### Table 1-1
Three Types of Federal Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Urban Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Services Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boards and commissions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Product Safety Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Reserve Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities and Exchange Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on "Major Organizational Units of the Executive Branch," in Lawrence G. Dodd and Richard L. Schult, Congress and the Administrative State (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1979)

The third article in Chapter 1 is a signal to twenty-somethings and to all of us: Working for government can be interesting, important, and rewarding. The key questions in this chapter for the student of public administration are:

- What does "bureaucracy" mean?
- Why is it important to study public bureaucracy in today's society?
- Is there something inherently bad about bureaucracy?
- How is public administration different from business administration?
- Is this significant to public executives? To citizens?
- Since we often hear about how bad government is, what's so good about working in the federal government or in a unit of state or local government?

**Why Study Bureaucracy?**

PETER M. BLAU
MARSHALL W. MEYER

"That stupid bureaucrat!" "That dumb bureaucracy!" Who has not felt this way at one time or another? When we are sent from one office to the next without getting the information we want, when forms are returned to us because of some inconsequential omission; when rules are of such complexity that no two people understand them alike—these are the times when we think of bureaucracy. "Bureaucracy" is often used as an epithet connoting inefficiency and confusion in government or elsewhere, such as in universities. But this is not its only meaning, and it is not the way the word will be used in this article.

If you alone had the job of collecting the dues in a small fraternity, you could proceed at your own discretion. However, if five persons had this job in a large club, they would find it necessary to organize their work, lest some members were asked for dues repeatedly and others never. If hundreds of persons had the assignment of collecting taxes from the citizens of a city or state, their work would have to be organized systematically to prevent chaos.

A hundred years ago, there was little coordination of tax collecting in most U.S. municipalities. Tax "farmers" had license to collect from whomever they could persuade to pay. Chaos and corruption resulted. Through the efforts of reformers, modern bureaus responsible for collecting taxes systematically and fairly from everyone were put in place. The type of organization designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by coordinating the work of many people systematically is called a bureaucracy. The concept of bureaucracy, then, applies to organizing principles that are intended to achieve control and coordination of tasks in large organizations. Since control and coordination are required in most large organizations nowadays, bureaucracy is not confined to government but is found in businesses, voluntary organizations, and wherever administrative tasks are undertaken.

Control and coordination are not, of course, ends in themselves. They are means toward the end of administrative efficiency, of completing successfully large and complicated tasks that no individual person could accomplish alone. The organizing principles of bureaucracy thus have the purpose of creating efficient organizations, not inefficient ones. But simply because bureaucracy is intended as an efficient form of organization does not mean that it always achieves efficiency. Critics of bureaucracy claim that its principles are inherently inefficient, and many citizens who are irritated by unresponsive and sometimes inept government agencies tend to agree.

Interestingly, while the term "bureaucratic" is often used as a synonym for "inefficient," at other times it is used to imply ruthless efficiency. The German sociologist Max Weber, whose analysis of bureaucratic structures will be discussed presently, held bureaucracy to be so efficient that its power was "overwhelming." Weber's American contemporaries, such as Woodrow Wilson, also worried considerably that the power of a large civil service orga-
nized according to bureaucratic principles would be inconsistent with democratic governance. Contemporary critics of both the political left and right also fear the power of bureaucracy. The left blames bureaucratic institutions for many of the evils of the world—the domination of weak nations by imperialist powers, the oppression of poor people, the uncertainties facing today’s youth. The right blames bureaucracy for inflation, high taxes, and the sapping of individual initiative by excessive regulation. There is some truth to all these allegations, but there is also much exaggeration.

The criticisms of bureaucracy leveled by the political right and left can be understood as a result of its ethical neutrality. Bureaucratic administration can be used as an instrument of economic domination, or it can be used to curb inequities that would arise were economic forces permitted to operate without restraint. Bureaucratic administration is necessarily employed to administer health and social service programs, whether governmental or private, whose purpose is to sustain the ill and needy. Bureaucracies have also been responsible for evils unimaginable in the prebureaucratic era. Hannah Arendt’s *Eichmann in Jerusalem* portrays Adolph Eichmann as the consummate bureaucrat meticulously carrying out Hitler’s orders to implement the “final solution” by exterminating all the Jews of Europe. The abolition of bureaucracies, to be sure, would limit the possibility of evils such as the Holocaust. But it would also eliminate their positive accomplishments. The challenge for democratic societies is to gain and maintain control over their bureaucracies so that they function for the benefit of the commonweal rather than for the benefit of bureaucrats themselves or of special interests.

