

BUREAUCRATIC IDEOLOGY: A FORM
OF VIOLENCE

By

DOUGLAS REID SATTERFIELD

Bachelor of Arts

Texas Tech University

Lubbock, Texas

1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1980

Thesis
1980
S253b
cop. 2



BUREAUCRATIC IDEOLOGY: A FORM
OF VIOLENCE

Thesis Approved:

Joan Chapman

Thesis Adviser

George E. Requist, Jr.

Jack C. Byrum

Norman N. Durhann

Dean of Graduate College

1057936

PREFACE

This study is concerned with the violence which is considered to be inherent within bureaucratic ideologies. The primary objective is to formulate a theoretical framework that will add to an understanding of the ever increasing rationalization which is an integral component of industrialization, bureaucratization, and liberalization of western industrial societies. This movement is destructive to social man because particular forms of knowledge have been elevated above other social knowledge.

The author wishes to express his appreciation to his major adviser, Dr. Ivan Chapman, for his guidance and assistance throughout this study. Appreciation is also expressed to the other committee members, Dr. Jack Bynum and Dr. George E. Arquitt Jr., for their invaluable assistance in the preparation of the final manuscript.

A note of thanks is given to Ms. Rebecca Bottoms for her assistance in typing earlier drafts, the final draft, and her valuable suggestions concerning form.

Finally, special gratitude is expressed to my many friends, Max, Barry, Leo, Rebecca, and numerous others, for their understanding, patience, encouragement, and tolerance during this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Need for the Study	3
Logic of the Study	4
Definition of Terms	7
Organization of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	13
Introduction	13
Theorists	13
Rationalization	22
Liberalism	22
Industrialization	26
Bureaucracies	29
Ideology	38
Violence	42
The Nature of Violence	42
Violent Ideology of Western Economics	44
Physical and Mental Forms of Violence	48
Instruments of Violence	55
III. CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE THEORY	58
Introduction	58
Theoretical Framework	59
The Use of Knowledge	59
Effects of Industrialization and Bureaucratization	60
The Essence of Bureaucratic Ideology	69
The Violent Nature of Bureaucratic Ideology	70
IV. METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	74
Introduction	74
Methodology	75
Literature	76
Interviews	77
Analysis	79
Proposition I	79
Proposition II	83
Proposition III	89
Summary	90

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	92
Summary	92
Conclusions	96
Limitations	97
Recommendations	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY	101

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It has been prophesized that the end of ideology is upon us in western industrial societies (Aron, 1957; Bell, 1961; Lipset, 1963). No longer are traditions, opinions, or doctrines needed to assist us in our movement from the antiquated and nonfunctional past to the rational and faultless world of the future. According to the American sociologist Lipset (1963, p. 406), "the fundamental problems of the industrial revolution have been solved." The industrialized nations have progressed beyond the era when human emotion and whim have controlled the forces guiding mankind. Kumar (1978, p. 14) argues that "mankind is now seen [by several theorists] as advancing, slowly perhaps but inevitably and indefinitely, in a desirable direction." As this dream of a utopian future approaches, some social theorists (Kant, 1784; Saint-Simon, 1814) began to see a decline of man's "primitive" affairs and thoughts typified by war, aggression, starvation, and the like. Civilization was perceived as having advanced to the point where rational thought would steer society to the realization of colossal dreams (Tocqueville, 1971, p. 115).

This faith in the rational control of humanity has, according to Domhoff (1978, p. xi), taken on support from powerful economic and economically-directed sectors in our society. Weber (1953, p. 6) viewed the power to control humanity as being primarily maintained through bureaucracy and as being an integral component of large organizations.

This study is an attempt to understand and to explain the techniques used within bureaucratic organizations to control humanity, and views these techniques of control as techniques of violence.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to bring to light and increase understanding of a human destroying warfare of bureaucracies. Bureaucratic systems are deemed a necessary part of society (Weber, 1953, p. 6), while at the same time these systems are seen as destructive to the individual (Asyris, 1975, p. 142). Huxley (1958) states this appropriately:

[Bureaucratic] organizations are indispensable; for liberty arises and has meaning only within a self-regulating community of freely co-operating individuals. But, though indispensable, organization transforms men and women into automata, suffocates the creative spirit and abolishes the very possibility of freedom. As usual, the only safe course is in the middle, between the extremes of laissez-faire at one end of the scale and of total control at the other (p. 23).

The warfare will be treated in this study as a drive towards the rationalization of all spheres of life. Kumar (1978, p. 102) looks on rationalization as a "deep-lying tendency in industrial society." He further notes the most significant aspect of rationalization as "is its transformation of attitudes towards economic life" which, as a process, "effects every area of society, the most public and the most private, the state and the economy as well as the relations of marriage, family, and personal friendship" (p. 102).

The process of increasing rationalization is violently destructive of social man. Man, being at the same time both rational and non-rational, and being cast into an entirely rational mold is mutilated. He has been cut into pieces.

Domhoff and others (Mills, 1956; Kumar, 1978) propose that rationalization is brought about by numerous techniques "through which members of the power elite attempt to shape the beliefs, attitudes, and opinions of the underlying population" (Domhoff, 1978, p. 169).

Violent events are thus brought about by these bureaucratic organizations. This violent aspect will be shown to be inherent in the philosophical premises basic to each organization's ideology, regardless of the label. The focus of this study will be limited to the United States but parallels in other western societies will be set forth.

Need for the Study

Increasing crime rates, divorce, inflation and recession, along with an apparent deterioration of the standard of living, need understanding and explanation. Deterioration of the traditional family, the school and local communities, along with the removal of power from the community in order to increase centralized government also need study and explanation. Individuals are beginning to express a general uneasiness over the apparent decline of society and of their immediate mental and social security. According to Fromm (1958):

Our contemporary Western society, in spite of its material, intellectual and political progress, is increasingly less conducive to mental health, and tends to undermine the inner security, happiness, reason and the capacity for love in the individual; it tends to turn him into an automation who pays for his human failure with increasing mental sickness, and with despair hidden under a frantic drive for work and so-called pleasure (p. 20).

In another view, Mander (1978, p. 23) notes that each individual is bombarded unceasingly by the media with information and therefore the population is being inundated with conflicting versions of increasingly

complex events. "People are giving up on understanding anything" (p. 23). The glut of information appears to be dulling awareness, not aiding it. "Overload. It encourages passivity, not involvement" (p. 23).

This study specifically points to these inconsistencies in an "open" society as the underlying basis for the confusion. This is done by briefly reviewing the historical development of capitalism with its rational liberal views, and the rise of bureaucracies with their ideologies. Such an analysis designed to serve as the groundwork for improving the understanding required for the removal of personal bewilderment and the reinstitution of confidence in society.

