JOHN DEWEY'S THEORY OF CITIZENSHIP AND COMMUNITY IN THE DEVELOPING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY AS SEEN THROUGH THE PHILOSOPHY OF PRAGMATISM AS A PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION MODEL FOR THE CITIZEN'S ROLE IN PUBLIC GOVERNANCE

A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Public Administration and Public Affairs

by

Elaine Andrews Lailas

APPROVED:

_____
Orion F. White, Chairman

_____   _____
Gary L. Wamsley   James F. Wolf

_____   _____
Cynthia McSwain   Camilla Stivers

December 15, 1998
Blacksburg, Virginia

UMI Number: 3021994

UMI®

_____

_____

John Dewey's Theory of Citizenship and Community in the Developing American Democracy as seen through the Philosophy of Pragmatism as a Public Administration Model for the Citizen's Role in Public Governance.

By

Elaine Andrews Lailas

Committee Chairman: Dr. Orion F. White, Center for Public Administration and Policy

(ABSTRACT)

At the time of the founding of the field of public administration, government was in a condition of some degree of failure. Since elitist and corrupt politics were the predominant mode of government at the time, the cause of this failure was seen as insufficient rationality, and coinciding with this, a lack of scientific information and technical expertise. Also, a popular involvement in government was perceived to be a need. This created a demand for a scientific rational government, run by technocratic experts that was, at the same time, open to popular access. In principle, this idea is consistent with Dewey's thought, but what developed is a form of government that saw science, or the process of bringing knowledge to bear on problems that made <u>interest groups</u> the key mode of access to policy making. This solution appeared to meet the needs of the time, while in fact it was far off the mark. In all of this, Dewey's true and more appropriate alternative was lost. These conditions still exist. The American government is a seemingly, ailing government; but the only thing that is suggested is to have more science and give groups more "participative" access. In essence, virtual gridlock has resulted. One solution is to rediscover and accurately understand Dewey, who can help us rethink science and the knowledge process in government and the possibilities for citizen involvement in government.

Acknowledgements

Dedications are extremely personal and filled with deep emotion. Remembering my parents at this time brings to my mind their absolute confidence in me in any endeavors whether they were educational, familial, spiritual, political, and/or social.

To my parents, I express my deep gratitude for instilling in me a confidence in myself with their love and teaching me that America is truly the land of opportunity and freedom just for the determination, will, and pursuit of a dream.

To my husband, I express my deep appreciation for his love, support, and encouragement all along the way. To my children, I thank them for their stalwart support, confidence, and love. To my sisters and brother together with their families, I appreciate their encouragement.

At Virginia Tech's CPAP community, I wish to express my feelings of deep satisfaction in the welcoming and supportive environment that was afforded to me. I especially want to thank Dr. Orion F. White, who opens the dialogue and offers an enabling, positive force to work towards the goal of accomplishment and achievement in being satisfied with one's ideas, vision, and purpose in writing upon one's subject. Dr. White served as my advisor during my academic studies and gladly accepted to chair my dissertation committee. He served as a positive force and demonstrated his complete understanding of my proposal and helped me in focusing in on the subject. We went through the process together sharing in the synthesizing of this topic of mutual agreement.

I extend my deep appreciation to my dissertation committee: Dr. Gary

Preface

The motivation behind writing this dissertation stems from my experience as a community and/or citizen activist. This means that I experienced different processes and ways of being involved in government that effected government policy. Whether it was lobbying on Capitol Hill, serving as an advocate for women that were victims of abuse, testifying in a Public Hearing before the House of Representatives sub-committee, monitoring public hearings of the different sub-committees on the House and Senate side, serving as an advocate in Richmond at the State Capitol to the State Senate and House of Delegates, serving on committees at the local level in reviewing budgets, preparing testimony or white papers, reporting on legislation before Congress to membership of an association in different parts of the country be it in Florida, Hawaii, California, State of Washington, Pennsylvania, New York, West Virginia, Ohio, Minnesota, Texas, or Virginia, testifying before an agency of the Commonwealth of Virginia, running as a candidate for the Virginia House of Delegates, political party membership and activism, elected to the local board that has taxation responsibilities, organizing a fact-finding study/action group, marching for women's rights in Washington, D. C., down Pennsylvania Avenue towards the Capitol, standing vigil in Richmond, Virginia and in Fairfax, Virginia, and the list goes on, these experiences provided me with the necessary motivation to research further and learn how the system really works from the inside.

I have witnessed the energy, enthusiasm, and wonder of our American democracy, but also, felt the frustration, disappointment, and feelings of helplessness from fellow citizens. Is there a better way for citizens to communicate their feelings and their beliefs? What exists for citizens to express themselves, practice their ideas aloud, and not experience that feeling of not

knowing or not being on the inside with adequate information? Citizens who attempt to express themselves are sometimes turned off by an unwilling audience of public officials and impatient citizens or a barrage of bureaucratic hurdles. Does a process, forum, or platform exist that allows citizens to practice democracy? Where do we learn how to practice democracy? And, when can we practice democracy? These are the questions that peaked my interest and propelled me to conduct an intellectual study of citizenship as it relates to citizen involvement and participation in the governance of our American democracy.

Virginia Tech's Center for Public Administration and Policy, popularly known as CPAP, welcomed me in their academic program in pursuit of a doctor of philosophy degree. I would be the student who would be different from the other students in that I was studying from the perspective of a citizen rather than a public administrator or public official.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION AND ANALYTIC STRATEGY

Introduction

American citizens originally practiced their democracy intensively in town meetings, school house meetings, and sometimes out in the streets. Today, citizenship as voting once every four years has become the norm for many people. Many others do not do as much. Is voting only one part of what should be the experience of citizenship? Are there barriers to or voids in our processes of governance that de-motivates citizen involvement?   Is it time to examine if and why Americans are so cut off from their own government?

Context for the Problem

I <u>believe</u> it is time to examine these questions. Therefore, the purpose of this dissertation is to contribute to the public administration literature on the citizen's role in public governance.   This contribution will introduce Dewey's philosophy of citizenship in our developing American democracy as a pragmatic means to filling the gap in public administration literature on citizen involvement in governance. I believe American citizens have developed a preference for solving our problems through technical devices rather than through civic collaboration.   For example, our response to riot-torn urban areas, like Los Angeles, was to eliminate the cause of the blight left by the riot through the quick remedy of economic development. As a result, we fail to recognize that many

such areas, like the District of Columbia, are facing a bankruptcy of inner civic soul as well as financial insolvency.   Watts continues to be blighted and its citizens fractious. Miamians are becoming more contentious to and disaffected from building a well-functioning *civil society*. Our historical impulse has been to look to public servants and political leadership for solving problems.

Statement of the Problem

We, as a people, find ourselves afflicted by cynicism and apathy toward our government. Even though extremism and radicalism have been with us all along, events like the bombing in Oklahoma City mark a new era of disaffection; people are feeling more than ever that their government is alien to them. In his commencement address to the Class of 1997 at California State University--Dominguez Hills, Dr. David Satcher declared that with the "erosion of communities" over the years, the "people face broken communities," and a government that they cannot trust.[1] He recalled the Belmont Report, which calls for the renewal of ethics and values in our government such as, Respect for the individual, Beneficence, and Justice.[2] These are code words of a civil society. He cited the cynical quotation, "I'm from the government, and I'm here to help you," in order to demonstrate his point that the government is given to comical innuendoes of fumbling and incompetence. Dr. Satcher reiterates the important question: "Can people trust us?"[3] Are citizens just not interested in their government or are they just disaffected--and why?

This is the problem around which this dissertation is centered. The specific theme of the research is that at the time of the founding of the field of public administration there was a moment containing the possibility for a fundamental redirection of the style and substance of governance in America toward citizen-based democratic governance. A pragmatic form of government could have been adopted that involves full citizenship participation. Instead, we took the option of governance as expert policy making, and this choice has

2

created our present condition. I will demonstrate from a historical perspective how this occurred and why this pattern has persisted over time.

Background and Focus of The Problem

I will argue that the changes recommended on behalf of the public interest by the generation of social scientists that founded the field of public administration were really more in service to the newly emerging expert class of the day than they were to the benefit of the principles of democracy and even American society. The emphasis on the principles of scientific management,[4] the sole aim of which was a narrowly-defined efficiency, established a need for experts who were university-trained and who preferably had a scientific background. The developing ethos of governance by trained experts led to universities providing such experts, and the movement toward governance grounded in citizen involvement lost momentum. William Willoughby, the first Director of the Institute for Governmental Research, had "little faith in an enlightened citizenry" and thought that a majority government was a "little better than mob rule."[5] In my opinion, such statements reveal that the tension between expertise and citizenship resulted whereby citizenship was given lip service only. Citizen participation suggests direct involvement by the citizens. However, in fact, citizen participation has been reduced to passive involvement through public hearings and receipt of information in the Federal Register. In some cases, not even that. For example, in 1994, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) proposed setting standards that incorporated a level of protection for soil and ground water that was equivalent to the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) draft proposal. Then, in December of 1996, the NRC unilaterally shifted their position from their original proposal and adopted a less protective position by increasing the dose and dropping the standard for ground water protection. The decisions were made even after public hearings were held, and discussions and reviews by the public and agencies with mutual interest, i.e. ground water,

drinking water, clean air, et cetera, had produced agreement upon the original level of protection.[6]   The NRC is an independent body of political appointees. It does not report to any federal agency and is not required by law to conduct public hearings, nor does it need Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval for its regulations.[7]

Given the way that the issue of expertise versus citizenship has been construed, the problem is unresolvable. Expertise will continue to be the basis, though a controversial one, for policy making, and the role of citizens will remain impoverished. What is lacking here is a model for citizenship that shows how citizens can play a role in democratic governance that goes beyond *participation as the expression of preferences, special interests, and protection of staffs* . In order to do this, the process of policy making itself must be reconceptualized in a way that highlights the necessity for citizens to possess a capacity for <u>creative</u> dialogue. What the literature of the field that has developed so far lacks is this idea of citizenship and the contribution it can make to democratic governance.

The heart of my argument is crystallized in the philosophy and theories of American Democracy, citizenship, and education promulgated by John Dewey. I will argue that Dewey's thought can form a forum from which we can find a new path for revitalizing America as it enters the Twenty-First Century. While Dewey's thought is seen as influential, he is also regarded as controversial, and this fact has diminished our being able to see the relevance of his work. Further, it is unfortunate that this damaging reputation was, in part, unjustly acquired, as many, like Lippmann and Niebuhr, whose thoughts <u>were</u> tremendously influential, expounded ideas similar to Dewey's while purportedly attacking him.[8]

Dewey can provide a key to creating a "civic culture."[9] Though commentators have continued to blame Dewey for his attacks on "degenerative individualism,"[10] which the critics allege teaches American students "that individualism and independence are selfish and mean spirited,"[11] his critique is being validated by the facts of contemporary life. Dewey is also blamed for the problems of American public schools. It is in the "American schools of education

where individuals have been taught that being self-sufficient is wrong."[12] This paper will help to correct such misunderstandings, show that Dewey has been misread, and suggest that his ideas, correctly understood, fit our present situation exceedingly well.

If the United States of America is to continue to be the beacon of hope for the future of democracy, it must find solutions to its social problems, and this means, I believe, involving more citizens in the governance processes. Many commentators are saying that the liberalism that gave rise to the American democratic state is dead. This argument says that America lacks the social foundation upon which to build a community and a nation, and that, consequently, is the reason that we have had to place so much emphasis on the expertise of the technocratic elite. Specifically, our #1 social problem--racial and ethnic prejudice--causes us to rely on technocrats or government as a source in solving our social problems.

I will argue that John Dewey's philosophy of pragmatism and his theory of emerging American democracy can form the core of a pragmatic model of citizen involvement in government. My thesis is that his philosophy of pragmatism failed to prevail because a distorted understanding of Dewey's thought developed around it. I will present what Dewey's pragmatism really means as a theory of governance and how it can create a workable foundation for the civil society we need and an alternative to government by experts only.

While a number of models of citizenship have been developed for the purpose of revitalizing its role in governance, none of these appreciates sufficiently the dimensions of the problem as Dewey understood it.   This is what John Dewey's pragmatic model of citizenship provides when it is understood--especially its emphasis on the education of citizens not as anti-experts or anti-political but as citizens. The gap that this dissertation will fill is to provide, through a corrected interpretation of Dewey, a model of a dialogically-creative citizenship. I will interpret Dewey so as to highlight how this model exists in his theory, show why it was misunderstood and subsequently ignored, and then

indicate through contemporary case illustrations how it is, and can be further, a workable alternative for reforming governance in America.

Analytic Strategy

The strategy of my research process will follow the interpretive methodology originally proposed by Pitirim Sorokin. Sorokin proposed that a grand theoretical process is best pursued through what he called the "logico-meaningful" method.[13] Sorokin explained that a sociologic-phenomenological style of making an argument aims at creating understanding rather than explanation. The difference between these is that explanation is made by breaking a situation into a set of variables, dependent and independent, and configuring them into a causal pattern, whereas understanding is created by setting out a <u>coherent</u> account of a situation or phenomenon, one with enough integrity and truth and illustrated enough by appropriate evidence to yield a sense of valid meaning.   This is why I found it necessary to present, what may be very distinct and separate topics, three historical pictures on public administration, expert elites, citizenship and community woven together by Dewey's theory of democracy.

In providing this all-encompassing historical backdrop, it is hoped that Dewey can become the forging link in understanding citizenship in the developing American Democracy. The content of the argument will be historical data showing how the "true" Dewey has been lost to us, how the development of public administration fostered the rise of a government of technocratic experts, and how the historical development of the concepts of citizenship and community took a limited form in the American context.   I will conclude with the presentation of practical designs that illustrate the alternative that I see Dewey's pragmatism as affording. Having specified the vehicle, let us begin this journey of understanding in the logico-meaningful method of Sorokin.

The Sorokin Backdrop for a Correct Understanding of Dewey.

Reconnecting to Dewey cannot properly occur without a review of Charles Sanders Peirce, his effect on John Dewey, and the relation between the work of the two men. It must be specified at the outset, however, that because Peirce was exiled[14] from the conventional academic world, he was not generally understood, and his influence on Dewey has not been widely recognized. If we review the history of their connection, we can better understand and see Dewey characterized as a social philosopher rather than as a controversial political ideologue. In the logico-meaningful method, Dewey's flirtation with political and social activism led him to be understood as being in a separate pragmatic orbit of his own, espousing a point of view that was interested in and grounded more in political and policy preferences than philosophical perspective.

Hence, using Sorokin's analytic strategy in providing an understanding of Dewey will begin by setting a backdrop of Charles Sanders Peirce's "Theory of Scientific Method" in order to help us understand Dewey's philosophy of pragmatism. (It is interesting to note that the neo-idealistic tradition in sociology within which Sorokin worked is based on symbolic logic--which of course was built upon Peirce's logic of relations.) Charles Sanders Peirce's "Theory of Scientific Method" will serve as the map for this journey of my dissertation, the analytic template. Dewey's ideas were nurtured through the theoretical roots set down by Peirce in his "pragmaticism"; thus, my analysis will be found at the core of Peirce's thought.

Charles Sanders Peirce's Scientific Method.

Peirce's key theoretical concepts are found in his distinctive definition of what he purported to be the Scientific Method. His first premise that the science community not only needed to communicate to each other as scientists but share with the greater community. In other words, science needed to be shared

with the Universe. Peirce held very strongly to the belief that in order for science to be understood and to be realized, science needed to be shared in the community of ideas of the universe.[15] This strong belief in the greater community placed Peirce in a realm separate from the belief system of the science community. The science community practiced science as in an esoteric coterie. Whereas, Peirce wanted to open the doors of science to all people in the dialogue of searching for truth. This bonding with the greater community as the basis for scientific practice became the foundation to the philosophy of Dewey. Later I will suggest how the separation of the scientific community from the greater community has contributed to the undermining of the possibility of a civil society.

Peirce's second key concept on his theory of the scientific method is that thinking, language, and culture are keys to opening up the ways to action. Even though Dewey's thought is set in Peirce's thinking, they differed in the way they reached conclusions. John Dewey rejected logical positivism, while Peirce relied heavily on the related discipline of logical symbolism. Peirce is noted for his mathematical genius and deliberated his ideas through mathematical logic. Dewey, on the other hand, leaned heavily on the scientific method generally as grounding for his metaphysical thoughts.[16] Peirce's greatest contribution to pragmatic thought, which had great meaning for Dewey, was his "semeiotics."[17] (Peirce preferred this form of spelling "semeiotics.") Peirce felt it was not natural to divorce this kind of thinking--semeiotics--from the mainstream of the world. "By explaining how thought is action, Peirce's semeiotics make it possible to understand why thinking, language, and culture are real historical forces."[18] The key to a correct understanding of Dewey is to understand Peirce's semeiotics. Dewey believed very strongly in language, meaning and language, and language development.

Peirce became more explicit in his writings in exploring and demonstrating how an individual's thinking on a particular issue is forever changing towards the common good--"summum bonum."[19] This thinking is expressed in a language

8

that is only understood by those who are experiencing the dialogue over and over again. The continuous thought process transforms eventually from thought into action. These actions are felt and achieved by one's culture and/or community. The culture of the group, then, will determine the action that will be practiced. Most importantly, Peirce felt that this was an ever-changing, on-going process which he called "synechism."

Dewey believed in Peirce's "semeiotics" for this main reason. Symbolism entraps the thinking mind towards a never-ending conclusion. If the culture is changed, the symbolic nature of thinking will also change. Dewey based his theory of education on the importance of language, cultural meaning, a sense of community building through education and communication. In order to achieve a goal, each participating individual needs to be on a level-playing field. This means that persons involved in a dialogue have the same understanding of the language used. The underlying dictum of Peirce is that thinking has no meaning if the knowledge base of language is of a different representation of meaning.[20] An example of this is when two or more people are having a dialogue and it appears that they are talking past each other. Conversation is taking place but understanding of the meaning of the discussion is blocked whereby each person is having a one-way conversation. Semeiotics is symbolism which is representation which becomes understanding in language hence an authentic dialogue.

The third key concept blends scientific inquiry as the basic rule of the scientific method. Peirce claimed that scientific inquiry is a continuing conversation that converges on the truth.   This becomes more clear as one is introduced to the fifth concept of the mind of the community. Even though Peirce claimed that he was not a pragmatist but a "pragmaticist," his scientific method laid the groundwork, the foundation, and the foot path for pragmatism that Dewey elaborated.

Peirce provided the structural framework upon which Dewey filled out with a pragmatic philosophy. Peirce tells us how to build a theory; Dewey gives us

9

the construction blocks with which those concepts are implemented in practical terms. Peirce explains in his essay, "The Fixation of Belief," that even though other methods have their value, the *scientific method* far outshines them because its foundation is logic.[21] The scientific method according to Peirce must include <u>experience</u> as a part of scientific inquiry.[22]

Abduction, Deduction, and Induction are the three types of reasoning that are basic to Peirce's scientific method. Abduction gives an explanation of the hypothesis based on the facts that have been observed. Abduction is the inference drawn from the observation. The perceptual judgment and the inference are both interpretive. In order to know, one must have experience which serves as the context for the next experience.   But in order to have the experience, one must have a belief about the experience. Peirce summarizes it succinctly when he states that "Experience is our only teacher."[23] Dewey's thinking on experiential learning and how that learning takes effect in the community of the classroom and not in isolation goes back directly to this aspect of Peirce's statement on experience.

Peirce argued that research is a "conversation with nature."[24] Observation begins the act of scientific inquiry and is supported by experience. Peirce states that observation is "an act of voluntary attentive experience. . . ."[25] Observation precedes the hypothesis to be researched. Peirce calls the incidence of surprise that begins inquiry as "brutal inroads of ideas from without."[26] Experience sometimes serves as a resistance to new experience. However, "experience" is conducive to "changes and contrasts involving resistance."[27]

The fourth key concept of Peirce's scientific method is that experimental verifiability equals pragmatism. This is the working part or walking through the experience part of the scientific method that translates itself to mean the practicing of pragmatism. Sifting through the hypotheses and proving their viability or non viability, one is experiencing experimental verifiability. "Pragmaticism is the logic of abduction."[28] It is the "method of sorting out conceptual confusions by relating meaning to consequences."[29] Peirce explains

that the abduction process eventually develops a practical effect. This is experimental verifiability. According to Peirce: "This is approximately the doctrine of pragmatism."[30] In order to understand the scientific method, one must proceed through the verification process.[31]

Through the induction process, justification of results or proof of the truth of the experiments occur. The process provides for the adoption, modification, and rejection of the hypothesis. Justification always leads towards the convergence on the truth. Peirce states it this way, that there is a "constant tendency of the inductive process to correct itself."[32] The induction process allows for the feature of regularity of the universe to become real in the research studies. "Reality is only the object of the final opinion to which sufficient investigation would lead."[33]

In explaining his theory on the regularity of the universe, he uses the term "Contrite Fallibilism" to explain the beginning and the end of inquiry. This term is used because in practice, inquiry is ongoing and continues to change as it converges upon the truth. In searching for the truth, one has to let go of some beliefs in order to proceed onto a new truth. As one truth is dismissed or changed into a new meaning with another truth, the reality of stating one's incorrect view of the universe becomes a contrite fallibillism. The mind fights with the reality that at one moment in time the truth is evident and in another moment in time, the truth has changed. Truth may seem to be infallible but proves to be fallible with the ongoing scientific inquiry. It is almost as if a Gestalt shift occurs in developing a new meaning that allows one to have a different perspective. Ideas and beliefs change and are not part of one's universe forever.

In his Introduction to Logic, (1909), Peirce's conviction is that all authentic communication requires interaction between speaker and listener as "shifters".[34] This can be interpreted to describe dialogue. In communicating between two persons, the discussion changes when the listener becomes the speaker and vice versa. Shifting in focus in the dialogue occurs between the two persons. Of

11

course, the same is done when the dialogue is between a speaker and a group. "The pragmatic method of scientific inquiry is such a method, and has as its aim the expression of the cosmos in an explanatory fashion."[35]   However, according to Peirce, reality can only be understood in the "mind of the community", not by the individual mind.   Again, the verifiability of the experience through the communication of one's experience with others creates reality. Reality is the evolution, the growth, and the continuing pursuit of the truth through experience. The universe "is continually growing in reality, in `existence,' which in the present context means in persistence and in regularity."[36]

Once regularity occurs, it appears that a repeated experience becomes a habit. Peirce confirmed this when he stated that: "All things have the tendency to form habits."[37]   Peirce explains how habits are formed. "Flashes" of insight occur and when the second flash and the third flash occur, the principle of habit closely connects the intermittent flashes into a growing tendency. This concept is also tied to Peircean "tychism"[38] which is the observation of increasing uniformity or the habit-taking form and the fact of diversity or variety of the world. In Peirce's essay, "How to Make Our Ideas Clear," (1878) he states that, "The essence of belief is the establishment of a habit, and different beliefs are distinguished by the different modes of action to which they give rise."[39] This Peircean concept of habits developing out of continuing experiences grounds the dogmatic thinking of Dewey, who promotes the practicing of democracy by citizens in order for democracy to be grounded into habit-forming practices of citizens.   In essence, these experiences in the practicing of democracy become the normative praxis of democratic principles.

As a key aspect of the continuing search for truth, Peirce evolved his doctrine of continuity as "Synechism." Continuity becomes an essential element in his philosophy. "The doctrine of continuity is that all things...swim in continua". "If all things are continuous, the universe must be undergoing a continuous growth from non-existence to existence."[40]   The Peircean concept of continuity is relevant to the thinking of Mary Parker Follett's principle of "coordination as a

12

continuous process,"[41] and John Dewey's "Principles of Interaction and Continuity."[42] Specifically, synechism is the developing phase of an idea, a conviction, or a truth; therefore, it is the advanced form of tychism. Dewey explains it in terms of a process that is cyclical. This cycle of learning gives the opportunity to go back in bringing forward those left behind in the process so that all swim in the continuum of the developmental process of growth in a democratic state.

Peirce sees God as the Creator who directs the universe through a process of growth and expresses his thinking in this way: It is in "His Infinite Goodness which He Himself is"[43] that God shares the beauty and magnificence of the universe or the cosmos. Peirce explains science this way: "Nature is something great, and beautiful, and sacred, and eternal, and real--the object of its worship and aspiration" (5.589).[44] Peirce's concept of the "infinite" includes the continuous inquiry concept.[45] Dewey grounds his book, <u>A Common Faith</u>, on this Peircean thought.

The purpose of going through all of this inquiry is in developing a sense of community. Peirce's fifth key concept is the developing of the mind of the community. The most important key to understanding Dewey's idea of reaching solutions to one's problems through dialogue is to be found in Peirce's conceptualization of community. "Peirce's belief that every individual encounter, in the form of inner dialogue, of inter-subjective communication, . . . can only be resolved rationally at some higher stage in an encounter with one's community of actual other people."[46] Peirce is not concerned with "free individuals" but free individuals in community. Freedom is when thinking only of one's property matures to include involvement in the community on behalf of the public interest.[47]

The culmination of Peirce's work and thus his sixth key concept of the scientific method was his explanation of the three levels of meaning. The first level of meaning is "communicating our knowledge to others" while others try to

communicate their knowledge to us.[48] We would call this a dialogue. This first level of meaning may occur as in a brainstorming session of a group of persons brought together for a greater purpose. The second level of meaning is the "responsibility, intention, and commitment of the person who conveys the message."[49] After a brainstorming session occurs, the process usually resolves in goal-setting and then in developing objectives that help in attaining those goals. How far one takes the knowledge and what kind of action is taken will set the stage for the third level. The third level of meaning, the highest form, relates to the consequences of the message. One possibility, a revolution, is in the extreme realm as an outcome of the second level of action upon society.[50] Of course, the revolution can be in thought, as in scientific thought, or in a revolt to societal norms. Another result may be the construction of a community center or a park or on a human level result in ways to better communicate concerns in a community.

Dewey's life is an outstanding example of someone who has translated Peirce's three levels of meaning to his life experiences. His prolific writings communicate his ideas to thoughtful readers, but he also personally communicated with a wider audience.   He had great exposure, both in the written word and orally, but also by participating in many organizations in leadership roles as well as taking an active role in controversial issues. Dewey's strategies for involvement through creative dialogue in the community sets the stage for responsibility and commitment.   "Study without action is futile but action without study is fatal,"[51] became a Deweyan truism.

"In order to understand pragmatism, therefore, well enough to subject it to intelligent criticism, it is incumbent upon us to inquire what an ultimate aim, capable of being pursued in an indefinitely prolonged course of action, can be."[52] Pitirim Sorokin's analytic strategy in his logico-meaningful methodology helps us in developing an understanding of what is missing in the public administration literature pertaining to citizen involvement in governance. I believe that John

Dewey's theory of citizenship in the developing American democracy is such a prolonged course of action.

The Format of the Dissertation

Chapter I of this essay in the Introduction begins, with an invocation of the current "civic crisis" in America--a crisis expressing itself as government in gridlock--and the assertion that it is necessary to revisit the way we practice governance. This invocation and assertion is expanded in the "Context for the Problem,"
"Statement of the Problem," and "Background and Focus of the Problem." The introduction explains the purpose of the dissertation--which again, is to introduce Dewey's philosophy of citizenship in our developing American democracy as a pragmatic means to filling the gap in public administration literature on citizen involvement in governance. As I have indicated, my analytic strategy will follow Pitirim Sorokin and the neo-idealistic tradition in sociology, which proposes the logico-meaningful method as the structure and rule of truth for analysis of the sort to be carried out here. In this way, my thesis will be presented that will allow the reader to better understand my stream of thinking in connecting public administration literature with Dewey's philosophy on citizenship. Sorokin's methodology is based on symbolic logic which is built on Charles Sanders Peirce's logic of relations. That is why the backdrop for the analytic strategy is on Peirce's works, as a step toward drawing the connection to Dewey. Setting Dewey's philosophy of pragmatism in this context will better help us understand his true message.

Following this introduction is a literature review in Chapter II, which will focus on those writings in the field of public administration that have examined the citizen's role in governance. This review will show specifically how the contribution of the dissertation is to add a missing element to the citizenship literature. Chapter III reviews the history of the founding of the field of public

administration, with a brief look at how the Federalist and Anti-Federalist points of view came to bear on this episode.   The main thrust of the chapter is an investigation and analysis of how the development of the expert class upon the founding of public administration foreclosed the possibility of the movement towards government by citizens. It will also delve into the influence of science and scientific thought in fostering the development of this expert class.

Having set this background perspective, the essay in Chapter III moves to the historical evolvement of citizenship and community and the subsequent stumbling blocks that prevented a seemingly natural growth of democracy through the centuries. Chapter IV is an historical development of citizenship and community as concepts immersed in the development of democracy for over two thousand years. Chapter IV provides the necessary backdrop for the next chapter that presents the philosophy of John Dewey. Chapter V is a presentation of John Dewey's life, his thoughts, and his philosophy. Pragmatists Peirce, James, and Mead are introduced to fill out the context within which Dewey's perspective was constructed. They, of course, are considered the core pragmatists as well as the change agents in developing pragmatic thought. Since Dewey's ideas are realized through citizenship and community, the previous chapter's focus on the importance of knowing how citizenship and community evolved historically comes to light in Chapter V. Chapter VI describes a variety of practical designs that serve as examples of the sort of citizen involvement consistent with Dewey's vision. These designs are all instances of actual current and working programs of citizen involvement in government, and, as such, serve as evidence of the practical feasibility of Dewey's idea of government through pragmatic community. Chapter VI will conclude with a summary reflection on the link between approaches to knowledge and approaches to government.

Endnotes

1.   Dr. David Satcher, Director, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Administrator, Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, "Keynote Address," California State University--Dominguez Hills Thirty-First Annual Commencement, May 24, 1997. Notes taken at commencement exercises.

2.   Ibid., notes taken at commencement exercises.

3.   Ibid.

4.   Frederick W. Taylor. "Scientific Management," <u>Classics of Public Administration</u>, Second Edition, Revised and Expanded. Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, Editors. Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987, pp. 29-32.   Taylor defined the principles of scientific management in 1912. His applications to the concept of expertise and relating the rules and laws to the concept of a science grew popular for managers. Even though he was very conscious of the fact that he did not have a college degree, he laid the groundwork for the need for experts, trained personnel, to develop a science that would "replace the old rule-of-thumb knowledge of workmen" (p. 30).

5.   James Allen Smith. <u>The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite</u>. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1991, p. 55.

6.   Cindy Skrzycki. "The Regulators: *EPA* vs. *NRC*--Going Nuclear Over the Ground Rules on Contamination," <u>The Washington Post</u>. Washington, D.C., Sunday, May, 1997, pp. G1 and 2.

7.   Nicholas Lailas, Supervisor, Environmental Scientist, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, Environmental Protection Agency, 1992-1998.

8.   Robert B. Westbrook, "The Challenge of Reinhold Niebuhr," in <u>John Dewey and American Democracy</u>. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991, pp. 521-532.

9.   Allan Bloom. <u>The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished the Souls of Today's Students</u>. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987, pp. 29-30.

10.   Richard MacIntosh, Ed. D. "The Destruction of Individualism," <u>The Wall Street Journal</u>, Wednesday, April 23, 1997, p. A19.

11.   Loc. Cit., p. A19.

12.   Loc. Cit., p. A19.

13.   Gideon Sjoberg and Roger Nett. <u>A Methodology for Social Research: With a New Introductory Essay</u>. Prospect Heights, ILL: Waveland Press, Inc., "Reflective Methodology: The Foundations of Social Inquiry," 1997, p. 64.

14.   "Peirce was dismissed from Johns Hopkins in 1884 in circumstances that have never been fully disclosed, and he was never able to regain another academic post." Israel Scheffler, <u>Four Pragmatists: A Critical Introduction to Peirce, James, Mead, and Dewey</u>. Routledge and Kegan Paul, London and New York, 1974, p. 13.

15.   Nathan House and Christian Kloesel, Editors. <u>The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings</u>, Volume 1 (1867-1893), Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1992, p. XL.

16.   Charles Sanders Peirce. <u>Reasoning and the Logic of Things: The Cambridge Conferences Lectures of 1898</u>. Edited by Kenneth Laine Ketner, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1992, p. 55.

17.   James Hoopes, Editor. <u>Peirce on Signs</u>. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991, pp. 5, 7, and 12.   Semeiotics is the difference between an "idea" and a "sign." Peirce held that a sign had no meaning until it became interpreted by a subsequent thought which became the interpretant. When an individual becomes aware of the thought, his understanding is translated into an action to observe the "sign." The process underlying the sign interpretation is the result of a "process of intelligence."

18.   Ibid., p. 12.

19.   Jeffrey Barnouw. "'Aesthetic' for Schiller and Peirce: A Neglected Origin of Pragmatism," <u>Journal of the History of Ideas</u>. Vol. 49, 1988, p. 608.

20.   Ibid., p. 31.

21.   Hoopes, p. 150.

22.   Francis Reilly. <u>Charles Peirce's Theory of Scientific Method</u>. New York: Fordham University Press, 1970, p. 37.

23.   Ibid., p. 36.

24.   Reilly, pp. 25-27.

25.   Ibid., p. 28.

26.   Ibid., p. 29.

27.   Ibid., p. 29.

28.   Ibid., p. 54. Peirce preferred to call it pragmaticism.

29.   Houser, Nathan and Christian Kloesel, Editors. The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings, Volume 1 (1867-1893), Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1992, p. xxii.

30.   Reilly, p. 55.

31.   The verification process includes the deductive and the inductive phase. Deduction is the prediction of what possible experiments will result from the hypothesis. Induction is "the experimental testing of a theory". See Reilly, pp. 59-63.

32.   Ibid., pp. 72-76.

33.   Ibid., p. 77.

34.   Ibid., p. 24.

35.   Ibid., p. 134.

36.   Ibid., p. 95.

37.   Ibid., p. 99.

38.   Ibid., p. 102.

39.   Hoopes, p. 166.

40.   Reilly, p. 110.

41.   Mary Parker Follett. "Ch. VIII, The Process of Control," The Science of Administration. 1932, pp. 161-169.

42.   John Dewey. Experience and Education. "Social Control," The Kappa Delta Pi Lecture Series. Toronto, Ontario: Collier-Macmillan Canada Ltd. Tenth Printing, 1969, pp. 51-60.

43.   Reilly, pp. 135-143.

44.   Ibid., p. 134.

45.   Peirce proposed that we develop an idea through stereographic viewing. "What we believe to be true is an idea which represents a discovery of a relationship, and is a

third view." See Reilly, p. 53.

46.   Kevelson, p. 126.

47.   Kevelson, p. 11.

48.   Roberta Kevelson. <u>Charles S. Peirce's Method of Methods</u>.
Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin s Publishing Company, 1987, p. 69.