**THE RATIONALIZATION OF MODERN LIFE**

Much of the magic and mystery that used to pervade human life and lend it enchantment has disappeared from the modern world. This is largely the price of rationalization. In olden times, nature was full of mysteries, and humanity’s most serious intellectual endeavors were directed toward discovering the ultimate meaning of existence. Today, nature holds fewer secrets for us. Scientific advances, however, have not only made it possible to explain many natural phenomena but have also channeled human thinking. In modern times, people are less concerned than they were, say, in the medieval era with ultimate values and symbolic meanings, with those aspects of mental life that are not subject to scientific inquiry, such as religious truth and artistic creation. This remains an age of science, not of philosophy or of religion, even though there is now greater interest in philosophy and religious belief than there was twenty years ago.

The secularization of the world that spells its disenchantment is indicated by the large amount of time we spend in making a living and getting ahead and the little time we spend in contemplation and religious activities. Compare the low prestige of moneylenders—lending at interest was once considered sinful—and the high prestige of priests in former eras with the very different position of bankers and preachers today. Preoccupied with perfecting efficient means for achieving objectives, we tend to forget why we want to reach those goals. Since we neglect to clarify the basic values that determine why some objectives are preferable to others, objectives lose their

portrayed in Budd Shulberg’s novel *What Makes Sammy Run*. The answer to the question in the title is that only running makes him run, because he is so busy trying to get ahead that he has no time to find out where he is going. Continuous striving for success is not Sammy’s means for the attainment of certain ends but the very goal of his life.

These consequences of rationalization have often been deplored, and some observers have even suggested that it is not worth the price. There is no conclusive evidence, however, that alienation from profound values is the inevitable and permanent by-product of rationalization; it may be merely an expression of its growing pains. The beneficial results of rationalization—notably the higher standard of living and greater amount of leisure it makes possible, and the raising of the level of popular education it makes necessary—permit an increased proportion of the population, not just a privileged elite, to participate actively in the cultural life of a society.

Our high standard of living is usually attributed to the spectacular technological developments that have occurred since the Industrial Revolution, but this explanation ignores two related facts. First, the living conditions of most people during the early stages of industrialization, after they had moved from the land into the cities with their sweatshops, were probably much worse than they had been before. Dickens depicts these terrible conditions in certain novels, and Marx describes them in his biting critique of the capitalistic economy. Second, major improvements in the standard of living did not take place until administrative procedures as well as material technology had been revolutionized. Modern machines could not be utilized without the complex administrative machinery needed for running industries employing thousands of people. For example, it was not so much the invention of railroad technology as the invention of management that permitted railroads to traverse long distances. Early railroads had no managers supervising operations and no printed timetables. At fixed times—say 9 A.M., noon, and 4 P.M.—trains would start at both ends of the line. The first to reach the midpoint, where there was a passing siding, would simply wait for the other. And each train had to reach the end of the line before another could begin its journey in the opposite direction. This system worked well so long as rail lines were short: thirty to forty miles. Once railroads were extended beyond this distance, however, trains could no longer wait for one another at the midpoint of a line. Many accidents resulted; to guarantee safety, therefore, the management of railroads was bureaucratized. Managers responsible for coordinating train movements were hired and timetables printed. *Rationalization of railroad administration*, in other words, was necessary to take advantage of technological changes.

Let us examine some of the administrative principles on which the productive efficiency of modern organizations—whether railroads, factories, or government offices—depends. If a person were responsible for all the different tasks at a given place of work, he or she would have to have many years of education and would still not be able to perform the job well. Imagine, for example, an automobile factory where every car was planned and assembled by a single worker. That worker would have to be at once a designer, a mechanical engineer, and a skilled craftsman. Not only would there be a shortage of people with these qualifications, but those workers who
none of them would have the time or experience to perfect the manufacture or assembly of any particular part. Specialization, whereby only a small number of tasks are assigned to each worker, permits the hiring of less qualified employees, and, moreover, workers with superior qualifications for the most difficult jobs; it also permits workers to become experienced at their jobs.

