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CHAPTER 5

Organizations and Modern Society

David L. Gardner

David L. Gardner is Assistant Chancellor and Assistant Professor of Higher Education at the University of California, Santa Barbara. His recent book, The California Deth Controversy, was acclaimed by Professor Sidney Hook as "... a contribution of the first importance to the educational history of the United States."

Our time is characterized by organized happiness. Indeed, modern society is in large measure an organizational society; that is, organizations possess and control our essential functional needs: communications, transportation, education, defense, social order, recreation, justice, and masters of the spirit. The organization is the most powerful social unit of which modern society is comprised for it ministers rationally, effectively, and efficiently to man's dependency better than does any other social form. While it may be a god to some and a devil to others, the ubiquitous organization is a simple fact of social life for modern man and, in the main, the arena within which his claims for success, income, and security are resolved.

Organizations constitute society's principal mechanism for men cooperatively to provide for their joint and delegated needs and to protect themselves and their resources. They have as well a pervasive influence upon individual and group behavior, expressed through a web of rewards, sanctions, and other inducements that range from paternal coercion to the most subtle of group appeals to conformity. The system of rules and norms by which this influence is in part manifested may be simple or highly complex depending upon the structure of the unit and the number and variety of its goals. Men's

interaction more broadly than does the United States, practice a scope of
regulation far narrower than do Communist societies where the most pervasive
control over organization relations is asserted. To whatever extent government
regulation is not manifested in organizational interaction, the pattern is dictated
by the processes of conflict or cooperation, exchange or bargaining, "all of
which are affected by ecological, cultural, and power factors." The paucity of
information and understanding of these processes, however, makes no less
substantial the critical nature of the problem. Modern society, whose dependency
on large-scale organization seemingly grows ever greater, tends to devise
more and more instruments of regulation, curiously to encourage the rationality,
effectiveness, and efficiency of organizations and man's happiness, freedom,
and well-being within them. How well this process is understood and how
efficaciously the balance is struck between organizational needs and human
values will determine in substantial measure the quality of life in our society and
the survival of our culture.

Factors in the Organizational Phenomenon

Organizations are not uniquely modern. By coordinating personnel with
resources, however unevenly, societies have cooperatively form recorded history
made provision for their several needs. The irrigation systems and the great wall
of China, the pyramids of Egypt, the legions of Rome, the navy of Great
Britain— all attest in ancient through medieval times to organized, collective
activity on a gigantic scale. But these organizations were few in number and
compromised relatively small numbers of the total population of those societies.
In contrast to earlier times, contemporary society has put a premium on
rationality, effectiveness, and efficiency. These attributes are the nature al\'ive
for modern organizations. The contemporary social environment, owing to
radical changes in the nature of society— secularization, urbanization,
industrialization, politicization—is both hospitable to large-scale organizations
and dependent on them for its functional requirements. What characterizes the
modern organization as against its antecedents is not so much its bewildering
complexity as its rationality and efficiency. It is these modifications in the
service of old functions, not the emergence of new functions, that distinguish
temporary organizations and give them their uniqueness. Ancient Egypt has
made clear that "small, simple societies fulfill the same basic social functions as
large, complex ones." Each produces goods, services, and wealth, however
crude; each allocates human and material resources, however vaguely; and
each realizes social and normative integration, however imperfectly.

2Ibid., p. 111.
If it is from the rational and efficient service of old functions that modern organizations derive their uniqueness, then it is to the society in change that we must turn for our understanding of those forces which nurture rationality and efficiency and thus nurture in this society of organizations.

The organizational phenomenon, while far from being clearly understood, embodies at least the elements of structural, cultural, and psychological change.

The Structural Factor

The twentieth century has been characterized in the advanced states by:

1. The separation of ownership from management
2. The decline of the competitive economy and its replacement by a system of administered prices, production, and relationships between capital and labor
3. The concentration of economic power
4. The growth of science and technology
5. The development of mass production and mass markets
6. The rise in education
7. The decline of individual autonomy
8. The specialization of labor
9. The emergence of an employee society
10. The decline of the family
11. The marked increase in social mobility
12. The growth in size and power of government
13. The rise of urbanization
14. The spread of urbanization
15. The startling growth in population

These sweeping changes in the societal structure, virtually occurring within the span of one lifetime, have radically modified the social controls of our society, substantially altered ideological positions, and irreversibly shifted the locus of social power. These structural alterations have encompassed the larger part of the population and have penetrated deeply into a wide range of social spheres.