49.   Ibid., pp. 69-77.

50.   Ibid., p. 69.

51.   Elaine A. Lailas. "100 Years of Achievement: Part IV: 1962-1981," <u>Graduate</u>
<u>Woman</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women, Volume 75,
Number 3, May/June, 1981, p. 28.

52.   Ibid., p. 135.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This literature review focuses on those writings in the field of public administration that have addressed the citizen's role in governance. I have found the literature to be a diverse offering of a variety of insights and opinions mostly indifferent or hostile to the idea of citizen involvement. Even though the idea of *citizen participation* has been discussed, especially in the sixties and seventies, this review will reveal that a *model* for citizenship in the full Aristotelian sense of *partnership* in governance in administration is lacking. The literature will show on the whole that the citizen is seen as an individual seeking something in return for his participation--and mostly in an indirect way. By contrast, Aristotle articulated the fact that a citizen has two roles to play in the public arena--the personal and the public. Dewey also sees the citizen function in a dual capacity--on the one hand, serving as the voice for the common good and, on the other, serving to receive personal benefits. The public administration literature is devoid of the citizens' public role in a democracy. It appears that the public administration literature on the citizens' role concentrates on citizens seeking redress from government or pursuing government subsidy, rights, and/or privileges for individual or interest group benefit.

In 1968, Judith V. May was asked by Professor Aaron Wildavsky of the University of California at Berkeley to write a background paper for a conference he would be attending on "Citizen Involvement in Urban Affairs," in essence, summarizing what is known about citizen participation. According to May, she

found little "in the existing literature on participation . . . ."[1] Even the case-studies had "severe limitations."[2] As a staff member of the Oakland Project, she observed the Oakland poverty and Model Cities program. In writing her review and subsequently after many attempts to re-write, she found that she remained critical of the works of others.

Democratic Theories

The organizational foundations of what we have come to know as Classical Democracy occurred during the Fifth and Fourth Centuries, B.C., according to Herodotus. This ancient or classical model will be introduced and discussed in Chapter IV in the historical development of citizenship and community. This discussion in Chapter II will focus on the democratic theories after the American and French revolutions.

Carole Pateman leads us to look at democratic theory to find clues as to why the void exists in public administration literature. In her book, Participation and Democratic Theory, she outlines succinctly and distinctly the dilemma we find ourselves in the discussion of democratic theory and participation. She also came to the same conclusion of others that citizen participation may have been popular in the sixties and seventies, especially among students, however, political theorists of the time found the concept of citizen participation as a myth promulgated by classical theorists on democracy. Democracy theorists, such as Mosca and Michaels, were among the first to state that participatory democracy was an impossibility.[3] It was Joseph Schumpeter, the economist, who declared that the democratic theory needed to be revised.[4] Berelson wrote in Voting (1954) that the problem with the classical theory of democracy is that it focused on the individual citizen. He favored limited participation and apathy as a positive force in serving to counter any factions or disagreements.[5] Robert Dahl, in A Preface to Democratic Theory (1956) and Hierarchy, Democracy and Bargaining in Politics and Economics (1956), proposes a modern theory of

democracy. He believes in a form of polyarchy that places the rule of authority in multiple minorities. He supports his argument by stating individuals have the power to switch their allegiance from one leader to another. This gives the assurance that leaders will be held accountable and responsive to citizens.[6] G. Sartori, in his book Democratic Theory (1962), concludes that we do not have to worry about citizen's apathy. He believed that the democratic ideal needed to be played down and not emphasized. So he, too, fell in the same category as stating that the classical theory of democracy expressing maximum participation was a 'myth.'[7] H. Eckstein in his book, A Theory of Stable Democracy (1966), focuses on the importance of maintaining stability in government. This stability can be attained by steering away from a pure democracy towards a "balance of disparate elements" and a "healthy element of authoritarianism."[8]

The critics of the contemporary theory of democracy, as Pateman came to call it, agree that the classical theorists had been misunderstood. Pateman, having exposed the so-called myth of the classical theorists and the modern, contemporary theorists of democracy, leads us to re-defining democracy again with the intention of including maximum and authentic participation. Pateman re-introduces her readers to the thinking of J. S. Mill and Rousseau.   Rousseau is more an expounder of participatory democracy to mean what Pateman calls a "participatory society."[9] The purpose of the citizen's role in participation is more than to maintain a stable representative government as John Stuart Mill implies. It is Pateman who declares that the "critics of contemporary theory of democracy have never explained exactly what the role of participation in the earlier theories is or why such a high value was placed upon it in some theories."[10] However, L. Davis (1964) tells us that the earlier theories of participatory democracy were very ambitious because it included educating the public as a governmental responsibility. He added that the theories left open an unfinished agenda.[11] Davis felt that education together with political activity in the broad spectrum needed to be included. G. D. H. Cole developed his theory of participatory democracy as it relates to an industrialized society in the form of civic guilds. His

democratic theory of Guild Socialism is a "theory of association."[12]

Rousseau, Mill, and Cole's theory of participatory democracy "is built round the central assertion that individuals and their institutions cannot be considered in isolation from one another."[13] As this paper briefly discusses the theory of democracy, it must be pointed out again that theorists such as Schumpeter propelled the discussion away from true democracy. This tenor of academic orthodoxy on the subject of democratic theory steered many academicians in the vortex of a paternalistic form of democracy. Many theorists have attempted to steer the course towards a more centrist view. This literature review will demonstrate how far off political theorists and public administration theorists have been thrown off course. Instead of expressing themselves from the perspective of the citizen, the theorists speak from the public administrator's perspective, all in the name of service on behalf of the people.

Organization, Political Science, and Public Administration Theorists

Political scientists, economists, and political sociologists since 1776 up to 1850 have been writing about citizen participation for a long time. On the other hand, according to May, organization theorists and public administrators--the group on which I focus here--had just become involved in the subject. Since the organization theorists and public administrators are a diversely-identified group, some overlap between the different disciplines occurs, but on the whole, the public administration literature is the focus.

In answering his own question as to why there was dissatisfaction with current opportunities for public participation, Herbert Kaufman responded:

> Fundamentally, because substantial (though minority) segments of the population apparently believe the political, economic, and social systems have not delivered to them fair--even minimally fair-- shares of the system's benefits and rewards, and because they think they cannot win their appropriate shares in those benefits and rewards through the political institutions of the country as these are

now constituted.[14]

Kaufman directs our attention to the fact that the "new demands for participation have centered primarily on administrative agencies."[15] The focus is on public administration and also on public administrators and other public officials. Charles Lindblom focuses on public administrators and officials rather than citizens (voters). Lindblom and Berelson focus on how decision makers resolve conflicts among competing groups rather than on the effects on the recipients of the decision and how the decisions were reached.[16]

William C. Loring, Frank L. Sweetser, and Charles F. Ernst believe that citizen participation should be used for certain *policy* goals to be achieved; for example, urban renewal. On the other hand, James Q. Wilson states that "participation of certain groups may jeopardize urban renewal"[17] policies. Junius Williams prepared a paper for the National Academy of Public Administration, in 1970, and in essence, "used citizen participation in order to alter the city's housing policy. . . . He strove for personal and organizational integration in order to facilitate the achievement of his goal, not as an end in itself, proving that public participation does not replace public policy in solving the problems of the poor. . . ."[18] These discussions of citizen participation were seen from the administrator's perspective as serving the purposes of the public administrator.

In discussing the negative conclusions of public choice theory as applied to the Third World, John D. Montgomery feels that the theory proposes the fact that when community action is practiced, the fruits of their labor are "taken over by the rich and powerful."[19] However, he, too, concludes that "popular participation is certainly not crucial for all policy actions, but it becomes so when governments want to change public behavior."[20] Once again, government is seen as coopting citizens in order to change public behavior or achieve a goal. The values inherent in the premise of citizen participation in a democracy are overlooked.

Democratic Workplace Theorists/Practices

Relying on the works of Maslow and Rogers, Chris Argyris believes that "nonhierarchical structures provide settings which encourage integrating individual and organizational goals."[21] These are democratic settings that promote self-responsibility, self-control, self-reliability, commitment, and dependability. In discussing participation in the workplace, McGregor (1960) exclaims that participation is a highly "misunderstood idea."[22] However, participation does depend on a positive environment for it to be practiced by all employees. Sawtell (1968) adds to this definition that the processes must be in place for individuals, other than managers, to have input in decision making. Lammers (1967) stresses the importance of the legitimacy of participation. Participation is important when it is legitimized that all concerned are an integral part of the decision-making processes.[23] Likert does not exactly use the term of participation but alludes to the process as a continuum. He felt that individuals, in order to be able to deliberate in decision-making, must have the requisite information. All of these theorists point to the direction of democratic processes, as well as, democratic environments in physical settings and atmosphere.

Larry Lane and James Wolf state: People who share a community participate in discussion and decision-making, and also share certain priorities which define the nature of that community . . . .[24] Lane and Wolf explain community to mean the community of people in the Federal workplace. But one can expand their ideas to include citizen participation in the development of community and commitment in governmental service.   This reinforces Argyris' underlying theme that democratic settings encourage the bonding of the individual and organization in a community sense, not in a cooptative manner.

May concludes that "an agency's responsiveness to citizen participants will increase with the agency's dependence upon them for defining and implementing its primary functions."[25] It seems that when power is shared, the public administrator and the citizen participants change the way benefits are

distributed. In other words, when public policy decision-making processes are restricted to a few inside the bureaucracy, the few may sidestep the mission statements and goals of the agency and supplant democratic processes. The end result is the proliferation of strategies that obliterate and deconstruct democratic values of equality, representativeness, and fairness.

Frances Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward point out that regionalism is being imposed upon localities creating another level of bureaucracy. They conclude that "federal administrations formulate policy in order to create constituencies as well as to respond to their demands, and changes in political structure are frequently manipulated with this intent."[26]

Social Reform Theorists

An agency established during the reform period in the early part of the 1900's and that enhanced the idea of citizen participation was the New York Bureau of Municipal Research.[27] The focus of the Bureau was twofold--"training for citizenship and for professional public service."[28] The New York Bureau of Municipal Research had in all its intent and purposes to fulfill the promise of the democratic ideal of training citizens on how to participate in the governing processes. The train began to take up steam and "training for citizenship" and "training for professional public service" merged in laying the groundwork for the expert class. The citizen's role was left waiting at the station for another day in the sun. The social reformers, influenced by Taylor's Scientific Management principles, believed in "training for citizenship", but having citizens involved in government management processes was not part of the training. Citizen participation beyond the rights of suffrage had not been thoroughly developed.

Leonard D. White noted that in the practice of public administration, Hamiltonian doctrine ruled while people echoed Jeffersonian participatory democracy. White's perspective on modern American government reflects a system of administration that strongly follows Hamiltonian ideals and ignores

popular preferences once set in motion by Jefferson.[29]

Follett championed a participative management style and believed that change was synonymous with social interaction.[30] In Follett's "The Process of Control", she focused her attention on the relational aspects of people in authority over workers (citizens). Follett persuaded her audiences to her way of thinking that "self-generated control"[31] was the only form of acceptable control. Follett's ideas helped to forge with democratic ideals of citizen participation and self-government consistent with Dewey. However, her choice of words, I. e. "process of control" and her emphasis on management in the bulk of her work seem to obscure any implications for a new state promoting democratic processes. The net effect of her influence seemed to fall on deaf ears until Follett's work was rediscovered decades later.

Other writers of Papers on the Science of Administration discuss management processes but confined their arguments to business. The science of administration that they contributed to was then thought to be applied to government. The science of administration did not translate well to democratic processes of government. Their arguments could not be extended to include citizens as part of the governance processes. This fact may have contributed to further removing citizen participation from public administration. As presidential administrations and legislatures struggled throughout the years to become more responsive to citizens in their rhetoric, presidential commissions were established to *fix* government. The *fix* came in the form of efficiency, economy, and effectiveness. As a result, active citizen involvement became more elusive.

Citizenship and Public Service Theorists

Lippman and Schumpeter are among the few critics who relate citizen participation and community to public service. They complemented each other's beliefs that citizens should leave governance to the "experts." Lippman stated that as citizens, "we are all in effect 'outsiders' . . . . every one of us is an

outsider to all but a few aspects of modern life, has neither the time, nor attention, nor interest, nor the equipment for specific judgment. It is on the men inside, working under conditions that are sound, that the daily administrations of society must rest."[32]

Schumpeter believed that citizens should maintain the responsibility of keeping the electoral process working but should leave the responsibility of administration to the experts. This appears to be a paternalistic treatment towards citizens as if they were children--to be seen and not heard. He also stated, "A well-trained bureaucracy of good standing and tradition is another necessity, and the electorate should exhibit self control and a large measure of tolerance for difference of opinion."[33]

Berelson observes three necessary levels of citizen involvement.[34] Each level serves to soften the shock of disagreement, adjustment, and change. The three levels of involvement are apathy, limited and moderate. He considered the amount of present citizen participation adequate to meet the requirements of a stable democracy. In his book Voting (1954), Berelson, Lazarsfeld, and McPhee, "argue that the political system benefits when individuals participate at different rates. He rejects the high standards for citizen participation and competence set by traditional democratic theory; by these standards, most citizens lack sufficient political interest, knowledge, principle, and rationality."[35] William Kornhauser senses the discontent and apathy of individuals, but knows community groups traditionally provide cohesiveness. He believes citizen participation mediates the tension between the masses and the elites.[36]

Terrence E. Cook and Patrick M. Morgan seem to be expressing the same fears that the Federalists feared during the Founding Period. "It would be sadly ironic if those who advocate escaping manipulation via participatory democracy became, in the end, manipulators themselves for the good of the people."[37]   James Madison wrote in Federalist Paper #10 that "the public good is disregarded in the conflicts of rival parties."[38] Cook and Morgan feel that many

advocates of participatory democracy oppose government by experts. My observation of this statement is that most proponents of participatory democracy do not mention public administrators in their writings.

Critics of Theorists/Practices

Neil Riemer blames the modern liberal democrats for losing faith in the common people and the common good, thus charging them with an elitist point of view. "They pay lip service to popular government, but they really mean representative government; they are very suspicious of a greater measure of participatory democracy."[39] This may be a critique of pluralism and the proponents of special interests. However, Riemer proposes his own form of popular democracy. He stresses the importance of democratic and constitutional principles for future democratic political order. He adds religious and scientific tenets to his proposals for the future of democracy. It is my belief that Riemer stretches the meaning of the Constitution in his proposals.

Clarke E. Cochran believes our troubles stem from individualism. "The heart is lonely because autonomous individualism teaches that each person is to make himself, to define himself, and to form and live his own moral and spiritual principles."[40] He feels pluralism must be part of the theory of political community for the value of diversity. He explains that interest-group pluralism is a variance from the norm. Cochran identifies commitment and responsibility as components of the kind of character needed for community governance.

Robert A. Dahl seems to capture the tension and confusion of what should constitute citizen participation. His is an elitist point of view. He uses Locke and Rousseau to weld two different principles of citizenship into one. On the one hand the principle is universal and yet is limiting. He states that: "Every person subject to a government and its laws has an unqualified right to be a member of the demos (i.e., a citizen)."[41] The tension between the elitist group and the common man exemplifies itself in this dual principle. This limiting

principle was the intention of the Founders and can be applied to the Federal Service. It set the norm for public service. A public servant is considered to be a citizen with full rights and privileges; however, the public servant is limited in exercising full participation in political activities by the Hatch Act. Dahl claims that citizens are barred three times from maximum participation because of the majority of the people's limited resources, their apathy, and Madison's constitutional checks and balances.[42]

Dahl perceived that the tensions between pluralism and democracy continue to exist. John Stuart Mill, a champion for individual involvement, helped to set the norm for this tension. According to Dahl, Mill "undermined his own argument for universal inclusion."[43] As Stein Rokkan remarked, "Votes count, but often organizational resources decide."[44] However, Charles Merriam, a liberal scholar, viewed community power as an effective measure to control their leaders.[45]

Hugh Miller remembered the participant "who urged that we put the public back into the public administration we profess."[46] "The demos itself has been ignored if not polemicized into oblivion, and skepticism that the public interest exists resonates widely, unfortunately."[47]

Chester A. Newland speaks strongly about the effects of "deinstitutionalization and partisan politicization . . . on the positive heritage from our past. American public administration is acutely alienated from society, bedeviled by complexity, and guided by limited knowledge and understanding."[48] Laurence J. O'Toole is not so hard on public administration but feels that it, too, is in a developmental mode. "American public administration has retained an orthodoxy of reform in its continuing series of attempts to reconcile the tensions between democracy and bureaucracy."[49]   O'Toole captures the sense of the not quite yet emerging model for citizen involvement in American public administration.

In 1980, Marilyn Gittell declared that the attempts at citizen involvement in the sixties and seventies created a dismal legacy for the eighties. She asserted,

"advocates of citizen participation have more reason to despair now than they did ten years ago."[50] Why this despair? One has to remember how the subject of "citizen participation" inundated public administration and political science literature in the sixties and the seventies. "Cit Pat" became synonymous with "boring." By 1978, citizen participation in practice as experienced by public administrators proved to be ineffective, problematic, and a waste of time on the part of public administrators.

Participatory Democracy Today

On the contrary, Daniel Elazar sees the future of democracy in the light of citizenship and community as ". . . a turning from the reified state--exclusive sovereignty--centralism syndrome toward one of partnership, negotiation, and sharing."[51] Gary Wamsley describes effective participation as "a real sharing of power and taking a part in decision-making."[52]

Perspectives emerging and converging on the horizon envision the future of governance and citizen participation, through concepts such as: "Strong Democracy," "Agency Perspective," "Agential Leader," "Lingua Franca," "Community and Commitment," and "Community of Knowledge." Such concepts have emerged from a different kind of literature. Benjamin R. Barber's A Strong Democracy suggests a theory of participatory politics for a new age.[53] Strong Democracy is a "distinctly modern form of participatory democracy. It rests on the idea of self-governing community of citizens who are united by homogeneous interests . . . ."[54]

Barber grounded his theory on Thomas Jefferson's philosophy of democratization--"I know of no safe depository of the ultimate power of the society but the people themselves, and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome discretion, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion."[55] Thomas Jefferson, a strong advocate of public education in America, believed that the way to empower citizens is to

educate them. Jefferson promoted knowledge to empower citizens.

Camilla Stivers grounds her idea of active citizenship on the concept of a "community of knowledge." In developing her thesis, "Toward a Community of Knowledge: Active Citizens in the Administrative State," Stivers interprets Wamsley's Agency Perspective:

> "The agency perspective thus acts as a 'city' within which to practice active citizenship, as administrative discretion grounded in the accountability that develops out of face-to-face interaction and dialogue, and situated by agency memory and contextual insight, expands the public space to include those the Founders left out so long ago."[56]

Stivers promotes a community of knowledge. "In such a community, all members possess inherent knowledgeability and membership is open to anyone who desires it."[57]   Stivers extends her definition of the knowledge community. "The notion of a knowledge community is an extension of the view that knowledge has its genesis in restricted intersubjective agreements about meaning, argued in Thomas Kuhn's theory of paradigms."[58] This is Peircean in thought as it blends two very important concepts of Peirce's definition of the scientific method. The mind of the community is basic in establishing any communication between individuals that help to build an epistemological basis for discussion. The epistemological basis sets the stage for responsibility and commitment to be felt by the participants. The language used and understood by the community serves as a bonding tool for building trust and commitment. This trust facilitates the process by which individuals in the expressions of their ideas develop their community of ideas.   The community of ideas then become the stepping stones for taking action in achieving goals and objectives.

Cynthia McSwain and Orion White state that the public administrator must serve as a "mediator of meaning." McSwain and White advocate creating a lingua franca.   In order for this to be accomplished in the public sector, the primary objective would be to develop a lingua franca. This would be a

"fundamental task of creating a lingua franca by which value issues can be discussed."[59]

Barber believes in a public language to transform into the strong democratic conception of politics. A Strong Democracy "seeks to create a public language that will help reformulate private interests in terms susceptible to public accommodations;. . . ."[60] To achieve a public language, Barber developed nine functions of strong democratic talk:

1. The articulation of interests; bargaining and exchange.
2. Persuasion.
3. Agenda-setting.
4. Exploring mutuality.
5. Affiliation and affection.
6. Maintaining autonomy.
7. Witness and self-expression.
8. Reformulation and reconceptualization.
9. Community-building as the creation of public interests, common goods, and active citizens.[61]

Barber identifies three kinds of leadership for a strong democracy. They are: transitional leadership on the model of the founder; facilitating leadership as a foil for natural hierarchy and a guarantor of participatory institutions; and moral leadership as a source of community.[62] One can imply that Barber's strong democracy means self-government. However, the three kinds of leadership appear to be very much like Wamsley's agential leader. "An Agency Perspective can only be functional for the political system if agents and principals hold one another in mutual respect. Agents must respect their principal(s) whether that means "the people", voters, the legislature, president, or some other constitutional superior."[63]

Wamsley's Agency Perspective and the Agential Leader converge with the ideas of Barber with regard to the democratic principle of active citizenship. According to Wamsley, the Agential Perspective is not possible without politics in

pursuit of the common good and the presence of active citizenship.[64] Wamsley further believes that Agency can serve as a focal point of interest and participation as well as an access point for citizen involvement in the policy subsystem.[65]

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) found that citizen participation processes tend to help citizens feel closer to individual programs.[66]

To reiterate the potential effectiveness of citizen participation, Barber's definition of participation links citizen and community. "Participation . . . enhances the power of communities and endows them with a moral force that nonparticipatory rulership rarely achieves. Moreover, in enhancing the power of communities, participation enlarges their scope of action."[67]

Barber seems to capture the essence of the potential power of citizen participation. "Politics gives the power of human promise. For the first time the possibilities of transforming private into public, dependency into interdependency, conflict into cooperation, license into self-legislation, need into love, and bondage into citizenship are placed in a context of participation."[68] Barber's theory of strong democracy offers a different "and more vigorous response: it envisions politics not as a way of life but as a way of living... ."[69]

However, something is lacking from this literature. It appears that these perspectives still see the knowledge base for participation as being objectively grounded, meaning that, in the end, the experts will potentially be able to trump the citizens. The participation is focused on politics, and the mention of public administration is minuscule. If the government agency or agent and citizen are mentioned in the same writings, the focus is on the private role of citizens--the attainment of public goods for one's personal use, not for the greater good. Dewey, on the other hand, following Peirce, sees the knowledge base as developing from and being critically dependent upon community process for validation. Hence, only citizens, through community process, can make

knowledge; and experts alone, without citizens, cannot ever really possess knowledge. This is why an adequate model of democratic citizenship requires something like Dewey's thought as a foundation. The citizens experiences become part of the knowledge base in the deliberation among public administrators and citizens as part of the democratic process.

Gawthrop serves as a guide in developing Deweyan thought. He has great faith in public administration to forge a bond between the individual citizen and government as they did previously. Gawthrop called an alert to public administrators to develop a model of citizenship in public administration by doing the following:

1. Developing ethical values of "faith, trust, and loyalty" that public administrators can inculcate into the relationships it develops with individual citizens;

2. Developing the "soul of government" in order for citizens to renew their faith in government; and

3. Exercising their energy to provide the ethical bases needed to effect a "faith" in government.[70]

CONCLUSION

It is important to conduct a survey of democratic theory as it has been understood, translated, and re-interpreted as it has evolved from just an ideal. Interestingly, from the classical theorists of democracy to the present day, the ideal of democracy has been to have an active, educated, participating citizenry. This ideal has been thwarted by those theorists who have claimed that participatory democracy is a myth. These theorists further claim that the myth has been promulgated over the centuries as a way to allay any fears citizens may have that their individual rights and sovereignty had been taken away. Pateman alerts us in her book, Participation and Democratic Theory, to this fact and presents the theorists who have been identified as either classical

36

democracy theorists, modern democracy theorists or contemporary democracy theorists.

The understanding of citizen participation has developed in various ways in the United States. Public institutions are discovering that citizen participation develops communities of support. Dialogue between public administrators and citizens binds them into a community.   This dialogue is what Peirce describes as a necessary key concept of his scientific method. The point must be made that citizen participation exists at all levels of government but mostly at the local level. Pateman gives credence to this point when she enlists Mill and Cole who state that individuals 'learn democracy' at the local level.[71] The range of citizen involvement,   effectiveness, and influence is broad from a "merely rubber stamp effort to where citizens and policy makers feel citizens did affect the setting of priorities."[72] Daniel Elazar in his Postmodern Epoch, states: "A public is a community that is . . . characterized by its civic character and political expression."[73] We can characterize the opportunity for citizen participation as expanding democratic principles.

An educated citizenry is an absolute necessity for participatory democracy to flourish. It is understood that this includes public administrators and bureaucrats. Participatory democracy will flourish within public administration institutions, as well as, within the citizenry. This can happen as "a community of knowledge," or "a lingua franca," or "strong democratic talk" is developed and becomes the foundation upon which public policy decisions are made. This is the "best hope for our civilization's democratic aspirations."[74]

The ideas are converging for the most promising hope for the future governance of American public administrative institutions. The best hope for the future of American public administrative institutions are those ideas with vision. The Agency Perspective, the Agential Leader, a Lingua Franca, Community and Commitment, Strong Democracy, and a Community of Knowledge are those with vision. According to Nancy Roberts, "Public deliberation, as a cornerstone of the generative approach to general management in the public sector, is an emerging

form of social interaction used to set direction for government agencies."[75] Will these be grounded as norms for the future of governance of the administrative state? Barber concludes that there is one road to freedom and it lies in democracy. He further implies that our best hope for the future, as two hundred years ago, is for America to be America, self-governing, democratic, and free.[76]

What is Deweyan in thought today is reminiscent of the thinking of Rousseau, Mill, and Cole when they each state that we "learn to participate by participating and that feelings of political efficacy are more likely to be developed in a participatory environment."[77] Pateman raises the question whether it is necessary to have participation in all segments of society. Of course, Dewey had already indicated a positive answer to that question to include religion. Pateman argues in support of participation in all spheres as a way of forging the meaning between the public and private role of individuals. Pateman claims that it is this view that has been "lost" in the contemporary theory of democracy.[78] Pateman concludes that, "we can still have a modern, viable theory of democracy which retains the notion of participation at its heart."[79] Gawthrop promotes his faith in public administration to rise up to the occasion in rescuing and revitalizing the faith of citizens in government.

The glue that binds the whole of the developing American democracy is the philosophy of John Dewey. His writings will fill in the gaps of the emerging public administration literature on citizen involvement. John Dewey's writings are "a feel of the whole," as expressed by Mary Schmidt[80] and "a feeling for the organism," as expressed by Barbara McClintock[81] in her research methods.   The strength of the developing American democracy can only occur when the knowledge base of governance is grounded in the community. Governance from this knowledge base legitimates the dialogue between citizens and public administrators.   John Dewey's pragmatism links citizenship and community with public administration in the governance of our developing American Democracy.

Endnotes

1.   Judith V. May. <u>Citizen Participation: A Review of the Literature</u>. Berkeley, California: University of California, at Davis, Institute of Governmental Affairs, Summer, 1968, p. iv.

2.   Ibid., p. iv.

3.   Carole Pateman. <u>Participation and Democratic Theory</u>. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970, p. 2.

4.   Ibid., p. 3.   From Schumpeter's book, <u>Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy</u> (1943).

5.   Ibid., p. 6.

6.   Ibid., p. 8.

7.   Ibid., p. 10.

8.   Ibid., p. 13.

9.   Ibid., p. 20.

10.   Ibid., p. 21.

11.   Ibid., p. 21.

12.   Ibid., p. 36.

13.   Ibid., p. 42.

14.   Ibid., p. 1.

15.   Ibid., p. 1.

16.   Ibid., p. 4.

17.   Ibid., p. 9.

18.   Ibid., pp. 18-19.

19.   John D. Montgomery. Bureaucrats and People: Grassroots Participation in Third World Development. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988, p. xiii.

20.   Ibid., p. xii.

21.   Ibid., p. 31.

22.   Pateman, p. 67.

23.   Ibid., p. 67.

24.   Larry M. Lane and James Wolf. Chapter 5: "The Search for Commitment and Community in the Federal Service," The Human Resource Crises in the Public Sector: Rebuilding the Capacity to Govern. Westport, CT: 1990, p. 126.

25.   May, p. 39.

26.   Ibid., p. 29.

27.   Chester A. Newland. Public Administration and Community: Realism in the Practice of Ideals. Public Administration Service, November, 1984, p. 12.

28.   Ibid., p. 10.

29.   Lynton K. Caldwell. The Administrative Theories of Hamilton and Jefferson: Their Contribution to Thought on Public Administration. Second Edition, New York: Holmes and Meier, 1988, p. ix.

30.   Elliot M. Fox and L. Urwick. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett. New York: Hippocrene Books, Inc., Second Edition, 1982, p. 1.

31.   Mary Parker Follett. "The Process of Control," The final lecture in a series at London School of Economics, 1932, p. 168.

32.   Carol S. Weissert. "Citizen Participation in the American Federal System," Washington, D.C.: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, August, 1979, SuDoc#Y3, p. 31.

33.   Ibid., p. 31.

34.   Ibid., p. 33.

35.   May, p. 2.

36.   Weissert, p. 39.

37.   Terrence E. Cook and Patrick M. Morgan. Participatory Democracy. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1971, p. 33.

38.   Michael Loyd Chadwick, Ed. The Federalist. "Securing the Public Good and Private Rights Against the Dangers of Faction," by James Madison, p. 45.

39.   Neil Riemer. The Future of the Democratic Revolution: Toward a More Prophetic Politics. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1984, p. 89.

40.   Clarke E. Cochran. Character, Community, and Politics. University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1982, p. 3.

41.   Robert A. Dahl. Democracy, Liberty, and Equality. Oxford, OX: Norwegian University Press, distributed by Oxford University Press, 1986, p. 209.

42.   Pateman, p. 9.

43.   Dahl, p. 210.

44.   Ibid., p. 243.

45.   David M. Ricci. Community Power and Democratic Theory. New York: Random House, 1971, p. 45.

46.   Hugh Miller. "Democratic Discourse for Public Administration," Dialogue. Green Bay, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1988, p. 16.

47.   Ibid., p. 15.

48.   Chester A. Newland. Public Administration and Community: Realism in the Practice of Ideals. Public Administration Service, November, 1984, pp. 5-6.

49.   Laurence J. O'Toole, Jr. "American Public Administration and The Idea of Reform," Administration & Society, Vol. 16, No. 2, August, 1984, p. 141.

50.   Marilyn Gittell. Limits to Citizen Participation: The Decline of Community Organizations. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980, p. 241.

51.   Daniel Elazar. Exploring Federalism. "Will the Postmodern Epoch Be an Era of Federalism," University, Alabama: University of Alabama, 1987, Ch. 7, p. 265.

52.   Gary L. Wamsley. "Imaging the Public Organization as an Agency and the Public Administrator as Agential Leader," Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, April, 1988, p. 22.

53.   Benjamin R. Barber. Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age. University of California Press, Berkeley, 1984, p. 6.

54.   Ibid., p. 23.

55.   Ibid., p. 6.

56.   Camilla Stivers. <u>Toward a Community of Knowledge: Active Citizens in the Administrative State</u>, The Evergreen State College, Olympia, Washington, 98505, April, 1988, p. 37.

57.   Ibid., p. 24.

58.   Ibid., p. 24.

59.   Orion F. White, Jr., and Cynthia J. McSwain. "The Phoenix Project: Raising a New Image of Public Administration from the Ashes of the Past," in Henry D. Kass and Bayard L. Catron (eds.) <u>Images and Identities in Public Administration</u>. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing Co., 1990, pp. 23-59.

60.   Barber, p. 119.

61.   Ibid., p. 178.

62.   Ibid., p. 239.

63.   Gary L. Wamsley. "Imaging the Public Organization as an Agency and the Public Administrator as Agential Leader," Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, April, 1988, p. 22.

64.   Gary L. Wamsley. "The Agency Perspective: Public Administrators as Agential Leaders," <u>Refounding Public Administration</u>. Newbury Park, California: 1990, pp. 130-131.

65.   Ibid., p. 150.

66.   Weissert, p. 10.

67.   Barber, p. 8.

68.   Ibid., p. 120.

69.   Ibid., p. 118. I found his comment regarding communitarians interesting; therefore, I refrained from using that term in this paper. Here is a continuation of the quote cited: "There they are secure from the manipulation of those bogus communitarians who appeal to the human need for communion and for a purpose higher than private, material interests only in order to enslave humankind."

70.   Gawthrop, pp. 210-215.

71.   Pateman, p. 38.

72.   Weissert, p. 10.

73.   Daniel Elazar. "Will the Postmodern Epoch Be an Era of Federalism," <u>Exploring Federalism</u>. Ch. 7, p. 265.

74.   Barber, p. 245.

75.   Nancy Roberts, "Public Deliberation: An Alternative Approach to Crafting Policy and Setting Direction," <u>PAR: Public Administration Review</u>. Washington, D.C., March/April, 1997, Volume 57, No. 2., pp. 124-131.

76.   Barber, p. xvi.

77.   Pateman, p. 105.

78.   Ibid., p. 110.

79.   Ibid., p. 111.

80.   Mary R. Schmidt. "Grout: Alternative Kinds of Knowledge and Why They Are Ignored," <u>PAR: Public Administration Review</u>. Washington, D.C., November/December, 1993, Volume 53, No.6, pp. 525-530.

81.   Evelyn Fox Keller. <u>A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock</u>. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1983, p. 198.

CHAPTER III

CITIZENSHIP IN AMERICA--IN THE BEGINNING--AND THEN GOVERNANCE AS PRACTICED BY CITIZENS WITH THE ONSET OF THE EXPERT ELITES

> "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;...."--*The Declaration of Independence*

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to give an historical perspective of the practice of citizenship in America. It will demonstrate that the original cultural ethos of America was basically self-government and that the transfer to a representative government was an epistemic shift that was not generally understood but passively accepted by the people. It will show that at the turn of the century, in the context of a groundswell of social reform, progressivism, and muckracking, the development of public administration emerged. This was a time for fundamental change that posed the options of either forming a pragmatic government that involved full citizenship or in forming a government of expert policy making. Government by expert policy makers was chosen in lieu of full citizenship--since this option served as a re-enforcement of the representative form of government set up in the Constitution. The attempts at strengthening representative government continues to go against the grain of the

44

cultural ethos of self government by citizens.

The American government belongs to the people. That is spelled out very clearly and plainly in The Declaration of Independence. The years prior to and immediately following the Revolution of 1776, the government as defined in the first constitution was highly democratic, with a great emphasis on popular sovereignty and decentralization of governmental authority.   A democratic form of government existed in colonial times. Let us take a moment to examine how the colonies were established and how they functioned in the colonial era.