Logic of the Study

Man as a social being, relates to others reciprocally by two-way interaction, a give and take association. Many forms of knowledge are employed by man to further these relationships: religious knowledge, personal knowledge, social knowledge, and the like.

Yet knowledge is not exclusively utilized by persons in social settings; knowledge can be used by bureaucracies to enhance the industrial system's position in the economic sector. Interestingly, while western industrial society moved from an agricultural and commercial capitalism to an industrial capitalism, the social philosophy of the times moved from individual liberalism to a corporate liberalism. The latter involves the idea that man must institutionally manage society to prevent it from deteriorating (Rossides, 1978, p. 1). Hence, the main thrust of industrialism involves political, social, and economic knowledge, with the economic factor being elevated to a supreme position. This

typifies what Kumar (1978, p. 102) calls an increase in the rationalization of society.

The elevation of economics over other forms of human endeavor, especially over the social, has resulted in the destruction of "social" man. Man, though both rational and non-rational, is being treated as totally rational with subjective components of man (needs, wants, desires, and emotions) no longer valued because these aspects are not measurable in dollars, which is the "industrial standard." Man, then, is being thrown into a violent struggle with bureaucracy, that is a struggle for control of the "definition of the situation." Thomas (1969) anticipated this warfare of man with bureaucracy as a conflict of the elements of spontaneity and organization in man with the statement, there is "always a rivalry between the spontaneous definition of the situation made by a member of an organized society and the definitions which his society has provided for him" (p. 42). Whoever controls the definition, controls the situation. The situation as defined by bureaucracy means that economics has primacy over man. In other words, profit becomes more important than people.

Yet it is industrialism which will control the definition because its elite have economic access to mass techniques for disseminating their ideology. One time advertising executive Mander makes this clear when he writes that "only the very rich can buy national advertising" (1978, p. 19). Mass media is a tool of bureaucracy that is used for this distribution, while science, another tool, has been employed to add a legitimacy to the ideological position which guides the system (Hummel, 1977, p. 214). The masses, declares Domhoff (1978, p. 170), are forced to adapt to this ideology. This process of controlling people, a

psychological and social "leveling affect," serves to reduce "social" man, who is characterized by many forms of knowledge, creativeness, and innovativeness, to "industrial" man, who is seen as a commodity to be sold, used, manipulated, and resold.

The ideological character of bureaucratic systems is signified by the elevation of economics over other forms of human endeavor. This warfare is a concession from two-way social logic to one-way bureaucratic decrees. In order to maintain the economic character of bureaucratic organizations, the concepts "efficiency" and "progress" have been reconstituted (Hummel, 1977, p. 69).

This conversion process or leveling affect is destruction of social man and is defined as violence. This violence takes place on two levels: the mental level or the physical level. A distinction between forms of violence is important in an analysis of bureaucratic systems, for today Ellul (1965, p. 11-12) comments that there has been a shift in the techniques used to convert people to a systems thinking. Regardless of the form of violence utilized, whether mental or physical, an ideology will be legitimized as a necessary way to achieve an organizational goal. However, organizations more commonly espouse an ideology of (physical) non-violence, while increasing the level of mental violence.

Three techniques used to convert people into economic (or industrial) people, are: purchasing the individual through offers of material wealth; or by using various forms of influence such as propaganda and advertising; or by physical force. It follows that violence may be the force behind the myths of efficiency and progress because these concepts assist in converting social persons into non-social persons.

Definition of Terms

The following paragraphs contain an understanding of the key concepts used in this study.

Ends: Those changes that members of a society, community, organization, or group expect to accomplish through the operation of the society, community, organization, or group. The prevailing objectives of a family, for example, may be broad and diffuse - those of a business organization more specific. A family may strive to provide all its members with a level of living compatible with its standards, and this may be the family's end or objective. A business organization may direct its activities toward the end of increasing its earnings which may often be measured in dollars.

Means: The methods used by a society, community, organization, group, or "system" as Loomis (1975, p. 1-2) calls them, or by an individual for the attainment of ends or objectives are means or techniques. Technique conveys far more than machine technology. Technique refers to any procedure for attaining a predetermined result. Thus, it converts spontaneous and unreflective behavior into behavior that is deliberate. Ellul (1964, p. vi) was convinced that "technique was extended to all domains of life." A child, for example, might use crying to obtain a wanted object, where an automobile company could utilize television advertising to sell a commodity.

Knowledge: Knowledge may be defined as intellectually construed objects, events, and ideas. Thus knowledge is constructed in people's heads, then symbolized for communication. In other words, knowledge is an abstraction, but it is also power in that it can be utilized to achieve an end. This instrumental character of knowledge indicates that

there are different kinds of knowledge.

Power: Power is the ability of an individual or group to carry out its wishes or policies, and to control, manipulate, or influence the behavior of others whether they wish to cooperate or not. "The agent who possesses power has resources to force his will on others" (Theodorson, 1969, p. 307). Power, as used here, is control over others or "systems." Loomis (1975, p. 5) comments that power has many components which he classifies under two major headings: "legitimized power designated as authority and non-legitimized power which may take the form of influence or coercive force."

Definition of the Situation: The "definition of the situation," as used by Thomas (1969, p. 42), is a process in which an individual examines and evaluates a situation prior to deciding what attitudes and behavior are appropriate. The way a given object or set of circumstances is interpreted and the meaning it has for the person or "system" are in great part determined by culture, particularly by values and social norms.

Industrial Man: Economic man or industrial man is a theoretical construct of man as a purely rational being motivated solely by economic interests. As used in this paper, economic man is similar to Whytes (1956) "organization man." These people "not only work for the Organization, but 'belong' to it as well" (p. 3).

Social Man: Social man, as contrasted to economic man, is a complete man in that this individual is both rational and non-rational. He has wants and desires, feels pain, loves, hates, possesses knowledge, lives, and eventually dies. Thus he has both a subjective and objective component.

Mass Media: Mass media is any means or instrument of communication reaching large numbers of people, such as books, periodicals, radio, television, and motion pictures. Specifically, it reaches outside the social community of its origin.

Ideology: For this paper, an ideology is a system of interdependent ideas (beliefs, traditions, principles, and myths) held by a social group or society, which "reflects, rationalizes, and defends its particular social, moral, religious, political, and economic institutional interests and commitments" (Theodorson, 1969, p. 195). Ideologies serve as logical and philosophical justifications for a group's or "system's" patterns of behavior, as well as its attitudes, goals, and general life situation.