The extent to which these shifts in structure have occurred is illustrated, for example, in the decline in the number of self-employed workers (nonagricultural). Between the years 1940 and 1960, in the United States, the number of these workers declined from 9,758,000 to 5,260,000, and this is spite of a considerable and continuous growth in the labor force as a whole. During the same period, the number of private wage and salaried workers grew from 30 million to almost 60 million, "while government workers more than doubled, rising from 3,560,000 to 8,000,000, and in 1960 nearly half the work force, about 25,000,000, were employed by 'big organizations.' More specifically, nearly one-fifth of the United States labor force in 1967 worked for the 500 largest industrial corporations whose aggregate production approximated 25 percent of the nation's total."

A second illustrative measure of the scope of these changes has been the scientific revolution in industry: the chemical changes in materials; the refinements in standards and specifications; the advances in electronics, automation, and computer sciences; and the evolution in systems of energy supply. The impact of each of these revolutions within a revolution affects every level of the productive apparatus from the extraction of raw materials to final use by the ultimate consumer, the transportation and communications networks, and the intranet of marketing, not to mention their significance for the educational system, the powers of government, and the quality of life in the broader society.

A third illustrative indicator of these changes and their interrelationship may be seen in the separation of individuals from the instruments of production. If man is to work today, he must more and more be employed; for to work he must increasingly have the ever more complex and sophisticated tools and equipment which only large-scale organizations can supply. To gain access to the means of production, therefore, man becomes a worker, either blue-collar, white-collar or high-collator. As the means of production are socialized in complex organizations, man correspondingly becomes a participant in the collective system, less autonomous, more conformist, and increasingly dependent.

The main sociological characteristics of modernization, however, may be what Rostow has called "differentiation," whereby rationality and efficiency are achieved and a number of specialized and distinct social units come to perform the various functions previously carried out by one social unit, the extended family. Differentiation fosters both the creation and growth of highly effective, specialized social units organized to perform the functions of production and allocation of goods, services, and wealth, and equips such units with norms and structure designed to match means and ends.

Production, once carried out by the father and his sons, is now carried out in the factory, which is free to put younger men in charge of older ones, or group the workers in the order it finds efficient. Education is carried out by organizations in which teacher-student relations are focused according to what is considered as advancing education; they are not enshrined in the older quasi-structure of the community. Even religion is largely

1See, e.g., op. cit., pp. 74 and 206.
removed from the family and tribe and invested in a structure which recruits persons whose religious leadership is more effective than that of the average father and chiefess. Allocation is not left to the primitive hunter-exchange, but has developed into a highly complex and organized system. 10

This structural differentiation in turn gives rise to secondary differentiation in each of its principal spheres. Thus, the school of medicine is differentiated from the school of nursing and each in turn from the school of pharmacy; the vocational high school is differentiated from the academic high school and each as well from the reform school; the police department is differentiated from the department of social welfare, and each is further differentiated from the vice squad. Thus, rationalization and efficiency of service is extended in an ever-widening circle to encompass the diverse and vaguette requirements of a heterogeneous society whose members are at once less self-sufficient and more dependent than in earlier, simpler times.

The Cultural Factor

The most extensive analysis of the place of cultural change in the organizational evolution has been made by the German sociologist, Max Weber. 11 His inquiry into the origins of large-scale economic units led him to claim that Protestantism had provided an ethos within which a rational form of organized production could arise and flourish. "Thrift, self-discipline, hard work, asceticism, worldliness--these and similar characteristics of the Protestant ethic," said Weber, "nurtured the conditions necessary for the development of capitalism, modern science, and bureaucratic organizations--all three of which support one another to a large degree." If the existing social order, as the Calvinists believed, were not God's but created man's doing, then man had the responsibility either to adapt himself to his society or to retreat into an other-worldliness. Rather, man's duty was to transform the worldly realm into the Kingdom of God. That being no small task, the cultivation of severe virtues which frowned on pleasure and smiled on disciplined being, was viewed as an essential, personal obligation for those who would join in building the Kingdom. Protestantism's two normative themes of worldliness, which requires an empirical reference and thus encourages rational behavior, and asceticism, which demands a high tolerance for frustration and discipline and, consequently, supports the rational view, combined to provide the cultural context for the organizational revolution and growth. Worldliness and asceticism, Ezioni has suggested, imply commitments not to short-term but to long-term goals: the building of a modern economy, scientific research, the devising of large-scale

10 Ezioni, op. cit., p. 207.
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complex organizations—all these typify long-range tasks and a high regard for rational behavior.