Colonial Self-Government from Imperial Control.[1]

The three forms of government that were established in the colonies were either corporate, royal, or proprietary. For example, Massachusetts' charter established a corporate colony. The corporate colonies were usually formed as a joint-stock company. The incorporated company's charter served as a mini-constitution. But something happened in the forming of these colonies. The Massachusetts Bay Colony, for example, established a self-governing commonwealth even though the original charter was formed as a joint-stock company. With some changes made along the way, the charter became the framework for the constitution of Massachusetts, which became a model for other self-governing colonies. Even though the governor was to be appointed by the King, the Massachusetts colonists elected their own governor.

Virginia became a royal colony. Virginia's governor was appointed by the King. The governor had responsibility for carrying out orders from the King; he oversaw the military and advised the assemblymen.   The royal form of government became the form preferred by England in establishing future colonies as well as in re-establishing existing colonies.

Maryland, on the other hand, became a proprietary colony, the first of the continental colonies. A proprietary colony was one that was established in someone's name rather than in the name of a trading company or a church.

Maryland's appointed governor, Lord Baltimore, chose to remain in England. He then appointed a governor to oversee the Assembly of Freemen. The royal governor usually disagreed with the decisions of the assembly and hence overturned their decisions frequently.

With the absence of direct oversight of the colonies, the idea of citizenship in America had taken shape in the context of direct self-government. The early colonists practiced self government in various forms, even though the colonies were under the authority and rule of the King of England. The early colonies organized governance in ways similar to what was familiar to them in England. The head of the English government was, of course, the King. The King, at that time, claimed rule by divine right. The English Parliament was organized in two houses--the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Suffrage was confined to property owners.

Even though the original colonies were established as corporate, proprietary, or royal, the monarchy found that the royal colonies were the most loyal and easy to govern. Therefore, colonies that had been established originally as proprietary or corporate were changed by the monarchy into royal colonies. As the colonies moved from a system of administrative rule to self government, their experience with practicing democracy served as an epistemic shift in their cultural ethos. As the self-governing colonists experienced government with the controlling factor of the monarchy, revolution erupted and democracy took on a new form. Their experience led them to form a government whereby the monarchy could no longer deny them specific freedoms. They enjoyed freedoms of decision-making as to governmental power, sovereignty, taxation, and representation. Let us inquire into how self-government was practiced.

Early America As a Set of Peaceable Kingdoms.[2]

Self-government was the exclusive model for citizenship in colonial times.

Zuckerman captured the essence of this model of governance in his book, *Peaceable Kingdoms*. New England towns in the 1600's were primarily organized as church communities. Newcomers were allowed to enter a community on the condition of compatibility over a three-week period. After that time, if the community dwellers felt the newcomer could fit in peaceably, then the newcomer could stay; if not, they had to move on. This way of handling conflict kept the communities peaceable and like-minded. People took turns being responsible for seeing that the community's needs were met. Hence, the explanation for the title and theme of Zuckerman's book, *Peaceable Kingdoms,* is understood in describing the settlements in New England. The behavior of these "peaceable kingdoms" could function in this manner because the frontier existed. The wide-open spaces allowed for new communities to be started for those people who could not find their niche, so to speak. "Go West" had a profound meaning to those individuals who had a different way of thinking about life styles.

Town meetings were gatherings as a means of developing and maintaining consensus. Consensus was not maintained by simple oppression but through a process of continual discussion and socializing, and that the need for conformity was high because it was necessary to sustaining this kind of dialogue. In an indirect way, it was an educational process for active citizenship. As such, it was not so much conformity as we understand it today as it was conformity to a kind of relationship among citizens. To assure that the city fathers were doing a good job, all citizens attended these town meetings. One could vote if one were a property owner; otherwise, one just listened.   One did not raise questions as to why something was done a certain way. One did not become a squeaky wheel for change. One was expected to go along with the group. One did not "rock the boat." Peace among the neighbors under all circumstances was the supreme word of the community. In this way, consensus did not mean oppression but a continuing of dialogue in the normal socialization of the citizens as a form of relationship-building or bonding among citizens. It

was a form of diplomacy working among neighbors and neighborhoods. Colonial self-government developed out of the way colonies were established from the very beginning.

What is very clear to understand is that from the outset, the sovereignty of the government belonged to the people as so stated in the Declaration of Independence. What happened in between the Revolution of 1776 and the Continental Congress in 1787 may have been that the federalists became unhappy with how self government was going. It was easy for them to turn to the British model of representative government--because they were familiar with it. This is a Deweyan thought: one's experience becomes one's practice. However, the practice for much of the populace was self-government. The colonists had started anew--new communities, new forms of government, and a new way of communicating with each other. This was a Gestalt shift from the very beginnings in the colonial era. The town meetings that required dialogue and a continuation of communication by frequent meetings of all the people in discussing mutual concerns of governance elevated the experience from monarchical control to an even playing field. Authoritative governance had been replaced by a true democratic form that focused on "ideal speech conditions."[3] Elias Canetti's model of health in social process describes this 'ideal speech condition.'   He maintains that an individual must have space in order to have normal personal human interrelationships.[4]   The new citizens found themselves in an environment that enhanced communication in the greater community. This may explain why the new Americans embraced "individualism" as part of their new-found psyche that had its roots in classical liberalism.

Then, however, the tendency toward self-government stalled in the developmental process. With the establishment of a representative government upon the adoption of the United States Constitution in 1787, this reverting back to what had been similarly practiced in England was not a comfortable position for the American people.   A change of heart or a change in mind may have been prompted by the fears of true democracy that is evident in The Federalist

Papers.[5] Publius of The Federalist Papers and the writings by the Anti-Federalists set these fears within a framework that posed the pros and cons of a strong central government versus a small decentralized government. In other words, the fear of true democracy is what motivated the argument in favor of a representative government. Therefore, in order "to form a more perfect union," the delegates at the Continental Congress in 1787 decided to form a representative government, a republican form, rather than a democratic form of government.   Could this work, when a democratic form of government existed in colonial times?

In summary, history tells us that in actuality, even though self-government was practiced, the frame of reference for government stemmed from England. England had parliamentary rule by the people with the King as head of the government. In this setting, government began to take form in the colonies. So when the delegates from the thirteen states met in Philadelphia in 1787, "to form a more perfect union," a representative form of government appealed to the Federalist point of view, as it reflected the basic experience of England.

From whence the dialectical pull–A Representative Government vs. A True Democracy–The Role of Citizens

The Federalist Point of View.

In the *Federalist Papers*, the role of the citizen is given some scrutiny. "Citizen" is mentioned twenty-five times,[6] while the word, "citizens," is mentioned one-hundred fifty-four times.[7] Citizenship is mentioned in Federalist Paper No. 62, in determining the qualifications of a member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and in Federalist Paper No. 42, in establishing a uniform rule of naturalization throughout the United States.[8] Madison pursued the argument that the republican form of government is recommended over the democratic form of government in Federalist Paper No. 14. He stated that "a democracy . . .

will be confined to a small spot. A republic may be extended over a large region."[9] In Federalist Paper No. 37, he argued that it would be combining stability and energy in government with liberty and a republican form of government. "The genius of republican liberty requires that all governmental power should be derived from the people and that those who are entrusted with power should be kept in a state of dependence on the people by a short duration of their appointment."[10] In Federalist Paper No. 51, he reiterated that the "fountain of all authority is the people." He continued in No. 57 that a "republican government provides the best framework for maintaining the liberty and happiness of the people."

Madison's strongest arguments are made in Federalist Paper No. 10, when he said that: "Democracies have been spectacles of turbulence and contention." Specifically, he argued that the two main differences between a Democracy and a Republic are the "delegation of the Government" and the "greater number of citizens, and greater sphere of country, over which the latter may be extended."[11]   These were in essence the main arguments for a representative government over a democracy as portrayed by the Federalists. Specific guidelines for the role of citizens are not mentioned.

The Anti-Federalist Views.

First of all, who were the Anti-Federalists? Were they really "disreputable characters and obstructionists, always ready to overthrow order and decency?"[12] Were they "men without principle, willing to use any argument to drag down the Constitution?"[13] Were they truly "narrow-minded local politicians, unwilling to face the utter inadequacy of the Articles of Confederation or incapable of seeing beyond the boundaries of their own states or localities?"[14] In actuality, the record demonstrates that the Anti-Federalists "were committed to both union and the states; to both the great American republic and the small, self-governing community; to both commerce and civic virtue; to both private gain and public

good."[15] Many of the Anti-Federalists were not part of the deliberations held in Philadelphia in 1787. They had to learn about the contents of the Constitution after its release to the public, and react immediately before ratification. Not having enough time for rebuttal, their focus of argumentation missed the mark for winning the debate because of a lack of a constitutional plan.

The anti-federalist author in *The Federal Farmer* was preoccupied with representation. In regards to the representative branch, he recommended: "an increase of the numbers of representatives," and, "That the elections of them ought to be better secured."[16] Agrippa, another anti-federalist, argued that a republican form of government would "degenerate to a despotism. . . ." He preferred a confederate form.[17] Brutus argued that "in a large republic, the public good is sacrificed to a thousand views"; . . .and that we have "no example of a free republic. . . ."[18] Brutus primarily based his arguments on the size of the country as too large in a democracy or in a republic, and that the people should know their "rulers."[19] The role of citizens is not made clear even though the sense of self government is recognized as a positive role.   The transition from self-government to representative government, from true democracy to a republican form of government, when the new Constitution was adopted was an abrupt change for the American citizens. It marked a definite break with tradition, in that the Anti-federalists really did represent the dominant revolutionary ethos better than the federalists. It will be demonstrated throughout this chapter that this abrupt change in the way the people practiced governance has left an ambivalence in the ethos of the American people. The gestalt shift that was to take place, to go back to the way things were practiced in England and thus the way the federalists established in the Constitution of 1787, has not taken strong roots even though many attempts to the contrary have been made.   Despite the fact that a representative government continues to enjoy success with the over two-hundred years old Constitution, the transition from self-government to representative government continues to evolve through a ying-yang effect. The revolutionary spirit against big centralized government,

against a national government telling the states what to do, and a demand for a public voice--the people's voice--continues to resonate in the halls of Congress. As a nation, we have been fixing and tampering with this transition ever since.

Republican Form of Government Begins to Show Distress.
   From Self-Government . . .

American citizens originally practiced their democracy in town meetings, school house meetings, and sometimes out on the streets. I believe that in the early years of this nation, the average person felt the need to become involved in governance of the community and of the nation. Today, citizenship as voting once every four years has become the norm for many citizens. Since voting is only one part of what should be the experience of citizenship, what is missing in our processes that makes the practicing of democracy one of diminishing returns for citizens, hence, de-motivating them?

   . . . To Cynicism and Apathy.

We, as a people, find ourselves in the midst of cynicism and apathy toward our American government. Even though extremism and radicalism have been with us from the very beginning, events like the recent bombing of a government facility in Oklahoma, and maiming and killing men, women, and children, are not the American way. Many people have begun to feel that government is not good. I believe that the frustration is from a lack of education and training in citizenship and the ability to practice and experience democracy. These are the root causes of this feeling of apathy by many people in the United States.

According to Louis C. Gawthrop, two other periods of our history were marked with low public confidence in government:

   "In the 1880's, when the excesses of political cronyism had

functionally disenfranchised millions of American citizens and in the 1930's, when citizens became almost comatose as public policy stagnated, the public administrative efficiency machine broke down, and economic collapse resulted."[20]

He reported that,

"Faith in democratic government was restored in the first instance by the emergence of a professional career service and in the second by an inventive public administration that combined administrative efficiency with political effectiveness."[21]

"The Growing Chasm Between Citizens and Their Government."

The fear of a "growing chasm between citizens and their government" reflects a previous time, one that resulted in the inauguration of President Jackson. Frederick Mosher[22] called Jackson's election "a turning point in the direction of American society and its government."[23] Seidman and Gilmore highlight the fact that Jackson believed that it was the president's duty "to protect the liberties and rights of the people and the integrity of the Constitution against the Senate, or the House of Representatives, or both together."[24]

Jackson's election promoted an egalitarian philosophy of society that allowed for elections for all the people, instead of the propertied men. The reforms that Jackson espoused were that he wanted to correct the abuses of the business of government by promising to "select men whose diligence and talents will insure in their respective stations able and faithful cooperation."[25] But what Jackson said and actually did were two very different things. In his inaugural address, Jackson commented on what has become, according to Mosher, the "doctrine of the simplicity of public work."[26] Jackson claimed that government work was felt to be very simple and did not require great expertise on the part of its employees. He exclaimed: "The duties of all public offices are . . . so plain and simple . . . ."[27] Jackson's administration expanded the idea that anyone could be a government employee. During Jackson's administration, the institution of the patronage system engulfed government employment. As the

spoils system[28] permeated government employment, graft, corruption, theft and incompetence became prevalent in the ensuing administrations.

Reform Is Needed As a Means to Fix Representative Government.

Calls for reform began in the 1850's but did not have any effect until Grant's Administration. Grant attempted to institute civil service reform but to no avail.[29] The backdrop of Grant's corrupt government cemented the groundwork for social reform. Mosher headlined the period between 1829 (the beginning of Jackson's administration) to 1883 (the passage of the Pendleton Act of 1883) as "Government by the Common Man."[30]

The Pendleton Act of 1883.

Widespread public demand for civil service reform may have been the underlying cause of the Pendleton Act. This demand was brought about by the mounting incompetence, graft, corruption, and theft in the federal departments and agencies. The immediate cause, however, was the assassination of President Garfield in 1881 by a disappointed prospective appointee. Civil service reform became a leading issue in the midterm elections of 1882.

In January, 1883, Congress passed a comprehensive civil service bill--sponsored by Senator George H. Pendleton of Ohio--providing for the open selection of government employees.[31] Only about ten (10) per cent of the positions in the federal government were covered by the new laws, but nearly every president after Chester A. Arthur, who signed the bill into law, broadened its scope. By 1980, more than ninety (90) percent of federal employees were protected by the act.[32]

Advocates demanding change for years finally made inroads when the Pendleton Act of 1883 was passed in Congress. The progressive era experienced a fervor for change--whether it was good, or better, or for the best

change possible. No matter how the change would effect the status quo, anything would be better than what was being experienced. However, egalitarianism continued to permeate the landscape of government. This philosophy found its way into The Pendleton Act, and provided the foundation of the merit system. Marc V. Levine et al called the Pendleton Act "a crucial historical landmark in the evolution of the modern United States state."[33]

The Pendleton Act had three main features:

1. Establishment of competitive examinations for entrance into public service;

2. Security of tenure for employees; and

3. Regulations intended to insure neutrality of civil servants.[34]

It also provided :

1. Ten percent of the positions in federal employment to be reserved for political appointments by the incoming administration--the victors; and

2. Stabilization in the career service of public employees.

Even though the Pendleton Act's purpose was to instill stability, capability, and expertise, it also had a side effect that was not intended. Levine alludes to this when he refers to the academic hurrah over distinguishing between administration and politics. Its effect was to separate further the government from its citizens.[35]

Civil Service Reform and Woodrow Wilson.

It is not coincidental that Woodrow Wilson, who advocated civil service reform, became president of the National Civil Service Reform League. Four years after the passage of the Pendleton Act, Wilson's famous essay, "The Study of Administration," (1887) is presented as a treatise on the neutrality of administration. His words set the frame for the discussion of separating administration and politics. He based his arguments on the proposition that

administration is neutral. His theme of neutrality permeated his discussion: ". . . administration lies outside the proper sphere of *politics*. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices."[36]

> *"Public administration advocates from Woodrow Wilson on believed that it was possible to separate politics--and policy--from administration of government."*[87]

The Politics/Administration Dichotomy--Wilson and Goodnow.

 As debate concerning the distinction between politics and administration ensued, Woodrow Wilson and Frank Goodnow began to discuss in their respective scholarly papers what has become known as the classical politics/administration dichotomy. The discussions focused on determining the executive's role in the execution of policy by those who were elected or appointed versus those who had to administer those policies to execute those policies. Those who make policy are those on the political side of the argument; while those who execute the policy are those on the administration side of the dichotomy. The citizen remained in the background of this discourse, undiscussed.   Policy-making and executing policy were to be done for the citizens, paternalistically. Government employees could do a better job than citizens at policy-making decisions because the experts are more efficient and are trained in the scientific method--or so the argument went.

According to Marc V. Levine et al in The State and Democracy, separating politics from administration "fueled a growing chasm between citizens and their government . . . "[38] But I am jumping ahead of the story. Let us go back to the beginning of public administration, at the time of Wilson's famous essay, "The Study of Administration," in 1887.

The Founding of PA–Public Administration

Nicholas Henry stated that Public Administration began in 1887 with Woodrow Wilson's paper on the "Study of Administration." Even though this work was not widely known or circulated, it became known as the founding treatise for public administration, the work that marked its beginning.[39]

The Heart of My Argument.

The time of the founding of the field of public administration was a moment containing the possibility of fundamental change. One possibility was to adopt a pragmatic form of government, one that involved full citizenship. Another possibility was governance through expert policy making, and this, obviously, was the possibility that was realized. I want to show from an historical perspective how this occurred and why this pattern has persisted over time. The heart of my argument is that the changes recommended as reforms on behalf of the public interest by the generation of social scientists that founded the field of public administration were really more in service of the project of establishing a class of new experts than they were in a project of bringing citizens into the process of governance.

What started out as an adjustment here and an adjustment there eventually changed the direction of governance as what had been in practice the first century of this nation. One can describe it as Michel Foucault's theory of the history of consciousness. White and McSwain[40] explain Foucault's theory as a "movement of human consciousness through time proceeds discontinuously . . . marked by shifts in the episteme that frames consciousness at a given historical moment." What happened at the turn of the century as public administration emerged to become a field of study in academia and to become a force in public policy proved to be an epistemic shift.[41] The new episteme of the times was

grounded in a progressivism which stressed that one can change what one already has by improving upon it through rational action. In other words, in the attempt of making government work better, citizens were left out of taking an active role in governmental processes. The citizens were left out of taking an active role in the direction of government, policy-making, and in the form of operations in governmental processes.

Progressivism.

Richard Hofstadter described it this way.   Progressivism was a "widespread and remarkably good-natured effort of the greater part of society to achieve some not very clearly specified self-reformation."[42] As Hofstadter noted, no clear direction or outline or theory appeared as specifically calling for change. People knew that something had to be done, but nothing specific.   The Populist presidential candidate, LaFollette, in his call for "readjustments of the political order of State and Nation"[43] served as an emblem of the vague impulse toward change that characterized these turbulent times.

In essence, what the social reformers of the times created when raising the rhetorical question of the role of citizens were so-called "adjustments." "Being informed" seemed to be a good role for citizens. The emergence of referendum, initiative, and recall at the state level seemed to be a functional way of implementing some form of direct involvement on behalf of the citizenry. Even the New York Bureau of Municipal Research was very much involved in "citizenship effectiveness."[44] The New York Bureau had a dual purpose: "training for citizenship and for professional public service."[45]   One of the first publications of the Bureau was entitled, Efficient Citizenship, (1907). The purpose of this publication and those to follow was to assert the premise that efficiency made for an "*efficient democratic society*"[46]--stating in essence that efficiency was not inconsistent with democracy.

Science of Administration--The Rage of the Age.

Social reformers seemed to be caught up in the science vogue that was having such an effect on the public. Science became a focus for emulation. Physical and medical sciences served as prototypes for the social sciences as they sought to achieve acceptance as a legitimate voice for change. Metaphors from the physical and medical sciences began to appear in social science literature. The word "adjustment" came out of the health sciences; whereas, the words "efficiency" and "effective" came out of the physical sciences like engineering and physics and especially economics--a social science.

Think Tanks Emerge.

The Russell Sage Foundation,[47] one of the oldest policy institutions in this country, was founded in 1907 under the surge of progressivism and social reform. Its purpose was to conduct research on public health and sanitation, conditions affecting children, working conditions for women, and other issues on the progressive era agenda. The Foundation also played an activist role in legislation. Other institutions began to appear in answer to this need to "fix" or "mend" or provide "preventive medicine" in order to make for an efficient and effective government. The Brookings Institution was founded in 1916, the Twentieth Century Fund, founded as the Cooperative League in 1911, and the National Bureau of Economic Research founded in 1920--all were founded on the scientific metaphor of efficiency.[48]

Other policy institutions began to appear that were dedicated to international issues such as world peace. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was established in 1910 for the sole purpose of ending war and instituting peace as an end.[49] As the need for other lofty aims were identified, other foundations and institutions were established to provide a source for research findings and information. The scientist was supposed to be an impartial

59

participant, an unbiased resource, and a nonpartisan expert; hence, the words, "neutral competence" described the new expert elite.

The Convergence of the Expert Class with Principles of Business.

At the turn of the century, the expert class emerged full blown. Two very important concepts materialized at this time. The Pendleton Act of 1883 paved the way for *an expert class*, a very important symbol. On the business side, the Rockefeller Standard Oil Trust was dedicated to *efficient, centralized, and systemized* business practices. Around 1880, the idea of efficiency in business became something to look for and compare to in government.   The two concepts converged--the expert class with efficiency, centralization and systems from business that could be a model for government.

The onset of heavy immigration would influence the people's thinking on the government's role, as a twenty (20) million person population increase posed huge problems in social development.   This was the time that a model city charter was proposed in 1899 in New York City by Robert Moses. In 1900, Frank Goodnow promoted the idea of separating politics from the administration of government, an idea that became known as the "politics/administration dichotomy." Political reforms began with the "Muckrakers" going after corruption and calling for political reform. All this had a great effect on the course of events.

Social Reforms Affects Citizens Interaction with Government.

The social reform movement had to be one of the greatest underlying reasons that served to change the way citizens and government interacted.   I have to repeat here that at the turn of the century, the founding of schools of public administration was a moment for the possibility of fundamental change. One of those possibilities was to form a pragmatic, collaborative government, one that involved full citizenship. The other possibility was to form a government of

expert policy making, and this is the change that was realized. According to Dwight Waldo, the efficient citizenship movement emerged during the Progressive era as the only time in American history that integrated both the "classical, activist type of citizenship and modern equalitarian democracy." Waldo evaluates the success of this movement as "modest, its scope as limited, and its time as brief."[50]

The Influence of the Principles of Scientific Management.

Also, during this time period, entering into the twentieth century, Frederick Taylor presented the *Principles of Scientific Management.* These principles effectively influenced the idea of bringing experts into the field of government. Where were the experts to come from? The universities proved to be resourceful in this respect.

Academia Responds to Fill the Need for Experts.

From the 1880's onward, we experienced the need for efficiency, the need for the education of experts and the need for governmental research. This had a great impact on what the country experienced. Hence, a groundswell of appreciation for expertise in government slowly became accepted by the public. This groundswell of appreciation appeared to get lost in the spirit of the times. Economy, efficiency, and effectiveness appealed to the public. These ideas, accepted by the public, became the tools by which the experts in government began to function. The democratic values of representativeness, responsibility, and responsiveness remained background considerations in designing the new public service.

At the turn of the century, reform-minded citizens set out to make it easier to get through the red-tape of government that swelled with political corruption, graft, and the ill effects of the spoils' system.   These reformers sought the help of business in organizing bureaus of municipal research to make for a more efficient

government. Forty to fifty bureaus were formed in the larger cities across the nation. The most prominent of these was the New York Bureau of Municipal Research which was incorporated in 1907. The New York Bureau instituted the Training School for Public Service in 1911. Early on, the Training School became associated with the Institute of Public Administration and eventually became part of the IPA. The IPA became affiliated with Columbia University.[51] The Training School became the forerunner to the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs.   By 1928, the IPA became the National Institute of Public Administration (NIPA). As these were in their developing stages, Smith tells us that "a fundamental change in the notion of citizenship" occurred.[52] As the cry for a more efficient government grew louder, the need for scientific expertise expanded. While the New York Bureau was distributing pamphlets and reports under the title of Efficient Citizenship, one of its leaders, Henry Breure was quoted as saying that "the need for professional service in behalf of citizen interests" had become necessary.[53] The die was cast. The need for trained public servants became paramount in meeting the challenges of social reform to combat political corruption, graft, and the ill effects of the spoils' system.

The influence of academia became great. The growth of programs in academia to provide the needed supply of experts created a new dimension in the university's mission.   Dual goals of educating people for good citizenship and training people for governmental service converged two different concepts. Citizenship evolved into a new meaning--citizenship became synonymous with training for governmental service. Good citizenship and liberal education became the training ground for governmental service. As citizenship remained a high goal, the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Service at Syracuse University was established as it took over the responsibility of training public personnel from the Institute of Public Administration.   The Training School for Public Service which began in 1911 was under the aegis of the Institute.[54] It sounded too good to be true. Reinforcing a good regime value--citizenship--with public service. The meaning of citizenship as a civic virtue whereby citizens were actively involved in

the governance processes was lost to a new meaning--citizens as public servants not as private individuals**.**

The Influence of Science--Neutral Competence.

Science became the motivation for the dual goals of educating people for good citizenship while still training "the best and the brightest" for government service. Scientific research reinforced the need for reform but added another burden to colleges and universities--to train people in the scientific method, including the social sciences.   Science came to be viewed as the key to all progress. Science could legitimize the importance of university education because *science* gave credence to social reforms. With emphasis on science and scientific training, educating for expertise in the social sciences became the engine for social reform. It became important to incorporate studies such as sociology, anthropology, and psychology into the *social sciences*. The scientific method became the basis and foundation in developing these fields of study.

All of this emphasis on the scientific method placed an added burden on universities to train people in the sciences. The schools of public administration began to emerge out of the political science field of study.   As an emerging expert class developed, the influence of academic credentials sustained the perceived need for an expert class. Institutions fulfilled the needs of government in providing research and technical expertise. The development of policy-making processes surfaced as a key element in the study of public administration.

As we approached the 1920's, three main concepts began to form a construct:

1. Much stronger emphasis on governmental reform;

2. Scientific management, as espoused by Frederick Taylor, became a new emphasis within public administration; and

3. Application of science in business and government.

Presidential Commissions Attempt To Reform Government.

The idea of reform was given a big boost with the Taft Commission on Economy and Efficiency in 1913. The staff experts and the leadership on that commission made recommendations on how to make government more efficient, more economical, and more effective.[55] The two Hoover Commissions of 1945 and 1955, respectively, served to bring expertise into public service as more and more people were applying with academic credentials.

Expert policy making and expertise tended to drive citizens away from deliberating on public policy. The means for the citizens to be involved in the policy making processes was not readily available because the experts began doing the job for the people. It sounded and appeared to be for the good of the people and for the public interest. However, on the way to reform, the self interest of public administration materialized and took over.

The Civil Service reforms that had begun with the Pendleton Act of 1883 re-surfaced. These reforms protected public servants from politics, established criteria for qualifications for government work, incorporated a career service corps of dedicated public servants, and provided an opportunity for the government workforce to represent the country geographically from the general population. The Classification Act of 1923 and other mechanisms were instituted as a way of creating a better bureaucracy.

Public Administration As A Field of Study.

Leonard White authored the first text for the study of public administration, The Introduction to the Study of Public Administration in 1926. The study of public administration as a separate field of study is considered seriously but the turf war between public administrationists and political scientists continued. Wilson and Goodnow's "politics/administration dichotomy" placed the emphasis on the separation of the two entities. "Goodnow and his fellow public

administrationists believed that "public administration should center in the government's bureaucracy."[56] Political Science departments in universities claimed ownership of public administration study and sought to keep it from being separated. However, public administration as a separate field of study has developed and flourished. The turf war between political science and public administration departments continues to the present day. What we are concerned with in this paper is that the model of citizenship that emerged during this time period placed the expert elite *in loco parentis.*

Political Science Is a Politics for Science.

Charles Merriam, a prominent student of American Democracy, believed that the study of politics of science should remain the politics for science.[57] This meant that the study of politics should be taught as a form of science using scientific methods. The tension mounted between democratic ideals and the findings of empirical research. Merriam encouraged two of his students, Harold Gosnell and Harold Lasswell, to study the psychological aspects of political behavior. Lasswell[58] became the resident expert on the psychopathology of politics. He believed that the role of the public in decision making should be limited and that the decision making should be left to those few persons who were capable of making rational decisions because they required intelligence.

Scientific Research Used To Convey Public Incompetence in Public Policy Decision Making.

Gosnell proposed that special tests should be given to the public to weed out "undesirables" from voting. He belonged to the chorus of social scientists who were calling for "an aristocracy of intellect and character."[59] During the meeting of the American Political Science Association (APSA) in 1934, the presidential candidate of the APSA, Walter Shepard, called upon his fellow

academics: "men of brains," to "seize the torch."[60]   David Ricci took the political scientists to task in <u>Tragedy of Political Science</u>, in that they were producing studies "to undermine the very object which the discipline was professionally committed to support, namely, the democratic polity."[61]

Democratic Realists vs. Democratic Idealists.

The adequacy of ordinary citizens to handle governmental work became a platform on behalf of the emerging expert class. Robert B. Westbrook explored this part of history examining the work done by Lewis M. Terman, Edwin G. Boring, and William S. McDougall, prominent psychologists of the early part of the twentieth century. To prove their contention that average citizens were not capable of practicing hands-on democracy and to decry participatory democracy, they pointed to the intelligence tests that were administered to 1.7 million soldiers during World War I. The results demonstrated that between "60 and 70 percent of the soldiers tested were mentally deficient."[62]

Proving a Point with Scientific Research.

Terman, Boring, and McDougall defended the reliability and validity of the tests. To emphasize his beliefs, McDougall wrote a book, entitled, <u>Is America Safe for Democracy?</u>   McDougall strained the argument to the extreme when he suggested that making democracy egalitarian would be dangerous for a stable government. He used the tests to "support a racialist theory of the politics of cultural degeneration . . . "[63]   Edward A. Purcell's book, <u>Crisis of Democratic Theory</u>, is critical of the democratic realists who were biased against participatory democracy. The realists identified the idealists as proponents of a theory of radical democracy, a kind of democracy that was dangerous. The democratic realists took the opportunity to demonstrate to the public through the proofs of scientific research and study. They jumped on the bandwagon of psychological

testing to prove government work was too difficult for the average American and that government work required trained and educated personnel.

Psychological and Educational Testing.

Three main streams of thought were converging that eventually brought the interest of psychological and educational testing to fruition.[64] First of all, as modern science began to take hold in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the scientific method became a source of interest in the biological sciences. Scientific experiments were being conducted in physiology in Europe, especially in Germany. As the research began to spread to cover all parts of the human anatomy, interest in psychology became a subject for scientific experiments. The second main stream of thought was brought in by Darwin's Origin of Species in 1859. England's Sir Francis Galton, sparked by Darwinian biology, took an interest in differences in humans. In Germany, psychological studies were focused on the general traits of humans.[65] The third stream of thought involved an interest in deviant behavior. These three main streams of thought converged in what has become one of the most influential and widely utilized scientific tools of social research to date.

It became the fashion for American students to study abroad, especially in Germany. James McKeen Cattell did his graduate studies in Germany and became exposed to Galton's work. When Cattell returned to the United States, he continued in this type of psychological study, using the techniques of statistical analysis that he had learned in Germany. One of Cattell's students, E. L. Thorndike, took a great interest in psychological testing and is known for influencing the spread of standardized educational testing.[66] R. L. Thorndike and E. Hagen gave this historical insight in their book, Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education, that through the translations of Alfred Binet's work[67], Lewis Terman produced the intelligence tests used in this country. Binet's work in France focused on the maladjusted individual. Binet and his colleagues

developed measures for intelligence. Based on Binet's work, Terman presented the most influential psychological tests to date, the *Stanford-Binet.* America was fertile ground for this new scientific tool. From the years 1900 to 1915, mental tests in America were known as the pioneer years; the years from 1915 to 1930 were known as the "boom" period.[68]   This is the backdrop upon which the expert elites began to weave their argument that public policy decision making required expertise.

Governmental Reforms--The Models for the Role of Citizens Emerge.

All the presidential commissions, starting with the Taft Commission, give resounding lip service to the purpose of making government work better--in the sense of being more of responsive to the citizenry.   The Brownlow Commission Reforms of 1937 and the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 (APA) were mechanisms designed to improve governments' response to the public. The APA produced the famous "Sunshine Laws," which held that citizens could have access to public documents. Participation by citizens meant access to public hearings and access to the Federal Register. Social reform may have just been lip service to the public in stating that government reform meant more accessibility of government to the citizens.   In reality, reform proved to be ways to "fix" government.   Because the experts were managing government, the citizens could only observe, read, and/or listen.

Why have these efforts to involve citizens failed at giving citizens the experience of authentic dialogue with their government? Although we are primarily focusing on the federal level of government, state government is also included in this indictment. At the local level, much depends on the state and on how each community has been able to develop a tradition of citizen involvement. If that tradition has been established early on, it is easy to continue.

The Development of Federal Standards for Citizen Participation.

Cahn and Passett commented on the development of Federal standards for citizen participation during the sixties. They concluded that one must begin with the "New England town meetings, Madison's analysis in The Federalist and Jefferson's philosophy."[69] Cahn and Passett have chosen the beginning of the twentieth century, when citizens and public officials began to interrelate. They cite the creation of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in 1912, whose initial purpose was to "give business and industry a formal advisory role in public decisions."[70] It is interesting to note that giving business and industry an advisory role in public decisions was equated with giving citizens a public role. An advisory role for citizens also occurred in the Farm Bureaus, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and the Resettlement and Farm Security Administration.

As one reviews the New Deal programs of the 1930's, one can find examples of citizen participation in the management of government agencies. The role of citizens participating in government agencies varied from program to program. For example, in the 1930's, the Farm Services Administration called for citizen participation to "build a political power base."[71] The Department of Agriculture developed a model program that provided both the theory and practice of citizen participation.[72] Despite the Department of Agriculture's efforts to develop a model for citizen participation, it was not until the passage of the APA that minimum standards of assurance were instituted that gave the public the opportunity to contribute to the administrative decision-making process.

However, the APA did not define how to involve citizens in this administrative process. Citizens were left to their own ingenuity and determination on how to become involved. The concept of involving citizens in the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) was called "voluntary association," but in reality, this was a method of cooptating citizens into an administrative apparatus that was viewed as democratizing society.[73] "TVA--the Grass Roots Democracy" did not adapt so much to the people as to the "existing institutions and centers of power."[74]

According to Cahn and Passett, the phrase "citizen participation" was

introduced in 1954 by the Urban Renewal Administration. "Meaningful participation" was rarely seen in the urban renewal programs of the fifties and sixties.[75] This laid the groundwork for the development of Federal standards for citizen participation that were implemented in the 1960's. When the seventies arrived, many attempts to involve citizens in the management processes of governance occurred in budgeting, personnel, planning, purchasing and in public hearings.