Liberalism: Liberalism is an "ideological orientation" based on the belief in the importance of the "freedom and welfare of the individual, and the possibility of social progress and the improvement of the equality of life through change and innovation in social organization" (Theodorson, 1969, p. 230). Liberalism has continued to emphasize the justification of actions in terms of "social progress rather than on the basis of an appeal to tradition" (p. 230). Rossides (1978, p. 7) complements this view by pointing out two phases of liberal social development, that is, "two distinct epistemological phases - rationalism and empiricism."

Economics: Economics, as an institution, is a system of social roles and norms organized about the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services.

Capitalism: The economic complex of capitalism is a system in which all or most of the means of production and distribution, such as land, factories, railroads, etc., are privately owned and operated for profit,

originally under fully competitive conditions. Capitalism, as far as this study is concerned, is generally characterized by a tendency toward concentration of wealth, as in liberalism, and in a more advanced stage (corporate capitalism) by growth of corporations, increased governmental control, and economic rationalization.

Rationalism: Rationalism is the "doctrine that reason itself and systematic thinking yield truth and knowledge," and are for this purpose "superior to experience or empirical investigation" (Theodorson, 1969, p. 335). An increase in rationalization means the development of greater standardization, consistency, and coordination in organizational structure. In industry the term has been used to refer to the principles of "scientific management" (p. 336).

Organizations: Organizations are an organized "group" having explicit objectives, formally stated rules and regulations, and a system of specifically defined roles, each with designated rights and duties. Organizations include schools, hospitals, voluntary associations, corporations, the military, government agencies, etc. It is a "rationally ordered system of norms and roles governing the relationships of persons in groups or in specified social situations" (Theodorson, 1969, p. 287). This is in contrast to an informal organization or the system of personal relationships that develop spontaneously as people interact within (formal) organizations.

Bureaucracy: A bureaucracy is considered to be a large-scale organization that is highly differentiated and efficiently organized by means of formal rules and departments or bureaus of highly trained "experts." Activities of these experts are coordinated by a hierarchical chain of command. The bureaucratic organization is characterized by a

"centralization of authority, and emphasis on discipline, rationality, technical knowledge, and impersonal procedures" (Theodorson, 1969, p. 34).

Power Elite: Mills (1956) first introduced the concept of a power elite into the sociological literature as a substitute for what Domhoff (1978) calls the "ruling class" (p. 14). This ruling class, according to Domhoff, is a "clearly demarcated social class which has power over the government and underlying population within a given nation" (p. 12). Power elite as defined here also refers to the ruling class.

Industry: Industry is a branch of economic activity devoted to organized large-scale manufacturing of goods. Industrialization is characterized by the replacement of hand production centered in a craftsman's home or small shop by machine production centered in factories, by the production of standardized goods with interchangeable parts, by the rise of a class of factory workers who work for wages and do not own the means of production or the goods they produce, also by a great increase in the proportion of the population engaged in nonagricultural occupations, and by the growth of numerous large cities (Theodorson, 1969, p. 201).

Violence: Violence is the use of force (technique) so as to injure or damage a person or to damage property. Physical violence occurs when a person is physically injured or killed as a result of an external force directed against that individual or group of whom he is a member. Mental violence takes place as man is forced, convinced, or otherwise influenced to move from a diverse social man to a more narrow industrial man. This violence is predominantly brought about through increased rationalization in our industrial society.

Organization of the Study

This study is divided into five chapters. Chapter II is a review of the increase in rationalization of thought in western societies, and how this is related to the concepts industrialization, bureaucratization, and ideology. Chapter III is the presentation of a theoretical framework which links the diverse literature in the previous chapter. Chapter IV contains the methodology that is employed in supporting the theoretical framework, and an analysis of the data used in confirming the theory. The final chapter, Chapter V, summarizes the study and presents some conclusions and recommendations for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

There are two purposes of this chapter. First, an increase in the rationalization of western societies will be traced since the Enlightenment. This rationalization of all sectors of human involvement will be interpreted as violently destructive to social man. The writings of social theorists are primarily used to demonstrate this destructive movement. Upon tracing this increase in the rationalization of thought, these theorists may be grouped into two categories. The first group emphasize the idea of universal human "progress," the empirical method of science, and the rationalization of thought. The last group of theorists hold that an increase in rationalization is a process which has narrowed mankind from a multi-dimensional being to a less than whole being.

The second purpose of this chapter is to show how rationalization is a necessary part of liberalism, industrialization, bureaucracy, and organizational ideology. Once these objectives have been accomplished, a theoretical model will be built in Chapter III.

Theorists

During the seventeenth and eighteenth century, western societies became involved in the philosophic movement known as the Enlightenment. This philosophical movement was characterized by an emerging "confidence"

in the ability of human beings to "understand and to control the forces in both nature and human nature" (Rossides, 1978, p. 4). A surge of confidence in human reason reached its apex during the French Enlightenment, when, as Rossides points out, "the belief in the power of reason to penetrate every reach of the phenomenal world characterized the model intellectual climate of western society."

Several theorists (Theodorson, 1969; Rossides, 1978; Kumar, 1978) refer to this reasoning as "rationalization." In other words, it was thought that systematic thinking, or reasoning which features greater standardization, empiricism, consistency, coordination, and carefully worked out schemes, yields absolute truth and knowledge.

This confidence in man's capability to control nature is demonstrated by the achievements in natural science of Copernicus (1473-1543), Galileo (1564-1642), and Newton (1642-1727). According to Rossides (1978, p. 4) these accomplishments were matched by the "attempts" of two early social theorists, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) and John Locke (1632-1704), "to make comparable discoveries about human nature." These writers marked a progression in rational thought.

Martindale (1960, p. 137) saw the core of Hobbes' thought as based on a "materialistic conception of man and nature and a rigorously empirical conception of knowledge." For Hobbes (1647, p. 63), the main spring of human action is a "general inclination for the perpetual and restless desire of power after power, that ceaseth only in death." Indicative of rational thought and not unlike Hobbes, was that science focuses on the problem of constructing knowledge out of the data of experience without appeal to transcendent principles of any kind. Locke (1689, p. 96) argued that "men, barely by the use of their natural facilities, may

attain to all the knowledge they have, without the help of any innate impressions."

A century later, this rationalism of thought began to take on a "positivistic" perspective. For example, Comte (1798-1857) presented several social theories as arguments against traditional philosophy, which he denounced as "metaphysical" (Martindale, 1960, p. 16). The very term "positivism" identifying the new field was intended to express this opposition. At the same time, notes Martindale (1960), the new "positive philosophy," or as Comte characterized it later, "sociology," relied on the "task of establishing laws of the regularities of social events" (p. 16). Comte (1853) acknowledges this rationalism in the new philosophy when he writes, "Its rational development constitutes the substratum of the science, in whatever is essential to it" (p. 105).