If the yields of a young economy are immediately absorbed by consumption without reinvestment, there will be no economic growth. If a scientist seeking a quick solution to a difficult problem violates the canons of empirical research, his findings will not be valid. If a bureaucrat is regularly guided by his emotions or kinship considerations rather than by established rules and procedures, the organization will be inefficient. 12

William H. Whyte, Jr., in contrast, holds that the Protestant ethic no longer meaningfully functions in American life for his people have abandoned the hopes and ambitions which previously characterized them. 13 The ethic, he claims, rather than supporting the organizational values of today has been replaced by a bureaucratic which has become the controlling and in itself. Thus, modern man looks not to his historical heritage for his security but to the big organization—corporation, government, university, military, elementary, labor union, and professional association. The organization no longer exerts its support and justification from the values of yesterdays' ethic, says Whyte, for the bureaucratic embodies its own respect d'œuvre. The large organization, J. K. Galbraith has said, is a bureaucracist first—a technocracy he calls it—and everything else last, the aim of which in the organized economic unit is security and corporate growth, in that order. 14 However, one may wish to explain cause and effect in the cultural context, the society of organizations is a present fact and demonstrates stable as it shapes and influences men in virtually every sphere of social reference.

The Psychological Factor

Modern organization man embraces a set of personality traits which equip him to function differentially in a loosely-organized society. In sharp contrast to primitive man whose closed society permitted stratification and defined his role and, thus, by constraining him, ensured his security in the broader social context, contemporary man operates within a bewildering system of diverse social units that differ in their peer and authority relations, in their structure, in their goals, and in their behavioral norms. On his ability to more effectively among these various units hinges not only his own claim to income, success, and security, but

12Ezioni, op. cit., p. 107.
are routinely expected attributes of organization man. But the essential characteristics include: (1) a desire to achieve; (2) an ability to postpone gratification; (3) a tolerance for frustration; (4) a willingness to compromise; and (5) a capacity and drive for disciplined work. These several qualities reflect organizational imperatives for commitment, career aspirations, functional expertise, rational behavior, and cooperation. Persons not strongly manifesting these traits are not likely to be found in the decision-making centers of complex organizations, whether large or small scale. The fact is that most functions in organized systems do exhibit these qualities more or less. This convergence of personality and organizational requirements broadly typifies our social environment, Eriksen believes, and is a condition owed primarily to the modern family and to the modern educational system, "both of which produce the type of person who will make a good organization man."11 It is not the organized system, therefore, that models man to its norms as much as it is the broader society which for whatever reason is characterized by an ethic that values highly behavioral patterns essential to organizational viability.

The Nature of Organizations

The search for more highly rational, effective and efficient organizational models has given rise to a number of competing theories of organization which fall roughly into three principal groupings: (1) the Classical School which perceives the organization as a highly structured, impersonal, and efficient instrument of social good, primarily economic and governmental, whose ends are clearly delimited, means are mostly repetitive, and order is imperative. Indeed, the complex organization is seen as society's ultimate collective expression of rational action; (2) the Human Relations or Interpersonal School which views the human element as indistinguishable from the organizational imperatives for rationality and order on the assumption that individual participants in the enterprise tend "to spill over the boundaries of their assigned roles, to participate as wholes";12 and (3) the Structuration or Comparative School which sees the organizational phenomena from a broader structural and cultural perspective than does either of the two other schools, and which strives to integrate the Classical and Human Relations approaches by seeing as desirable the inevitable conflict between man and the organization. This discussion of the nature of organizations will assume that formal structure and informal relationships interpenetrate and complete one another; thus, they will be considered together along with the power and authority system that integrates them.

11 Eriksen, op. cit., p. 110.
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The Structure

The complex, large-scale organization is dependent for its manifest effectiveness more or less on the following general conditions:13

1. "Continuous organization of official functions bound by rules." This imperative assures both stable and comprehensive conditions by facilitating standardization and equality in the organization's internal relations with its environment. This in turn reduces the power wielding elements of discretion, uncertainty, expediency, and judgment which are antithetical to organizational viability if indiscriminately and disproportionately exercised within the system. This differentiation within the structure among degrees and kinds of expertise ordering these relationships systematically so that participants know not only their own boundaries of responsibility, rights, and power but, similarly, the roles of others in the organization. Such a delineation of roles in a firmly ordered system of super- and sub-ordination markedly decreases the probability of subversion of the sort that inevitably flows from authority and responsibility in disorder.