The greatest gain for citizen involvement occurred in 1979. Funds were made available for citizens to be a part of the decision-making processes. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) made the following recommendations regarding citizen participation:

1. Citizen participation must be at each level of government.

2. Citizen participation is required in federal aid programs to assure positive and consistent federal policy.[76]

The ACIR evaluations of the federal programs revealed that public administrators were frustrated by the recommendations to involve citizens in the government processes. They did not know how to involve citizens. The guidelines were said to be unclear and the goals not specific.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare found:

"Attempts to conduct a study in a participatory spirit confirmed . . . many citizens were unhappy about the way in which Government operates. It further revealed that citizens were reluctant to do business with government officials. They were suspicious of the rhetoric of 'openness' and often believed that citizen participation was a ruse for cooptation or propagandizing."[77]

The distrust of government officials by citizens fascinated Toner and Toner. In their perspective, "Citizen participation is an interactive process, involving an exchange of important information between public officials and citizens for use in planning and decision making."[78] With all the attempts made in the name of increasing citizen participation in the last half of the twentieth century, very few have come close to resembling what Dewey exclaimed in his belief of experiencing

democracy. Two divergent views continue to surface on the landscape of governance--limited participation and maximum participation.

Forester and Benveniste discussed the citizen's role in the policy process. Forester advocated the inclusion of citizens along with business and government officials in working together throughout the entire policy making process. Benveniste, on the other hand, believed that it is quite adequate to include only the power brokers in the policy making process. In other words, Benveniste closed the door to citizen participation. He included only those persons necessary to get a policy enacted and implemented. Benveniste admitted that open participation is time consuming. He preferred "a form of selective participation."[79] Forester, on the other hand, believed that the open forum provided "a dialogue among planners, clients, developers, citizen groups, and other stakeholders. . . ."[80] Forester and Benveniste captured the essence of our dilemma in practicing participatory democracy.

One way of renewing citizens' faith in government is to revitalize the conceptual crown jewel of public administration--the "public interest." Charles Goodsell[81] revived the "Public Interest" Model as presented in 1936 by E. Pendleton Herring. Goodsell argued the "public interest" from the point of view of Legality-Morality, Political Responsiveness, Political Consensus, Concern for Logic, Concern for Effects, and Agenda Awareness.[82] He reviewed the old arguments that put a death knell on "public interest." Goodsell's arguments for the importance of the "public interest" as serving as the purpose for civil servants challenges the nay-sayers.   For example, Charles Lindblom publicly stated that the concept "public interest" was not more than what the individual public administrator wanted it to be from his personal perspective.[83] In essence, Lindblom argued that the "public interest" was a nice concept but in reality, there was no "public interest" so to speak.

Camilla Stivers developed a model of citizenship in her dissertation, Active Citizenship. She made the argument that before public administration could achieve legitimacy in governance, the people must be included in the process of

dialogue. She identified this process of dialogue as active citizenship. Stivers'
chapter entitled, "Active Citizenship and Public Administration" in <u>Refounding
Public Administration</u>, described the added dimension that supported White's
"Authority/Participation debate," Wamsley's "Agential Leadership," and the
centerpiece of public administration, Goodsell's "Public Interest Model."[84]

In the beginning, expert elites were considered "guardians and philosopher
kings."[85] However, Bruce MacLaury is a little more cautionary in his assertion of
what is expected of expert elites. He stated: "From the 19th century battles
between social Darwinists and social reformers to today's contentions between
libertarians and pragmatists, the role of expert knowledge in service to political
power has been in dispute."[86]   As we consider the role of citizens and the role of
expert elites in governance, it must be taken in context with politics. Attempting to
distinguish the difference between politics and administration has been the subject
for theoretical discussions over the years since Wilson introduced the idea in 1887
and Goodnow promoted it in 1900. It is Dwight Waldo who seemed to have the
last word on attempting to distinguish the difference when he stated that "public
administration is properly served by multiple theories, perspectives, strategies, and
roles, and by a situational, pragmatic adaptation of means to ends."[87]

Conclusion

As this review shows, efforts have been made to involve citizens in
governance since the founding of public administration. Despite these many
attempts to recognize citizen involvement as a viable force in the government
processes, citizens feel that the forces have missed their mark. Public
Administration literature has been deluged with insightful writings regarding ways
to make government more accessible to citizens. However, few theorists have
provided adequate building blocks upon which to forge a foundation for a
pragmatic role model for citizens. Those theorists who have provided the building
blocks will be illustrated in the discussion of John Dewey's developing theory of

American Democracy.

The American founding placed the sovereignty of the government in the hands of the people--as so stated in the Declaration of Independence. Self-government proved to be the exclusive model for citizenship in colonial times. In the typical early communities of the 1600's, peace for the sake of peace appeared to be the rule of thumb. However, the form of government that was adopted seemed to replicate what was experienced in England.

As the country prepared itself for the twentieth century, social reform became a calling. Governmental reforms stressed efficiency, economy, and effectiveness. The drive for reform overshadowed the role of citizens. For decades, the spoils system and the abuse by employees under the patronage system caused dismay in the public. In response to this abuse of public power, of public monies, and of the public trust, social reformers of the progressive movement sought ways to reform government. In 1883, the Pendleton Act was passed, thus instituting the merit system. Just as with anything new to a system, the institutionalization of the merit system and the implementation of the Pendleton Act took time. In the meantime, the social reformers were hard at work taking their new role seriously. Just as engineers and scientists were designing the workplace for more effectiveness and efficiency, so then, it was thought, one could compare industry or business with government.

The social reformers suggested that an informed public seemed to be the answer for an effective government. Citizenship became a catchword for institutions of higher learning. The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University took over the work started by the Training School for Public Service which had begun with the New York Bureau of Municipal Research.

Early governmental reforms tended to submerge authentic participatory roles for citizens in the policy-making processes. However, some public administrators did actively seek to include citizens in governance. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations developed efforts in demonstrating to citizens that government was accessible and working for the people.

In all the models of citizenship in governance that have been either proposed by public administration theorists or by government sponsorship, citizens have been given a token role in governance. Until the environment is created whereby citizens are able to practice democracy on a regular basis through the communication vehicle of authentic dialogue, citizens will continue to feel alienated from their government. Educating citizens for active involvement in governance is the cornerstone of citizenship in a democracy.

Endnotes

1.   John D. Hicks, <u>The Federal Union: A History of the United States to 1877</u>. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, The Riverside Press, 1957, pp. 52-92.

2.   Michael Zuckerman, <u>Peaceable Kingdoms</u>. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1970.

3.   Orion F. White, "Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate,'" <u>Refounding Public Administration</u> by Gary L. Wamsley et al, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1990, p. 208.

4.   Ibid., pp. 198-200.   For further information on Canetti's ideas on social pathology, read Orion White's chapter on "Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate." Canetti's book <u>Crowds and Power</u> is an in-depth description of his thinking.

5.   Refer to FP#10 in <u>The Federalist</u>. Edited by Jacob E. Cooke, Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, Third Printing, 1989, pp. 61-64.

6.   Federalist Papers #'s 2, 8, 10, 21, 35, 38, 40, 44, 45, 48, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, 62, 65, 70, 75, and 78.

7.   Federalist Papers #'s 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 72, 78, 80, 81, 83, 84, and 85.

8.   Alexander Hamilton, John Jay and James Madison. <u>The Federalist</u>. Ed. Michael Loyd Chadwick, Springfield, Virginia: Global Affairs Publishing Company, 1987, p. 334 and p. 229 respectively.

9.   Ibid., p. 69

10.   Ibid., p. 190.

11.   Ibid., p. 62.

12.   Hicks, p. 212.

13.   Murray Dry, "Preface," <u>The Anti-Federalist</u>, Ed. By Herbert J. Storing, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985, p. 1.

14.   Ibid., p. 1.

15.   Ibid., p. 4.

16.   "The Federal Farmer" Letter #VII, December 31, 1787, <u>The Anti-Federalist</u>, Ed. By Herbert J. Storing, Preface by Murray Dry, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985, p. 74.

17.   "Agrippa" Letter #VI, December 3, 1787, <u>The Anti-Federalist</u>, p. 235.

18.   "Brutus" Letter #1, October 18, 1787, p. 113.

19.   Ibid., pp. 114-116.

20.   Louis C. Gawthrop, "Toward an Ethical Convergence of Democratic Theory and Administrative Politics," in <u>A Centennial History of the American Administrative State</u>. Edited and Introduction by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1987, pp. 189-190.

21.   Ibid., p. 190.

22.   Frederick C. Mosher, <u>Democracy and the Public Service</u>, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., Second Edition, 1982, p. 56-82.

23.   Ibid., p. 64.

24.   Harold Seidman and Robert Gilmour. <u>Politics, Position, and Power</u>. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., Fourth Edition, 1986, p. 67.

25.   Ibid., p. 65. Quoted from James D. Richardson, Ed. <u>Messages and Papers of the Presidents</u>, Vol. II (Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1903), p. 438.

26.   Mosher, p. 65.

27.   Ibid., p. 65.

28.   The term "spoils system" refers to Senator William L. Marcy of New York in 1832: "They see nothing wrong in the rule, that to the victor belong the spoils of the enemy." (As quoted in Leonard D. White, <u>The Jacksonians</u>, New York, Macmillan, 1954, p. 320).

29.   Mosher, pp. 66-69.

30.   Ibid., p. 64.

31.   To be administered by a Civil Service Commission and guaranteeing the right of citizens to compete for federal appointment without regard to politics, religion, race or national origin.

32.   Encyclopedia Britannica, Chicago, Illinois: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Vol. 9, 1993 edition, pp. 207-209.

33.   Marc V. Levine, Carol MacLennan, John J. Kushma, Charles Noble, with Jeff Faux, and Marcus G. Raskin. The State and Democracy: Revitalizing America's Government. New York: Routledge, 1988, p. 55.

34.   Ibid., p. 55.

35.   Ibid., p. 55.

36.   Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration," (1887), in Classics of Public Administration. Edited by Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde. 36. Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987, p.20.

37.   Levine, p. 54.

38.   Ibid, p. 56.

39.   Nicholas Henry, "The Emergence of Public Administration as a Field of Study," A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1987, p. 39. Note: Countering this proclamation is Paul P. Van Riper who states that it is Alexander Hamilton who is the father of the administrative state not Woodrow Wilson nor the reference Wilson cited in the person of Dorman B. Eaton.

40.   Orion F. White, Jr., and Cynthia J. McSwain. "The Phoenix Project: Raising A New Image of Public Administration From the Ashes of the Past.", in Henry D. Kass and Bayard L. Catron (eds.) Images and Identities in Public Administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing Co., 1990, pp. 23-59.

41.   I agree with White and McSwain in explaining the difference between Foucault's "episteme," and Kuhn's "paradigm." A paradigm shift is incommensurable; whereas, an epistemic shift is an historic movement of human consciousness.

42.   Richard Hofstadter,   Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955, p. 5.

43.   Ibid., p. 89.

44.   Chester A. Newland, Public Administration and Community: Realism in the Practice of Ideals. Public Administration Service, November, 1984, p. 12.

45.   Ibid., p. 10.

46.   James A. Smith,   The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and The Rise of the New Policy Elite. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1991, pp. 50-51.

47.   Ibid., p. 290.

48.   Ibid., p. 17.

49.   Ibid., p. 297.

50.   Dwight Waldo, "Politics and Administration: On Thinking about a Complex Relationship," A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1987, p. 111.

51.   Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor A. Thompson. Public Administration. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., Sixteenth printing, October, 1974, p. 18.

52.   Smith, p. 50.

53.   Ibid., p. 51.

54.   Paul P. Van Riper, "The American Administrative State: Wilson and the Founders," in A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited and Introduction by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1987, p. 20.

55.   Presidential commissions that seek some kind of reform always tend to emphasize the principles of economy and efficiency.

56.   Nicholas Henry, "The Emergence of Public Administration as a Field of Study," in A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited and Introduction by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1987, p. 40.

57.   Robert B. Westbrook. John Dewey and American Democracy. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991, p. 280.

58.   Ibid, pp. 282-285.

59.   Ibid., p. 285.

60.   Ibid., p. 285. See Walter Shepard, "Democracy in Transition," American Political Science Review 29, (1935): 18-19, 20.

61.   Ibid., p. 281.

62.   Ibid., p. 282.   It should be noted that many foreigners served in World War I to gain citizenship.

63.   Ibid., p. 282.

64.   Robert L. Thorndike and Elizabeth Hagen, <u>Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Second Edition, Seventh Printing, March, 1967, pp. 3-6.

65.   Ibid., p. 4.

66.   Ibid., p. 5.

67.   Ibid., p. 4.

68.   Ibid., pp. 5-6.

69.   Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett, Editors., <u>Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change</u>. Published in cooperation with the New Jersey Community Action Training Institute, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971, p. 130.

70.   Ibid., p. 130.

71.   <u>Citizen Participation</u>. Community Services Administration, Washington, D. C., 1978, p. 13.

72.   Vincent Mathews, <u>Citizen Participation: an analytical study of the Literature Prepared for the Community Relations Service</u>. Washington, D.C. Catholic University of America, June, 1968, p. 38.

73.   Philip Selznick,   "The Cooptative Mechanism," in <u>Classics</u> of Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, Eds. Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987, p. 197.

74.   Mathews, p. 41.

75.   Cahn and Passett, p. 45.

76.   <u>In Brief.   Citizen Participation in the American Federal System</u>. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D. C. August, 1979, pp. 34-35.

77.   New Carroll Toner and Walter B. Toner, Jr. <u>Citizen Participation: Building a Constituency for Public Power</u>. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978, p. iii.

78.   Ibid., p. 1.

79.   Jay D. White,   "From Modernity to Postmodernity: Two Views of Planning and Public Administration," Book Reviews I in Public Administration Review. November/December, 1991, Vol. 51, No. 6, p. 565.

80.   Ibid., p. 565.

81.   Charles T. Goodsell, "Public Administration and the Public Interest," in Refounding Public Administration, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990, pp. 96-113.

82.   Ibid., p. 112.

83.   Charles Lindblom served as the Guest Speaker for Hightable at Virginia Tech's Center for Public Administration in Blacksburg, March, 1992.

84.   Orion F. White, "Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate," pp. 238-241; Gary L. Wamsley, "The Agency Perspective," pp. 148-155; Charles T. Goodsell, "Public Administration and the Public Interest," pp. 96-113; Camila M. Stivers, "Active Citizenship and Public Administration, pp. 246-273, in Refounding Public Administration.   Further discussion in Ch. 5.

85.   Donald N. McClosky is John F. Murray Professor of Economics and Professor of History, University of Iowa, from his book, Crisis of Late Modernism, quoted in The Idea Brokers, cover.

86.   Bruce MacLaury is President of Brookings Institution, quoted in The Idea Brokers, cover.

87.   Dwight Waldo, "Politics and Administration: On Thinking about a Complex Relationship," A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York: MacMillan, Inc., 1987, p. 108.

CHAPTER IV
HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF CITIZENSHIP AND COMMUNITY

Introduction

The historical development across time reveals that while democracy has evolved as a standard part of the modern idea of social organization, the idea of full democratic citizenship which is at the very core of Western Civilization has been deeply suppressed throughout the development of democracy. In order to make the reader aware of the dimensions of the evolutionary process of citizenship and community, an introductory rationale for this broad historical backdrop is necessary.

Citizenship could be said to have begun in Ancient Greece with the onset of constitutional government in the city-states.[1] This tradition of democratic citizenship, now regarded as the ancient or classical model, beginning with the Greeks, showed citizens as playing a de facto, integral role in governance: governance was citizenship and citizenship was governance. Further, citizenship was seen as an integral part of attaining mature adulthood: only citizens could be adults and adults could become adults only through being citizens.

In the Beginning of Classical Democracy

Riesenberg views that "the history of citizenship began with Solon."[2] Solon earned his role as legislator for his patriotism and wisdom. In 640 B.C., Solon stressed that the interest of the community must come before one's class

or clan.   As the wealthy took unfair advantage of their financial superiority, reining in this imbalance of power became an issue. "Pesistrator (600-527 B.C.) increased the rights of the common man and brought nobility under the rule of law."[3]   This is a big step towards the concept of *equality under the law* for all men. The Athenian assembly known as the Pnyx could accommodate 5,000 citizens in the late Sixth Century B.C.. It was not until the Fourth Century B.C. that 10,000 citizens could meet. Those who wished to express their disagreements with the majority met in the *perischoinisma,* "a roped-off place in the agora."[4]

Cleisthenes, in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries, B.C., according to Herodotus, provided the organizational foundations of what we have come to know as Classical Democracy. He did this by increasing the four existing tribes of Athens into ten. Then, each tribe chose its own phylarch (leader). The people (demes) were placed into a specific group which put structure in the new formation of the neighborhood tribes.[5] Today we describe these neighborhood groups as precincts. After the year 480 B.C., "the Boule, who were the representatives to all Athenians, became the city's executive body."[6] The demos (the body of people) also assumed a greater role in the court system known as dikasteria.   In the United States today, we would describe these as majority and minority parties.

In this early classical democracy, citizenship was primarily based on family and neighbor. It was the leadership of Pericles, whose mother was a niece of Cleisthenes and whose father was an Athenian general (Xanthippes), that mainly influenced the establishment of the citizenship law of 451-50 B.C.[7] This law purports to place the 'state' in the role of setting requirements for citizenship.

By the Third Century, Thucydides wrote that Pericles seemed to have more faith in the common man in 450 B.C., than Plato did in 399 B.C..[8] However, it is made clear by Xenophanes that the Greeks were primarily concerned with culture and language in determining the citizenship laws. Race

did not seem to play a major determinant. It shows in Plato's thinking when he made it clear that one's lack of education, not one's 'race' was considered to be the "greatest obstacle to . . . becoming a citizen of Magnesia (Laws)."[9] It is interesting to note that in the United States, literacy laws were imposed that served as a barrier to voting rights--and mainly affected certain racial groups and new immigrants.

"Pericles ushered in a great age of democracy and the flowering of art."[10] By 450 B.C., the administration of Athens and her Empire placed a greater emphasis on citizenship participation because the needs were far greater. During the Pericles era, we find the "development of an urban civic center, broadening the base of participation, and instituting the payment for public service."[11] Of course, payment for public service drew criticism. Today, as well as in the time of the Founding, a fine line separates public service for a career versus public service as an avocation. The *"Americorps"* of today receives criticism because it is based on payment for community service to young people. Along with the administrative growth in the Golden Age of Pericles came the rules, regulations, and procedures that coincided with the development of the city. Plutarch discusses, for example, the debate among the demos on whether to build the Parthenon.[12]

As the development of civic institutions grew, the role of citizenship became more important. To be a citizen meant one was an Athenian or the other way around, to be an Athenian meant one was a citizen.[13] The private and public character of an individual became more apparent. At the core of Athenian society, one's oikos, (family), determined membership. "A foreigner or non-Athenian could only become an Athenian by being accepted and entering into that descent group--into the oikos, phratry and deme, and tribe."[14]

In Book III of the Politics, Aristotle asked, "What is a state?" He answered the question by describing what the citizen does. "The most suitable definition of a polites (citizen) is he who shares in the 'indeterminate' office of assemblyman or juryman or . . . one who is actively participating in the business and decisions

of his city."[15] Aristotle stated that a citizen is one who is born from two citizens. The development of requirements for citizenship as determined by Athenian law began to take shape. Citizenship is not based on one's service but on oikos, one's descent or origin. Aristotle's legacy is his definition as stated in his Book III of the Politics: "The good citizen should know and have the capacity both to rule and be ruled, and . . . is the virtue of a citizen.[16] To be a citizen is to participate in the polis. Aristotle's Greek maxim in his Nicomachean Ethics links equality to opinions: "Friendship is equality." The importance of friendship in the community is explained by Mansbridge. "Equality of friendship is an equality of mutual respect, binding one person to another, a necessary basis of the state."[17] It is this quality of community that Dewey sought to emulate for American communities.

Privilege and exclusion, for the most part, defined citizenship in Ancient Greece. What we have come to know as Democracy in Ancient Greece was actually incomplete democracy. Democratic roots were set down but the times remained undemocratic from the time of Classical Greece in the Fifth Century, B.C. until after 1789. Riesenberg described it this way: "The history of citizenship . . . is of the constant struggle in which the public good has always had to bargain and compromise with the private."[18]

Two Eras of Citizenship.

The history of citizenship is divided into two eras--before and after the French Revolution. The legacy of the first era existed from the time of the Greek city-state. It was "small-scaled, culturally monolithic, hierarchical, and discriminatory--and also moral, idealistic, spiritual, active, participatory, communitarian, and even heroic in that it commanded personal military service from its citizens."[19] In the first era, one is truly considered a citizen only if one participates. The Aristotelian legacy's hallmark required that one could only gain civic virtue "through active participation in governing."[20] Riesenberg described

the second era of citizenship as "civic virtue being drained out of the citizenship--an ideal from the beginning . . . ."[21]

From the Greek city-state era, Aristotle and Plato defined citizenship in terms of privilege and status. While Athenian society divided itself into four orders based on an agricultural yield, landownership was not a prerequisite for citizenship in Sparta. Spartan citizenship, however, placed greater emphasis on responsibility of commitment to public service.[22] In Sparta, only a few voted, held public office, and made policy decisions. "Whether in Sparta, Athens or any other polis, citizenship was a privileged status."[23] The primary difference was that Sparta struggled greatly against democracy.[24]

The great funeral oration of Pericles sets down for posterity the canons for Athenian democracy. Citizenship is seen as "part of an educational program and of an inspiring moral tradition in which each generation acknowledges a connection to all others and a responsibility to them all for maintenance of the community and the traditions."[25] It is in this tradition that Dewey bases his philosophy--education becomes the basic tenet in providing the strong roots for participatory democracy. The encouragement of self-government began with the Greeks; but, Ancient Greek Democracy was partial. The subcultures, working-class populations, demanded allegiance. A new dimension of citizenship developed into two allegiances, first to one's family, and then to one's ethnic community. Subsequently, subcultures learned to coexist among each other because of self-government within these communities. Remnants of this form of ethnic allegiance and the practice of self-government within the confines of these ethnic communities have survived to the present day.

The prosperity of the Periclean Age gave way to wars and strife between the city-states. After the Sicilian campaign prophecy, "the spirit of the age had always tended to weaken the authority of tradition, to loosen the cohesion of the community, and to direct the individual reliance upon his personal judgment in all critical questions."[26] The strength of keeping the community together lay in the strength of religion. One must keep in mind that the Hellenic religion was

interwoven into the fabric of daily life. The Golden Age of Pericles was a sign that the gods saw the people in great favor. When prosperity began to disintegrate, with war and strife taking its toll, the state religion was blamed for causing this great calamity.

> "Together with the Hellenic gods, the human and civic virtues
> which they demanded fell into disrepute. . . and gradually all sense
> was lost of the truth, that a state cannot exist except by the virtues
> of its citizens. The Ancient religion became defenseless against
> the hostile spirit of the times."[27]

Universal Citizenship.

Concurrently in 509 B.C., Rome began to build its Empire on law of which citizenship was a keystone. The traditional monarchy came to an end as the Republic was born. Even though the Roman Empire became a republic, the idea of democracy did not take root. The Empire was based on "universal citizenship of free men and a Stoic notion of the universal brotherhood of mankind."[28] While Greece gave us participatory citizen democracy, Rome gave us universal citizenship.[29] Two very different concepts. These are the two different perspectives that are in tension in American democracy. The one conceptual definition of citizenship is based on allegiance and service to the state. The other definition of citizenship includes the rights and privileges of being a citizen but also the responsibilities of citizenship to include involvement in the decision-making processes of governance.

The idea of Alexander the Great, to create a brotherhood of mankind, became a reality in the Roman Empire. One did not have to be born in Rome to become a citizen, as was the requirement in Athens. Outsiders were welcome and able to receive the high honor of becoming Roman citizens. As the Roman Empire expanded using citizenship as a reward for allegiance and service, it built an administrative apparatus which became supported by the institution of Roman Law.[30] In Rome, if one were an active citizen, twenty days of service would be

required in a given year. The typical day of the twenty days of service would begin at dawn by a trumpet call to duty. Sometimes it would be necessary to attend an informational session called a *contra*. Attendance was compulsory.[31]

Christianity Effects Change in Concept of Citizenship

As Christianity began to spread in the Western World, the Roman Empire responded with barbaric measures. The early centuries after Christ, Christianity was seen as a cult and not taken seriously.   As Christianity became more organized, its powers and influence as a movement dramatically changed. As Christianity became more influential and powerful within the Roman Empire, the concept of citizenship changed in unexpected ways. As the Empire spread, Christianity began to alter the thinking of the times. By 55-135 A.D., Epictetus answers the question, "What is a man?" as one who is a part of a civic community (polis). He is more specific in separating one's faithfulness into two communities. Epictetus presaged what was to become a conflict in values. Allegiance first belonged to the community of Gods and men, and then to the (civic) community. By the Third Century A.D., it is less easy being a good citizen. In 391 A.D., Emperor "Theodosius I made Christianity the official religion of the Empire."[32]

Christianity demanded a different kind of loyalty. Instead of loyalty to the community or service to the state, Christianity emphasized loyalty to one's private self and to the church community. St. John Chrysostom, the great Greek Orthodox theologian, wrote the "Sermons on the Statues" which reflect one's Christian citizenship responsibilities. St. Jerome, who served in Palestine, and St. Ambrose, who served in Italy, pronounced the faith of the Holy Fathers to accept the concept of Roman political universalism and Christian spirituality.[33] Besides writing on worship, organization, authority, history, and theological questions, Augustine emphasized that "true Christian citizens are those who in spiritual development, . . . model their lives on Christ and the Apostles."[34]

Augustine's interpretations and formulations of Christian and Platonic thought finally give Christianity its powerful stance.[35]

The Power of the Bishop.

Out of this mix of theological messages, imperial authority replaced individual citizen participation and the growth of the monastic movement began. The development of the bishopric and the powers relegated to the bishop increased. The political and religious powers merged. Loyalty becomes relegated to the "city through the bishop and saint . . . ."[36] The key person in this "Christian cultural-political development was the bishop."[37]

As the influences of the bishop increased, the importance of citizenship and civic virtue waned. The bishop's main interest was in creating Christians out of pagans rather than converting the pagan public to active civic citizenship. Interest in the public domain became equivalent to having interest in pagan ideas.

Romans and Germans.

As Christianity grew in its influence in numbers throughout Italy and into Germany, the early middle ages became the seed bed for the church being responsible for the basic educational institutions. Large numbers of educated citizens had become the norm prior to this time in point. However, as the church assumed the educational responsibilities, these great numbers of a well-educated citizenry soon plummeted.[38] In Gaul, the church dominated the learning institutions, while in Italy, the city was the main institution. However, in the plain of the Po, the northeastern Italian coastline region, civic institutions and civic virtue flourished.

As democracy stopped at the borders of Greece, it was held in abeyance until the American and French Revolutions. Citizenship as an issue remained

prevalent; however, due to the growth of the Roman Empire, interest in citizenship, as an exchange for allegiance and protection, continued to dominate the thinking on citizenship through the Middle Ages. Citizenship in the classical mode was eclipsed, blotted out.

Civic institutions survived one thousand years after Constantine's reign in the Third and Fourth Century (285-337 A.D.,). The Byzantine era, from 1050 to 1150 A.D., witnessed the time of "great social mobility."[39] A transvaluation occurred in Italy where a new civic consciousness arose. Civic loyalty emerged, whereas in Europe, the driving force was making people subject to the monarchy. Interestingly, the concept and idea of citizen and citizenship continued. Citizenship embraced many subcultural and traditional concepts. The monarchy also found the idea of citizenship in their favor because of the implications of service to the state and active community service traditions.

The Second Era--Two Principal Traditions of Citizenship

The Renaissance Ideology.

In the next three centuries the citizenship construct survived in "two principal traditions."[40] The Renaissance ideology and the civic humanist institutions were given credence by the writings of Machiavelli and then onto others such as Harrington. James Harrington "thought it possible to create a perfectly stable and unchanging republic". . . "by arranging a suitable balance of interests in the organization of the government through such devices as a separation of powers, division of the legislature, and rotation in office."[41] He is known for his "blueprint" for a perfect republic in his work entitled, The Commonwealth of Oceana.   These ideas reached the shores of France where Rousseau embraced and embellished the concept of citizenship in the civic humanist tradition. Property rights and the acquisition of property as pursued by the medieval merchants and lawyers set the tone for the second citizenship

tradition.

The Civic Humanist Tradition.

The second concept of citizenship was encouraged by the writings of "More, Montaigne, Bacon, Shakespeare, Hobbes, Locke, Franklin, and many others . . . ."[42] As economic activity increased and improved for the average person in Europe, citizenship in the tradition of the Ancients flourished. During the Reformation, the theologians began to favor public activism for the betterment of the community. Sir Thomas More, fascinated with the Ancient Greek Model, believed that the individual can be virtuous by being active in community rather than in a passive state in isolation or in contemplation. From a different perspective, Bodin viewed citizenship in the promotion of subjectship to the monarchy.[43] Johannes Althusius (1557-1638) focused his writings on an individual's life--whether it is contemplative versus an active one. Althusius expounded on the idea that "what makes a citizen is his membership in and service to the community."[44] Althusius was an early advocate of popular sovereignty and became the intellectual father of modern federalism.[45]

No difference existed between naturalization and denization[46] in the Fifteenth Century. In the Seventeenth Century, English Law "incorporated aliens into the community."[47] Naturalization costs consumed great amounts of time and monies. Even though aliens could purchase land, the king maintained ownership and use of the land.[48] Citizens began to resist the tyranny; however, this form of protest was limited in scope. The Levellers (1646-1649), religious dissidents from the major cities of England, made a dramatic announcement to Parliament. They demanded a democracy, but their pleas fell on deaf ears. Their ideas reflected the thinking following the bloodless English Revolution. However, the Levellers' pleas for democracy foreshadowed the thinking and actions that were to take place 150 years later with the American Revolutionaries and the French bourgeoisie, workers, and peasants.

During the Middle Ages, the citizenship tradition continued to emphasize the exchange of protection for taxes and service between citizen and community in France. The Renaissance period followed in this tradition. Montesquieu's writings stressed the importance of the role of *citizen*--defining citizenship within the realm of liberty and society--"a life being lived under the rule of law."[49] Montesquieu's popularity and public acceptance gave credence to the ideas of young Rousseau, who echoed Montesquieu's thoughts and proposed his own ideas on the *virtuous citizen*. Early on, Rousseau discussed the new society, which was "to be based on civism, heroism, sacrifice, and equality."[50] Rousseau's writings left a legacy on the importance of education. He predicated his beliefs of educating the individual on the basis of liberty. He saw liberty as depending on an educated populace. The Rousseauean thought, that *the most important business of the state* is education, began to strengthen the roots of republicanism.

Both these citizenship traditions treated the public realm differently than they did the private domain. In Rousseau's elevation of 'Liberate, Egalite, and Fraternite,' men contracted with each other as citizens but in a form of brotherhood that treated women differently from men. Men were involved in the public realm in the community and commerce; whereas, women were considered to be in the private domain of domesticity requiring protections by the government. Rousseau excluded women in his lengthy writings on the equality of men. He also believed that "real democracy is only an ideal."[51] Carole Pateman, political theorist, in her two books, The Problem of Political Obligation and The Sexual Contract, delves into this subject of how brotherhood destroys "the practice of citizenship."[52] Mafia-type organizations are reminders of this destructive order. Other writers insist that the citizenship rules need to be rewritten, especially in terms of the effects on the sense of community relating to the private and public realm.[53]

The critics of the times were more inspired by the Ancient Greeks, especially the ideas of Aristotle, who saw a need for community involvement.

Philosophers, Hobbes and Locke, looked to the subject of *citizen* and *citizenship* not in the narrow legal sense but in the way the Ancient Greeks envisioned citizenship--as the form of civic virtue and civic consciousness of the community. They saw the individual as a moral, thinking being who reflected on society and acted on those demands and needs. Hobbsean thinking focused on the individual and the individual's influence in society. Locke, on the other hand, seized upon the idea of the role of the individual and expanded that role to include the individual's role in government and in property acquisition. During the 1700's, the moral side of citizenship is revived. The citizen, in the eyes of Montesquieu, is seen as "a worthy political figure."[54] Montesquieu's citizen is similar to Locke's in character--one who is law-abiding, productive, and a loyal subject.

Transvaluation Occurs.

As we have seen the development of citizenship and community emerge out of Classical Greece and be transformed in Rome, we experienced a convergence with Christianity. The concept of citizenship reached a plateau and remained a secondary influence while the Bishopric and its institutional formation was cultivated. Along this strain of development converged the monarchical element. As these three doctrinal forces merged with each other, revolutions of spirit in the name of mankind and humanity occurred. The powers described as the church (religion), the monarchy, and the state, evolved in revolutionary terms to launch a new era. This is why, in the modern era, we have such difficulty with *getting* the idea of citizenship. Dewey, realizing this, developed a theory of democratic governance and citizenship that held that we can understand citizenship, and learn how to be citizens, only by doing it in the context of actual community processes. *We can never get the idea of citizenship from our theoretical traditions about governance because, in effect, it has been lost to us.* What we got in its place was citizenship through representative government.

Representative Democratic Government

Liberalism Influences.

At the dawn of liberalism, the era of American Democracy began. Liberal concepts such as individualism, republicanism, liberty, equality, and fairness were embraced. Dietz outlines the basic tenets of liberalism:

1. Individuals are rational in their thinking and have intrinsic worth.

2. Society ensures freedom to realize one's capabilities.

3. Individual liberty and human equality translate as political egalitarianism.

4. The individual is the bearer of formal rights and has equal access to those rights--which are inviolable and in a private realm that the state cannot legitimately interfere with.

5. Liberal thinking paved the way for an economic system based on profits.[55]

However, liberal concepts tend to promote the means to the ends of an economic system that declares that the "market maketh man."[56] Spotlighting the shortcomings of liberalism, Mary Shanley recognizes that "human interdependence . . . is part of the life of both families and polities. . . ."[57] Liberalism does not have the concepts or the language to help in that interaction. These weaknesses are identified in the liberal concepts of "rights, interests, contracts, individualism, representative government, and negative liberty."[58] In contrast to these liberal principles, Sheldon Wolin identifies the family of concepts surrounding citizenship as vital: "participation, action, democracy, community, and political freedom."[59]

Republican Ideals.

Democratic theory then slowly develops in bits and pieces, but it does not recover the Greek tradition fully, producing, as a result, only an impoverished idea of citizenship as part of representative government. American Democracy is born out of the republican ideals that pronounce that sovereignty resides in the consent of the people. Lockean principles declaring that "the People shall be Judge" convinced those in the Virginia House of Burgesses to dissolve the government that bound them to the Motherland.[60] As the Eighteenth Century comes to a close, republican governments have been installed on each side of the Atlantic. However, the aftermath of the Reign of Terror in France and of Shay's Rebellion in America held democracy at bay. Republican forms of government were instituted, with hierarchical structures and elitist political traditions.