Spencer (1820-1903) takes positivism a good deal further as he fuses it with organicism (Martindale, 1960, p. 65). Spencer was not so simplistic as to argue that since everything we know comes from the environment, then, by proper manipulation any kind of society can be developed. Mental development, he argued takes place slowly. Spencer's explanation of this came about in his concept of evolution. Spencer (1958) defines evolution this way:

Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation (p. 394).

This formula, according to Martindale (1960, p. 66), was believed to apply to the universe, to the evolution of the earth, and to the development of biological forms, the human mind, and human society. Thus Spencer is indicative of an increase in the rationalization of thought.

Another social theorist of this time, expressing a similar line of thought which illustrates an emerging dominant trend of thinking, was Pareto (1848-1923). Coser (1971) points out that Pareto's ambition was to construct a system of sociology analogous in its essential features to the "generalized physico-chemical system which J. Willard Gibbs formulated in his Thermodynamics" (p. 387). Pareto (1935) had the conception of a social system in which "molecules" were individuals with interests, drives, and sentiments "analogous to the mixture of chemical compounds found in nature" (p. 148). With such a limited model to explain mankind, it is easy to see the narrowness of Pareto's work. He maintained his restrictive approach to the study of social theory throughout his lifetime. Toward the end of his life, Pareto (1934) wrote:

Driven by the desire to bring an indispensable complement to the studies of political economy and inspired by the example of the natural sciences, I determined to begin my Treatise, the sole purpose of which is to seek experimental reality, by the application to the social sciences of the methods which have proved themselves in physics, in chemistry, in astronomy, in biology, and in other such sciences (p. 291).

Two contemporary theorists expressing a rationalistic mode of thought, are Simon and Barnard. They represent a school of thought which views organizations as rationally arranged structures. Wolin (1960, p. 133) calls the theorists "rationalists." In thinking of the "rationalists," there is no trace of romanticism, no fondness for modes of natural growth, only a world of hard rationalism (Wolin, p. 133) for example, Simon (1960, p. 134) believes that organizations are the least "natural, most contrived units of human association." The rationalists, notes Wolin (p. 134), are "most impressed by the capabilities of an organization for focusing human energy and pooling human talents." They

see its primary values in "efficiency of operation and the ability to survive rather than in communal solidarity" (p. 134).

Another group of theorists have elaborated upon the effects that an increase in rationalization has upon society. Sumner (1840-1910) expressed this in his explanation of mankind's movement from "random blundering" efforts to satisfy man's needs to the development of "laws" and "institutions" for the same purpose. The ideas of Sumner are important because he observed and attempted to understand mankind's behavior, and the origins of behavior, in a manner which deviates from the previously mentioned theorists. In other words, man's actions are not seen as purely logical, rational, and reasonable, but that behaviors may contain other components. For example Sumner (1906, p. 2) notes that, "as time goes on," folkways, which are the result of a group struggle to maintain existence, "became more and more arbitrary, positive, and imperative" (p. 3).

Man has now gone beyond individual blundering efforts to a kind of dependency upon the small group. In this respect man has given up part of himself so as to gain security. Yet over time, folkways become "custom" and hence "develop into mores by the addition of some philosophy of welfare, however crude" (p. 54). The mores, as Sumner observed, were then made "more definite and specific as regards to the rules, the prescribed acts, and the apparatus to be employed" (p. 54). This produced a "structure and the institution was complete" (p. 54).

Sumner goes further by distinguishing between institutions (property, marriage, religion) and mores. He remarks that "laws and institutions have a rational and practical character, and are more mechanical and utilitarian" (p. 57). The great difference is that "institutions and

laws have a positive character," while "mores are unformualted and unde-fined" (p. 57). In other words, laws, being positive prescriptions, supercede the mores so far as they are adopted.

Toennies (1855-1936) also expanded upon the idea of an increase in rationalization thought, by tracing what he called "natural will" to "rational will" (1957, p. 247). He returned to the simple problem of "what, why, and how do thinking human beings will and want?" (p. 247). He answered the question simply; "they want to attain an end and seek the most appropriate means of attaining it" (p. 247). In plain terms, people strive toward a goal and seek the correct way leading thereto. This striving is "will" or "volition", an act of willing.

Toennies makes it clear that "will" has changed in western societies. An older form of will is "natural will" (Wesenwille), which is not only what an individual has learned but also the "inherited mode of thought and perception of the forefather's influences on his sentiment, his mind and heart, and as his conscience" (p. 247). This is contrasted with "rational will" (Kurwille), the type of "thinking which has gained pre-dominance and come to be the directing agent" (p. 247). He goes even further to contrast rational will with "intellectual will" because although

. . . intellectual will gets along well with subconscious motives which lie deep in man's nature and at the base of his natural will, rational will eliminates such disturbing elements and is clearly as conscious as possible (p. 247).

Thus, social man is being narrowed by the elimination of some human components.

Toennies also mentions that in the rational will, the "means are not fundamentally connected to the end" (p. 248). Also, the means may

be completely isolated and therefore may possibly even stand in strong opposition to the ends. By this, Toennies means that,

. . . on the other hand, there is the simple emotional (impulsive) and, therefore, irrational volition and action, whereas on the other there is the simple rational volition and action in which the means are arranged, a condition which often stands in conflict with the feelings (p. 248).

Furthermore, these two modes of will explain the existence of two basic types of social groups. Timasheff (1976, p. 180), in studying "classical writers," quotes Toennies as saying, "A social group may be willed into being because sympathy among the members to make them feel that this relationship is a value in itself." On the other hand, a social group may arise as "an instrument to attain some definite end" (Toennies, 1976, p. 180). The first type of group, the expression of natural will, Toennies (p. 180) called "Gemeinschaft," the rational willed group "Gesellschaft."

Since Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft correspond to types of will, Toennies treats social relations as manifestations of these. Human wills may enter into "manifold relations," emphasizing either preservation of social order or its destruction; but only the former, relations of reciprocal affirmation, "should be studied by sociologists" (p. 180). Reciprocal affirmation itself varies in intensity. Thus, according to Toennies,

. . . a social state exists if two persons will to be in a definite relationship; this relationship is commonly recognized by others. When a social state obtains between more than two persons, there is a 'circle.' If however individuals are regarded as forming a unit because of common natural or psychic traits, they form a 'collective.' Finally, if there is organization, assigning specific functions to specific persons, the social body becomes a 'corporation' (p. 181).

According to Toennies (p. 181) all these social formations may be based on natural will or rational will. It is, however, hard to conceive how a collective could be Gesellschaft or a corporation a Gemeinschaft.