3. "The organization of offices follows the principle of hierarchy; that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one." At the center of the higher office over the lower implies the power to impose, promote, and dismiss; compliance of the latter to the former is left less to chance than would otherwise be true. Thus, accountability within the system is largely resolvable both by office and by function, in which the allocation of responsibility and control is more readily checked and informed.

4. "The roles which regulate the conduct of an office may be technical rules or norms. In both cases, if their application is to be fully rational, specialized training is necessary. It is thus normally true that only a person who has demonstrated an adequate technical training is qualified to be a member of the administrative staff..." This principle implies that the host of bureaucratic authority rests in the knowledge and training of the bureaucrats. Fitness for office normally involves a substantial period of formalized instruction as a condition of eligibility, measurable by examination or by similar rational procedure. Thus, it is not the attested competence that fits him for participation in the organizational society, not his social standing, his wealth, or his possession of other such traditional forms of influence.

5. "It is a matter of principle that the members of the administrative staff be completely separated from ownership of the means of production or
administration... There exists, furthermore, in principle, complete separation of the property belonging to the organization, which is controlled within the sphere of the office, and the personal property of the official... This separation, which is seen as an essential principle of organizational rationality, is not designed to prevent the official’s private life from being infringed by organizational demands, but, rather, to preclude the intrusion of nonorganizational considerations on his formal bureaucratic role. To whatever extent the participant is privately influenced or monopolized by the organization’s external resources, then, in that measure is he constrained in the organization freely to assign organizational rationality to his bureaucratic behavior in allocating such resources.

6. "Administrative acts, decisions, and rules are formulated and recorded in writing..." Only the written word within the organized setting can maintain a consistent, systematic interpretation of institutional norms and regulations. The system of control and accountability is dependent on the recorded word for its rationality and effectiveness in the same way as is the organization in its clientelic relationships.

7. The remaining essential conditions necessary to organizational vitality and integrity mainly include the need to compensate by salary as against payments from clientele, to promote systematically on merit as against "influence," to reward conformity as against encouraging deviation, and to favor impartiality as against partiality.

Conditions of Survival

The basic conceptual assumption is that structure is fundamental to collective, organized rationality. Thus, maintenance of the integrity and survival of the system is the overriding imperative to be obtained Philip Selznick suggests, by seeking:18

1. The security of the organization as a whole in relation to social forces in its environment
2. The stability of the lines of authority and communication
3. The stability of informal relations within the organization
4. The continuity of policy and of the sources of its determination
5. A homogeneity of outlook with respect to the meaning and role of organization

While trade unions, governments, business corporations, churches, political parties, universities, and the like are commonly conceded to be rational social units within the formal structure we have been describing, they are disposed in their ability to maintain organizational integrity and institutional survival.

members a variable but always substantial amount of conformity."22 To state the imperative, exclusively in favor of human relations, neglects the aspect of rationality and efficiency that gives the organization its raison d'etre; and to state the imperative, exclusively in favor of the classical view, overlooks the fact that individual participants in any organized enterprise tend to function as autonomous agents out of highly personal and diverse motivations. Thus, if organizational dysfunctions relate to the delicate balance between organizational needs for order and predictive behavior, and human needs for recognition, status, autonomy, meaningful work, and personal happiness, then authority and power within the system must be so structured as to ensure conditions that will enhance the balance, not serve to advance one set of needs over that of the other.

The Authority System

In legal and political writings, the distinction between power and authority is often neglected for both refer to the ability of an individual or group of individuals to induce others to comply. Authority and power, nevertheless, are distinguishable. Authority can be defined as the "ability to evoke compliance," owing mostly to superior wisdom, expertise, prestige, or position; and power can be defined as the ability to compel adherence by coercion or force. Whereas authority relies for its use and effectiveness upon the subjects' acceptance of the values implied in its exercise—what Weber calls "legitimate power"—the use of power depends on one's capacity to impose his will on another regardless of the other's opposition. Authority and power, however, both relate to the idea of freedom in that both bear on the capacity of persons and groups of persons to make choices. How authority and power are allocated in our society and organizations is, therefore, a principal determinant of the freedom individually and collectively enjoyed by the people.