John Pocock observed that "Machiavellian ideas are those that were prescribed for our republican government, and that it is Harrington, not Locke, who is the primary philosopher for the framers."[61] Whether Lockean principles or Harringtonian premises are imbedded in the regime values of America, Pirsig resonates Kettner's thoughts that the Natives practiced self-government long before the white man set foot on American shores. As Pirsig is so adept in illustrating that "when you borrow traits and attitudes from a hostile culture you don't give them credit for it."[62]

Pirsig overrides Lockean influences in America when he states that the idea "All men are created equal" is a gift to the world from the American Indian."[63] A Gestalt shift is needed to see the influences of the Indians to our American value system. The point of this discussion is that the questions of allegiance in America surfaced as new immigrants arrived, relations with the Indians deteriorated, and the pressures against slavery increased. One's obligations to the community remained strong through the 1820's. However, the period between 1820 and the Civil War marked this period as a "clash of principle and prejudice"--all in the quest for defining citizenship.[64]

Hierarchy--Aid or Threat to Democracy.

The genius of representative democracy was to protect the citizenry from tyranny while democracy had time to develop and grow into a true democracy. Decisions are made at the top of the hierarchy by the representatives who represent those at the bottom levels of society because of their right to vote. If we believe that our vote is an expression of our feelings and that representatives automatically do our bidding, we have become hooked into the technocratic mind set. Follett called this *ballot box democracy* whereby we <u>think</u> we share in public opinion.[65] According to Thayer, "representative government preserves hierarchy."[66] It is a Weberian hierarchical framework that establishes order and consistency in representative government created to look like democracy.[67] However, Merton cites the Weberian structure with excesses creating "irrationality and inefficiency" in its "punctilious adherence to formalized procedures" known as "red tape."[68] The primacy of decision-making in Simon's work is predicated on hierarchical organizational structures, which seek efficiency and control from subordinates.[69] Theorists Dahl, Eckstein, and Sartori--"emphasize the <u>need</u> for hierarchy."[70] But Thayer states that representative democracy is impersonal democracy.

Technocracy Imposes Upon Democracy.

The bottom line is that the traditions of democracy--civic virtue and community--stem from Ancient Greece and were seeded twenty-five hundred years ago. As the Industrial Revolution created great changes, the republican form of democracy took roots. The electoral process as designed by the Founders implied a *technocratic* system in determining the election of the President by a distant, mechanical process. Thayer described the electoral college as an "alienating character"(istic) in the election process.[71] Functionalism, as promoted by Frederick Taylor, in the 1920's, under the guise

of scientific management, left its mark on the republican form of government. One of Taylor's maxims--*one best way*--resonates in our society to the present day. The values of scientific management--economy, efficiency, and effectiveness--became relegated to a primary place in democratic thinking.[72]

The economic way of thinking permeated the upper levels of public management levels or executive circles as a means to satisfy the public. In the process of promoting efficiency, effectiveness and economy, democratic values of representativeness, responsibility, and reliability are relegated to a place of no return. For example, economic theories such as the Agency Theory and Transactional-Cost Economics Theory are both premised on contractual agreements between the agent and the client/customer.[73] These theories may be good for the business world but translated in governmental terms they obviate the possibility of true democracy.

Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA), Zero-Based Budgeting (ZBB), and Management by Objectives (MBO) are some of the processes promoted as cost-effective, efficient, and economic.[74] These technocratic forms of operation function only too well; however, they are not a replacement for democratic processes any more than a computer is for a brain. They are detrimental to a democracy; because, they automatically assume a life of their own. They are outside democratic measures and thus bypass accountability, due process, deliberation by the people, the legislature, and public information on behalf of the people.   Sartori describes this technology in the form of "horizontal communication" between the experts and the political leaders--the techno-experts.[75]

Waldo put the concept of efficiency in perspective. He reminds us that the concept of efficiency works within "a framework of consciously held values."[76] It is our responsibility to remember and practice our democratic values and beliefs when instituting the concepts of efficiency and effectiveness. In other words, democratic processes must be protected when utilizing these concepts of efficiency and effectiveness within the framework of our democratic value

system.

White and McSwain describe technocracy and the dangers with "the technicist episteme."[77] White uses powerful language in describing technicism. "Technicism amounts to nothing less that a specter--a specter that portends the diminishment and possible loss of the human principle itself."[78] With the onset of the electronic town hall made popular in the 1996 presidential election, the warning White issues may be coming true. "What we must truly fear is that technical decision will become our dominant social process."[79] Abramson and Pearl also see the negative affects on the public. However, they see the process as an "awkward transition from a representative democracy to something closer to a true democracy, and official Washington is having a hard time coping."[80] Technology creates a false sense of community at best.

Technocratic mechanisms are violating our privacy and our ways of deliberation. Caroline Kennedy Schlossberg and her colleagues are researching and writing about these kinds of violations as a breach of the public trust. These violations are all technically-based because they are automatic functions of a process and are relegated to a place of no return. The media, computer industry, cyberspace, Internet, and other electronic innovations are transgressing the domain of free speech, privacy ethics, and democratic processes.

In the mid-1990's, a modern view of technology and the future of political parties as organizations of the past is summarized by Kevin Phillips. The value of town meetings, initiatives, referenda, and the techniques of electronic democracy will become "technology-facilitated participatory democracy" as the United States moves toward the 21st century.[81]

Citizen Participation--Citizen Involvement

In searching through the literature on how we as a people have attempted to clarify the purpose of democratic government and how to include citizens in government, I find it interesting and illuminating to actually define the concepts of

participation and involvement. In seeking out definitions for participation and involvement, one immediately senses confusion. The dictionary definition of participation is "to take part or have a share in common with others;"[82] the definition for involvement is the act of having an effect on.[83] It is a paradox which the citizen faces. Participation suggests action but is passive; involvement is the act of doing and effecting change.   According to Barber, the political knowledge that one learns by doing or experiencing becomes the "epistemology of the process."[84] These are the thoughts echoed over a century ago by Alexis DeTocqueville who believed that a person became "educated in the process" as one became involved.[85] We are at a critical crossroads of citizen participation and involvement in government processes. In other words, we are in transition that holds out the possibilities for a true, direct democracy existing within the confines of a republican form of democracy. However, it is threatened by a technocracy that masks as if it were a democracy. In our quest to determine whether or not we are ready for a more direct democracy, we must be alert to what could be alienating and repressive features of democracy in its true form. The words of *The Declaration of Independence* cry out, "That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Public Consciousness.

Forces in this country are identifying and addressing the various problems and resolutions to those problems which are present or are on the horizon. Orion White's "public consciousness" sets the tone.[86] He has resurrected Deweyan ideas of the public and its responsibility. Public as well as private institutions share responsibility for carrying out the democratic values of citizenship as practiced as civic virtue for the greater good or commonwealth, freedom, liberty, equality, and fairness through education.

In the Public Interest.

      In the Seventeenth Century, James Harrington believed that the main interest of all of mankind is the "'Law of Nature' and described 'the publick interest of a commonwealth' as 'nearest that of mankind.'"[87] Charles Goodsell brings the "public interest" to focus for the Twenty-First Century.   The "public interest" relegates democratic values to primary levels so that the public will is made for the long term, not for special interests in the short term. White equates the "public interest" with "public consciousness." Mosca, Pareto and Michels feel that in the delegation of political power by the people to the representatives, the public's interest may well be reflected by those representatives rather than the people.[88] However, the values inherent in the meaning and understanding of "public interest" elevate the concept in the public arena.

      Goodsell dissects the value content of the term "public interest" into six value constructs. The *legal-moral* interpretation of the meaning of "public interest" implies that the individual applying the term is using discretion and operating in the legal and moral realm. Another interpretation of the public interest is the application of *political responsiveness* in a democratic manner. It also implies *political consensus* where deliberation involves all participants in the political spectrum.   The expression, "in the public interest," also is interpreted to mean a *concern for logic*. Things make sense because appropriate measures have been made to be accountable to the public. In this way, the *concern for effects* on the public is more readily received because it is felt that the public will receive benefits from a particular public policy that is instituted in the "public interest." The final measure that Goodsell explains is why the term "public interest" suggests a safe haven. Because *of agenda awareness,* the responsible public administrator is knowledgeable of the big picture and takes into account all perspectives in helping to develop public policy.[89]

Active Citizenship.

Camilla Stiver's "Active Citizenship" primarily begins by laying the groundwork for public deliberation. Before a community of self-interested individuals together with public officials and civic-minded citizens meet on behalf of the public interest, the language of understanding becomes a prologue to the deliberations. Stivers claims and demonstrates in her case studies that it is necessary for "the development of understanding that strengthens citizens' capacity for purposeful action."[90] As these ideas merge with each other, the key facilitator to this process becomes apparent--the public administrator.

Bureaucrats may need citizens, as Stivers suggests in her paper, "Toward a Community of Knowledge," but in a different way from that practiced in the early days of the Founding. "Active Citizenship" is not anathema to management but can be an effective way to improve policy-making decisions that have a public face, not just an administrative one.[91] "Shared understanding," "accountability," and "legitimation,"[92] are the dynamics engendered by both the public and public administrator in enhancing the sense of community and the greater sense of the whole. Where Stivers defines *shared understanding* as a necessary tool for the sense of community to function, White and McSwain describe it as generating a *lingua franca* for the process to serve the developing society.[93]

Agential Leadership.

Wamsley's *agential leadership* ideas are necessary in building a community between interested citizens and government. The building up of a consensus around a problem which opens up dialogue among the interested parties can alleviate the tensions of power struggles between government officials and citizens to the sharing of the power. Wamsley sees "the Agency as a potential focal point for building community at all levels of our government, . . .

Essence of Community.

This *sharing of the power* is the key principle of Thayer's "Essence of Community." He identifies the problem in terms of the "professional-citizen dichotomy." Each party separates from the other because of either status, expertise, and/or roles. If, on the other hand, citizens were considered *professional citizens*, the status and role may be erased. The issue at hand becomes the place from which the participants begin to deliberate and reach consensus or some conclusions.   Mansbridge believes that it is this consensus-building process that focuses attention on the different arguments and places the onus on those participants to see the whole picture. The highest act of citizenship is involvement.

Sharing in the Office.

In reflection, Herbert Croly was calling for a *Great Community* in the early part of this Twentieth Century.[95] Along came John Dewey, the pragmatist philosopher who wrote in his book, The Public and Its Problems (1927) that in our development as a nation we are processing toward the *Great Community*. Dewey shared the vision of Aristotle and Plato that each individual citizen has a responsibility to the public welfare as well as to oneself. Dewey called this the dual citizenship role. A citizen is first, a public officer of the state and has responsibility for the public interest, the public consciousness. The citizen is also the private self who votes for his own interests. When the public and private interests conflict with each other, the citizen is responsible for deliberating with others in face-to-face interaction in searching for the truth. It becomes a win-win situation whereby the public interest and private interest can coexist.

In Arendt's thinking, the community of co-existence and participation

guarantees that the people can retain their power. For, "power is the lifeblood of human artiface."[96] "The people are their own best advocates."[97] In a democracy, the people may choose their leaders, but the leaders can only be effective if the community is successful in including the public. Briand gives two reasons why the public must be involved in policy making and addressing a community's problems:

1. Public problems cannot be solved without involvement by everyone who is affected by the problem.

2. Our most difficult problems require input and cooperation from everyone.[98]

As Arendt concludes: "Citizens who deliberate, choose, and act together are those who have power."[99] Croly gave the most statesmanlike reason:

"The character of a nation, like the character of an individual, is wrought not by submissive obedience to the law, but by the active assertion of the needs and purposes of its own life."[100]

These ideas in concert give credence and function well with Dewey's ideas; each alone would not have that same value.

The genius of representative democracy may have been preferred by the Founders to protect the citizens from the tyranny of factions in the aggregate of the community.[101] However, "a democracy cannot delegate all its powers and remain a democracy."[102] That is the danger of hierarchy in a representative democratic government. "Participation of the governed is necessary in a democracy."[103]

Hannah Arendt identified "politics as the active life of citizens" with the community. For it is the citizens who form the community who make the "affairs of the community," . . . "the people's affair."[104] Democratic citizenship is a relationship of civic peers. The guiding principles are mutual respect, "positive liberty" of democracy and self government, which is not the "negative liberty" of noninterference.[105] Arendt alerted us in the late fifties that "citizenship is the 'lost treasure' of American political life."[106] It is in the public realm of the sense of

community that the spirit of democracy must be awakened.

As a new dawn arises on the horizon of the twenty-first century in America, the British are also reflecting on the concept of citizenship. The words of Douglas Hurd who purports to seek a new definition of citizenship sounds more like supporting the Tories of the past. The Conservatives feel that *active citizenship* will serve to alleviate the pressures of too much dependence on the welfare state, the crime rate, and also, help to increase responsible citizens. This kind of citizenship espoused by Hurd could prove to be destructive to the idea of society. Interestingly enough, caution is expressed to be careful not to make citizenship too burdensome and obligatory. However, in an editorial, the blare of the trumpets sound the cause for "a community of equals" whereby citizenship "grows up" from the people on "behalf of the community."[107] It is the practicing of citizenship that will promote civic virtue that will, in turn, *harness* the sense of community.

Conclusion

Americans are the inheritors of ancient traditions of citizenship and community. The two traditions from the Ancients that are intrinsically intertwined in our foundation are democracy and citizenship. As western civilization developed, the meaning of these two traditions has been transmuted with the onset of Christianity. As the organizational structures of Christianity became formalized, the power struggles between the church and state together with the remnants of monarchical powers strangled the development of democracy and put citizenship into a latent state. When civilization spread along with Christianity, the roots of democracy and citizenship that had been dormant for so long finally took sprout and broke through the surface and began to flourish.

In England, subjectship to the monarchy via parliament was automatically assumed. However, in America, the questions of allegiance surfaced. A revolution of the human spirit in the throes of freedom and equality of man

created a new paradigm of democratic values and self government. The value systems of citizenship in practice as civic virtue and a sense of community provided a strong foundation upon which a representative democratic government could flourish. The pioneer spirit continues in the ideals that have been entrusted to us and are at the threshold of our developing American democracy as envisioned by John Dewey.

Endnotes

1.   The Great Ideas: A Syntopicon I. "Citizen" Chapter 11 in Great Books of the Western World. Robert Maynard Hutchins, Editor in Chief. University of Chicago, 1952, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., p. 219.

2.   Peter Riesenberg. Citizenship in the Western Tradition: Plato to Rousseau. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992, p. 11.

3.   The Random House Encyclopedia. New York: Random House, Inc., 1983, p. 993.

4.   Jane J. Mansbridge. Beyond Adversary Democracy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1980, p. 375.

5.   Cynthia Patterson. Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451-50, B.C.. University of Pennsylvania, 1976 and Arno Press, Inc., 1981, pp. 24-25.

6.   Ibid., p. 83. "Boule" means "workers" in Modern Greek. "Dikasteria" means lawyers in Modern Greek.

7.   Ibid., p. 85 and p. 28.

8.   Patterson, pp. 94-95.

9.   Ibid., p. 98.

10.   Samuel Enoch Stumpf, President, Cornell College. Socrates to Sartre: A History of Philosophy. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1966, p. 37.

11.   Ibid., p. 94. Plato disagreed with this practice of paying citizens for public service; he felt it would make people lazy.

12.   Ibid., p. 136.

13.   Ibid., p. 129.

14.   Loc. Cit., p. 129.

15.   Ibid., p. 151.

16.   Riesenberg, p. xviii.

17.   Mansbridge, pp. ix to 2.

18.   Ibid., p. xvii.

19.   Ibid., p. xviii.

20.   Ibid., p. xix.

21.   Ibid., p. xix.

22.   Ibid., p. 11.

23.   Ibid., p. 34.

24.   Professor Dr. Ernst Curtius.   Curtius' The History of Greece. Translated by Adolphus William Ward, M.A., New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., Vol. IV, pp. 9-10. Undated.

25.   Riesenberg, p. 24.

26.   Curtius, pp. 79-80.

27.   Ibid., pp. 83-84.

28.   Ibid., p. 57.

29.   The word, 'city' and its derivative, 'citizen,' came from the Latin word 'civitas' meaning 'body politic.' It did not imply a large town. The Latin word, 'civitas' was always compared to its opposite definition 'peregrinus,' which means an alien, or a foreigner. This derivation of 'perigrinus' gave us the word 'peregrination' meaning to wander and to be a fugitive as in Cain's punishment. (See "Citizen Cain's Silenced Sisters," New Statesman and Society. Vol. 1, #26, December 2, 1988, p. 18.)

30.   Ibid., p. 57.

31.   Ibid., p. 82.

32.   Ibid., p. 84.

33.   Ibid., p. 88. St. John Chrysostom (Golden-mouth) wrote homilies against the display of statues in the homes of Christians.

34.   Ibid., p. 90.

35.   Stumpf, p. 132.

36.   Ibid., p. 92.

37.   Ibid., p. 98.

38.   Ibid., p. 98.

39.   Ibid., p. 84 and p. 100.

40.   Ibid., p. 110.

41.   "James Harrington (1611-1677)," <u>Encyclopedia of Philosophy</u>, Paul Edwards, Editor in Chief, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Volume Three, 1967, pp. 415-416.

42.   Ibid., p. 204.

43.   Ibid., p. 206.

44.   Ibid., p. 206.

45.   "Johannes Althusius (1557-1638)," <u>The New Encyclopedia Britannica</u>, Fifteenth Edition, Volume 1, Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., 1990, p. 300. Althusius, a Dutch Calvinist political theorist, wrote a systematized tract on all forms of human association (1610-1614), a general treatise on Roman law, as well as, other legal essays.

46.   The state of being an inhabitant in a state or country where one is not native born.

47.   James H. Kettner. <u>The Development of American Citizenship, 1608-1870</u>. Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, by The University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, 1978, p. 29.

48.   Ibid., p. 30.

49.   Riesenberg, pp. 254-257.

50.   Ibid., p. 254.

51.   "Citizen Cain's Silenced Sisters," <u>New Statesman and Society</u>. London: Statesman & Nation Publishing Co. Ltd., Vol. 1, #26, December 2, 1988, p. 19.

52.   Ibid., p. 19.

53.   Ibid., p. 19.

54.   Ibid., p. 256.

55.   Mary G. Dietz. "Context Is All: Feminism and Theories of Citizenship," <u>Daedalus</u>. Boston, Massachusetts: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Fall,

1987, pp. 2-4.

56.   Ibid., p. 5.

57.   Ibid., p. 6.

58.   Ibid., p. 6.

59.   Ibid., p. 9.

60.   Kettner, p. 168.

61.   Ibid., p. 267.

62.   Robert M. Pirsig. <u>LILA: An Inquiry Into Morals</u>. New York: Bantam Books, 1991, p. 46.

63.   Ibid., p. 58.

64.   Kettner, p. 288.

65.   Fry, p. 107.

66.   Frederick C. Thayer. <u>An End to Hierarchy and Competition: Administration in the Post-Affluent World</u>. New York, New York: New Viewpoints, 1981, p. 3.

67.   Brian R. Fry. <u>Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo</u>. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1989, p. 35.

68.   Ibid., p. 41.

69.   Ibid., p. 201.

70.   Thayer, p. 63. See Carole Pateman, <u>Participation and Democratic Theory</u>. Cambridge: University Press, 1970, Ch. 1.

71.   Thayer, p. 57.

72.   Frederick W. Taylor. "Scientific Management," <u>Classics of Public Administration</u>. Edited by Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde.   Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987, Second Edition, pp. 29-32.

73.   Charles Perrow. <u>Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Third Edition, 1986. See page 224 for Agency Theory and pages 236-247 for TCE.

74.   Donald Axelrod. Budgeting for Modern Government. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1988. See page 80 for information on CBA, page 18 for ZBB, and page 22 for MBO.

75.   Geraint Parry. "Democracy and Amateurism--the Informed Citizen," Government and Opposition. London: Government & Opposition, Vol. 24, #4, 1989, Autumn, p. 489.

76.   Fry, p. 227.

77.   Orion F. White, Jr., and Cynthia J. McSwain. "The Phoenix Project: Raising a New Image of Public Administration from the Ashes of the Past," in Henry D. Kass and Bayard L. Catron (Editors.) Images and Identities in Public Administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing Co., 1990, p.23.

78.   Orion F. White, Jr. "Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate," in Refounding Public Administration. By Gary L. Wamsley et al. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990, p. 238.

79.   Ibid., p. 238.

80.   Jill Abramson and Daniel Pearl. "Capital Culture: Congressman's Sojourn in Washington Teaches Bitter Political Lesson; Cynicism and Self-Interest Are Worse Than Ever, The Public Unforgiving," The Wall Street Journal, Vol. CCXXII, No. 117, Wednesday, December 15, 1993, pp. A1, A4.4.

81.   Kevin Phillips. "Volatile Voters Imperil Republicans," The Washington Post. Sunday, November 13, 1994, pp. C1-2.

82.   Funk & Wagnalls Standard Desk DICTIONARY. New York, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Inc., p. 1977, p. 477.

83.   Ibid., p. 343.

84.   Parry, p. 496. See Benjamin Barber's Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984, p. 167.

85.   Ibid., pp. 495-496.

86.   White, p. 239.

87.   "James Harrington (1611-1677)," p. 415.

88.   Ibid., p. 14.

89.   Charles T. Goodsell. "Public Administration and the Public Interest," Refounding Public Administration. By Gary L. Wamsley et al. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990, pp. 96-113.

90.   Camilla M. Stivers. <u>Active Citizenship in the Administrative State</u>. Dissertation: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, March, 1988, p. 110.

91.   Ibid., p. 37.

92.   Ibid., p. 38.

93.   White and McSwain, pp. 27-28.

94.   Gary Wamsley, "The Agency Perspective," in <u>Refounding Public Administration</u>. By Gary L. Wamsley et al. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990, p. 153.

95.   Harry C. Boyte. "Reinventing Citizenship," <u>Kettering Review</u>. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, Winter, 1994, Dayton, Ohio, p. 80.

96.   Hannah Arendt. "Power and the Space of Appearance," <u>Kettering Review</u>. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, Summer, 1993, p. 23.

97.   Noelle McAfee. "Relationship and Power," <u>Kettering Review</u>. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, Summer, 1993, p. 26.

98.   Michael Briand. "People, Lead Thyself," <u>Kettering Review</u>. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, Summer, 1993, pp. 38-46.

99.   Ibid., p. 41.

100.   Herbert Croly. <u>Progressive Democracy</u>. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914, p. 167.

101.   James Madison. "The Federalist No. 10," <u>The Federalist</u>. Edited by Jacob E. Cooke. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1961, pp. 56-65.

102.   Hook, p. 9

103.   Ibid., p. 8.

104.   Dietz, p. 13.

105.   Ibid., p. 14.

106.   Ibid., p. 17.

107.   <u>New Statesman</u>. "Citizen Hurd," Vol. 115, No. 2977, April 15, 1988, p. 3.

Chapter V
JOHN DEWEY--His Life, His Thoughts, His Philosophy

A Biographical Sketch of John Dewey

Why it is important to know about Dewey's life in order to understand his importance to public administration. I want to put a human face on public administration. The main problem the field of public administration has is that it wants to present itself as a human enterprise, one that helps people, serves the public interest, keeps the people informed and involved in what is needed by the public. It then seeks to accomplish these noble purposes with the methods of the cold, objective professional. Public administration's hierarchical framework is the antithesis of a democratic one.

I want people to know Dewey, the person. Dewey had a great capacity for goodness and had a generosity of human spirit that demonstrated honesty with his fellow human beings, open-mindedness that invited communication via dialogue, intelligence that encompassed all criteria in judgment, and the wisdom to expound his ideas to others in philosophical terms. He had a great belief in democratic ideals and wanted to share those beliefs, ideas, and philosophies with the general public. He truly believed that each citizen was an officer of the state and had responsibility in the decision-making processes representing the public and the self. Dewey calls this the public voice and the private voice. His view was that in a democracy, an individual must determine how one is expressing one's will in the public sector, in one's government. Does one express it for one's own private interests or should one consider the public's

interest. Let us meet John Dewey, the man, whose thoughts we want to know, to understand, and to activate in practice so that each American can feel and experience democracy, as John Dewey so deeply felt. Let us meet John Dewey, as a model for an alternative to the cold, objective professional, who embodied the point of view that "good government" did not necessarily mean government by experts alone.

Recently, on television and in <u>The Miami Herald</u>, advertisements were bombarding the public in Florida to vote against a bill whose purpose was to protect the Everglades. The advertisements lambasted bureaucrats, who were said to be milking the public by spending money on expensive limousines, posh restaurants, and indulging in heavy drinking. It seemed that the purpose of the ads was to provide an image of public bureaucrats as self-interested, self-indulgent, and as using their public positions for self-aggrandizement. The images of the public officials exhibited them as self-promoting "fat cats" and wheeler-dealers behind the scenes of power in government, loosely spending public monies. The stereotyping of the individuals and the graphic language used in doing this created a strong impression that tax dollars were being wasted.

If the public cannot recognize public officials as being honest and practicing in the public interest, citizens will continue to be estranged from public administrators. John Dewey's model for citizenship can help us out of the dilemma we are in, where we dislike government officials whom we need to serve the public interest. That model for citizenship shows citizens as learning how to interact with their government, public administrators as productively interacting with citizens. Further, the whole social system with all its parts, public and private, could use this model in all aspects of life: in work, in the arts, and in community life.   This was the personal insight of John Dewey, the man, whose thoughts, were they to be put into practice, would give each American a deeply felt experience of democracy.

John Dewey was born in Burlington, Vermont, in 1859, to Archibald and Lucina Rich Dewey. Archibald and Lucina came from old-line Vermont families. Dewey's father left farming to open a grocery store. He was said to be very interested in the community of Burlington, jovial, and not one to press customers to pay their past-due accounts. He was fifty years old when John Dewey was born. He was a "replacement child." John was born nine months after his older brother, who was named John, had died a horrible death from falling into scalding water.

The religious atmosphere of Burlington and environs was influenced by the First Congregational Church, to which Lucina had been converted early in her life. One might, indeed, call Dewey's mother a religious zealot. Her piety greatly deepened John's religiosity but also caused him great pain and ambivalence. His early writings, which are replete with references to God's will, are influenced by his religious upbringing.

Though Dewey was born into the middle-class, his mother came from a well-to-do Vermont family, and Lucina had great aspirations for her three sons . She supplemented their education with auxiliary reading materials, since she saw the Burlington schools as leaving much to be desired.   In 1875, John, together with his brother Davis, enrolled at the University of Vermont. A leading American transcendentalist, James Marsh, headed the University. He was very careful not to offend the townspeople with the pantheism of the transcendentalist theology which he professed. Therefore, he packed his lectures and writings with references to God. Marsh's teachings and influence continued through both the head of the department of philosophy, Joseph Torrey, and his nephew, Henry Torrey. H. A. P. Torrey conducted studies of Kant's three Critiques, through which he transmitted Kant's philosophy to his students.

Dewey said in later years that he owed a great deal to Torrey for his introduction to Kant's philosophy. The first two years of Dewey's educational experience would not have led one to believe a promising student philosopher

was to emerge. He was considered an average student. The intellectual "fire in his belly" did not develop until he was introduced to the natural sciences--which served as a catalyst for his education in philosophy. He graduated as a Phi Beta Kappa.

Upon his graduation, he taught two years in the high school of a small town called Oil City, Pennsylvania, and one year in a small town south of Burlington. Apparently, these experiences were not good ones. His students were a rowdy group of boys and his classroom lacked order. One of his students remarked about Dewey's teaching, "How terribly the boys behaved, and how long and fervent was the prayer with which he opened each school day."[1]

It is in this setting that he later remarked to Max Eastman that he had a "mystical experience." As an escape from his inexperience as a classroom teacher, he found solace in his interest in philosophy. He would find himself looking forward to the solitude of the quiet evenings and meditate while looking up in the dark skies. Conjuring images from Wordsworth and Whitman, he felt a "oneness with the universe," expressing it in terms that "everything that's here is here, and you can just lie back on it."[2] Not too happy with his teaching experience, he relished the world of his own thinking. He wrote an article, "The Metaphysical Assumptions of Materialism," and submitted it to the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* with a note attached. He asked the editor if the subject at hand was worth pursuing and whether he showed promise in writing about it. The article on philosophy was published and served as the beginning of a lifetime pursuit of philosophical studies which was to span from 1881, (date of the published article) to 1952.

Writing a second essay, entitled "The Pantheism of Spinoza," he applied for a fellowship in philosophy at the Johns Hopkins University. As Johns Hopkins was only five years old, monies for promising students was scarce, especially for graduate students studying philosophy. He was discouraged from following his inclinations, since there was little promise of college teaching positions after graduation for graduate philosophy students. In his

determination, he borrowed five hundred dollars from an aunt and set out to the university to major in philosophy and minor in history and political science. Charles Sanders Peirce, together with G. Stanley Hall and George Sylvester Morris, were lecturers in the Philosophy Department at Johns Hopkins University, where Dewey sought a graduate fellowship. Dewey did not become enthralled with Peirce's ideas at first, but rather leaned towards George Morris, who became his initial mentor. Morris, a post-Kantian idealist, introduced Dewey to the writings of Immanuel Kant, the British idealist T. H. Green, and Hegelianism. This immersion into ethics and philosophy served as a catalyst for Dewey as he discovered he had a proclivity towards the subject of epistemology. He received his Ph.D. degree from Johns Hopkins University in 1884. Following his graduation, he went to the University of Michigan, where he taught philosophy for ten years. In 1888, in what appeared as a move to demonstrate his independence from his mentor, George Sylvester Morris, Dewey left Michigan. He accepted a professorship at the University of Minnesota. While at Minnesota, Morris died unexpectedly. Dewey then returned to Michigan to head the Philosophy Department.

It is at the University of Michigan that Dewey met his future wife, Alice Chipman, one of his students who found him warm despite other students' characterization of him as "cold, impersonal, psychological, sphinx-like, anomalous and petrifying to

 flunkers," . . . .[3] Two persons who had a great influence on his life were Alice Chipman Dewey and T. H. Green, a leader of the School of Philosophy known as British idealism. Alice brought Dewey from the theoretical world into the real world by exposing him to social problems. She influenced him to engage in politics and in social reform. This is what he was to do for the rest of his life. She was responsible for his turning away from liberal Congregationalism to espouse a more social Christianity that encompassed the community, leaving behind his association with any organized religion.

In 1894, he left Michigan to be included among those select few to be

appointed to the faculty of the new university in Chicago. Up until this point, Dewey was not considered a major intellectual force in philosophy. However, he wanted to be associated with the new university that Rockefeller was promoting; so, in order to make the move, he took a salary cut. He also took a leave of absence in the hiatus between his association with Michigan and Chicago. He and his wife, together with their three children, went on a much-needed vacation to Europe. It was in Milan, Italy, that Morris, their youngest child, contracted diphtheria and died at the age of two. This devastated Alice and was to have a profound effect on her emotional well-being. Her grief weighed heavily on her health until her death in July of 1927. Dewey became head of the department of Philosophy, Psychology, and Pedagogy at the University of Chicago and also served as a professor of education in the Department of Education. The Philosophy, Psychology, and Pedagogy Department became known as the center of the "Chicago School" of pragmatism.

In Chicago, Alice introduced him to Jane Addams of Hull House. A settlement house, similar to those in New York and London, Hull House, provided a place for immigrants to learn English, be introduced to the arts, and listen to philosophical discussions. It proved to be a precursor to what our adult education programs and community colleges provide today. Hull House also became a refuge for women in need. Jane introduced Dewey to the underside of life in Chicago. She led him on tours to the red-light district, where he attempted to persuade women to change their way of life, to the meat factories to witness the unsanitary conditions there, and to city hall to see the corruptness in government first hand. Jane was a true reformer.

Jane Addams provided a place for immigrants to share their culture and heritage. She was appalled by the way immigrants were treated. For example, the Ford Motor Company's orientation for all new employees would include a demonstration of how an immigrant should dress--i.e., to put aside ethnic dress and don American clothing as the acculturation to American ways, so as to become part of the "melting pot" medium. Dewey agreed with her in this respect.

However, Dewey tended to be a nationalist in his reformer role. He believed that immigrants should be educated in the English language and be able to converse in English. In a way, he believed in the "melting pot" idea, but not to the point where immigrants lost their identity entirely. He believed in pluralism as the source of America's strength. Dewey lectured often at Hull House. He saw Hull House as an educational institution linked to the community, providing a service to the local residents--adults as well as children.

Taking up the charge of the importance of education to children, Dewey convinced community leaders as well as the administration at the university that a demonstration school needed to be established to conduct research, to observe, and to evaluate different theories of pedagogy, primarily Dewey's. He founded the Laboratory School that came to be known as the Lab School. His wife, Alice, took an active role in the administration of the school. Dewey was criticized for the nepotism of having his wife on the payroll and playing such an important role in the research project.

He resigned in 1904, being disheartened when his wife was told her appointment was not being renewed by the Education Department. It has to be said here that funds for his school were a problem from the start, even though Dewey did much fund-raising himself. With no job in sight, he wrote to his friend Catell, who notified the president of Columbia that it would be a coup to get Dewey on the staff. The president immediately convinced a few people to establish an endowed chair for Dewey. Dewey accepted the position with Columbia University, where he was to teach until his retirement in 1930. Following his retirement, it was agreed that he would receive the title Professor Emeritus, get his regular salary, maintain an office, interview graduate students occasionally, and lecture intermittently. Due to the economic crisis of the Great Depression, this agreement was eventually terminated. However, Dewey maintained an ever-ready pen, his typewriter clicked away as he wrote abundantly--books and journal articles, together with his lectures, continued to provide him well financially. He traveled upon request to China, Japan, Mexico

116

and the Soviet Union. In China, he lectured at the University of Peking on philosophy and education. He served as a consultant to the Turkish Government in reorganizing their schools on a national basis.

Dewey maintained an active civic life. His actions provided proof of his words. He was at the cutting edge of societal change. We must remember that innovators frighten people. He brought discomfort when he expounded on academic freedom and individual rights   He was founder and president of the American Association of University Professors, a vocal activist for academic freedom. He was one of the founding members of the American Civil Liberties Union. He was the first president of the People's Lobby, chairman of The League for Independent Political Action, and helped to found the Liberal Party. He was president of the American Psychological Association as well as honorary life president of the National Education Association. He was founder of the New School for Social Research in New York, championing the cause for democratic administration of schools and universities. He was a charter member of the first Teachers Union in New York City but withdrew when it was found to be under the influences of communist groups.