A more recent social theorist, Mosca, presented a similar idea but included an economic character to the theoris. Mosca (1960, p. 197) notes that with the growth of population and therefore in consumption a very important transformation in the social structure occurs. "Wealth" rather than "military valor" comes to be the characteristic feature of the dominant class: "the people who rule are the rich rather than the brave" (p. 197). Mosca states this appropriately by pointing out that the condition required for such a transformation is that,

. . . social organization shall have concentrated and become perfected to such an extent that the protection offered by public authority is considerably more effective than the protection offered by private force (p. 198).

This comes about through a "series of gradual alterations in the social structure whereby a type of political organization," which he called the "feudal state," is "transformed into an essentially different type," which he called the "bureaucratic state" (p. 198).

These "gradual alterations" Mosca wrote on, are brought about through a rationalization process. Although Mosca never referred to the process as rationalization, he nevertheless understood the concept as can be seen in the following quote:

The fact is that what philosophers and theologians call free will - in other words, spontaneous choice by individuals - has so far had, and will perhaps always have, little influence, if any at all, in hastening either the ending or the beginning of any historical period (p. 198).

The theme of increasing rationalization of thought has been further expanded upon by such present-day writers as Mills (1951, 1956), Domhoff (1978), Giddens (1979), and Marcuse (1964). Mills and Domhoff see a movement of power from the many to the few (a power elite). Giddens notes a progression from personal power to use resources, to bureaucratic power to use resources.

For illustration, Giddens (1979) separates conceptually two major types of resource which "constitute structures of domination, and which are drawn upon and reproduced as power relations in interaction" (p. 100). By "authorization" he refers to capabilities which generate command over persons, and by "allocation" he refers to capabilities which generate command over objects or other material phenomena. Societies have changed over time, "early civilizations existed by emphasizing authorization over allocation, now the reverse is true" (p. 162). Although "early civilizations and modern capitalism share an instrumental relation to nature," the latter is exploitative of allocation (p. 163).

Marcuse has made the effects of this process of rationalization on individuals more clear. According to Marcuse (1964) the rational organization of an entire society around the production of material objects rather than the internal development of its individuals' selves, and the relationships between them produces,

. . . a pattern of one-dimensional thought and behavior in which ideas, aspirations, and objectives that, by their content, transcend the established universe of discourse and action are either repelled or reduced to terms of this universe. They are redefined by the rationality of the given system and of its quantitative extension (p. 12).

What Marcuse has termed the "One-Dimensional Society" and "One-Dimensional

Thought," are increasing rationality, efficiency, and growth vis-a-vis material products.

Marcuse (1964, p. xiii) gives us a good analysis of the type of society which produces one-dimensional thought. Indeed, our society's "sweeping rationality which propels efficiency and growth, is itself irrational." And, "the fact that the vast majority of the population accepts, and is even made to accept, this society does not render it less irrational and less reprehensible."

As can be seen, many theorists have acknowledged an increase of rational thought through mankind's history. At this point, rationalism as manifested in liberalism, will be elaborated on.

Rationalization

Liberalism

As the confidence of mankind in understanding and controlling nature grew in western societies, a social philosophy called liberalism began to emerge. The term liberalism will refer to the political, legal, economic, and social values and doctrines of the middle class. Translated into its sociological synonyms, "it is equivalent to such terms as positive, industrial, Gesellschaft and rational-legal" (Rossides, 1978, p. 4). The idea underlying liberal logic is that "human beings, functioning in large part individually, can achieve both a theoretical and a practical mastery of the natural and social universes" (p. 4).

The advent of an economy based on private ownership of the means of production and distribution (capitalism) was a momentous event in human history. "The social philosophy that emerged with this capitalism was liberalism" (p. 1). The most radical aspect of the capitalist era was

the transformation of an agricultural and commercial capitalist economy into an industrial capitalist economy.

However, until well into the industrial period, the natural environment (that which was neither humanly made nor controlled) was never far removed from the routine round of mankind's daily life. Throughout much of the civilized past, even those who lived in that most humanly regulated of abodes, the city, knew that not far beyond the town limits was untamed wilderness and forest. In recent times, the necessity of living a life completely enveloped by man-made and man-controlled environment has increased rapidly and enormously.

The confidence in the power of human reason to permeate all worldly phenomena reached its apex during the Enlightenment. This also marked a time when thinking about mankind and society was increasingly future directed.

The Golden Age of the human race is not behind us but before us; it lies in the perfection of the social order. Our ancestors never saw it; our children will one day arrive there; it is for us to clear the way (Saint-Simon, 1814, p. 13).

John Wren-Lewis (1970, p. 291) echoes this belief when he analyzed "traditional forces" and concluded that they make for "inhumanity, depersonalization, and mechanization; forces which stunt the sense of beauty and freedom and spaciousness and joy." To put it in another way, "these evil forces of our time" are not new things produced by science and technology which take us into the future, "but very ancient things which threaten us only because we are not allowing science and technology to take us into the future fast enough" (p. 291). The tendency for society to regiment people and deprive them of individual initiative is no greater today than it was in past ages, and "if it grows worse in the future it

will be because we use computers and robots too little rather than too much" (p. 291).

In other words, there has been a shift in the logic underlying capitalistic society. As Rossides (1978, p. 5) points out, the social development of capitalism can be divided into two general phases, something political science refers to as early and late liberalism. The first period, from the late Middle Ages and climaxing in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, "had an intellectual and institutional unity based on Newtonian cosmology" (p. 5). Nature, including human nature, was being rethought in the light of Newtonian physics and the needs of a business civilization. Doctrines of natural rights in politics and of laissez-faire in economics were the mainstream thought; ideas of individual liberty, political-legal equality, private property, contract, profit, and the self-equilibrating exchange economy were being institutionalized in many Western countries. According to Rossides (p. 61-62), this was in part the result of a long drawn out literary controversy between the "Moderns" who saw the golden age in the future and the "Ancients" of classical antiquity who vehemently opposed this view of mankind by believing that the great golden age of man was really in the past. Victory of the "Moderns" over the "Ancients" established the conviction that modern philosophy and modern science were not only equal to that of the ancient world but successively superior (p. 62). Mankind could now be seen as inevitably and indefinitely advancing in a desirable direction.

The second period of liberalism, which emerged in the latter part of the nineteenth century with the on rush of industrialism, gradually replaced the doctrines of natural rights and laissez-faire in early

liberalism. Western societies now became more concerned with the stability, vitality and morality of industrial corporate capitalism. Rossides noted that theorists of the time,

. . . faced with the ravages and conflicts produced by hectic and undirected industrial expansion, came more and more to see social harmony, progress, and individualism not as emanations from a benevolent and rational order but as social products that had to be created through institutional management (p. 6).