The ceaseless and changing debate about the proper balance between authority, power, and freedom emerges from the efforts to organize collectively for social action; that is, when persons come together for organized purposes, they are confronted with these major tasks: setting goals, differentiating functions, gathering and communicating information, assigning relationships, establishing priorities, fixing responsibility, determining rewards, allocating resources, and providing sanctions.

As reasonable people can disagree on ends as well as on means, a society collectively striving to meet its dependency-needs through organized action must make certain provision for the rational arbitration of conflicting views in ways which will not structurally or procedurally threaten, by making more dependent

22Ibid, p. 182.
23Feuerbach, op. cit, p. 195.

than the rest, any part of the enterprise. To whatever extent the dependency factor is disproportionately assigned in the society, then in that measure the system is less rational and less free, and more power than authority oriented. Thus, the Negroid in America is an example. The Negro does not enjoy equal participatory in the rational system; his right to education, to civil rights, and to employment are generally unequal to the white man's. The place of the Negro in America is an example. The Negro does not enjoy equal participatory rights in the rational system; his right to education, to civil rights, and to employment are generally unequal to the white man's.

Thus, the Negro is more dependent for his needs on the arbitrations of the white man than he is on the rational structure which more or less systematizes and equalizes the dependence and uncertainty factors for most of the rest of society. As he is unable, therefore, to legitimate power within the rational process, his acceptance of the system and its dictates rests less on his own willingness and more on the power of the rest of society to coerce him. The result is that he is a less free man than those who participate in the system. Men must be enabled in a rational system and a free society formally or informally to legitimate authority; otherwise, the deprived will either reject authority and the fabric of cooperative endeavor will unravel or he will behave against his will under coercion—a condition prospectively as fatal to social order and coherences as is anarchy.

Modern institutional order in the developed state is characterized by what Weber has called "rational-legal authority" by which he means bureaucratic authority or the authority of the imperial order itself which grants legitimate power to individuals according to their office under written rules—authority which is exercisable only within the bureaucratic structure and only so long as the individual occupies the office. Within Weber's bureaucracy, men hold their positions by virtue of their fitness to perform the task. Thus, their power is legitimized for it reflects both expertise and position within a system impersonally ordered to maximize rational decision-making and to minimize arbitrary and illogical actions. While rational-legal authority is less stable than "traditional" authority—authority reliant on kinship, inherited rights, and status which was commonly found in medieval society—it is more stable than "charismatic authority" which depends for its effectiveness and legitimation on discipleship, moral precept, and the personal magnetism of leaders; but even then times of severe social disorder and widespread uncertainty as in Nazi Germany in 1933, Bolshevik Russia in 1917, and revolutionary France in 1789. The rigidity of traditional authority and the unpredictability of charismatic authority are in a complex society equally unacceptable means of rationally coming to terms with the perplexing and volatile demands of modern civilization. Indeed, the preoccupation of these two forms of authority but of rational-legal authority is in an advanced industrial states is crucial to them and to whatever liberties their peoples enjoy.

While the development of rational-legal authority with bureaucratic administration has been both dependent on the breakdown of traditional authority and on the containment of charismatic authority, it has not resulted in
a multitudinous-authority network characterized by centralized decision-making. Rather, the result has been a highly complex, structured decentralization of the organizational process into pluralistic semi-autonomous subsystems. This network of delicately interacting and interconnected parts reflects the diversity of views about means and ends that only free men will overly exhibit, the tolerance for change that so typifies our culture, and the unwillingness to generalize any single solution, as Crozier points out:

The greater confidence derived by the progress of knowledge, the possibilities of mastering the environment that is implied, have not tended to reinforce the rigidity of the decision-making process. They seem, on the contrary, to have obliged organizations to discard completely the very notion of one best way. The most advanced organizations, because they now feel capable of integrating areas of uncertainty in their economic calculus, are beginning to understand that the illusion of perfect rationality has too long persisted, weakening the possibilities of action by insisting on rigorous logic and immediate coherence. Substituting the notion of program for the notion of operational process, introducing the theory of probability at lower and lower levels, reasoning on global systems, and integrating more and more variables without separating ends and means, they are experiencing a deep and irreversible change. The crucial point of this change consists, for us, in recognizing—first implicitly, then more and more consciously—that men cannot look for the one best way and has not actually even searched for it. The philosophy of the one best way has been only a way of protecting oneself against the difficulty of having to choose, a scientist's substitute for the traditional ideologies upon which rested the legitimacy of the rulers' decisions. Man has never been able to search for the optimum solution. He has always had to be content with solutions merely satisfactory in regard to a few particularistic criteria of which he was aware.13