In his intellectual discourse with others, he found himself in a most difficult position. Whereas his reputation was internationally recognized as a philosopher, liberal thinker, and educator, many sought Dewey as the point man in which to refute his ideas and to propel their own ideas. He was an anti-Marxist, anti-communist, anti-Stalinist, and against state socialism. However, he was challenged in his political ideologies on two fronts. When he visited the Soviet Union upon invitation with a group of educators, he returned to the United States with his observations. He found it necessary to highlight the strengths of the educational system of the Soviet Union. He was criticized for any comparisons made between the American and Russian educational system and his visit brought him under scrutiny. When he declared that the "fundamental principal of democracy is that the ends of freedom and individuality for all can be attained only by means that accord with these ends," he got himself into a web of

117

confusion when he continued with the statement: "I should want to see politics used to forward the formation of a genuinely cooperative society . . . ."[4] No one heard the rest of the story. What Dewey wanted everyone to hear was "the absolute importance of democratic action in determining the policies of the government--for only by means of 'government by the people' can government for the people be made secure."[5]

On the one hand, Dewey would discuss Jeffersonian thought of self-governing communities and ended up being confused with left-wing thinking of the times, when he used words such as "scientific planning." He had very little patience with Walter Lippman who became by the mid-thirties as a right-wing thinker. The confusion over the terms "planned" and with "planning" caused a whirlwind of writings that appeared in periodicals such as the New Republic, the Nation, Common Sense, and Plan Age. [6] Even though he is grouped with the progressives and liberals of the times, Dewey got caught up in the rhetoric of ideologies in flux. Westbrook describes Dewey in this point in time, 20's and 30's, as "a unique anti-Stalinist radical in that he did not care much for Marx."[7] Dewey argued that the "Soviet dialectical materialism . . . was a pernicious philosophy . . . ."[8]

Where Dewey got himself into trouble is ironic in itself. He was against anything that was Stalinist or Trotskyist. He was considered to be so highly respected for his objectivity and for his earnestness to speak freely upon his ideas, that in March of 1937, he was asked to serve as the chairman of the Commission of Inquiry into the Charges Made against Leon Trotsky in the Moscow Trials. This became known as the Dewey Commission.[9] It is at this point that I believe he found himself between a rock and a hard place. The American liberals and radicals along with Trotskyists were members of the American Committee for the Defense of Leon Trotsky of which Dewey was an honorary chairman. He remained adamantly opposed to anything that resembled communistic but defended "Trotsky's right to a public trial, although I have no sympathy with what seems to me to be his abstract ideological

fanaticism."[10] He tried to keep this committee from using the trial for pro-Trotsky propaganda while attempting to demonstrate the unfairness of the Stalinists. Both sides crushed in on Dewey making him a scapegoat, a target. Dewey's conclusions to this political fiasco is rather telling of Dewey's intellectualism, cool-mindedness, and even-handedness in dealing with the criticisms. He concluded this by saying: "The lessons for Americans was that they must stop looking to the Soviet Union as a model for solving our own economic difficulties and as a source of defense for democracy against fascism."[11] He was hailed as a "Charlie McCarthy for the Trotskyites" by the American Communist press. He also fell out of favor by the Soviets. But more importantly for Dewey, he was utterly shocked to be criticized by the liberals and progressives who found the Dewey Commission to be "threatening the unity of the popular front against fascism."[12]

In the early forties, we again find Dewey in the midst of a foreign policy issue of how to deal with Stalin and Russia against Hitler's Nazism. He stated that he knew that the United States needed to give aid to the Russians against the Nazi invasion, but he felt America should not close its eyes to "Stalin's repressions."[13] He used the New York Times as an instrument to vent his thoughts against Ambassador Davies' memoirs on the Moscow Trials. He charged that "totalitarianism and democracy will not mix . . ." and felt we must end this "fatuous one-sided love feast now going on in this country."[14]

Westbrook believed that Dewey is, in part, to blame for the Cold War climate of fear. His writings became the groundwork for the emotionally-charged climate that catapulted Senator Joseph McCarthy into the limelight. The 'red fear' became the fuel for a reactionary attack against all who were considered radical thinkers. An even-handed criticism of Dewey during these times was the fact that it is necessary "to recognize how difficult it was to be an intelligent anticommunist in the early Cold War."[15] In this early part of the McCarthy era, we find Dewey was under surveillance by the FBI. The irony is that in his defense of "his most cherished end of participatory democratic community," he bumped into those whose interests were primarily self-promoting leftists as well

as the Communist party.[16]

Dewey was a prolific writer, authoring over one thousand books, journal articles, and reviews. He wrote on a broad array of philosophical questions: ethics, logic, psychology, education, the arts, democracy, politics and law, history, science, religion, language, nature and culture, and Marxism.

After Alice died, he remained alone for almost twenty years until he met Roberta Grant Lowitz. At the age of 87, Dewey married Lowitz, age 42, in 1946. They adopted two Belgian children, John and Adrienne, who called him "Grandpa."[17]   He died at the age of 92 due to complications from a broken hip that he happened to get while playing with his children.

The Intellectual Journey of John Dewey

John Dewey started out as a Kantian philosophical idealist. The philosophy of Immanuel Kant first captured his attention when he was an undergraduate at Vermont. Darwin's theory of evolution also became an underlying theme of his writings on naturalism. In his graduate studies at Johns Hopkins, his professor George Sylvester Morris--his mentor to be--re-introduced him to Kantian ideas again and to Hegelianism. Kantian ideas at this point had a negative effect on Dewey, and he instead turned to Hegel with profound zeal. Dewey was by nature a person of positive perspective, almost to the point of seeing the world through rose-colored glasses. In the meantime, William James published an article in the British journal, *Mind.*[18]   James commented on how popular Hegel had become in the United States and how interest in Hegel had waned in Europe. Hegel clubs appeared; Torrey helped to launch the first journal in philosophy, *The Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. Dewey became involved despite James' comments that even though Hegel had become popular in the United States, Europeans thought him passé.

Morris' influence on Dewey continued for many years. Morris taught at both Johns Hopkins and Michigan, helping to spread the neo-Hegelian

philosophy of idealism that he espoused. While Dewey was at Michigan, both he and Morris collaborated on papers elaborating on the philosophy of idealism. Idealism soon fell out of favor with most philosophers, though, and Dewey himself diverged from it as he developed his own brand of philosophy.[19]   With the industrial revolution and the developing American Democracy, Dewey saw the importance of forging forward away from German epistemology.

Dewey contributed greatly to the new wave of empirical philosophy that developed after the decline of interest in Hegel.[20] He began with the writings of William James and G. Stanley Hall, attempting to convince others that a new psychology should replace logic in philosophy. He targeted three audiences-- the theologically based, the idealists, and the psychologists. He wanted to convince the first that the new psychology would not affect ideas of God's place in the universe. To his associates, the idealists, he argued that psychology should replace logic in philosophy, and to his fellow psychologists, he contended that a superior being existed in the universe, thus seeking to bridge the gap between natural science and religion.

He did not get many converts, so he retreated to his favorite subject, ethics. Josiah Royce lauded Dewey with praise as "one of the most brilliant, clearly conscious, and enviably confident of all our philosophical writers in America."[21] Dewey eventually left the teaching of psychology to "his assistants, James H. Tufts, and then to George Herbert Mead and Alfred H. Lloyd."[22] He concentrated on ethics and political philosophy. It is in this period that Dewey developed his theory of democracy. His wife, Alice Dewey and the writings of T. H. Green greatly impressed upon him the importance of *public service.*

Pragmatism

It is necessary to understand pragmatism by comprehending Dewey's influence in shaping it. In turn, Dewey can only be understood from within an understanding of the pragmatist movement generally. Dewey and pragmatism

121

enable us to move beyond the individualistic, interest-based idea of democratic politics and the government by experts that has come to go along with it. The pragmatic philosophy of reality, truth, and science and the psychology that goes with it not only deny the present pattern of governance, but reveal that the present pattern distorts both the human condition and the process of democratic governance.

Western philosophy developed primarily from the thought of Classical Greece. Greek thought was all-inclusive, delving into the problem of understanding the universe, God and supernatural phenomena, religion, aesthetics, logic, ethics, reasoning, politics, science, education, and mathematics. In the Eighteenth Century, philosophy began to include discussions of psychology and education as had been previously discussed in Classical Greece. The nineteenth century witnessed further diversification. Scientific thought emerged as a philosophical force with the introduction of Darwin's Origin of the Species.

Pragmatism is a philosophy born on American soil. However, the exchange that occurred between American thinkers and European thinkers provided germination for seeds in this soil. Dewey was among one of the American intellectuals who served to facilitate this international exchange of ideas and thought. Alan Ryan states that Dewey was involved in an international movement of philosophical thought. He references James Kloppenburg, an expert on the subject of international intellectualism of that day.[23] Dewey became a pragmatist at the same time he was helping to create pragmatism. His exchange of ideas with other great thinkers helped this process of mutual development. Peirce became the undergirding of Dewey, as indicated in the introductory chapter, and understanding Peirce, James, and Mead is to further understand Dewey. It is their intellectual exchange that fostered the development of pragmatism as a major philosophical force. Their individual philosophical viewpoints broadened the perspective of pragmatism, not in a singular perspective, but in providing Gestalt shifts enabling one to understand

its depth and breadth.   Again, to reiterate the point, understanding Peirce, James, and Mead is to understand Dewey.

Charles Sanders Peirce.

In addition to what has already been said of Charles Sanders Peirce, it is important to focus on Peirce's explanation on how fundamental is the act of inquiry in the pursuit of truth. This is one of the linchpins of Dewey's educational philosophy for citizenship. To reiterate, Peirce is the founder of pragmatism. His pragmatic test of truth was not how much a truth proved to be successful or in attaining the end result, but its <u>staying</u> power. He believed that a version of the scientific method provided an accurate road map for the search for truth. A Peircean truth is that truth that ultimately survives. In other words, in a Darwinian perspective, in the "ecological" turmoil of searching for truth, the idea that survives is the truth. Peirce said it succinctly: the truth is that which has staying power, that survives.[24]

Peirce said that every hypothesis, every hypothetical idea, must be forced through a verification process. The verification process in conducting inquiries could be done by three other methods besides the scientific method--the method of authority, the method of tenacity, and the metaphysico-speculative <u>a</u> <u>priori</u> method. According to Peirce, the scientific method is the best method because it is "self-corrective and stable."[25]   When it came to methods in conducting inquiry, Peirce really felt that the method was secondary to actually believing in something. In other words, once someone declares something to be the truth, it maintains a priority over any kind of method that follows. The methods play a secondary role to the belief system.[26]

Peirce is recognized as a principle pioneer of the "presuppositions of inquiry approach."   As early as 1898, Peirce made a commanding charge that before we begin the search for truth one must have freedom. "The very first and most fundamental element that we have to assume is a Freedom, or Chance, or

Spontaneity. . . ."[27]   This is what he means when he states that before we can begin in the inquiry approach of searching for truth, one must be in a state of "freedom." He goes on to say that once we understand that we begin in the state of freedom, we have to be able to decipher the symbols that would represent our thinking and our research.

Therefore, the second most fundamental element Peirce refers to is the importance of understanding "symbols" in order to be able to communicate. Peirce stated: "The woof and warp of all thought and research is symbols, and the life of thought and science is the life inherent in symbols; so that it is wrong to say that a good language is *important* to good thought, merely, for it is the essence of it."[28] This strong statement, *that good language is the essence of thinking*, became a Dewey Truism. In developing a community, an exchange of ideas that is communicated in a medium that is understood by each communicant is a necessity.

Does Peircean Thought Reflect a Different Point of View from Dewey's?

A fine line separates Peirce's philosophy of searching for truth because of Peirce's emphasis on semiotics. Even though Peirce initially led the camp of logical positivism (which is more reductionist) and where Dewey tended more toward philosophizing from a practical point of view, their ideas converged in the areas of language and communication. According to Charles W. Morris, eventually both camps, the logical positivists and the scientific empiricists, began to agree. We find a convergence of ideas whereby pragmatism encompasses its interpretation of mathematics and logic as the "complex developments of the linguistic process, and so as falling within a general theory of symbolism."[29]   This development brings Peircean and Deweyan thoughts under the same umbrella in discussing deliberation--the importance of language and the community.

Peirce is called the founder of pragmatism because he was the first person to use the word "pragmaticism" to explain that the search for truth must

reflect a purpose, one in which one believes. The person who sparked the idea of the philosophy of pragmatism for Peirce was Alexander Bain, in his book, The Emotions and the Will in 1859.[30]   Murray G. Murphey, The Development of Peirce's Philosophy, concludes that Bain "supplies a psychological foundation for Peirce's denial of Cartesian doubt, for Bain holds that men are naturally believers and that doubt is produced only by events which disrupt our beliefs--not by pretense."[31]   Peirce picked up on this thought and in pronouncing his theory of inquiry laid the foundations for the philosophy of pragmaticism as a way of searching for truth through the scientific method. This is the linkage between scientific method and pragmatic understanding. What is distinctive about Peirce is that he saw reality as approachable only through signifiers or symbols. The implication of this is that the only way to discover reality is to bring purpose or intention to it. This means drawing on a kind of intuition that cannot at the moment of action be described, then seeing the effects of these intentions and discussing them. The final arbiter of truth is the community itself rather than any objective test.

Peirce presented a paper on his theory of inquiry before The Metaphysical Club,[32] in 1872. The original paper does not exist but two essays were published subsequent to the presentation entitled, "The Fixation of Belief" and "How to Make Our Ideas Clear."   It is the second paper, "How to Make Our Ideas Clear," where Peirce's ideas appear, that Scheffler reluctantly terms as Peirce's "so-called pragmatic maxim." In "attaining the third grade of clearness of apprehension," Peirce explains his maxim thus: "Consider what effects, which might conceivably have practical bearings, we conceive the object of our conception to have. Then, our conception of these effects is the whole of our conception of the object."[33] Scientific inquiry processes could eventually lead us to some kind of action; even though the process of scientific inquiry is ongoing.

Peirce defended his pragmatic theory from those who criticized it as being utilitarian when he said "the meaning and essence of every conception lies in the application that is to be made of it."   He further argued that when he wrote that

he did not mean to "subordinate the conception to the act, knowing to doing."[34] This idea is reflected in his philosophy of American education when he states that education should not be just for the welfare of the student but should have grander aims. Peirce obviously would be a supporter of liberal education. He uses the same premise in stating that religion becomes "spiritual meagerness"[35] when religion is practiced for one's own salvation. Peirce stated that : "no other occupation of man is so purely and immediately directed to the one end that is alone intrinsically rational as scientific investigation."[36]

William James.

Pragmatism did not find its true sense of direction as a social philosophy until William James emerged. James and Peirce were contemporaries. They belonged to the same Metaphysical Club in Boston and carried on many philosophical discussions in that context. Peirce dominated the group's discourse with his thinking on the search for truth, the scientific method, and the power of the belief system in what one is investigating. Peirce developed a philosophy of truth leading to a *methodology* but it was James who formulated pragmatism's core--a theory of truth as *epistemology*. Even though Peirce indicated that purpose and belief needed to be associated with inquiry, it was James who in 1907 presented Peirce's *pragmatic maxim as* not only a theory of action but as an essential part of pragmatism.[37] The message was that one does not study an issue just for the glory of study. One searches for the truth, and acts upon that truth.

Even though he became a great philosopher and psychologist, James' early medical training gave him the foundation to pursue his strong interest in the psychological arm of philosophy, an aspect that was new in its development. He saw science as the way to bridge philosophy and psychology. His work provided the historical link to nineteenth century psychology, which was a new field of study. The Principles of Psychology (1890) sustained its prominence as

126

a psychology resource book for many years. He also applied science to unify religion with philosophy and psychology. In his book, <u>Varieties of Religious Experience</u> (1902), he states that religion cannot stand alone as an idea, in that it represents collective thought.[38] He explains that in unifying philosophy and religion, one's search for truth and action becomes disentangled. This disentanglement is possible if we look to Peirce's principle of pragmatism. James quotes from Peirce's article, "How To Make Our Ideas Clear," (1878) to explain his reasoning:

> "Thought in movement has for its only conceivable motive the attainment of belief, or thought at rest. Only when our thought about a subject has found its rest in belief can our action on the subject firmly and safely begin . . . . To develop a thought's meaning we need therefore only determine what conduct it is fitted to produce; that conduct is for us its sole significance; and the tangible fact at the root of all our thought-distinctions is that there is not one of them so fine as to consist in anything but a possible difference of practice." [39]

James claimed that if we apply Peirce's pragmatic principle to God's metaphysical attributes we would have no trouble in discerning the truth and falsehood, separating the good from the bad.

James in his lectures on pragmatism and in his book entitled, <u>Pragmatism</u> (1907), remarks that Dewey among others presented the theory of truth as a "power to work."[40]   He stated that this was an instrumental view of truth that claims that "ideas (which themselves are but parts of our experience) become true just in so far as they help us to get into satisfactory relations with other parts of our experience, ..."[41] In explaining how the search for truth is a continuous movement and in essence is a developing or growth process, he demonstrates that when we align a new truth with an old truth, we are moving forward and growing. James tells us in his lectures that Schiller and Dewey are condemned by rationalist thinkers who denounce pragmatism. It is because pragmatists feel uncomfortable without facts and rationalist thinkers are comfortable only in

discussing abstractions.[42]

James continues in his dialogue to ask the pragmatic question, "What difference does it make if you have found the truth?" "What is the truth's cash-value in experiential terms?" He answers with the pragmatist's answer: "True ideas are those that we can assimilate, validate, corroborate and verify. False ideas are those that we can not." He goes on to defend this answer when he states that: "Truth *happens* to an idea. It *becomes* true, is *made* true by events. Its verity *is* in fact, an event, a process: the process namely of its verifying itself, its veri-*fication*. Its validity is the process of its vali*dation*."[43] It is Scheffler who points out that to James the "truth of our ideas and beliefs are the same thing that they mean in science."[44]

James also explains his theory of habit, which eventually becomes a major theme in his writings. In explaining his concept of habit, he demonstrates how the mind and body are unified through experiences of habit. The concept of habit is used to explain one's choices, actions and character.[45] In his line of thinking, James applies his philosophical-psychological thinking in explaining to teachers that children need to be educated according to their interests. Some of these interests are innate and others can be cultivated by the teachers. But it requires an "*effort.*"[46] Teachers can be the catalyst to a student's furthering an interest and possibly an innate gift in music, art, or other talents. *But it requires an "effort" on the part of the teacher.*

Let us give William James credit where credit is due. If it were not for William James, Dewey's pragmatism along with his colleagues would not have been as widely received. Ryan points out that even Dewey's daughter reflects that William James' favorable review of the collected essays by members of Dewey's department at Chicago gave it a "certain recognition, for the most part hostile."[47] James described the collection as "splendid stuff, and Dewey as a hero. A real school and real thought."[48] It was James' influence that steered Dewey away from Idealism to appreciate human intelligence and the practicality of knowledge. It is not in isolation that Dewey observes the individual. He

recognizes the fact that the individual must be evaluated in the context of his/her environment in society. Dewey understood the fact that we may have mastered technology but have left unclear the values of human nature and how to expand the horizons of humankind.

George Herbert Mead.

According to Scheffler, George Herbert Mead is the better known of "his fellow pragmatists.[49] He worked with Josiah Royce and William James at Harvard in 1887 and 1888. It was at the University of Michigan, beginning a teaching position in 1891, that Mead met John Dewey. They became the best of friends and collaborators.[50] In fact, when Dewey went to the University of Chicago, he took Mead along with him in 1894, to form the Philosophy, Pedagogy, and Psychology Department. Mead became a strong advocate of pragmatism and became part of "The Chicago School," so named by James and subsequently called by Peirce. Mead's claim to fame was as a social psychologist, more specifically, a social behaviorist.[51]

Mead's corner of the pragmatic philosophy that Dewey keyed in on was the idea that the human self, human identity, is a product of social interaction, thus replacing the traditional idea of "personality." Mead believed that the individual could only get out of his selfhood, out of his self-interest and self-centeredness, through experiencing the social process. The idea of the human being as merely a "unit" that is motivated by interests is an adequate account of human identity. He proposed and Dewey built upon this idea that one is shaped through a dialogue in community that is critical to both individual and the collective. Experience alone for an individual is not adequate but requires the sharing of that experience with other social beings. Within this process of individuation and interaction with others an individual can reach an objective picture of oneself.   He states in his famous book, <u>Mind, Self, and Society</u>: "We are aware of ourselves, and of what the situation is, but exactly how we will act

never gets into experience until after the action takes place. . . . Taken together [the 'I' and the 'me'] constitute a personality as it appears in social experience."[52]

Where Peirce practiced his philosophy in the laboratory, James focused on the individual, and Mead studied the individual in the social process, John Dewey sought to build these basic concepts into a distinctive American philosophy--pragmatism. Dewey explains "pragmatic" as: "namely the function of consequences as necessary tests of the validity of propositions, *provided* these consequences are operationally instituted and are such as to resolve the specific problem evoking the operations, ..."[53] Dewey confirms what American citizens feel is their basic right, viz., to practice and experience governance of their government. According to Dewey, citizen inclusion in the "dialogue" in the governance processes is the key to experiencing democracy and the key to America's becoming a "Great Community."

Dewey's Philosophy and Theories

Education and Experience.

John Dewey, as the American Pragmatist philosopher, believed that American Democracy is a continuous process and that American Democracy is continually developing. The key ingredients to this developing process of American Democracy are: citizens in their public role and private role, the Great Society becoming a Great Community through communication, and education. These key ingredients are necessary if citizens are to become a meaningful part of democracy.   Public administrators can then serve as the guarantors and facilitators that provide citizens with the opportunities for exercising true powers of governance. Public administrators will be able to serve in the roles of teacher and learner as they collaborate with citizens. This is how freedom will be experienced in a democracy according to Dewey.[54] His pragmatic philosophy which is imbedded with democratic theory includes democratic organizations

who foster democratic ideals whose end result is freedom.[55] Follett did not define democracy in terms of participation, but like Dewey, defined it in terms of the "organization, the relating of parts, co-functioning . . . ."[56] Follett did not believe that the Lockean principle--*consent of the governed*--explained the reason for democracy. The true heroes of democracy, then, are the teachers who help the people have "vision, method, and knowledge."[57] Follett quotes Dewey in citing the important role of teachers. The teachers primary purpose is to "increase freedom." Freedom and education become interchangeable terms when understood in this light. It becomes so easy to come to the conclusion that public administrators could become the teachers Dewey speaks of in fostering democratic ideals whose end result is freedom.

To understand John Dewey's philosophy of pragmatism is to understand Dewey's philosophy of education *a*s a "lived-experience" philosophy. It also is a "shared experience" which implies that a person experiences learning with others, hence, the expression "experiential learning."   This "shared experience" becomes a basic tenet of Dewey's philosophy of pragmatism. Learning with others is experiencing with others.

This is the foundation of Dewey's philosophy of education. The theory of experience as a basic tenet of the philosophy of education brings together the pragmatic lessons of theory and practice. Through experiencing with others one learns one of the "most important lessons of life, that of mutual accommodation and adaptation."[58]

A Dewey Truism: "Education is a mode of life, of action."[59]

As education becomes a part of the individual, armed with the scientific method, the "pursuit of happiness" becomes real.   The individual is free to determine what is worthy of pursuit for ones' self as well as for the community. The individual experiencing democracy with others is in a continuing mode of education.   One begins to feel and understand the learning cycle that Dewey

talks about in all his writings--though not explicitly, but as weaving in and out of his ideas, in a cyclical manner. Dewey says it best:

> "Education is by its nature an endless circle or spiral. It is an activity which includes science within itself. In its very process it sets more problems to be further studied, which then react into the educative process to change it still further, and thus demand more thought, more science, and so on, in everlasting sequence."[60]

The underlying theme of Dewey's prolific writing is the concept: "cycle of learning." The cycle of learning concept entails growth and development in an expanding experiential sense. The cycle of learning requires communication in the sharing of ideas. Dialogue then becomes the vehicle by which this transformation of growth and development take place. Dewey recognizes "language" as an important ingredient in carrying on this sharing of ideas in achieving an authentic dialogue. He explains this in his "Principles of Continuity and Interaction"[61] concept that leads us to "experiential continuity."[62] Continuity is symbolic of growth. Dewey believes that growth occurs continuously when individuals experience government with others--public administrators, power brokers, and ordinary citizens. The sharing of ideas through authentic dialogue by all parties concerned is a growth in the learning process.

Society and Democracy

According to Dewey, democracy is to be practiced in all institutions, using the scientific method and the concept of the cycle of learning--public and private--as a working pattern. This means educational, cultural, social, religious, sports, and community organizations.[63] Dewey felt that just as the Cartesian school of thought went out of fashion when the Galilean-Newtonian method triumphed, it would not be necessary to mention the importance of experience. Dewey hoped that this would eventually happen in philosophy. Experience would be considered the orthodox practice of thinking and searching for the truth.[64] Dewey

felt that the scientific attitude of <u>thought</u>, <u>observation</u>, and <u>inquiry</u> is the chief business of study and learning.[65] He believed that by using the scientific method we would understand how necessary it is to be able to coordinate our knowledge and understanding in order to control our lives.[66] (It is here that Dewey may have raised a red flag in his discussion of "control of human relationships." This is similar to Follett who also used the word "control" which at that point in time sent an undercurrent of thinking of fascism or other authoritarian means over the human condition, which of course, was far from their intentions, Dewey or Follett.)

> "When ideas, hypothesis, begin to play upon facts, when they are methods for experimental use in action, then light dawns; then it becomes possible to discriminate significant from trivial facts, and relations take the place of isolated scraps. Just as soon as we begin to use the knowledge and skills we have to control social consequences in the interest of shared abundant and secured life, we shall cease to complain of the backwardness of our social knowledge."[67]

It is here that Dewey becomes very strong in his belief that one's intelligence and one's courage are the source of our focus and strength in achieving practical ends to improving the human condition. This can only be achieved in the practical use of the scientific method. In Dewey's words: "When our faith in scientific method is made manifest in social works," the possibilities for the future will emerge to conquer human problems as we have shown in science and technology.[68]

Experiential continuity, Dewey's method, is to be achieved by using the scientific method as a template for explanation and action. The pattern, in turn, becomes the cycle of learning for an individual. This cycle of learning concept can be applied to a group, an institution, a community, a state, or a nation. Dewey combines his thoughts of the practical ends of knowledge with the use of scientific methods and the practice means to that end.

> "It will ensue when men collectively and cooperatively organize their knowledge for application to achieve and make secure social values; when they systematically use scientific procedures for the

control of human relationships and the direction of the social effects of our vast technological machinery."[69]

Dewey outlines a plan in the development of purposes, described as the "formation of purposes." This includes:

1.   Observation of surrounding conditions;

2.   Knowledge of what has happened in similar situations in the past, a knowledge obtained partly by recollection and partly from the information, advice, and warning of those who have had a wider experience; and

3.   Judgment which puts together what is observed and what is recalled to see what they signify.[70]

Dewey lays the groundwork for this experiential learning by the implementation of democratic social arrangements.[71] Democratic working environments become necessary for the individual to experience growth and development to the fullest potential of the individual in life's experience.

A Dewey Truism: ". . . recognize in the concrete what surroundings are conducive to having experiences that lead to growth."[72]

The implications for public administration are profound: create democratic working environments.   Such environments provide the air of freedom that allows for "adaptation and mutual accommodation."   The environment is not dictatorial but is a "co-operative enterprise."[73] What is implied here is that the physical arrangement of a group be democratically oriented and also that the experiences for the members in the group be conducted in a democratic manner.

Dewey explains this when he describes his "existential matrix of inquiry as cultural." "The environment in which human beings live, act and inquire is not simply physical. It is cultural as well."[74] Dewey grounds his arguments on the basis of nature and biology, combining the sociology of human beings with their physical environments. "Inner harmony is attained only when . . . terms are

134

made with the environment." [75] Cultural conditions affect the learning capacities of humans. "The acquisition and understanding of language with proficiency in the arts" is cultural. "To speak, to read, to exercise any art, industrial, fine or political, are instances of modification wrought *within* the biological organism by the cultural environment."[76] Dewey explains further how importantly social and cultural conditions affect language formation, understanding, articulation, development of analytical skills, and use of language. Language is of utmost importance in effecting even the formation of the environment. The third chapter entitled, "The Existential Matrix of Inquiry: Cultural," in his book on logic, becomes the essence of his philosophy of pragmatic action. If the use of language is of utmost importance, then Dewey's emphasis on education, on democratic settings, and on democratic practice require a continuing effort toward furthering language development for the benefit of the greater good, the greater community. It is important to reiterate Dewey's concept of "cycle of learning" in understanding the idea that while democracy is developing, the individual is developing, and the community is developing, in an ever-changing process.

Education, then, becomes the basic component to democracy. Through the vehicle of education, democracy can advance, can grow, and can develop. To achieve a democratic state, Dewey holds that education is absolutely necessary. The individual, who is educated in a democratic environment, who experiences what is learned, who shares in the learning, is best able to deliberate, to carry on a dialogue, to make inquiries, and to experience the process of governance. Dewey does not say that everyone will participate at all times in the dialogue, but states that every person should be educated in the experiential processes and in a democratic environment so as to be able to experience democracy in the active sense. Then, and only then, can the government truly be of the people, by the people, and for the people. Then, and only then, can public administrators serve as catalysts for promoting democratic environments as well as providing an organization that is administered,

managed, and supervised in a democratic manner. Then, and only then, can public officials serve and represent the people.

Dewey expands his thoughts on authentic dialogue in his book, <u>Human Nature and Conduct</u>. By using the scientific method when in deliberation, one realizes that one is experimenting with the use of language. Deliberation is that process that allows for all to express their thoughts. Each deliberative expression becomes an experiment for examination. These examinations become rehearsals for the next deliberative expression.[77] Whether one examines an idea physically or verbally, the deliberative process is the same. Choices may result as a conclusion to the process or it may not result in a conclusion. It may lead to more deliberation or be blocked. The educational experience gained from the deliberation adds to the cycle of learning and becomes part of a habit one calls an *experience*.

In public administration, deliberation that includes all parties involved in the decision--the decision-makers together with the recipients--serves to clarify all concerns. Dewey states that the "variety of competing tendencies enlarges the world. It brings a diversity of considerations before the mind, and enables action to take place...by a long process of selections and combinations."[78] To be deliberative, "is to be slow, unhurried."[79] Dewey warns us that deliberations begin in anguish and can end in "a course of action" which straightens everything out.[80]   But in the end, if an individual is not free, deliberation decided upon in any organized manner--whether in legislation, or in any other institutional form--will not matter. Freedom for the individual comes first, then the organization of the political will, working in harmony, will ensure civil liberties.[81]   "Freedom for the individual comes first" is a Peircean thought.

As if in a warning to the exigencies of bureaucracy, it is possible to be in a state of "over-organization" that can become a "hindrance to freedom."[82] Organization is necessary for providing structure and regulating a democracy. In order for democracy to work, organization must exist; but, the organization must in turn practice democracy. Therefore, the organization must be a democratic

organization in praxis and in structure.

Democratic Ideals

In the area of morality, Dewey reiterates a philosophical maxim that came out of the Renaissance era. He states that the individual in searching for one's purpose in life finds excellence when applying one's intelligence into action.[83] He confirms the conclusion that this could only have developed through the onset of democracy from ancient Greece. Dewey alludes to his concern with the founding fathers, who of course emphasized individualism, self-interest and ambition. But he goes on to conclude that through the developmental process of democracy, it is necessary to experience individualism, self-interest, and ambition. Dewey calls it part of the "motion"[84] that will eventually develop into "social harmony."[85] Once the citizenry is familiar with the process, the result is two-fold. Responsibility for effecting change is one result. The public good conducted in an equitable fashion becomes the second part to that sense of responsibility.[86]

In A Common Faith, Dewey expands upon this kind of thinking when he states that: "Ours is the responsibility of conserving, transmitting, rectifying and expanding the heritage of values we have received that those who come after us may receive it more solid and secure, more widely accessible and more generously shared than we have received it."[87] Dewey sometimes alludes to common sayings that reflect the people--for example, the expression, "use it or lose it." For a democracy to work, one of the requisites of democratic thinking is taking responsibility for oneself. In order to accept responsibility, the individual must exercise his intelligence. "Intelligence becomes ours in the degree in which we use it and accept responsibility for consequences."[88]

It is reminiscent of a biblical beatitude and a parable that in essence states that God grants one many gifts and talents. If one uses the gift and talent wisely, one will receive more; if one does not use the gift and talent, one will lose

the gift and talent. Dewey is ever conscious of a Universal God and often implies Christian values in his writings.   Dewey also believed that each individual is born with an intelligence that can be nurtured and developed for critical thinking and inquiry, and that would enable one to deliberate effectively.   One is reminded that Socrates held that intelligence was the highest virtue one could possess. Even as the beatitude and parable is stern about practicing one's gifts and talents, one can expand the argument. One could say that if an individual does not exercise his/her intelligence, the individual will have lost the opportunity for further development. In research studies today, the expression of *window of opportunity* applies to developing one's intelligence. One could say that if an individual does not exercise or experience democracy, that individual will lose his/her freedom. The argument can be stated in the positive mode that experiencing democracy by citizens will enhance the development of democracy for the next generations to come, and so on. However, this all takes place in the context of community.

Sense of Community

Dewey concludes that science is the result of civilization. It is through civilization that intellect has developed science, which effects change and may effect development and growth. It is through one's civilized community that one's intellect becomes an integral part of society. We are all in a sense a reflection of our community.[89] Our environment determines our "moral responsibility and our moral judgment."[90] Discussing this in the "cycle of learning" process, Dewey would say that as one participates in the learning process of experiencing community life, one's intellect is enhanced. This interaction is subject to deliberation wherein one's experiences are exposed to a diversity of choices, ideas, and plans.

The diversity in the deliberation of ideas expands one's intelligence and capacity to search for more choices, to choose those that will become habits,

and to find those that will not. The more one interacts in one's community, the more one learns about the surrounding world. This educational process not only provides us with abstract knowledge of studying a problem. It should lead us to be able to experiment in the details of solving society's ills. Accepting responsibility in society becomes the form of action. One feels a part of the larger community because one has witnessed, experienced, and deliberated in a democratic manner that has meaning to one's self, to one's family, and to one's community.

Charles Hoch describes the present state of affairs as a grab for power that has alienated people from their government and disenfranchised people within their communities. "The bureaucratic message ruptures and fragments community life."[91] He is referring to the planning theories that have permeated into public organizational structures. He reminds us that we must recall the pragmatism of John Dewey, William James and Charles Peirce. It is in John Dewey's pragmatic action theory that we will find the way to "resist the encroachment of illegitimate power relations while contributing to the practical formation of powerful democratic communities."[92]

Dewey included the private sector in his basic philosophy of education. Every institution, public **and** private, has the responsibility to educate people in democratic philosophy. This is the essence of community building, the essence of language development, the essence of American democracy. Hierarchical organizational structures that create and establish authoritarian environments inhibit the development of American democracy. What Hoch describes as communities fraught with "fragmentation," Habermas refers to as "colonization of the life world."[93]   Habermas's social theory stresses the point that our society depends on communication but uses that communication in capturing power, centralizing that power to the detriment of community. It is instrumental rationality that has caused this centrifugal force and that led to self-aggrandizement among professional planners.[94]

John Forester's, <u>Critical Theory and Public Life</u> and <u>Critical Theory,</u>

concentrates on Habermas's social theory and Foucault's theory of power. They all come to the conclusion from different perspectives that "meaningful democratic practice" is the only saving grace in combating this "social pathology."[95] Dewey turns this around by saying that "the idea that 'the end justifies the means' is in as bad repute in moral theory as its adoption is a commonplace of political practice."[96] Concepts such as expediency, efficiency, effectiveness, and economy have become driving forces working against the regime values of our American democracy as established in our Declaration of Independence and our United States Constitution.

