his case for a workable framework to guide public

officeholders.

Stopping an Ethics Meltdown with a Revolution

In *Ethics for the New Millennium* the Dalai Lama makes an uncompromising call for a spiritual revolution that recasts the place of "self" in the scheme of things. There is little doubt that Americans, if not others throughout the so-called first world nations, have become increasingly self-centered and self-serving over the past several decades. Indeed, the "me" generation of the 1980s has received much attention as has the materialistic driven, throw-away society that Alvin Toffler wrote so poignantly about in his 1970 best seller *Future Shock*. The Dalai Lama reminds us that many people, including professionals from all walks of life, believe that virtues such as compassion, which demand an other-person centered perspective, have become largely irrelevant to professional life. The consequences of this viewpoint can be dire. As he puts it, compassion is not only relevant, "but that when compassion is lacking, our activities are in danger of becoming destructive. This is because when we ignore the question of the impact our actions have on others' well-being, inevitably we end up hurting them" (p.128).

A spiritual revolution then requires a revolution from within the heart and soul of each and every human being. But is this not to suggest that one must turn to established religions to bring about such a change? And, if so, how could this be carried out in a society that draws distinct legal lines between church and state? And, more specifically, how are professionally trained public administrators to join in such a spiritual revolution? These are large and controversial questions that the Dalai Lama addresses in the following manner. First, he dismisses the notion that such a revolution, which elevates the place of caring about others, can and should be pursued through Buddhism, Christianity, Islam, Muslim, Confucianism, or other established religions. "I have come to the conclusion," says the Dalai Lama, "that whether or not a person is a religious believer does not matter much. Far more important is that they be a good human being" (p.19). We cannot, he asserts, do without basic spiritual qualities such as love and compassion, patience, tolerance, forgiveness, contentment, a sense of responsibility, a sense of harmony-which bring happiness to both self and to others (p.22). But, we can do so without religion. "My call for a spiritual revolution is thus not a call for a religious revolution . . . Rather, it is a call for a radical reorientation away from our habitual preoccupation with self. It is a call to turn toward the wider community of beings with whom we are connected, and for conduct which recognizes others' interests alongside our own" (pp.23-24). A "spiritual revolution entails an ethical revolution" (p.33).

Cast in this light, it is not unimaginable that public administrators could and should join in this spiritual revolution. While they might not be on the front-lines, there is no compelling reason why they should be in an ethically or morally safe zone. An ethics for the new millennium, concludes the Dalai Lama, is not a wish but a necessity in an age in which the forces of globalization-the shift to market driven economies, the embracing of democratic political institutions, the spread of dazzlingly new information technologies, and the rise of supra-national organizations like the European Union and the WTO-are challenging our well-being as members of common humanity.

Final Thoughts

The three books reviewed here offer the reader a veritable potpourri of ideas and challenges about how we might begin the arduous task of stopping an ethics meltdown at home and abroad. It is time to give a resounding "yes" to the question "is anyone listening?" Yes, we are listening and we do care. Ethics matters. Integrity matters. Excuses are not good enough.

***

Donald C. Menzel is Professor and Director of the Division of Public Administration at Northern Illinois University.

CALL FOR MANUSCRIPTS

Public Voices is a unique journal that focuses on historical, artistic and reflective expression concerning public administrators and the public service. Published by the National Center for Public Productivity (NCPP), it is now accepting submissions for Volume VI.

Public Voices is sponsored by Rutgers University – Campus at Newark and the University of Illinois at Springfield.

Unlike traditional social science journals, *Public Voices* publishes unorthodox, controversial perspectives on bureaucracy in particular and the public sector in general. We seek submissions from public servants, writers, artists, and academics in all fields. In addition to analytical articles, submissions may include original fiction, poetry, photographs, art, critiques of existing works, and insights based on experience, observation and research. Especially encouraged are manuscripts that explore ethical dilemmas and public controversies, discuss value conflicts, or generate new ideas for improving public service and public organizations. Personal essays that relate fictionalized experiences in government agencies are also welcome.

All submissions will be evaluated on a blind, peer-reviewed basis.

CALL FOR BOOK AND OTHER REVIEWS

We welcome reviews of novels, literature, popular fiction, a series of works by one author, scholarly books, films, art, etc.

For manuscripts, submit five copies, with the author's name and affiliation on a separate cover page, to:

Dr. Willa Bruce, Managing Editor, *Public Voices*
Doctor of Public Administration Program
University of Illinois at Springfield
PAC 326
P.O. Box 19243
Springfield, IL 62794-9243
Email: bruce.willa@uis.edu

Proposals for symposia, as well as movie reviews, photographs and art work, should be sent to:

Dr. Marc Holzer, Editor-in-Chief, *Public Voices*
Ph.D. in Public Administration Program
Rutgers University, Campus at Newark
701 Hill Hall
360 King Blvd.
Newark, NJ 07102
Or for further information:
Email: mholzer@andromeda.rutgers.edu

Book Reviews should be sent to:

Dr. Meredith Newman, Associate Editor, *Public Voices*
Washington State University
14204 NE Salmon Creek Ave.
Vancouver, WA 98686
Email: newman@vancouver.wsu.edu