Centralized authority is further mitigated by the following two factors: (1) the separation-of-powers concept; as the separation in governmental structure between legislative, executive, and judicial authority; and (2) to the presence of collegial bodies of equals in the place of hierarchy; as in the authority of expertise embodied in the university faculty. These two factors and the forces discussed by Crozier produce wide variations in organizational structure and process. The corporate unit organized to produce goods will serve to illustrate the point. However large, complex, and decentralized it may be, this organizational model, especially in its manufacturing processes, will tend to favor hierarchical authority in the classical style. The uncertainties of the market, the predictable pressures of labor, and the complexity of inducing participation from vast numbers of skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled workers all press toward

---

13 Crozier, op. cit., p. 139.

---

In addition, the organizational imperatives of more rather than less control of subordinates by superior officers, tighter rather than looser structure, impersonal rather than partial human relations, and a lower rather than a high tolerance for individual discretion. A university, on the other hand, with relatively few skilled or semiskilled workers and large numbers of highly trained professional persons engaged autonomously in a bewildering array of diverse endeavors at levels of sophistication understood only by peers clearly demands a looser rather than a tighter structure, less rather than more hierarchy, tigher rather than low tolerance for individual judgment and discretion, and a wide rather than a narrow band of delegated administrative authority to coordinate with the authority of expertise collectively present in the body of scholars.

Organizational Dysfunction

What is conspicuous, however, about the modern organizational society is not so much the complexity and variety of its organized forms, but that they are nearly all variations on the same theme; that is, they are rational, effective, and efficient units characterized by hierarchy, differentiation of function, impersonality, and order, and integrated by the Weberian concept of rational-legal authority—however controlled or decentralized the unit may be, however hierarchical or diffused authority may be, however useful or useless.

Organizations end only be, however large or small the scale of operation may be. Robert Pershing has observed that "rational, educational, and spiritual activities have embraced bureaucratic organization, seeking efficiency, and the techniques of commerce," Pershing continues, "they have inevitably adopted some of its values, and their character has changed accordingly."

Indeed, for modern man, the corporate organization constitutes the arena, the mechanism whereby man wins or loses success, power, and personal worth. In terms of quality and of human values, however, the effect of large-scale organized endeavor "in art, liberal education, and mass communication is," for Pershing and others, "a disturbing question."

Impact on Higher Education

Consider for a moment the impact of this condition of hypocracy and impersonality on education at the higher levels. In September of 1964, Bradford Cleveland wrote the following which was widely distributed on the Berkeley campus of the University of California when the Free Speech Movement was in its nascent state:

14 Pershing, op. cit., p. 20.
15 Ibid.
The salient characteristic of the multiversity is massive production of specialized excellence. The multiversity is actually not an educational center but a highly efficient industry engaged in producing skilled individuals to meet the immediate needs of business or government.

Below the level of formal power and responsibility (the Regents, president and chancellor), the faculty itself is guilty of a massive and disastrous default. More concerned with their own increasingly affluent specialized careers, they have permitted an administrative process to displace, and become an obstacle to, extended thought and learning for the undergraduate. Professors have made a gift of the undergraduate learning situation to the bureaucrat.

The process [of education] is a four-year-long series of sharpstraction: eight unometrics, forty courses, one hundred twenty or more "units," ten to fifteen impertinent lectures per week, and one to three oversized discussion meetings per week led by poorly paid underemployed graduate students.18