What has been taken apart through specialization must be put back together again. A high degree of specialization creates a need for a complex system of coordination. Formal coordination is not needed in a small workplace where tasks are less specialized, all workers have direct contact with one another, and the boss can supervise everyone's performance directly. But the president of a large company cannot possibly discharge his responsibilities through direct supervision of each of several thousand workers. Managerial responsibility is therefore exercised through a hierarchy of authority, which furnishes lines of communication between top management and every employee for obtaining information on operations and transmitting operating directives. (Sometimes, these lines of communication become blocked, and this is a major source of inefficiency in administration.)

Effective coordination requires disciplined performance, which cannot be achieved by supervision alone but must pervade the work process. This is a function of rules and regulations that govern operations, whether they specify the dimensions of nuts and bolts or the criteria to be used in promoting subordinates. Even in the ideal case, where every employee is a highly intelligent and skilled expert, there is a need for disciplined adherence to regulations. Imagine that one worker had discovered that he could produce bolts of superior quality by making them 1/8 inch larger and another worker had found that she could increase her efficiency by making nuts 1/8 inch smaller. Although each made the most rational decision in terms of the given task, the nuts and bolts would be useless because they would not match. How one's work fits with that of others is usually far less obvious than in this illustration. If the operations of hundreds of employees are to be coordinated, each must conform to prescribed standards even in situations where a different course of action appears to be the individual to be most reasonable. This is a requirement of all teamwork, although in genuine teamwork the rules are based on common agreement rather than being imposed from above.

Efficiency also suffers when emotions or personal considerations influence administrative decisions. If the owner of a small grocery expands his business and opens a second store, he may put his son in charge even though another employee is more qualified for the job. She acts on the basis of her personal attachment rather than in the interest of business efficiency. Similarly, an official in a large company might not promote the best qualified worker to supervisor if one of the candidates were his brother. Indeed, his personal feelings could prevent him from recognizing that his brother's qualifications were inferior. Since the subtle effects of strong emotions cannot easily be suppressed, the best way to check their interference with efficiency is to exclude from the administrative hierarchy those interpersonal relationships that are characterized by emotional attachments. While relatives sometimes work for the same company, they are generally not put in charge of one another. Impersonal relationships assure the detachment necessary if efficiency alone is to govern administrative decisions. However, relationships between employees

These four factors—specialization, a hierarchy of authority, a system of rules, and impersonality—are the basic characteristics of bureaucratic organization. Factories are bureaucratically organized, as are government offices; if this were not the case, they could not operate on a large scale.

**THE VALUE OF STUDYING BUREAUCRACY**

Learning to understand bureaucracies is more important today than it ever was. It has, moreover, special significance in a democracy. In addition, the study of bureaucratic organization makes a particular contribution to the advancement of sociological knowledge.

**Today**

Bureaucracy is not a new phenomenon. It existed in relatively simple forms thousands of years ago in Egypt and Rome. But the trend toward bureaucratization has greatly accelerated since the beginning of this century. In contemporary society, bureaucracy has become a dominant institution—indeed, the institution that epitomizes modernity. Unless we understand this form, we cannot understand the social life of today.

The enormous size of modern nations and the organizations within them is one reason for the spread of bureaucracy. In earlier periods, most countries were small, even large ones had only a loose central administration, and there were few formal organizations except the government. Modern nations have many millions of citizens, vast armies, giant corporations, huge unions, and numerous voluntary associations. To be sure, large size does not necessarily compel bureaucratic organization. However, the problems posed by administration on a large scale tend to lead to bureaucratization. Put somewhat differently, in the absence of bureaucratization, large-scale centralized administration has been very difficult to maintain.