It was recognized that intelligent state action (the so-called welfare state) was necessary to counteract the ills and cleavages of economic and social life. In short, means of control were formed as devices to channel western society by separating all social functions and placing them in a value hierarchy. Thus, there was a movement from individual liberalism to corporate liberalism, an elevation of economics over the social. As Rossides saw,

. . . the resort to state action during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries by the middle class marks merely another phase in the continuing rationalization of social life that began in the late Middle Ages (p. 6).

With western societies monetary interests were elevated above all other forms of human needs. Systems were traditionally designed with people in mind whether those people were in corporations, government, religious, or military organization. However, as the dollar became the goal; people were placed lower and lower in a list of priorities until they were no longer of much consequence.

But as seen by Reich (1970, p. 94), organizations needed "stability, freedom from outside interference, and constantly increasing profits." They also needed more and better personnel, more functions, increased

status and prestige: in a word, growth. "The medium through which these needs were to be obtained was law" (p. 94). A legal system not primarily concerned with justice, equality, or individual rights; but a system functioning as an instrument of system domination, and acting to prevent the intervention of human values or individual choice. The forces driving the system were to be impersonal and wholly indifferent to man's needs. A "system expressly designed for the purpose of destroying human beings and their society" (p. 94).

Reich (p. 95) sees the essence of the "Corporate State," or the process of industrialization, as "relentlessly single-minded." It has only one value, he notes, "the value of technology-organization-efficiency-growth-progress." Simply put, industrialization is perfectly rational and logical. "It is based upon principle," Reich (p. 95) concludes, "but life cannot be supported on the basis of any single principle." In other words, to have only one value is to be part human.

Industrialization

According to Kumar (1978, p. 59), industrialization has become the generic term encompassing all the major changes in the movement of "the modern society." The industrial society has come to be identified as the distinctive type of "modern" society, incorporating common features well beyond those of a simply economic and technological character. As Kumar (1978) puts it,

. . . industrialization means the transformation of the productive forces of society through the application of a machine technology and the factory system; but it also means urbanization, secularization, the 'rationalization' of thought, institutions, and behavior, the individualization of consciousness and conduct, and a host of other changes in family life,

politics, and culture (p. 59).

Hence industrialization is more than a question of producing more goods in a new way. It also entails a "process of socialization which aims at stabilizing and inculcating fidelity among those whose labor is being conscripted" (Ewen, 1976, p. 6). As Marx (1962, pp. 362-363) had perceived in his "Preface to a Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," the "modern stage of development of the material powers of production" required the maintenance of specific and corresponding social formations and relations of production.

In a striking series of polarities the movement from the previous to the present order of a rational society was conceptualized by nineteenth century thinkers as a succession of two logically and sociologically contrasting states or types of society. Thus Spencer, echoing Saint-Simon not merely in the content of the opposition, traced the movement from "militant" to "industrial" society; Toennies saw it as a movement from "community" (*Gemeinschaft*) to "association" (*Gesellschaft*). "Sir Henry Maine, traced it from a social order based on 'status' to one based on 'contract'" (Kumar, 1978, p. 59). For Durkheim, the movement was seen essentially in terms of the contrasting principles of social integration, the earlier based on "mechanical solidarity," the present on "organic solidarity" (p. 59). Also, Weber saw the distinction chiefly in the differing bases of authority, both political and intellectual, in the change from "traditional" to "legal-rational" political forms and modes of thought (p. 59). Redfield (1947, pp. 293-308), an American anthropologist, later added a further polar contrast between "sacred" and "secular" societies.

The point made here, is that many social thinkers viewed "modern"

society as having changed. This change was brought about through a rationalization of thought which is a narrowing of social man, a destruction of a person's "multi-dimensionality." For example, a technologically advanced civilization reduces and standardizes the skills required for wanted performances; it simplifies and mechanizes many tasks. It is therefore not as dependent on the rhetoric of morality or the mobilization of moral sentiment to ensure desired performances. Thus, as Gouldner (1970, p. 277) postulates, "within the technologically advanced sectors of society, individuals are less likely to be required to possess moral qualities and to be treated as moral actors." For men are becoming more interchangeable, more replaceable, and removable at lower costs. Gouldner (p. 277) sees morality as becoming a "private" matter. Technicians now "process" cases according to impersonal rules and narrow standards. Industrialism as "utilitarian culture" has found its hardware embodiment in "modern technology" and its organizational embodiment in "modern technology" and its organizational embodiment in "modern bureaucracy;" it can now fulfill its promise of treating persons as objects (p. 277). And all this is happening together with increased longevity of life and welfare. Everywhere in industrialized societies apparent "decencies" are growing, and everywhere in them men are being indecently diminished.

In other words, men are less likely to experience themselves as potent and in control of their own destinies as industrial bureaucracy, technocracy, and science become increasingly autonomous and powerful forces by which men feel entrapped. Men's capacity and need to see themselves as moral individuals are threatened. Appropriately, as Foucault (1966, pp. 396-398) concludes, "Man" will begin to die out in

the twentieth century as "God" did in the nineteenth century.

Bureaucracies

At this time, bureaucracies will be discussed in themselves and then in relationship to a mode of thought called rationalism. First of all, bureaucracy is an intellectual construct but one of which actual formal organizations may approach to varying degrees. Also, according to Theodorson (1969, p. 34), "no formal organization is ever completely rational, efficient, and formalized in its organization and operation," but insofar as this construct is dominant in practice, "organization is usually regarded as a bureaucracy."

During the nineteenth century, a number of descriptive accounts of modern bureaucratic systems were brilliantly given. However, it was Weber who began the systematic study in this area. He attempted to define a "pure type" or an "ideal type" of bureaucratic organization by abstracting some of the more characteristic features of bureaucracy. Weber (1956, pp. 126-127) noted in his studies the "trend toward increasing bureaucratization, as one of its central manifestations, of the western world."

Once bureaucracy is fully established, says Weber (1960, p. 177), it is among those social structures which are the hardest to destroy." Bureaucracy is "the" means of carrying "community action" over into rationally ordered "societal action" (p. 177). Therefore, as an instrument for "societalizing relations of power, bureaucracy has been and is a power instrument of the first order - for the one who controls the bureaucratic apparatus" (p. 177). Thus, Weber acknowledges the rational character of bureaucracies: "naturally, bureaucracy promotes a

'rationalist' way of life" (p. 187), and its destructive ability: "the march of bureaucracy has destroyed structures of domination which had no rational character" (p. 191).

Weber (pp. 164-165) also postulates why bureaucracy tends to "progress." The decisive reason for "the advance of bureaucratic organization has always been its purely technical superiority over any other form of organization" (p. 165). Hence, the fully developed bureaucratic mechanism compares with other organizations exactly as does the machine with the non-mechanical modes of production. Briefly, bureaucracy is characterized by "precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of the files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs" (p. 165).