"Do not bend, fold, or mutilate," read the IBM card pinned to the front of those students at Berkeley who regarded their University not as a center of learning but as an "impersonal bureaucracy," a "machine," and "knowledge factory." Education, they claimed, had been usurped and demeaned in favor of bureaucracy; that is, in preference to having learning as its end the University had chosen instead to produce men for the organizational society whose values and competencies would mesh with the needs of government and industry. Thus, it was asserted, the University typified in its structure and processes the same characteristics as would be found in other organized efforts calculated to produce measured and standardized goods and services. The University's bureaucracy had placed a premium on precision, efficiency, speed, control, continuity and similar administrative measures which optimized returns on input, depersonalized human relationships, and minimized nonessential considerations. Not only that, these students argued, but the rigid enforcement of rules designed not so much to enhance the learning process as to facilitate the administrative process had displaced the goals of education by becoming themselves the terminal values of organizational effort. Set against the learning ideals of free inquiry and expression, personal worth, spontaneity, and individual autonomy, the organizational cliques, at least for these students, were dysfunctional. Indeed, personal freedom and progress, measured by these students in terms of effective choices and meaningful participation in the educational process, had for them been subverted by what they regarded as centralized power and decision-making. The acquisitive demands of our society had, as they understood it, subordinated the University's real values and aspirations. The University in turn, they inevitably had regarded as instruments rather than as ends.

The underlying reason [for the dysfunction] is the passionate specialization of the university organization. All the dynamics of training, of values, and of professional recognition push one toward restricted fields of analysis. As a result, trained incapacity, technical introversion, and bureaucratic in-fighting are characteristic of many university departments.19

Moreover, dysfunction occurs when those most qualified to make rational judgments are structured out of the decision-making process as it is too often in contemporary university and college administration. Structure and process in higher learning today find the professional increasingly alienated, the administrative apparatus weakened, and ultimate power vested in synods whose values often remain consonant to those collectively held by the faculty and students and whose competence to make educational decision is clearly peripheral.20

The Culture as a Constraint

The university condition illustrates in microcosm the quite unwanted dysfunctions of bureaucracy which generally, although in quite different terms, which arise when organizational imperatives for order, efficiency, rationality, and impersonality confound human needs for autonomy, personal worth, and spontaneity. The example cited points up the fact that organizations are not merely instruments to provide goods and services, but constitute the environment in which most of us spend most of our lives.

In their efforts to rationalize human energy they become sensitive and versatile agencies for the control of man's behavior: employing subtle psychological sanctions that evoke desired responses and inculcate consistent patterns of action. In this sense, by organizations are a major disciplinary force in our society. Their influence spills over the boundaries of economic interest or activity into spiritual and intellectual sectors; the
accepted values of the organization, shape the individual's personality and influence his behavior in extracurricular ways.\textsuperscript{31}

Thus, large-scale organizations socialize their values through their authority and reward system, their unrivaled capacity to manipulate, and their centrality in modern man's pattern of survival. Culture, on the other hand, does act as a constraint on organizational character. Those societies, for example, which place great stress on authoritarian models, little emphasis on education for the masses, and considerable value on strict order in the home and school experience are more likely to emerge with an organizational pattern which favors a hierarchical bureaucracy in the rigid, classical sense; whereas, those societies which value equality of social relationships, mass education, and permeability in the home and school environment are more likely to develop a loosely articulated, pluralistic, highly diffused organizational situation. Complex organizations in Germany reflect German culture,\textsuperscript{32} as those in Britain are patterned by the British culture,\textsuperscript{32} and as those in Japan bear the stamp of Japanese culture.\textsuperscript{34} The American organizational pattern, as the examples above, is stamped with the character of the culture which surrounds it and is more than not typified by the deep-seated sentiments in our society which oppose the use of men as instruments of impersonal ends (shocking exceptions include, among others, the use of Neron slaves in the agricultural south, the employment of Chinese in the building of the western railroads, and the use of child labor and women in the sweat shops which accompanied our earlier industrialization). The cultural bias which places a high valuation on individual worth has caused men to impede, through the enactment of antitrust legislation, the encouragement of unionism and the establishment of regulatory agencies, the otherwise dominant trend toward central authority and economic monopoly. Of course, the system remains imperfect as inevitably it must in any volatile, dynamic, and shifting social scene. Moreover, organizations while existing with the consent of the surrounding society do not automatically fall under societal control. But however one may view the contributions of the organization to and its dysfunctions in American life we are but better for or for worse an organizational society:

We are born in organizations, educated by organizations, and most of us spend much of our lives working for organizations. We spend much of our

\textsuperscript{31}Footnote, op. cit., p. 36.


\textsuperscript{35}Footnote, op. cit., p. 7.
Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion. These papers are concerned with the problems of size and morale in large-scale organizations.


Garrett, David P., *The California Oath Controversy*. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1967. This work reports the controversy of 1949-52 that raged in the University of California over a loyalty oath required of the faculty by The Regents and the organizational dysfunctions which attended that dispute.