In the United States, employment statistics illustrate the trend toward large, bureaucratized organizations. The federal government employed some eight thousand civilian personnel in 1820, a quarter million at the beginning of this century, and almost 3 million now. The largest private firms, such as General Motors and Exxon, have upward of half a million employees apiece. Self-employment, which was once the norm, has become rare. In 1800, 57 percent of the U.S. working population were self-employed; in 1970, however, only 10 percent were. Moreover, within organizations of all kinds, the proportion of employees with supervisory or administrative duties has increased dramatically, especially in recent years. In 1900, the ratio of administrative to production employees in U.S. manufacturing industry was about 1:10: it was approximately 2:10 in 1950. This A/P ratio, as it is known to sociologists, now exceeds 4:2:10 in manufacturing. Perhaps of greater importance, supervisory or administrative ratios have increased in other industries—for example, mining, finance and insurance, retailing, service—just as rapidly as in manufacturing.

A large and increasing proportion of the American people, then, spend their working lives in large organizations, and these organizations are increasingly bureaucratized in the sense that a greater proportion of work is of a super-
what the U.S. Census calls establishments) has decreased slightly since World War II, but individual workplaces are increasingly linked together in bureaucratic hierarchies. Outside of work, the organizations we deal with are themselves becoming more bureaucratic. The corner hamburger stand has been largely displaced by the franchised outlet that is part of a national chain. The independent physician is increasingly rare as medical care becomes organized into group practices and health maintenance organizations, the latter often owned by giant corporations. Bureaucratization of our institutions has become so ubiquitous that it is now difficult to imagine alternatives to the bureaucratic form. But alternatives to bureaucracy are essential, as we shall point out below, to preserve individual autonomy and innovativeness in organizations.

In a Democracy

Bureaucracy, as [German sociologist] Max Weber pointed out, “is a power instrument of the first order—for the one who controls the bureaucratic apparatus.”

Under normal conditions, the power position of the fully developed bureaucracy is always overweening. The “political master” finds himself in the position of the “dilettante” who stands opposite the “expert,” facing the trained official who stands within the management of administration. This holds whether the “master” whom the bureaucracy serves is a “people,” equipped with the weight of “legislative initiative,” the “referendum,” and the right to remove officials, or a parliament, elected on a ... “democratic” basis and equipped with the right to vote a lack of confidence, or with the actual authority to vote it.

Totalitarianism is the polar case of such concentration of bureaucratic power that destroys democratic processes, but it is not the only example. The same antidemocratic tendencies can be observed in political machines that allow political bosses to assume power legally belonging to voters, in business corporations that enable managers to take power rightfully belonging to stockholders, and in unions that let union leaders exercise the power rightfully belonging to rank-and-file members. The use of bureaucratic administration by totalitarian regimes has led some writers to contend that the present trend toward bureaucratization spells the doom of democratic institutions. This may well be too pessimistic a viewpoint, but there can be little doubt that this problem constitutes a challenge. To protect ourselves against the threat of bureaucratic domination while continuing to take advantage of the efficiencies of bureaucracy, we must first learn to understand how bureaucracies function. Knowledge alone is not power, but ignorance surely facilitates subjugation. This is one reason why the study of bureaucratic organization has such great significance in a democracy.

Another and perhaps more subtle threat posed by bureaucratization is erosion of public confidence in democratic institutions. The taxpayers' revolt evident in California's Proposition 13 is but one expression of the discontent with government that has become widespread in recent years. Discontent with large organizations is also exemplified by the dramatic increase in both antigovernment and antibusiness sentiments found in opinion surveys of the American public. From the late 1950s through the present, increasing num-

although negative sentiments about government have risen much more rapidly than negative attitudes toward business. Antigovernment attitudes may be attributed partly to the Watergate scandal and the failure of U.S. policy in Vietnam. But there is evidence also that the large size of government and business organizations has contributed to declining confidence in them. Large institutions, the federal government and large corporations particularly, are suspect. Whether aversion to large size is due to the perception of “fat” or inefficiency in big government and big business, the perception that power is misused by both, or the substantial rewards that accrue to executives, cannot be determined from opinion data. It is clear, however, that considerable distrust of large, bureaucratized organizations has accumulated. An understanding of the sources of perceived inefficiency and misuse of power in both public and private bureaucracies could possibly suggest corrective that would help rebuild confidence in our institutions....