Conclusion

Dewey's learning cycle is applicable to this discussion. The institution of education must take on the responsibility of teaching about democracy, democratic principles, and democratic practices. In a democratic environment with democratic experiences, students will have been inculcated with the language and praxis of democracy. As each institution becomes acclimated to the learning cycle, they, too, will accept the responsibility for teaching democracy, democratic practices, and building a democratic environment and experience. Dewey is all inclusive in his theory of education and democracy when he incorporates art and aesthetics as primary in the "remaking of the experience of the community in the direction of greater order and unity."[97]

Art form and expression are important here because Dewey considers it another form of language and communication. "In the end, works of art are the only media of complete and unhindered communication between man and man that can occur in a world full of gulfs and walls that limit community of experience."[98] Dewey quotes Galsworthy, the English writer, who described art "as the imaginative expression of energy . . . ."[99] It is this energy that defines experience and that drives for more learning. Hence, the cycle of learning continues. The experience of democracy as envisioned by Dewey brings energy

140

to the human person. That is why Dewey insists on his point that "Esthetic experience is imaginative."[100] Imagination produces a vision in pursuing the truth and acting upon that truth. Dewey says it even more explicitly: "The aims and ideals that move us are generated through imagination. But they are not made out of imaginary stuff. They are made out of the hard stuff of the world of physical and social experience."[101]

In a collection of essays from fellow Deweyan pragmatists, Dewey claims that "experience . . . is full of inference," unlike the interpretation of ancient philosophies that stated that "in the traditional notion experience and thought are antithetical terms."[102]   This traditional notion of experience has "hypnotized European philosophy since the time of Socrates into thinking experiencing is a mode of knowing. . . ."[103] In other words, knowledge was considered everything and could substitute for experience. Dewey is saying that a person requires both knowledge <u>and</u> experience, even when the experience comes first. For example, as a teaching method for building up the vocabulary of young children to learn how to read and write, especially in a second language, the teacher may ask the students to look at an icon. The teacher would state: "Tell me what you <u>see</u>, not what you <u>know</u> about the picture.   In this way the human being's natural inquisitiveness would drive the individual to seek knowledge and to seek the truth to support or dispute the experience. Experience energizes the individual to act upon the resolution discovered in the quest for "certainty" or truth. Of course, this brings us full circle to the beginning of Dewey's basic premise on the importance of education in democratic principles.

Charles Hoch, in his article entitled, "A Pragmatic Inquiry," summarizes other present-day philosophers and theorists to support his premise of the importance of resurrecting pragmatism. Pragmatic influences can challenge the gridlock we find in governance and in our communities.   John Dewey is the guide, together with his fellow pragmatists, James, Mead, and Peirce, in laying the foundation for the American pragmatic philosophy. It is John Dewey's action theories, his philosophies of education, experience, art, and logic that sets the

truest foundation for developing American democracy.

Endnotes

1.   Robert B. Westbrook. <u>John Dewey and American Democracy</u>. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1991, p. 8.

2.   Ibid., p. 8.

3.   Ibid., p. 35.

4.   Ibid., p. 453.

5.   Loc. Cit., p. 453.

6.   Ibid., p. 455.

7.   Ibid., p. 457.

8.   Ibid., p. 466.

9.   Ibid., p. 480.

10.   Ibid., p. 480.

11.   Ibid., p. 482.

12.   Ibid., p. 483.

13.   Ibid., p. 487.

14.   Ibid., p. 487.

15.   Ibid., p. 494.

16.   Ibid., p. 495.

17.   Ibid., p. 536.

18.   Ibid., p. 13.

19.   Alan Ryan. <u>John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism</u>. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1995, pp. 62-67.

20.   Westbrook, p. 23.

21.   Ibid., p. 33.

22.   Loc. Cit., p. 33.

23.   Ryan, p. 375. James Kloppenburg's, <u>Uncertain Victory</u> (New York, 1986), is filled with documentation supporting the acclaim of international intelligentsia exchange between the United States of America and Europe.

24.   Nicholas Rescher. <u>Methodological Pragmatism: A Systems-Theoretic Approach to the Theory of Knowledge</u>. New York: New York University Press, 1977, pp. 58-60.

25.   Ibid., p. 77.

26.   Ibid., pp. 77-78.

27.   Roberta Kevelson. <u>Charles S. Peirce's Method of Methods</u>. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1987, p. xi.

28.   Morris R. Cohen and Ernest Nagel. <u>An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method</u>. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1934, p. 117.

29.   Charles W. Morris. <u>Logical Positivism, Pragmatism, and Scientific Empiricism</u>. Paris: Hermann et cie, Editeurs, 1937, p. 47.

30.   Israel Scheffler. <u>Four Pragmatists: A Critical Introduction to Peirce, James, Mead, and Dewey</u>. London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, first published as a paperback in 1986 from the 1974 publication, p. 58.

31.   Ibid., p. 59.

32.   Ibid., pp. 14-15. Peirce founded The Metaphysical Club in 1871. The Club met in his study or in William James' study in Cambridge. The participants were Peirce, James, Chauncey Wright, Oliver Wendall Holmes, Jr., and Nicholas St John Green.

33.   Ibid., pp. 77-79. Scheffler states that Peirce's pragmatism is not a theory of truth but of meaning. It is a process of clarification of ideas worth pursuing.

34.   Ibid., pp. 85-90.

35.   Ibid., p. 86.

36.   Op cit., p. 86.

37.   William James. <u>Pragmatism</u>. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1991, first published in 1907, p. 3.

38.   William James. <u>The Varieties of Religious Experience</u>. New York, New York: Viking Penguin, Inc., 1986, first published in the United States of America by Longmans, Green, and Co, 1902, pp. 26-27.

39.   Ibid., pp. 444-445.

40.   James in <u>Pragmatism</u>, pp. 28-29.

41.   Ibid., p. 28.

42.   Ibid., pp. 32-33.

43.   Ibid., pp. 88-89. Author's emphasis.

44.   Scheffler, p. 104.

45.   Ibid., p. 122.

46.   Ibid., p. 146.

47.   Alan Ryan. <u>John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism</u>. 47.47. p. 118.

48.   Ibid., p. 118.

49.   Scheffler, p. 150.

50.   Ryan, p. 123.

51.   Ibid., p. 152. Charles W. Morris, of the University of Chicago (and one of the members of The Chicago School of Pragmatists), in 1934, edited and wrote an Introduction of Mead's famous book: <u>Mind, Self and Society: from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist</u>, in which he states that Mead is different from Watson in that he is a social behaviorist focusing on the individual and symbolism in the social sense.

52.   Ibid., p. 166.

53.   John Dewey. <u>Logic: The Theory of Inquiry</u>. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1938, p. iv.

54.   John Dewey. <u>Experience and Education</u>. New York: Collier Books, Tenth Printing, 1969, (copyright, 1938, by Kappa Delta Pi), p. 71.

55.   James A. Stever. "Technology, Organization, Freedom: The Organizational Theory of John Dewey," <u>Administration & Society</u>, Vol. 24, No. 4, February, 1993, page 433.

56.   Fry, p. 175.

57.   Hook, p. 12.

58.   Ibid., p. 60.

59.   John Dewey. The Sources of a Science of Education. New York: Horace Liveright, 1929, p. 75.

60.   Ibid., p. 77.

61.   Dewey, Experience and Education, p. 51.

62.   Ibid., p. 36.

63.   William M. Sullivan. Reconstructing Public Philosophy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982, p. 184. A Deweyan thought: "Our need is to extend the spirit of republican democratic life into the sphere of the major economic and administrative institutions."

64.   John J. McDermott, Editor. The Philosophy of John Dewey: Two Volumes in One; 1. The Structure of Experience, 2. The Lived Experience. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1973, 1981, p. 253.

65.   Ibid., p. 394.

66.   Ibid., p. 395.

67.   Ibid., p. 396.

68.   Ibid., p. 397.

69.   Ibid., p. 397.

70.   Dewey, Experience and Education. p. 69.

71.   Ibid., p. 34.

72.   Ibid., p. 40.

73.   Ibid., p. 72.

74.   John Dewey. Logic: The Theory of Inquiry. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1938, p. 42.

75.   John Dewey. Art As Experience. New York: Minton, Balch and Company, copyright, 1934, by John Dewey, p. 17.

76.   Dewey.   Logic: The Theory of Inquiry, p. 43.

77.   John Dewey. Human Nature and Conduct. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1922, pp. 189-198.

78.   Ibid., 197.

79.   Loc. Cit., p. 197.

80.   Ibid., p. 199.

81.   Ibid., p. 306.

82.   Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct, p. 306.

83.   John Dewey. Ethics. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1908, p. 11.

84.   Ibid., p. 15.

85.   Ibid., p. 15.

86.   Ibid., p. 24.

87.   John Dewey. A Common Faith. New Haven: Yale University Press, copyright 1934, Tenth printing, February, 1950, p. 87.

88.   Dewey, Human Nature and Conduct, p. 314.

89.   Ibid., p. 314.

90.   Ibid., p. 316.

91.   Charles Hoch. "A Pragmatic Inquiry," Society. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction, Inc., Volume 26, November-December. 1988, p. 28.

92.   Ibid., p. 28.

93.   Ibid., p. 30.

94.   Ibid., p. 30.

95.   Ibid., p. 30.

96.   Dewey, Logic: The Theory of Inquiry, p. 496.

97.   Dewey, Art As Experience, p. 81. Dewey ties nature, biology, art, aesthetics, and environment into the fold of experience and education.

98.   Ibid., p. 105.

99.   Ibid., p. 185.

100.   Ibid., p. 272.

101.   Dewey, <u>A Common Faith</u>, p. 49.

102.   John Dewey. <u>Creative Intelligence</u>, "A Recovery of Philosophy," New York: Octagon Books, Reprinted 1970, copyright by John Dewey in 1945, and originally copyrighted in 1917 by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., p. 8.

103.   Ibid., p. 48.

Chapter VI. PRACTICAL DESIGNS

Introduction

My contention is that the people, as individual citizens, can be productively involved and will be readily accepted in the governance processes, on all levels of government--local, state, and federal if their relationship to the process is theorized on Dewey's terms. Citizenship in our American democracy can truly mean taking responsibility, being involved in the deliberation of issues, and effecting change in the greater community for the greater good of the commonwealth. We have a historical inheritance of self government from the early New England town meetings, the Federalist and Anti-Federalist writings, and Jeffersonian thought.   Citizen participation hyperbole of the 60's and 70's and its seemingly failures should serve as a caution. It therefore would be more than prudent on my part to get an assessment of how we are doing.

Remember the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946? Remember the 'sunshine laws' and the efforts to seek citizen input? The Fiftieth Anniversary of that great leap forward in bringing government to the people has come and gone, but not without effect. Marissa Martino Golden[1] conducted a study on how well the APA has fared these past fifty years in the "notice and comment provisions." The purpose of this phrase was to solicit input from the citizens who would be affected by a regulation or rule. Three federal agencies were chosen--Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA). After examining 11 rules, the study reveals that even though HUD received 268 comments on one rule alone, the number of comments from other government agencies far

surpassed the 24 citizen comments. EPA had received 45 comments per rule but hardly any from ordinary citizens, and surprisingly, not one from a public interest group. NHTSA was next, with all comments on three rules coming from the business community.

Golden recommends two ways in which we can fulfill the promise of "the APA with respect to its democratic goal of citizen participation."[2]

1. Public administrators who serve to draft, develop, and coalesce the final proposed rules, must be reminded of the possible bias when receiving comments from different interests . "Be aware of the unrepresentativeness of rule-making comments. . . ."

2. Realizing that not all people have access to Internet or the *Federal Register,* federal rule-makers need to develop and plan for more and diverse methods in reaching out to the public to ensure that those likely to be affected by federal rules are aware of the proposals and are able to comment on them. "Improve the notice we provide through better outreach. Invite them to the negotiating table prior to the issuance of a proposed rule in the *Federal Register.*"[3]

 Public administrators are in a unique position to enlighten citizens on the issues, invite and encourage discourse in a positive, receptive atmosphere, and serve as the catalyst for desired change. The public administrator has a better opportunity to reach out to sense the pulse of the greater community on a particular issue. This is possible when all parties are involved in the political process as well as the governing processes. As Goodsell states so succinctly, "Many of the institutions of citizen participation that have sprung up within the American political system in the past two decades have been initiated by administrative agencies." [4]

A Glimpse at Citizen Participation in the 60's and 70's

With the onset of the Great Society programs, an underlying theme began to emerge that resonated through the country: "only the poor know the full dimensions of poverty."[5] It was concluded that it would be necessary to have the poor on boards that would enable them to express their problems directly to government. The Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO), developed the following strategies for this:

1. Membership of the poor on boards
2. Employment of the poor in projects
3. Community meetings
4. Elections of board members[6]

Historical precedence reveals that similar efforts were made in 1933 under the New Deal that established a "then radical innovation of a planned national crop . . . involv(ing) farmers in the process of making . . . innovative decisions."[7] The wealthy farm owners could manage themselves, but the small and poorest farmers had no way to be represented or involved in policy decisions affecting their crops. It is the Department of Agriculture that "developed both the theory and practice of citizen participation."[8] The Extension Service continues today in communities throughout the country.

An earlier role of government in establishing strategies of encouraging citizens to participate in governance occurred with the creation of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in 1912. Its purpose was to give business and industry the opportunity to serve in an advisory capacity in public policy decisions.[9]

The famous TVA--grass roots democracy program began as a means to bridge the gap between local government and a federal program. Its purpose was to demonstrate genuine concern for democratic procedures. Selznick's analysis, of the road to cooptation of citizens of the bureaucracy, explained why citizen participation became ineffective. His analysis stated that:

Responsibility for administration and program was a first priority;

membership size and representation and leadership selection were controlled; the area for decision making was limited severely; outsiders had limited access to the group because of administrative control; and a routinized service program that demonstrated its inflexibility.[10]

By 1954, citizen participation became a federal requirement, as legislated in the Housing Act. In urban renewal cities, most cities established advisory committees to meet this requirement. These advisory committees had few representatives from the projects or members of non-business organizations. The citizen participation requirement was not considered to be important. It seemed that advisory committees were the only conceivable approach to citizen participation. In Dahl's words, referring to the city of New Haven, Connecticut, these advisory committees "never initiated, opposed, vetoed, or altered any renewal proposal."[11]

> "All these suggestions are the stuff of men's dreams. The reality, based upon urban renewal's own experience and its continued vulnerability to attack, should be more of the same: Citizen participation will likely be avoided or converted into an instrument of public relations. The Authority will retain real control by manipulating its control of information and expertise--a good reason not to support advocacy planning. Plans and information will be withheld or transmitted too late, or kept deliberately value. Such bureaucratic weapons constitute its first line of defense. Disarmament, in their view, can only lead to catastrophe."[12]

In studying community power, Mathews believes that political scientists have focused on power relationships regarding initiating and vetoing proposals, rather than on the other face of power--non-decision making. "We must analyze dominant values, established procedures, and rules of the game, as well as persons or groups, if any, who gain from existing bias, and who are handicapped."[13] Another important caution is that rules and regulations that are changed by *administrative discretion* reflect policy changes through public management but not through legislative enactment.

Cahn and Cahn conclude in their study of the different citizen participation projects of the 1960's that in order for citizens to be effective participants in

151

decision-making processes, training of the participants needs to take place. Also, the prevailing image of citizens participating is in the "village democracy" mode.

 "Village democracy is a meaningless model in megalopolis . . . . We need to stop thinking of them as a homogeneous mass. People differ; communities differ; and participation is not an end in itself. Participation is a constantly changing process . . . ."[14]

In 1978, Toner and Toner, in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Education, developed a paper offering ideas about:

1.	Integrating citizen participation into the planning process.

2.	Adopting guidelines for planning citizen involvement programs.

3.	Selecting and evaluating objectives and methods for citizen participation.[15]

Toner and Toner believed that "successful citizen participation in planning is the responsibility of those who manage the planning and decision-making process."[16] The model they produced and the problems they addressed are through the lens of the public agency as they proceed from the 1970's to the 1980's. A summary of the studies during the decade of citizen participation concludes with the cynicism felt by the general public.   In 1997, Berman examines the extent of citizen cynicism. He "suggests that cynicism and trust are deeply rooted in the management of government-citizen relations."[17]

Citizen Science

Let us examine technological culture and the citizen culture as they have developed after WWII. Irwin believes that 'democratic ideology' demands a behavior that may affect the way each culture reacts to the other. What we have experienced is a polarized, contentious community. After the Second World

151

War, the Association of Scientific Workers sought to reconcile differences through an "enhanced public understanding."[18] Three statements of purpose were recommended for implementation:

- that a technically-literate population is essential for future workforce-requirements;

- that science is now an essential part of our cultural understanding; and

- that greater public understanding of science is essential for democratic reasons.

These ideals were never realized. The Royal Society resurrected the debates in a 1985 report that indicated no progress.   The status report indicated the following results:

> 'We have reached the point of incommensurability between those accounts of science which stress its empowering and enabling role and those--drawing broadly on a notion of science as a source of legitimation (Habermas), alienation (Marx) or disenchantment (Weber)--which stress its role as a form of social control and dehumanization."[19]

In its quest for an environment that is safe for the planet, scientists have placed themselves in the role of *protector*. The citizens are seen as the nameless public who are to be spectators to those experts who save us from armageddon. Obviously, the role assigned to citizens has met with extreme opposition--to the point where neither party listens to the other.

Irwin is optimistic in his belief that we should strive "toward a dialogue between scientific and citizen groups in creating a 'citizen science.'"[20]   However, he is aware that "hazardous environments and social powerlessness do indeed seem to coexist."[21] Different kinds of dialogues have been attempted in a trial-by-error approach in creating a 'citizen science.' In Holland, one type of science-citizen interaction is called the 'Science Shop.' The Science Shop "has served to encourage the growth of new communication links between university researchers and community groups, stimulate researcher awareness of

community problems, and promote closer interactions between scientific technical specialists and the general public."[22] Ecological neighborhoods and/or communities are being established in Denmark, Sweden and Germany.[23] Whether in the United States, Sweden, Germany, France, Holland, or Denmark, private citizens are seeking an equal voice in the public policy decisions surrounding environmental issues, especially regarding public health and protecting the natural resources from being polluted and depleted.

Turner explains it in terms of *public space* and *private space.*[24] Environmental risk is considered to mean the rules and regulations set forth by the state in protecting the public, encompassing *public space*. The *private space* is that realm where the citizen may respond to the moral and ethical environmental questions. The final conclusion is that the scientific community is not alone in the dialogue with governmental officials in deciding public policy. Neither is the public in a sphere unto itself that discusses the environmental risks, scientific breakthroughs, and environmental quality without the expertise of the science community. Both *citizen* and *technical* knowledge are needed to pursue and attain a quality environment.

"A Feel for the Hole" and "A Feel for the Whole"[25]

Scientific knowledge is attained through a methodical process that includes rules for disseminating knowledge and putting that knowledge to practical use. The guiding principle of science is "to make reliable predictions, eliminate uncertainty, and through technology, bring nature under control."[26] Just as citizens should be included in the deliberations and have a role in the decision-making processes, the same premise applies to the work place. Journeymen, laborers, and other workers on a job site should be included in providing the necessary information to be included in the decision-making processes. Hummel calls this "Bottom-up Knowledge"[27] because the person who works with his hands has a knowledge about the work he does that only he can

explain. Schmidt describes it as "a feel for the hole." She describes a situation involving work being done close to a dam. Knowledge of the area and how it reacts to water pressure may have been the kind of expertise that a structural engineer or water engineering expert or other scientist could address. However, the hands-on experience that the workmen had is more difficult to explain. It is a "feel" for the job, "a feel for the hole." A master craftsman can work along with someone to help in understanding this special hands-on experience. It is experiencing the grouting process that helps in that understanding. The success or the unsuccessful project depends on whether the bottom-up knowledge is included in the whole process of decision-making.

Schmidt describes this *collective knowledge* as necessary in any organization. It is putting the little bits and pieces of knowledge together from the different stakeholders as well as from those working in the field.   It is the *passive/critical knowledge* that disappears as fast as it is experienced. Every one may have been a witness to the experience but each person sees it from a different perspective. Schmidt brings to mind Barbara McClintock's research, in which she summarizes her life's work in the expression--"a feeling for the organism."[28]

A feel for the Whole requires the *intimate knowledge* of every one in the organization. Building trust in the organization that allows for bottom-up knowledge to surface and to be appreciated and accepted can raise those doubts out of oblivion onto the decision table. Potential disasters can be prevented from happening. The knowledge of the "ordinary person" would be accepted instead of that person made to feel that those in charge of a particular project know much better and can do without his input. "Outside amateurs" may have some information vital to a particular project but may feel like an "unqualified meddler." The individuals at the bottom rung of an organization may know important information about the project but will withhold the information because it may be interpreted as if s/he were a "whistleblower."[29]   The bottom line is "we need each other, because of our different perspectives and limited

abilities."[30]

Public Hearing--Environmental Protection Agency

At the federal level, the public demands a say regarding radiation and nuclear wastes. The Department of Energy had lost credibility with the public because DOE is a polluter. DOE is also a self-regulating agency and a licensee. The Superfund Re-authorization Bill of 1994 compensates those who are affected by the pollutants and files suit against those polluters of hazardous materials. Under the Bill, DOE is to be regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

The NRC has completely changed the way it does business for setting regulations and standards, especially in setting standards for decommissioning and decontamination of their radioactive sites, their licensees. Previously, NRC acted in a vacuum. They would put their regulations in the Federal Register, awaiting for the standard sixty to ninety days (60-90 days) for formal comment, then run it through the NRC Commissioners, who are political appointees. This is how regulations and standards have been set.

As a result, the last time NRC made proposals through this process, the public said "NO WAY." "You need public participation and public dialogue." However, the public demanded a different way of doing business. Therefore, the EPA and the NRC opened the process to include the public in an enhanced participatory process. This involved conducting workshops around the country where EPA and NRC made public presentations. The public could ask questions and have input into the workshop process. The workshops were advertised in newspapers, widely publicized with the first workshop held in Washington, D. C.. After the third workshop, it was noted that they were too technical. Therefore, the night before the next workshop, this was corrected by providing training to the general public on radiation concepts.[31]

In 1991, Green and Zinke had seen this need for training but for the

employees. They called for training of EPA employees to help them "understand how their technical/scientific knowledge should be used in a regulatory enforcement environment."[32] They particularly pointed out the importance of "community and media relations, conflict resolution, persuasive speaking, and translating technical and policy jargon into public vernacular."[33]

The public demands to be part of the decision-making process regarding their own self-interests of health and property that include 'public space' and 'private space.' The inalienable rights--the regime values promised in the Preamble to the Constitution are imbedded in our foundation as a nation. The Anti-Federalists are alive and well; their arguments have been taken up in today's political environment by the conservatives of both Republican and Democratic parties--smaller government and decentralization.

But active participation as a platform has no ideology. Public participation, which translates to include authentic "dialogue" in governance, is politically-correct language. If governance is to include citizens in the dialogue among the different actors in the subsystem, then American Democracy can be saved from the enticement of technocracy and associates.

Private Citizens Litigate.

Frustrated with the federal government and politics as usual, organizations, such as, the Natural Resources Defense Council have implemented a Citizen Enforcement Project. After the Reagan Administration cut EPA's budget and disabled many environmental controls, EPA became unable to enforce clean water regulations. In order to stop industry from dumping poisons and polluting the waterways, private citizens and the NRDC brought suit against individual polluters. A section in the Clean Water Act "empowers private citizens to sue individual polluters directly."[34] The mission statement of NRDC is as follows:

"*We work to foster the fundamental right of all people to have*

Whether it is citizen science or Science Shops or public hearings, a sharing of the power among the stakeholders will alleviate the confrontations between citizens and scientists, between citizens and public officials, between citizens and elected officials.

A PRACTICAL DESIGN:
A MODEL PLAN FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Citizen participation has been developed, implemented, re-developed, and re-implemented over the years by different federal agencies. In 1996, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency Office of Environmental Justice together with the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council have developed "A Model Plan for Public Participation," under the auspices of the Public Participation Accountability Subcommittee. Besides the Model Plan, "Core Values for the Practice of Public Participation" has also been developed by *Interact: The Journal of Public Participation.* A Checklist coordinated by the Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice is available for Federal and State agencies. The Guiding Principles of the Model Plan are:

1. Encourage public participation in all aspects of environmental decision making. Communities, including all types of stakeholders, and agencies should be seen as equal partners in dialogue on environmental justice issues. . . .

2. Maintain honesty and integrity in the process and articulate goals, expectations, and limitations.[36]

The critical elements are outlined in regards to preparation for the dialogue, identifying all of the participants, the logistics in developing the appropriate atmosphere, and the mechanics needed to accomplish the principles. Dewey's perspective on the Model Plan for Public Participation would include the following elements:

1.	Education of the public on the issue;

2.	Training public administrators and citizens on creating a democratic environment in physical layout of the room as well as in democratic procedures;

3.	The practice of democratic procedures for the public administrators and the public;

4.	Stress the importance of inquiry in searching for the truth on the part of both the public administrators and the public--an educational process; and

5.	Developing a mutual understanding of the language being used to enhance deliberation, authentic dialogue, and in the processes of governance.

Let us examine another model that encourages public participation.

A Practical Design: Charrette.

Sharing in the power is the name of the game. This expression of faith in the individual is pronounced whether one has the authority in government, politics, business, think tank, or as a citizen. Sharing in the decision-making processes of governance can relieve the tensions and confrontations between and among the different groups. The **charrette** is a process that allows for many people to participate. Thayer described it this way:

> "The 'charrette' is the best example we have yet. A word used to describe horse-drawn carts which carried prisoners to the guillotine, and also the carts used later to gather up the plans the Beaux Arts architectural students submitted for the annual Paris competition, 'charrette' has acquired a new meaning for schools and other forms of community planning. In contemporary settings, the charrette is a process vehicle (without wheels), systematically constructed to collect and sort out as many ideas as possible generated by individuals directly interested in a given project."[37]

Charrettes have become a popular vehicle for urban planners involved in

development in the community. All the citizens are invited to participate in a charrette to deliberate upon an issue of interest to the community. This means that residents of the community, organizational representatives, educators, business owners in the community, architects, urban planners, politicians, experts, and youth delegates meet together over a long period of time. Meeting times could vary--it could be weekends for a couple of months or whatever is agreed upon. The different representations of the community are arranged in groups that would have at least one representative from the different groups. Each group would be a microcosm of the larger group. The group facilitators help each group to get through the get-acquainted stages. A lot of steam is vented in the beginning to allow each participant to "unload" concerns, anger, frustrations, and problems encountered in the past. It is a trust-building process.

Charrettes have occurred in the past and will continue to be used as an effort to enhance and expand public participation together with all interested parties. It allows for the highest act of citizenship to be exercised and experienced. Each person in a representative role, is placed in the role of "citizen." Thayer describes this role as the "professional-citizen dichotomy." The process places emphasis on an equal playing field; every one has an equal voice; every one has a particular knowledge to share with the others.

A charrette occurred in Brooklyn, New York, whereby all interested persons in the neighborhood met over a period of a couple of months in the designing of a ten- thousand capacity student educational center. The result concluded with the center being built and that the school cafeteria became a community restaurant in the evening.[38] The Department of Urban Development helped to finance a number of charrettes in different communities. An example of a more recent charrette occurred in South Miami, Florida. The City of South Miami sponsored two charrettes. The first of the two charrettes experienced great results.

The South Miami Home Plan.

Victor Dover[39] and his partner, architects and urban planners, graduates from Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Virginia, were primarily responsible in convincing the city council and the community at large to have a charrette to discuss what the people want for the main streets and business sections in South Miami. The commercial section at Sunset Drive runs about two blocks wide and six blocks long with private residences and a few apartment dwellings surrounding the east side. The west side borders the U.S. 1 Highway and the metro train line. The citizens of South Miami, merchants, property owners, residents, urban planners, public officials, and all other interested parties agreed to meet all day Saturday. The charrette enabled citizens, public officials, urban planners, together with merchants, and property owners to deliberate on what they felt they wanted for downtown South Miami.

The South Miami Home Plan was developed out of a series of meetings in the form of a charrette. They agreed to narrow the lanes on Sunset Drive from four to two lanes so that drive through traffic would be discouraged to use Sunset Drive; lower the speed limit; turn some of the side streets to one way streets; widen the sidewalks to allow for sidewalk cafes and other public strolling enhancements; and construct a brick sidewalk to allow individuals to make donations towards the beautification of South Miami, placing the names of a loved one or of a noted person to be memorialized on a brick. The community feeling was enhanced and a dialogue had begun to emerge between the different neighborhoods.

A second South Miami Home Plan was initiated by citizen activists to discuss the South Miami Hospital and other development problems. According to Susan Redding[40], citizen activist, the second charrette was not as successful as the first. The organizers did not think it necessary to advertise it to include every one, and did not have the enthusiasm as before because of the time it took to organize and to go through the charrette processes.

160

Other Forms of Public Involvement.

In 1984, I was elected as the Vice Chairperson to the Governing Board of the McLean Community Center (MCC) and served as the Program Chairperson[1]. In the capacity of Program Chair, I organized program meetings for committee members and staff beginning with goal setting for the Community Center. The brainstorming sessions brought about the feeling of the need to energize that which belonged to McLean long ago--*a sense of community.* The citizens in Small District One of McLean, Virginia, approximately forty-thousand people, were invited and encouraged to attend the program meetings.

Over twenty citizens, some representatives from schools, community organizations, and clubs, gathered at our initial meeting. We organized ourselves in an open-seating arrangement in the round. In that meeting, every person was encouraged to participate in the discussion which ultimately came around to a discussion about our young people. The idea of a youth center was sparked at this meeting. The word went out about establishing a place for our youth to "hang out" and was met with community enthusiasm. A local church pastor saw an article in the local newspaper mentioning a center for the youth and offered a site on Church property. Unfortunately, even after many private and public meetings and support by the Church members and community members at large, the site for the Youth Center was denied at the Planning and Zoning Commission Hearing because the neighbors to the Church were opposed to the project.

This initial effort sparked the establishment of a Youth Committee under the auspices of the MCC. Teenagers from the Small District's Junior and Senior High Schools and private schools were invited to participate.   The idea for a youth center became a driving force with the Youth Committee, the McLean

---

[1]

Fairfax County uses the term chairperson as the official language. I chose to use the word "chair," whenever I could.

Citizens Association, the McLean Community Center, and other community leaders. The search for an appropriate site for the youth center began.

The site for a Youth Center was an old fire station. A new fire station in McLean was being built in another location. The old fire station property came to the attention of builders, investors, contractors, business owners, and the community leaders for commercial development and future tax revenues. After long deliberations, arguments, and meetings, the "Old Firehouse" became an established youth center for 12 to 21 year olds, who live in the Small District. The *sense of community* is a strong positive force. However, the youth center is not a drawing force for families; it is a center for only young people. The movie house and bowling alley that used to be part of the center of McLean and that used to serve as family-oriented establishments are no more. In the planning sessions in the Dranesville District, families and young people were left out of the decision-making processes. Dewey would explain this social phenomenon as an example of a lack of authentic dialogue, inquiry, and democratic processes at work.

A Fairfax County, Virginia Effort to Increase Citizen Input.

For more than ten years, the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors has appointed a Fairfax County Citizens' Budget Overview Committee (FCCBOC) for each budget year. Each supervisor appoints a citizen from his/her district. Ten open seats are considered at large and are usually filled by a representative from a notable public organization in the community.

My appointment to the FCCBOC came under the auspices of the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors to represent the five branches of the American Association of University Women on this committee in 1989. The chairman of the committee was appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors. The thirty members were subdivided into five groups and given assignments representing the different agencies.

The sub-committee to which this writer was assigned would review and make recommendations on the budgets of the Office for Children, the Virginia Extension Service, the Park Authority, the Social Services Department, the Community Action Board, and a few others. We met twice a week for ten weeks. At each meeting, a different department would be reviewed. The heads and assistant heads of each department would sit across the table from the subcommittee, each person with a set of budget books to review. Questions and answers followed covering the highlights of the budgets, vision of the department, out of the ordinary expenditures, the viability of the department, the necessity of the department, and the employees necessary to do the job. With some departments, the meetings seemed calm and ran smoothly. Others appeared to be confrontational.   For example, after the meeting with the Office for Children, I received a telephone call at home telling me that they heard I asked questions of the Office Director.

My observations of the whole citizen budget overview process are:

1. It is a commendable exercise requiring a lot of hours, an intensity of effort, and commitment on both the part of the government officials and the appointed citizen.   Interestingly enough, five of the citizen appointees attended the first and the last meetings.

2. It appeared to me that the appointees, on the whole, were beholden to   their own respective supervisor. A cooptation of citizen, government official, and elected public official seemed to happen.

3. It appeared that individuals had their own personal agendas. They came as advocates for the schools, the parks, the fire fighters, the police, public health services, community services, et cetera.

4. It appeared that very few appointees functioned with the *sense of community* and the *public interest* in mind.

5. The public may feel comfortable in knowing that a citizens' group oversaw the budget and made recommendations. We did go through the motions of a thorough review of the budget.

Did the private and special interests prevail? One will never know. We do know that the county does attempt to make a sincere effort in encouraging citizen participation. John Dewey would state that citizen participation is not enough. He would conclude that democratic principles were not set in place from the outset in this instance. The functional processes were established; but, the ground rules for democratic processes and environment were not instilled. The public administrators and citizens were not educated and experienced in practicing democracy except by exercising their vote. The lines were drawn between the public administrators and the citizens in a confrontation that placed the different parties in adversarial roles.

Coconut Grove.

NET of Coconut Grove, Florida, stands for Neighborhood Enhancement Team. This is city administration at the neighborhood level. The NET serves as an ombudsman for the 46 civic/home associations for Coconut Grove and works with the Coconut Grove Village Council having to do with all complaints involving the City of Miami. I went inside the office which is located in the center of Coconut Grove. The name of the Secretary of the Village Council--David Cull-- was given to me.   During my interview with Team Member, Christina Abrams, she confirmed what has been understood by the community at large that Coconut Grove is a very active community; very involved; where many community activists live. One can see the signs of an active citizenry in community by the bike and walk paths, parks accessible for people to use, exercise and meditation facilities, and a safe environment for all ages.