Marx (1958) also argued that the "rationalization" and "centralization of society were inevitable consequences" of the rise of the industrial bourgeoisie:

The bourgeoisie keeps more and more doing away with the scattered state of the population, of the means of production, and of property. It has agglomerated population, centralized means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands. The necessary consequence of this was political centralization. Independent, or but loosely connected provinces, with separate interests, laws, governments and systems of taxation, became lumped together into one nation, with one government, one code of laws, one national class-interest, one frontier and one customs-tariff (p. 38).

Kumar (1978, p. 90) summarized this movement to centralization by speaking of it as "the nationalization of society." This phrase not only, and quite accurately, indicates the "central association of the emerging industrial order with the developing nation-state," it also suggests the movement of centralization that was taking place in all European societies,

... breaking down the insulation between the different parts (regions and classes) of society, and tending to a leveling affect in which all individuals became uniformly subject to a centralized state (p. 90).

This becomes apparent as social systems increasingly become institutionalized or formalized: bureaucracy slowly at first then at an ever increasing speed replaces the individual's primary group and social institutions. Social goals not being perceived as useful to the bureaucratic system, are negated.

Michels (1915, pp. 185-188) set forth a popularly held conception that "the organization of the (industrialized) state needs a numerous and complicated bureaucracy." It seems mandatory for large organized societies to develop and maintain large bureaucratic structures to promote economic efficiency and power. Michels states this aptly:

This is an important factor in the complex of forces of which the politically dominant classes avail themselves to secure their dominion and to enable themselves to keep their hands upon the rudder (p. 185).

Often boldly given as a reason for the required presence of bureaucratic systems in the U.S. society is that without such a structure, chaos would result leading to the death of millions, nations would dissolve, and survivors would be forced to live in a feudal-like system; a regression in human affairs rather than progress. This study will view such statements from elite perspectives as meaning to say the world would no longer be economically and bureaucratically efficient if the perspective were changed.

Helmer (1967, pp. 152-154), following this logic, predicts that by the year 2000, "world population will be in excess of five billion," and that in order to direct our future from almost certain "misery,"

then "social scientists" must "find out about the possible futures that lie ahead; single out the more desirable ones among them; and invent the instrumentalities for their deliberate pursuit." An organized effort, according to Helmer (p. 155), to enhance our capability, as "analysts," to deal with these three tasks is "prerequisite to putting the process of shaping the future of our society on a more rational foundation."

Helmer also notes that

. . . it constitutes the basis for the application of social technology, that is, for the invention of social institutions and the design of social policies (maintained and promoted through bureaucratic processes) that promise to fulfill our reasonable aspirations (p. 155).

For the purpose of this study, then, bureaucracy may be defined as that type of hierarchical organization which is designed "rationally" to coordinate the work of many individuals in the pursuit of large-scale tasks. The following terms may be associated with the concept of bureaucracy: precision, stability, discipline, reliability, calculability of results, formal rationality, formalistic impersonality, and formal equality of treatment. There are other fundamental features included which are necessary to expand the definition above. First, bureaucracy is a man-made thing, a construct, but nevertheless very real in that people are effected by its consequences. Power resides in this abstraction, it has the backing of the rule makers and often the rule followers; power entails the means of acquiring legitimacy. "Might (coercion, violence, force) creates its own legitimation and is not merely willingly 'exchanged' for it," according to Gouldner (1970, p. 293). Yet one should not simply define power as legitimate and Gouldner chastised Talcott Parsons for doing so. Gouldner states that

. . . legitimacy may be born of a tacit alliance and trade-off between the criminal and his victim: the victim conceals his impotence by acknowledging the legitimacy of the claims made upon him, while the criminal conceals his brutality by forcing his victim to acknowledge the legitimacy of his claims (p. 293).

Weber's (1956, p. 24) conceptions of legitimacy and their inner justifications are based on the assumption that if a state is to exist, "the dominated must obey the authority claimed by the powers that be." Three "pure types" of authority supposedly exist concludes Weber (1956, p. 124); traditional, charismatic, and legal-rational. Although these pure types exist in complex combinations, we are interested above all in the latter of these types: domination by virtue of legality. Legal-rational authority does indeed rest, as Weber (p. 124) pointed out in his discussion of the three dominant forms of authority and organization, on the possibility of using reason to determine the "legitimacy of orders from above." In contrast, traditional authority rested on habit, and charisma rests on affect. However, it must be understood that, in reality, regardless of type of authority, that

. . . obedience is determined by highly robust motives of fear and hope - fear of the vengeance of magical powers or of the power-holder, hope for reward in this world or in the beyond -- and besides all this, by interests of the most varied sort (p. 126).

Knowing that fear is from force, coercion, etc. and applying Weber's idea to a rational bureaucracy, this hierarchical system will maintain itself predominantly through fear. Fear, being a component of the non-rational part of man, now controlled, means that man himself is dominated in both the rational/logical sphere and non-rational/emotional/needs sphere.

Bureaucracy now becomes the "supreme eagle."

A tool of bureaucracy, advertising, is the epitome of the use of

fear as a device to force the individual into thinking, feeling, and acting in a directed manner. Supporting this reasoning, Ewen (1976, p. 97) reports that while some "ads" continually paint pictures in which people could trust no one (not even themselves) in their immediate surroundings, "the corporations were presented as an alternative for communities which are pictured as eroded by mistrust." People are fragmented from one another by such privatized problems as "sneaker smell," "paralyzed pores," "vacation knees," "spoon-food face," "office hips," "underarm offense," and "ashtray breath." The immediate world of the "consumer" was in fact presented as one in which "fear" justifiably reigned (p. 97). Woodward (1926) aptly states this idea:

Give 'em the figures about the baby death rate - but don't say it flatly. You know if you just put a lot of figures in front of a woman she passes you by. If we only had the nerve to put a hearse in the ad, you couldn't keep the women away from the food (p. 98).

Secondly, as the rationalization of the overall organization increases in bureaucracies, the "ability of any given person employed within the organization to know the purpose of what he does decreases" (Mannheim, 1940, p. 59). Mannheim (p. 59) dealt with this paradox in that increasing systems' rationality produces decreasing individual rationality by distinguishing between the system's "functional rationalization" and the individual's "substantial rationality." By "functional rationalization" he means the logical subdivision of an overall task into ever-smaller units of work, each tightly integrated with the others.

Efficiency is the original goal of such rationalization. "Substantial rationality" refers to the individual's ability to know how his small task fits into the overall task (p. 59). On this knowledge hinges

not only his ability to use his own reason to better integrate his work into the overall activity of the system, but also his sense of purposefulness in the aim of his work and meaningfulness in the conduct of his work.