THE CONCEPT OF BUREAUCRACY

The main characteristics of a bureaucratic structure (in the "ideal-typical" case, according to Weber) are the following:

1. "The regular activities required for the purposes of the organization are distributed in a fixed way as official duties." The clear-cut division of labor makes it possible to employ only specialized experts in each particular position and to make every one of them responsible for the effective performance of his duties. This high degree of specialization has become so much part of our life that we tend to forget that it did not prevail in former eras but is a relatively recent bureaucratic invention.

2. "The organization of offices follows the principle of hierarchy; that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one." Every official in this administrative hierarchy is accountable to her superior for her subordinates' decisions and actions as well as her own. To be able to discharge the responsibility for the work of subordinates, the superior has authority over them, which means that she has the right to issue directives and they have the duty to obey them. This authority is strictly circumscribed and confined to those directives that are relevant to official operations. The use of status prerogatives to extend the power of control over subordinates beyond these limits does not constitute the legitimate exercise of bureaucratic authority.

3. Operations are governed "by a consistent system of abstract rules... and consist of the application of these rules to particular cases." This system of standards is designed to assure uniformity in the performance of every task, regardless of the number of persons engaged in it, and the coordination of different tasks. Explicit rules and regulations define the responsibility of each member of the organization and relationships among them. This does not imply that bureaucratic duties are necessarily simple or routine. It must be remembered that strict adherence to general standards in deciding specific cases characterizes not only the job of the file clerk but also that of the Supreme Court justice.
latter, it involves interpreting the law of the land in order to settle the most complicated legal issues. Bureaucratic duties range in complexity from one of these extremes to the other.

4. "The ideal official conducts his office ... in a spirit of formalistic impersonality, 'Sine ira ac studio' without hatred or passion, and hence without affection or enthusiasm."[22] For rational standards to govern operations without interference from personal considerations, a detached approach must prevail within the organization and especially toward clients. If an official develops strong feelings about subordinates or clients, she can hardly keep letting those feelings influence her official decisions. As a result, and often without being aware of it herself, she might be particularly lenient in evaluating the work of one of her subordinates or might discriminate against some clients and in favor of others. The exclusion of personal considerations from official business is a prerequisite for impartiality as well as for efficiency. The very factors that make a government bureaucrat unpopular with his clients, an aloof attitude and lack of genuine concern with them as human beings, usually benefit these clients. Disinterestedness and lack of personal interest go together. The official who does not maintain social distance and becomes personally interested in the cases of his clients tends to be partial in his treatment of them, favoring those he likes over others. Impersonal detachment engenders equitable treatment of all persons and thus equal justice in administration.

5. Employment in the bureaucratic organization is based on technical qualifications and is protected against arbitrary dismissal. "It constitutes a career. There is a system of 'promotions' according to seniority or to achievement, or both."[23] These personnel policies, which are found not only in civil service but also in many private companies, encourage the development of loyalty to the organization and esprit de corps among its members. The consequent identification of employees with the organization motivates them to exert greater efforts in advancing its interest. It may also give rise to a tendency among civil servants or employees to think of themselves as a class apart from and superior to the rest of society. This tendency has been especially pronounced among European civil servants, but it may be found in the United States too.

6. "Experience tends universally to show that the purely bureaucratic type of administrative organization ... is, from a purely technical point of view, capable of attaining the highest degree of efficiency."[24]

The fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with nonmechanical modes of production. Precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the file, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs—these are raised to the optimum in the strictly bureaucratic administration, and especially in its monarchical form. As compared with all collegiate, honorific, and avocation forms of administration, trained bureaucracy is superior on all these points. And as far as complicated tasks are concerned, paid bureaucratic work is not only more precise but, in the last analysis, it is often cheaper than formally unremunerated honorific service.[25]

Bureaucracy, then, solves the distinctive organizational problem of maximizing coordination and control and thereby organizational efficiency, not only the productive efficiency of individual employees.