Apparently, these NETs are supposedly all over the City of Miami so people can have immediate access to their city government for services or other complaints. However, only Hialeah and Coconut Grove have organized NETs. A NET member intervenes on a citizen's behalf, or for citizens in general on particular decisions to be made by the Village Council or for the City Council of

Miami without going through the bureaucracy.

My meeting with NET caused me to immediately think of my questions regarding citizens having a dialogue with their government. NET and the civic organizations in the community appeared to be involved in some form of dialogue. The NET served as a process for a one-on-one interaction.   In regards to citizens being involved in charrettes, Christine said that the NET would represent the Village Council government in the charrette. To me, this still is representative government at work. The question remains, "Is authentic dialogue taking place?" How will citizens carry on their dialogue? Don't they do that now with their city councils and civic associations? Maybe authentic dialogue occurs somewhat at the local level, not as much at the state level, and hardly at all at the federal level.   This is what James Smith meant when he said that "the distance between knowledge and power was being bridged routinely."[41]

Dewey would call NET an effort to alleviate tension between the citizens and their government. It is paternalistic in some ways. However, if NET's purpose is to just serve as an intermediary, an ombudsman, then it has accomplished its purpose of making government work for citizens. This is not citizen participation but a service that government has established in helping to bridge the gap between the citizen and bureaucracy.

Camden, New Jersey.

Another county government chooses to meet the needs of its citizens in a one-stop "County Store." Similar in concept to the one in Coconut Grove, it chooses to bring government to the public. The County Store is called the Camden County "Citizen Service Center."[42] This is one-on-one personal interaction and service-oriented. However, the importance of this effort, brings the government closer to the public. It becomes visible and has presence in the community. Confidence is built that demonstrates that government is working for people's taxes. Again, it is a governmental service that is to be commended and

is a good format in establishing good public relations.

Management Journal.

The Management Journal is one resource for those public administrators who are interested in different techniques and methods in enhancing the community spirit and in developing a public trust in participating in the decision-making processes. Annually, the Public Management Journals recognize public managers who have made great strides in public participation efforts. They present the "Award for Program Excellence: Citizen Participation" to three practitioners, representing small, medium, and large communities, who have successfully conducted programs that included a large segment of the community representing all public and private interests.

Two examples are given of how communities' participation enlarged their scope of action . An Award for Program Excellence for "Citizen Participation" was presented to J. Thomas Lundy, Manager of the County of Catawba, North Carolina, with a population of over 20,000. He won this award on the basis of a unique process that produced the county's first strategic plan. This effective undertaking did not end with the production of the plan--it resulted in an ongoing vehicle for dialogue between county government and citizens. James A. Calvin, city manager, City of Toccoa, Georgia, received the Award for Program Excellence for "Citizen Participation" for his participation in an intergovernmental cooperation planning effort. His community has a population of under 20,000. The plan known as "Toccoa-Stephens 2000" resulted in increased citizen involvement, enhanced communication between the local government and its citizens, improved service and service delivery, and improved city-county relations.[34] Wamsley would call Calvin and Lundy role models for his agential leaders.

These success stories are described in enough detail to serve as models for others to emulate. In order to have these kinds of examples continue, the

populace needs to be educated in democratic inquiry and processes. This must begin in the schools and continue into the greater community.

"Citizens First".

Recently reported in the *PA TIMES*, the County Chairman of Orange County, Florida, meeting with community leaders and volunteers, called for a program that put "Citizens First?"[43] The concept delivered, by County Chairman Linda W. Chapin, states that, "To the extent that people are willing to assume (the role of citizens), those . . . in government must be willing to listen--and to put the needs and values of citizens first in our decisions and actions . . . . In other words, those of us in government must put citizens first." This plea is in response to many governments who choose to serve the public better by prompting the motto of 'better customer service.' Citing the limitations of treating citizens as if they were customers is a reminder of the 'economic' way of thinking that may be good for business but when it comes to government, the relationship is quite different. The difference is that: "customers focus on their own desires and wishes and how they can be expeditiously satisfied. Citizens, on the other hand, focus on the common good and the long term consequences into the community."[44] As Denhardt concludes, "a responsive and committed citizenry is a prerequisite to both the quality of community life and the effectiveness of government."[45]This is another form of a good public service.

Forging New Links with Government.

Remnants of the '70's survive. In response to the requirements made in the War on Poverty programs that "maximum feasible participation by citizens" be incorporated, "St. Paul, Minnesota, Dayton, Ohio, and Birmingham, Alabama, created the quasi-official bodies for citizen input into planning for their neighborhoods."[46] In today's anti-government climate, local governments are

looking to different ways in enhancing citizen involvement. The community of Burlington, Vermont, re-energized the local assemblies which are comprised of recognized citizens who take a direct role in the public-policy process in deciding "how Burlington's federal Development Block Grant will be spent."[47] Lewis states that communities find it difficult to find citizens to participate. The other problem is that it is so easy for these groups to be coopted by politicians and bureaucrats. "It's a fragile balance," said Ted Wimpey, who moderated the assembly's discussion . . . ."[48]

CONCLUSION

"We are all a part of a greater entity known as community."[49]

"All values are important, everyone who has ever touched my life in some way was a mentor for good or bad. Life is a blend, and a person is a blend of all the influences that have touched their lives."

"It is in the community where our values are nurtured--a loving family, compassionate neighbors, ethical workplaces and an uplifting church life family." [50]

These are the words of Gen. Colin Powell, former chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff. He reiterates the important role others have on our lives. The societal learning influences can be enhanced by public administrators who are at the cutting edge of democracy. The examples mentioned previously seem like fairly usual examples of participation. This is problematic because Dewey's thinking carries us beyond participation as the venue for citizen involvement. John Dewey believed in the responsibility of each institution to enhance the processes for effective societal learning to take place. This must be learned in the classroom and practiced so that experiencing democracy occurs early and often. Democracy does not stop in the textbooks, as knowledge does not stop with the textbooks. Democracy does not stop at the voting booth. What we need to do is to bring the sensitivities of Dewey to these processes that we casually call public

administration. The examples of public participation or public services mentioned in this paper are specifically inspired by or related to or are a reflection of the sort of ideas Dewey developed. We need to add the Dewey dimension to the democratic processes of governance so that we can achieve what we got in the first South Miami charrette.

> "Only as society, broadly defined, learns what it wishes to pursue and how to achieve those desired outcomes more reliably can citizens participate effectively in policy choices and in collective action by their informed, as opposed to coerced, bought, or manipulated, actions."   **--John Dewey,** 1927[51]

Kirlin makes the argument that public administration should accept the responsibility for being at the forefront in developing a democratic polity. "Public bureaucracy and democratic polity should be seen as complementary; both are needed in our society."[52] This was the beginning of public administration. The first universities established for the sole purpose of educating individuals for public service had 'citizenship' in their names. The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs of Syracuse University was founded in 1924, and the School of Citizenship and Public Administration of the University of Southern California was founded in 1929.[53] The underlying theme of Dewey's philosophy places demands on those in public administration and in public office--"No government by experts in which the masses do not have the chance to inform the experts as to their needs can be anything but an oligarchy managed in the interests of the few."[54]

In 1927, Dewey stated at length the importance of the positive role of government in cultivating societal learning; Appleby, in 1949, provided a "strong rationale for the importance of expecting public administration in a democracy to positively contribute to societal learning."[55] Kirlin reiterates in 1996, that "an important challenge for public administration in a democracy is to improve the whole of societal learning."

Citizen involvement in the decision-making processes of governance cannot be relegated as a "thing that happened in the '60's and '70's." Educating

and training for citizenship is an important element for citizen participation to be successful, meaningful, and productive. The practical designs are plentiful in the forms of charrettes, public participation forums, public hearings with training sessions for the public, science shops, citizen science forums, citizen and technology knowledge-based programs, advisory committees, and neighborhood enhancement teams. If all else fails in regards to environmental protections, litigation is a last resort.   Authentic dialogue processes are also in abundance in the forms of a "Bottom-up Knowledge" format, "A Feeling for the Organism" philosophy, a collective knowledge and a "Citizens First" rationality. American ingenuity has surfaced again inspiring many in communities around the country to develop and to nurture civic virtue. Practicing authentic dialogue and experiencing democracy that results in achieving civic virtue and establishing a sense of community all in the name of the public good is the "highest act of citizenship."[56] These are the fundamental precepts of John Dewey.

Endnotes

1.   Marissa Martino Golden. "Administrative Procedure Act at 50: Taking Stock," PA TIMES. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Public Administration, Vol. 19 No. 7, July 1, 1996, pages 1 and 20.

2.   Ibid., p. 1.

3.   Ibid., p. 20.

4.   Charles T. Goodsell. "Public Administration and the Public Interest," in Refounding Public Administration. By Wamsley et al. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990, p. 109.

5.   Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett, Editors. "Maximum Feasible Participation: A General Overview" by Edgar S. Cahn and Jean Camper Cahn, p. 25.

6.   Ibid., p. 103.

7.   Ibid., pp. 101-102.

8.   Vincent Mathews. "Citizen Participation: an analytical study of the Literature," Prepared for the Community Relations Service by Dr. Vincent Mathews, Professor, Catholic University of America, June, 1968, p. 38.

9.   Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett, Editors. Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change. Published in cooperation with the New Jersey Community Action Training Institute, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971, "Maximum Feasible Participation: A General Overview" by Edgar S. Cahn and Jean Camper Cahn, p. 130. See Ivan C. Elmer's chapter, "Chambers of Commerce Participation and the Establishment," p. 214. "The first chamber of commerce in America--and the first completely independent commercial organization ever formed--was the New York Chamber of Commerce, founded April 5, 1768."

10.   Ibid., p. 40. Excerpt from Philip Selznick's book, TVA and the Grass Roots (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949) p. 234.

11.   Ibid., p. 49.

12.   Ibid., p. 54.

13.   Ibid., p. 70. Schattschneider, Dahl, and Scoble would also add that the system confines itself to "majority issues." See Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz, "Two Faces of Power," <u>American Political Science Review</u> 66, December, 1962, pp. 947-952.

14.   Cahn and Passett, Ibid., pp. 108-109.

15.   Nea Carroll Toner and Walter B. Toner, Jr. <u>Citizen Participation: Building a Constituency for Public Power</u>. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978, p. 7.

16.   Ibid., p. 7.

17.   Evan M. Berman. "Dealing With Cynical Citizens," <u>PAR: PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION REVIEW</u>. Washington, D.C., March/April, 1997, Volume 57, No. 2, p. 110.

18.   Alan Irwin. <u>Citizen Science: A Study of People, Expertise and Sustainable Development</u>. New York: Routledge, 1995, p. 11.

19.   Ibid., p. 16.

20.   Ibid., p. 33.

21.   Ibid., p. 177.

22.   Ibid., p. 156.

23.   Ibid., p. 174.

24.   Ibid., pp. 179-180.

25.   Mary R. Schmidt. "Grout: Alternative Kinds of Knowledge and Why They Are Ignored," <u>PAR: Public Administration Review</u>, Washington, D.C.: November/December 1993, Volume 53, No. 6, pp. 525-530.

26.   Ibid., p. 527.

27.   Ibid., p. 526.

28.   Ibid., p. 527. Read <u>A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock</u> by Evelyn Fox Keller, New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1983.

29.   Ibid., p. 529.

30.   Ibid., P. 530.

31.   Interview with Nicholas Lailas, Director, Center for Remediation, Technology, and Tools, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C., held on February 13, 1994.

32.   Richard T. Green and Robert C. Zinke. The Rhetorical Way of Knowing and Public Administration. A paper submitted to the Fourth National Symposium on Public Administration Theory, March 21-23, 1991, at the George Washington University, Washington, D.C., p. 9.

33.   Ibid., p. 9.

34.   "25-Year Report of the Natural Resources Defense Council," New York, 1995, p. 2.

35.   Ibid., p. 1.

36.   "The Model Plan for Public Participation," Developed by the Public Participation and Accountability Subcommittee of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, a Federal Advisory Committee to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, November, 1996, p. 2.

37.   Frederick C. Thayer. An End To Hierarchy and Competition. Administration in the Post-Affluent World. New Viewpoints, New York, New York, 1981, pp. 28-29.

38.   Ibid., p. 29. See W. L. Riddick, Charrette Processes: A Tool in Urban Planning. York, PA.: George Shumway Publishers, 1971, Ch. 1.

39.   Interview with Victor Dover, in his office in South Miami, Florida, February, 1994. He gave me a Video cassette copy of the "South Miami Home Plan," which outlines the process of the charrette. Victor Dover's enthusiasm, energy, and personality had a lot to do with the positive results of the first charrette. He served as the catalyst in the community together with civic activists.

40.   Interview with Susan Redding, by telephone, South Miami, Florida, February, 1996. She continues to chair the Commemorative Brick Committee and is active in the community.

41.   James A. Smith. The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and The Rise of the New Policy Elite. New York: The Free Press. A Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1991, p. 94.

42.   Louis S. Bezich. "NJ County Shows Citizens What's In Store," PA TIMES. American Society for Public Administration, Washington, D.C.: Vol. 20, No. 3, March, 1997, pp. 1 and 28.

43.   Robert B. Denhardt. "Local Governments Lean to Put "Citizens First," PA TIMES. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Public Administration, Vol. 20, No. 2,

February, 1997, p. 1.

44. Ibid., p. 2.

45. Ibid., p. 2.

46. Mark Lewis. "Citizens Forge New Links with Government," <u>PA TIMES</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Public Administration, Vol. 19 No. 4, April 1, 1996, pp. 3 and 4.

47. Ibid., p. 3.

48. Ibid., p. 4.

49. Richard G. Capen, Jr. "Community: Venture out of the cocoon," <u>The Miami Herald</u>, Miami, Florida: Sunday, September 8, 1996, pp. 1L and 6L. Richard Capen Jr. is former publisher of The Herald and former U.S. ambassador to Spain, and author of new book, <u>Finish Strong</u>, San Francisco: Zondervan, 1996. This article is derived from the book.

50. Ibid., p. 1L.

51. John J. Kirlin. "The Big Questions of Public Administration in a Democracy," <u>PAR: Public Administration Review</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Public Administration, September/October 1996, Volume 56 Number 5, p. 419.

52. Ibid., p. 417.

53. Ibid., p. 417.

54. John Dewey. <u>The Public and Its Problems.</u> Denver: Henry Holt and Company, 1927, p. 208.

55. Kirlin, p. 420.

56. Thayer, p. 40.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abramson, Jill and Daniel Pearl. "Capital Culture: Congressman's Sojourn in
        Washington Teaches Bitter Political Lesson: Cynicism and Self-Interest
        Are Worse Than Ever, The Public Unforgiving," <u>The Wall Street Journal</u>,
        New York, New York: Dow Jones & Company, Vol. CCXXII, No. 117,
        December 15, 1993.

Arendt, Hannah. "Power and the Space of Appearance," <u>Kettering Review</u>.
        Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, Summer, 1993.

Axelrod, Donald. <u>Budgeting for Modern Government</u>. New York: St. Martin's
        Press, Inc., 1988.

Barber, Benjamin R. <u>Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age</u>.
        Berkley: University of California Press, 1984.

Barnouw, Jeffrey. "'Aesthetic' for Schiller and Peirce: A Neglected Origin of
        Pragmatism," <u>Journal of the History of Ideas</u>. Rochester, New York:
        University of Rochester Press, Vol. 49, 1988.

Benton, Sarah. "Citizen Cain's Silenced Sisters," <u>New Statesman and Society</u>.
        London: Statesman & Nation Publishing Co., Ltd., Vol. 1, #26, December
        2, 1988.

Berman, Evan M. "Dealing With Cynical Citizens," <u>PAR: PUBLIC
        ADMINISTRATION REVIEW</u>. Washington, D. C.: American Society of
        Public Administration.   March/April, 1997, Volume 57, No., 2.

Bezich, Louis S. "NJ County Shows Citizens What's In Store," <u>PA Times</u>.
        Washington, D. C.: American Society for Public Administration, Vol. 20-,
        No. 3, March, 1997.

Bloom, Allan. <u>The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has
        Failed Democracy</u>. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987.

Boyte, Harry C. "Reinventing Citizenship," <u>Kettering Review</u>. Dayton, Ohio:
        Kettering Foundation, Winter, 1994.

Briand, Michael. "People, Lead Thyself," <u>Kettering Review</u>. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, Summer, 1993.

Cahn, Edgar S. And Barry A. Passett, Editors, <u>Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change</u>. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

Caldwell, Lynton K. <u>The Administrative Theories of Hamilton and Jefferson: Their Contribution to Thought on Public Administration</u>. New York: Homes and Meier, Second Edition, 1988.

Capen, Jr., Richard G. "Community: Venture out of the Cocoon," <u>The Miami Herald</u>. Miami, Florida: Knight-Ridder Papers, Sunday, September 8, 1996.

Chadwick, Michael Loyd. Editor. <u>The Federalist</u>. Springfield, Virginia: Global Affairs Publishing Company, 1987.

"Citizen" See Encyclopedia Brittanica

<u>Citizen Participation</u>. Washington, D. C.: Community Services Administration, 1978.

Cochran, Clarke E. <u>Character, Community, and Politics</u>. University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press, 1982.

Cohen, Morris R. and Ernest Nagel. <u>An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method</u>. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1934.

Cook, Terrence E. and Patrick M. Morgan. <u>Participatory Democracy</u>. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Cooke, Editor, Jacob E. <u>The Federalist</u>. Middletown, Conneticut: Wesleyan University Press, Third Printing, 1989.

Croly, Herbert. <u>Progressive Democracy</u>. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1914.

Curtius, Professor Dr. Ernst. <u>Curtius' The History of Greece</u>. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co., Vol. IV., undated.

Dahl, Robert A. <u>Democracy, Liberty, and Equality</u>. Oxford, OX: Norwegian University Press, 1986.

Denhardt, Robert B. "Local Governments Lean to Put 'Citizens First,'" <u>PA</u>

TIMES. Washington, D. C.: American Society for Public Administration, Vol. 20, No. 2, February, 1997.

Dewey, John. 1908. Ethics. New York: The Columbia University Press.

_____. 1917. Creative Intelligence. New York: Octagon Books, Reprinted, 1970, copyright by John Dewey in 1945, and originally copyrighted in 1917 by Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

_____. 1922. Human Nature and Conduct. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

_____. 1927. The Public and Its Problems. Denver: Henry Holt and Company.

_____. 1929. The Sources of a Science of Education. New York: Horace Liveright.

_____. 1934. Art As Experience. New York: Minton, Balch and Company.

_____. 1934. A Common Faith. New Haven: Yale University Press, Tenth printing, February, 1950.

_____. 1938. Logic: The Theory of Inquiry. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

_____. 1938 copyright by Kappa Delta Pi. Experience and Education. Toronto, Ontario: Collier-Macmillan Canada Ltd., 1968.

Dietz, Mary G. "Context Is All: Feminism and Theories of Citizenship," Daedalus. Boston, Massachusetts: American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Fall, 1987.

Dover, Victor. Interview with Victor Dover, architect, in his office in South Miami, Florida, February, 1994.

Dry, Murray. "Preface," The Anti-Federalist, Herbert J. Storing, Editor. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985.

Elazar, Daniel.   "Will the Postmodern Epoch Be An Era of Federalism," Exploring Federalism. University, Alabama: University of Alabama, 1987.

Encyclopedia Britannica. Chicago, Illinois: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Vol. 9, 1993.

Encyclopedia of Philosophy. "James Harrington (1611-1677)," Paul Edwards, Editor in Chief, New York: Macmillan Company, Volume Three, 1967.

Follett. Mary Parker. "Ch. VIII, The Process of Control," The Papers on the Science of Administration. Edited by Luther Gulick and L. Urwick. New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University, 1932.

Fox, Elliot M. And L. Urwick. Dynamic Administration: The Collected Papers of Mary Parker Follett. New York: Hippocrene Books, Inc., Second Edition, 1982.

Fry, Brian R. Mastering Public Administration: From Max Weber to Dwight Waldo. Chatham, New Jersey: Chatham House Publishers, Inc., 1989.

Funk & Wagnalls Standard Desk DICTIONARY. New York, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Inc., 1977.

Gawthrop, Louis C. "Toward an Ethical Convergence of Democratic Theory and Administrative Politics," in A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. New York, New York: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1987.

Gittell, Marilyn. Limits to Citizen Participation: The Decline of Community Organizations. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1980.

Golden, Marissa Martino. "Administrative Procedure Act at 50: Taking Stock," PA Times. Washington, D. C.: American Society for Public Administration, Vol. 19, No. 7, July 1, 1996.

Goodsell, Charles T. "Public Administration and the Public Interest," Refounding Public Administration. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990.

Green, Richard T. And Robert C. Zinke. The Rhetorical Way of Knowing and Public Administration. A paper submitted to the Fourth National Symposium on Public Administration Theory, March 21-23, 1991, at the George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Henry, Nicholas. "The Emergence of Public Administration as a Field of Study," A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1987.

Hicks, John D. The Federal Union: A History of the United States to 1877. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, The Riverside Press, 1957.

Hoch, Charles. "A Pragmatic Inquiry," <u>Society</u>. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction, Inc., Volume 26, November-December, 1988.

Hofstadter, Richard. <u>Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR</u>. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955.

Hoopes, James. Editor. <u>Peirce on Signs</u>. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Houser, Nathan and Christian Kloesel, Editors. <u>The Essential Peirce: Selected Philosophical Writings</u>, Volume 1, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1992.

Hutchins, Robert Maynard. Editor-in-Chief. <u>The Great Ideas: A Syntopicon I</u>. "Citizen" in <u>Great Books of the Western World</u>. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago, 1952.

<u>In Brief, Citizen Participation in the American Federal System</u>. Washington, D.C.: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, August, 1979.

Irwin, Alan. <u>Citizen Science: A Study of People, Expertise and Sustainable Development</u>. New York: Routledge, 1995.

James, William. 1901.   <u>The Varieties of Religious Experience</u>. New York, New York: Viking Penguin, In., 1986, first published in the United States of America by Longmans, Green, and Co..

_____.   First published in 1907.   <u>Pragmatism</u>. Buffalo, New York: Prometheus Books, 1991.

Keller, Evelyn Fox. <u>A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock</u>. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1983.

Kettner, James H. <u>The Development of American Citizenship, 1608-1870</u>. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina, 1978.

Kevelson, Roberta. <u>Charles S. Peirce's Method of Methods</u>. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 1987.

Kirlin, John J. "The Big Questions of Public Administration in a Democracy," <u>PAR: Public Administration Review</u>. Washington, D. C.: American Society for Public Administration, September/October, 1996, Volume 56, Number 5.

Lailas, Elaine A. "100 Years of Achievement: Part IV: 1962-1981," <u>Graduate Woman</u>. Washington, D. C.: American Association of University Women, Volume 75, Number 3, May/June, 1981.

Lailas, Nicholas, Supervisor, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, Environmental Protection Agency, 1992-1998. Interview: May, 1995.

_____. February 13, 1994. Interview with Director, Center for Remediation, Technology, and Tools, Ul S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D. C.

Lane, Larry M. and James Wolf. "The Search for Commitment and Community in the Federal Service," <u>The Human Resource Crises in the Public Sector: Rebuilding the Capacity to Govern</u>. Westport, Ct.: Quorum Books, 1990.

Levine, Marc V., Carol MacLennan, John J. Kushma, Charles Noble, with Jeff Faux, and Marcus G. Raskin. <u>The State and Democracy: Revitalizing America's Government</u>. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Lewis, Mark. "Citizens Forge New Links with Government," <u>PA TIMES</u>. Washington, D. C.: American Society for Public Administration, Vol. 19, No. 4, April 1, 1996.

MacIntosh, Richard, Ed.D. "The Destruction of Individualism," <u>The Wall Street Journal</u>. New York, New York: Dow Jones & Company, Wednesday, April 23, 1997.

Madison, James. "The Federalist No. 10," <u>The Federalist</u>. Edited by Jacob E. Cooke. Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, 1961.

Mansbridge, Jane J. <u>Beyond Adversary Democracy</u>. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1980.

Mathews, Vincent. <u>Citizen Participation: An Analytical Study of the Literature Prepared for the Community Relations Service</u>. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, June, 1968.

May, Judith V. <u>Citizenship Participation: A Review of the Literature</u>. Berkeley, California: University of California, at Davis, Institute of Governmental Affairs, Summer, 1968.

McAfee, Noelle. "Relationship and Power," <u>Kettering Review</u>. Dayton, Ohio: Kettering Foundation, Summer, 1993.

McDermott, Editor, John J. <u>The Philosophy of John Dewey: Two Volumes in</u>

One; 1. The Structure of Experience, 2. The Lived Experience. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1973, 1981.

Miller, Hugh. "Democratic Discourse for Public Administration," Dialogue. Green Bay, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, 1988.

"The Model Plan for Public Participation," Developed by the Public Participation and Accountability Subcommittee of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Council, a Federal Advisory Committee to the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D. C., November, 1996.

Montgomery, John D. Bureaucrats and People: Grassroots Participation in Third World Development. Baltimore, Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Morris, Charles W. Logical Positivism, Pragmatism, and Scientific Empiricism. Paris: Hermann et cie, Editeurs, 1937.

Mosher, Frederick C. Democracy and the Public Service. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., Second Edition, 1982.

Natural Resources Defense Council. "25-Year Report of the Natural Resources Defense Council." New York: Natural Resources Defense Council, 1995.

The New Encyclopedia Brittanica. "Johannes Althusius (1557-1638)," Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Fifteenth Edition, Volume 1,1990.

Newland, Chester A. Public Administration and Community: Realism in the Practice of Ideals. McLean, Virginia: Public Administration Service, November, 1984.

O'Toole, Jr., Laurence J. "American Public Administration and The Idea of Reform," Administration & Society. Vol. 16, No.2, August, 1984.

Parry, Geraint. "Democracy and Amateurism--the Informed Citizen," Government and Opposition. London: Government and Opposition, Vol. 24, #4, 1989.

Pateman, Carole. Participation and Democratic Theory. New York, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Patterson, Cynthia. Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451-50 B.C. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1976, and Arno Press, Inc., 1981.

Peirce, Charles Sanders. Reasoning and the Logic of Things: The Cambridge

Conferences Lectures of 1898. Edited by Kenneth Laine Ketner. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Perrow, Charles. Complex Organizations: A Critical Essay. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company, Third Edition, 1986.

Phillips, Kevin. "Volatile Voters Imperil Republicans," The Washington Post. Washington, D. C.: The Washington Post Company. Sunday, November 13, 1994.

Pirsig, Robert M. LILA: An Inquiry Into Morals. New York: Bantam Books, 1991.

The Random House Encyclopedia. New York: Random House, Inc., 1983.

Redding, Susan. Interview by telephone with Susan Redding, community activist, South Miami, Florida, February, 1996.

Reilly, Francis. Charles Peirce's Theory of Scientific Method. New York: Fordham University Press, 1970.

Rescher, Nicholas. Methodological Pragmatism: A Systems-Theoretic Approach to the Theory of Knowledge. New York: New York University Press, 1977.

Revelson, Roberta. Charles S. Peirce's Method of Methods. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1987.

Ricci, David M. Community Power and Democratic Theory. New York: Random House, 1971.

Riemer, Neil. The Future of the Democratic Revolution: Toward a More Prophetic Politics. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1984.

Riesenberg, Peter. Citizenship in the Western Tradition: Plato to Rousseau. Chapel Hill and London: The University of North Carolina Press, 1992.

Roberts, Nancy. "Public Deliberation: An Alternative Approach to Crating Policy and Setting Direction," PAR: Public Administration Review. Washington, D. C.: American Society of Public Administration, March/April, Volume 57, No. 2., 1997.

Ryan, Alan. John Dewey and the High Tide of American Liberalism. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1995.

Satcher, Dr. David. 1997. "Keynote Address," California State University--

Dominquez Hills Thirty-First Annual Commencement.

Scheffler, Israel. Four Pragmatists: A Critical Introduction to Peirce, James, Mead, and Dewey. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1974.

Schmidt, Mary R. "Grout: Alternative Kinds of Knowledge and Why They Are Ignored," PAR: Public Administration Review. Washington, D.C.: American Society of Public Administration, November/December, Volume 53, No. 6, 1993.

Seidman, Harold and Robert Gilmour. Politics, Position, and Power. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., Fourth Edition, 1986.

Selznick, Philip, "The Cooptative Mechanism," Classics. Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987.

Simon, Herbert A., Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor A. Thompson. Public Administration. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, In., Sixteenth printing, October, 1974.

Sjoberg, Gideon and Roger Nett. A Methodology for Social Research: With a New Introductory Essay. Prospect Heights, ILL: Waveland Press, Inc., 1997.

Skrzycki, Cindy. "The Regulators: EPA vs. NRC--Going Nuclear Over the Ground Rules on Contamination," The Washington Post. Washington, D.C.: The Washington Post Company, Sunday, May, 1997.

Smith, James Allen. The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and the Rise of the New Policy Elite. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1991.

Stever, James A. "Technology, Organization, Freedom: The Organizational Theory of John Dewey," Administration & Society, Vol. 24, No. 4, February, 1993.

Stivers, Camilla M. Active Citizenship in the Administrative State. Dissertation: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia, March, 1988.

_____. Toward a Community of Knowledge: Active Citizens in the Administrative State. Olympia, Washington: The Evergreen State

College, April, 1988.

Storing, Herbert J. Editor. <u>The Anti-Federalist</u>. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1985.

Stumpf, Samuel Enoch, President, Cornell College. <u>Socrates to Sartre: A History of Philosophy</u>. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1966.

Sullivan, William M. <u>Reconstructing Public Philosophy</u>. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Taylor, Frederick W. "Scientific Management," <u>Classics of Public Administration</u>. Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987.

Thayer, Frederick C. <u>An End to Hierarchy and Competition: Administration in the Post-Affluent World</u>. New York, New York: New Viewpoints, 1981.

Thorndike, Robert L. And Elizabeth Hagen. <u>Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Second Edition, Seventh Printing, March, 1967.

Toner, New Carroll and Walter B. Toner, Jr. <u>Citizen Participation: Building a Constituency for Public Power</u>. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978.

Van Riper, Paul P. "The American Administrative State: Wilson and the Founders," <u>A Centennial History of the American Administrative State</u>. New York, New York: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1987.

Waldo, Dwight. "Politics and Administration: On Thinking About a Complex Relationship," <u>A Centennial History of the American Administrative State</u>. New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1987.

Wamsley, Gary L. "Imaging the Public Organization as an Agency and the Public Administrator as Agential Leader," Blacksburg, Virginia: Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, April, 1988.

_____. 1990. "The Agency Perspective: Public Administrators as Agential Leaders," <u>Refounding Public Administration</u>. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc..

Weissert, Carol S. "Citizen Participation in the American Federal System," Washington, D.C.: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, August, 1979.

Westbrook, Robert B. <u>John Dewey and American Democracy</u>. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.

White, Jay D. "From Modernity to Postmodernity: Two Views of Planning and Public Administration," <u>Public Administration Review</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Society of Public Administration, November/December, Vol. 51, No. 6, 1991.

White, Jr., Orion F. and Cynthia J. McSwain. "The Phoenix Project: Raising a New Image of Public Administration from the Ashes of the Past," in Henry D. Kass and Bayard L. Catron (Editors) <u>Images and Identities in Public Administration</u>. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publishing Co., 1990.

White, Jr., Orion F. "Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate," <u>Refounding Public Administration</u> by Gary L. Wamsley et al, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1990.

Wilson, Woodrow. "The Study of Administration," <u>Classics of Public Administration</u>. Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987.

Zuckerman, Michael. <u>Peaceable Kingdoms</u>. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1970.

ELAINE ANDREWS LAILAS

ACADEMIC CREDENTIALS

Ph.D., December, 1998. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Public Administration and Public Affairs. Dissertation title: *"John Dewey's Theory of Citizenship and Community in the Developing American Democracy as seen through the Philosophy of Pragmatism as a Public Administration Model for the Citizen's Role in Public Governance."*
Doctoral Candidate-Ph.D. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Public Administration and Public Affairs, Studies: 1989-93. Certificate of Advanced Graduate Studies, December, 1993.

M. Ed., Guidance and Counseling, University of Virginia.

B. Ed., Business Education, University of Miami, FL.

EXPERIENCE

Hellenic American Academy, Principal, 1997 to present. Head of private, independent elementary school of 100 students with a teaching staff of eighteen.

Greek Orthodox Church of Saint George, Bethesda. Church Consecration Chair, 1995-98; Grand Hall Interior Design Committee Chair, 1993-95; Parish Council President-1990-93; Vice-President-1989-90; Member 1988-93 ($3.5 m. Cultural Center Building Program.); Director-Church School, (Nursery to adult) 1980-83; Curriculum development coordinator, 1979-83.

U.S. Department of Education, Horace Mann Learning Center, **Research Analyst Consultant**, Fall, 1992. Conducted national research on Self-Assessment Inventories and/or other tools on Skills--Basic, Leadership, Personal, Career-Planning and Development, Professional, Technology Skills and provided data base of research.

Fairfax County Department of Human Development: Coordinator and Co-trainer of Fairfax Project conducted by Virginia Tech--Center for Public Administration and Policy, Fall, 1989 to 1992. Graduate Assistantship. Organizational Development to change culture of social welfare agency to a team-based system where end result is to achieve client independence.

Fairfax-Brewster School. **Headmistress**-1982-88. Managed 40-member staff of elementary school with 230 pupils ages 3-12. Articulate legislative matters pertinent to private elementary education in Richmond.

American Association of University Women--National Program Vice President, 1983-85. Officer of Executive Board and Board of Directors, Legal Advocacy Board and Foundation Executive Board and Board of Directors. **Research/writer.** AAUW, 1980-81. **Government relations**. AAUW, 1976-1981. Lobby on Capitol Hill; articulate legislation to membership at the national, state, and local levels; legislative committee--set agenda and priorities. **Legislative consultant**. AAUW, 1977. Assist in researching and writing "Action Alert.." **Travel Visitor**--consultant to state divisions on legislation, and other pertinent issues. **State President,** Program Development V. Pres., Treasurer, AAUW, 1974-80.

Additional Experience

Democratic Party--Fairfax County committee member, 1981-1991; Grassroots precinct coordinator for Don Beyer for Governor of Virginia, 1996; State Delegate Candidate for the House of Delegates-1981.
McLean Community Center-Chairperson, Governing Board-1986-88 (Catalyst in coalescing grass-roots support of The McLean Project for the Arts with the Center and establishing a Teen Center in a non-partisan manner.); Vice Chairperson, 1984-86. Secretary, 1983, Member 1982-88. ($4.5m. Capital Improvement Program).
Adjunct faculty member. Northern Virginia Community College; Guidance-Counselling practicum.
Instructor. Adult Education in Fairfax County , Charlottesville, and Dade County.
Teacher. Lane High School, Charlottesville, Virginia.