The superior effectiveness of bureaucracy—its capacity to coordinate large-scale administrative tasks—and superior efficiency are the expected results of its various characteristics as outlined by Weber. An individual who is to work effectively must have the necessary skills and apply them rationally and energetically, but more is required of an organization that is to operate effectively and efficiently. Every one of its members must have the expert skills needed for the performance of her tasks. This is the purpose of specialization and employment on the basis of technical qualifications, often ascertained by objective tests. Even experts, however, may be prevented by personal bias from making rational decisions. The emphasis on impersonal detachment is needed to eliminate this source of nonrational action. But individual rationality is not enough. As noted above, if members of the organization were to make rational decisions independently, their work would not be coordinated and the efficiency of the organization would suffer. Hence there is need for discipline to limit the scope of rational discretion, which is met by the system of rules and regulations and the hierarchy of supervision. Moreover, there are personnel policies that permit employees to feel secure in their jobs and to anticipate advancements for faithful performance of duties, and these policies discourage attempts to improve work by inducing clever innovations, which may endanger coordination. Least of all, stress on disciplined obedience to rules and regulations undermine the employee's motivation to devote his energies to his job, incentives for exerting effort must be furnished. Personnel policies that cultivate organizational loyalties and that provide for promotion on the basis of merit serve this function. In other words, bureaucracy's characteristics are intended to create social conditions constraining each member of the organization to act in ways that, whether they appear rational or otherwise from the individual's standpoint, further the rational pursuit of organizational objectives.

So far, Weber's analysis of bureaucratic structures emphasizes mainly their positive functions. The division of labor and specialization promotes expertise, but the work of specialists must be coordinated through organizational hierarchies. Rules and the norm of impersonality contribute further to coordination by removing individual biases from decision-making. And career incentives motivate employees to perform their duties diligently. But Weber also identified some potentially negative consequences of bureaucracy. Among these are the following:

1. Bureaucracies tend to monopolize information, rendering outsiders unable to determine the basis on which decisions are made. Every bureaucracy seeks to increase the superiority of the process, traditionally informed by keeping their knowledge and intentions secret. The concept of the 'official secret' is the specific invention of bureaucracy, and nothing is defended so fanatically by the bureaucracy as this attitude.[26]

2. "Once it is fully established, bureaucracy is among those social structures which are the hardest to destroy. . . . The idea of eliminating these organizations becomes more and more utopian."[27] The very specialization and expertise of bureaucratic work is almost impossible to
administer large nation-states or private enterprises without them. To be sure, individual officials can be replaced should they leave, voluntarily or otherwise. But the overall pattern of administration consistent with the bureaucratic model is not easily changed. This occurs not simply because people are reluctant to change but especially because they rightly fear that the elimination of existing procedures may well lead to disorganization or return to the "spoils system" dominated by favoritism and corrupt practices.

3. Established bureaucracies are, at best, ambivalent toward democracy. On the one hand, bureaucratization tends to accompany mass democracy. "This results from the characteristic principle of bureaucracy: the abstract regularity of the execution of authority, which is a result of the demand for 'equality before the law' in the personal and functional sense—hence of the horror of 'privilege,' and of the principled rejection of doing business 'from case to case.'" On the other hand, bureaucracies tend not to be responsive to public opinion.

Democracy inevitably comes into conflict with the bureaucratic tendencies which, by its fight against notable rule, democracy has produced. . . . The most decisive thing here—indeed it is rather exclusively so—is the leveling of the governed in opposition to the ruling and bureaucratically articulated group, which in its turn may occupy a quite autocratic position. . . .

Weber's analysis of bureaucracy leads thereby to paradoxical conclusions. Due to the effectiveness and efficiency it imparts to large-scale administration, bureaucracy has many positive functions. But its tendencies toward monopolizing information, resisting change, and acting automatically (even if in compliance with rules) are usually not viewed positively; they were not so regarded at the time Weber wrote, nor are they today. Both the positive and negative effects of bureaucracy can be understood as outcomes of organizing principles intended to achieve coordination and control. Effectiveness and efficiency are attained because bureaucracy concentrates technical expertise and acts predictably. But the same predictable action based on expertise makes bureaucracies extremely powerful institutions, which have the capacity to resist external forces pressing for change. In the language of sociological theory, Weber's analysis suggests both positive functions as well as negative dysfunctions of the bureaucratic form. The fact that bureaucratic organizations (as well as most other social institutions) have both functions that contribute to and dysfunctions that detract from adaptation and adjustment is not always understood, but it is important to a complete and scientific understanding of bureaucracy. Weber's penetrating analysis has become the prototype of bureaucracy—it is the basic concept we use in comparing organizations. . . .
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