It follows that, according to Hummel (1977, p. 86), "purposelessness and meaninglessness are the unavoidable product, not an accidental one, of modern organizations constructed on bureaucratic premises." For if meaninglessness at the individual (employee) level is a direct, although undesirable, product of bureaucracy, then to attempt to reduce meaninglessness "will have a reciprocal impact on the desirable characteristics of modern organization" (p. 87). Specifically, the manager within a bureaucracy, will expect to lose efficiency in return for humane attempts on his part to let employees share in the overall purpose and meaning of the institution.

But economic (or output) efficiency will not be lost. In other words, bureaucratic action separates people from the actions themselves and from those on whom these actions impinge, freeing them of the implications of social ties and social obligations, the bureaucratic culture "frees" them from concern with ultimate values (p. 88). Whether an action is "good" or "bad" from the viewpoint of the client or subordinate employee acted upon, is no longer an issue. The standards against which conduct is now judged "are all concerned with means not ends" (p. 88).

Thirdly, Domhoff (1979, p. 169) points out that the ideology within the bureaucratic process contains various methods through which those of the "power elite" attempt to shape the beliefs, attitudes and opinions of the underlying population. It is within this process that the power

elite tries to create, disseminate and reinforce a set of attitudes and values that assure Americans that the United States is, for all its alleged defects, the best of all possible worlds. Domhoff sees that

. . . free and open discussion are claimed to be the hallmark of the process, but past experience shows that its leaders will utilize deceit and violence in order to combat individuals or organizations which espouse attitudes and opinions that threaten the power and privileges of the ruling class (p. 169).

Finally, this ideological process of bureaucracies turns two-way social processes into one-way non-social processes for control, a kind of mind control. The power elite, or corporate elite, purchase techniques of social control (advertising, technology, etc.) then use them the way they see fit. The masses are then forced to adjust, usually a result of psychic manipulation: violence with respect to the mind. These impersonal forces over which we have almost no control seem to be pushing us all in the direction of a "Brave New Worldian" nightmare; and this impersonal pushing is being consciously accelerated by representatives of commercial, political, religious, and educational organizations (ad infinitum) "who have developed a number of techniques for manipulating the thoughts and feelings of the masses in the interest of some minority" (Huxley, 1958, pp. 6-7). This psychological and social "leveling affect" serves to reduce individual thinking ability and creates passiveness in the individual, destroying creativeness and other human qualities.

Ellul (1964, p. 3) formulates this perspective in his "technological society." He begins by defining technique, which refers to any complex of standardized means for attaining a predetermined result. Thus, it converts spontaneous and unreflective behavior into behavior

that is deliberate and rationalized. "Ours is a progressively technical civilization" (p. 5). By this Ellul means that the ever-expanding and irreversible rule of technique is extended to all domains of life. "It is a civilization committed to the quest for continually improved means to carelessly examined ends" (p. 10). Indeed, technique transforms ends into means. What was once prized in its own right now becomes worthwhile only if it helps achieve something else. And, conversely, technique turns means into ends. "Know-how" takes on an ultimate value.

The vital influence of technique is of course "most evident in the economy" (p. 10). It produces a growing concentration of capital. Vast concentrations of capital require increasing control by the state. Once largely confined within the business firm, planning now becomes the order of the day for the economy as a whole. The dominance of technique imposes centralism upon the economy (despite comparatively inconsequential efforts to decentralize individual industrial firms), "for once technique develops beyond a given degree, there is no effective alternative to planning" (p. 11).

In Ellul's (p. 331) conception, then, "life is not happy in a civilization dominated by technique." Even the outward show of happiness is bought at the price of total acquiescence. The technological society requires men to be content with what they are required to like. For those who are not content, it provides distractions such as an escape into absorption with technically dominated media of popular culture and communication. And the process is a natural one: "every part of a technical civilization responds to the social needs generated by technique itself" (p. 398). Ellul (pp. 399-402) concludes "that progress consists in progressive dehumanization: a busy, pointless, and in the

end, suicidal submission to technique."

Several theorists have now expressed the rational nature of bureaucracy. What follows is an explanation of the rational character of bureaucratic ideology.

Ideology

First of all, the concept ideology is used in a variety of ways. The term ideology has an intricate history. Indeed, some have referred to the "modern age" as preeminently an "Age of Ideology" (Kramnick, 1979; Rossides, 1978) while others declare that ideology has come to an "end" in western industrial societies (Aron, 1967; Bell, 1961).

The word "ideology" appeared for the first time in the late eighteenth century. The word "ideologie," coined by the Frenchman Destutt de Tracy (1754-1836), was intended to convey a theory of learning which described the origin of abstract ideas in a mind otherwise formed by sense experiences. Political connotations were added to the word when Napoleon (1769-1821) used "ideologues" to malign not only intellectuals but all "men of ideas." These men or ideas "were thought to be trouble makers in the pursuit of abstract truths remaining blind to historical reality" (Kramnick, 1979, p. 1).

Ideology as a concept has had a torturous history since the days of Destutt de Tracy and Napoleon. What has remained fairly constant has been its association with debate over the role of ideas in shaping and determining historical and social development. The term ideology, as used in this study, incorporates this idea as indicating schemes of social change. Hence, it involves theories, concepts, and sets of ideas. Some "modern" ideologies are: liberalism, conservatism, anarchism,

feminism, Democracy, nationalism, Communism, anti-Communism, and Marxism.

Urry (1975) gives a popular twist to the concept with the inclusion of the idea of distortion:

The most frequent form of distortion is that resulting from the intrusion of values, which stem from particular moral, political, and religious beliefs, the preferences and tastes of the individual theorist, and the like (p. 176).

The difference here, according to Urry (p. 176), "is between value-free and value laden works, the latter seen as ideological and non-objective because of its subjective elements."

Feuer (1975, p. 1) also expands upon the distortion idea although he does so somewhat differently. He examines ideologies and concludes that every ideology is composed of an "invariant myth" (p. 1). He says there are many themes of myth which "fundamentally remain the same within a particular ideology adopted; those of creation, the sexes, the rivalries of brothers, the origins of technology, societies, languages, and mosaic" (p. 1). Feuer (p. 17) attacks ideologies another way. Ideologies try to "demonstrate the truth of its contained myth from basic philosophical and scientific premises" (p. 17). In other words, the myth, a byproduct of special interests, is cloaked in philosophical and scientific language to validate the theoretical makeup of the ideology. Ideologies must show themselves to be "deducible from the laws of existence" (p. 18).

Myth or value, whether one or the other is spoken of as a necessary portion of ideology, the reference is actually to individual special interests. Persons possess many forms of knowledge -- social knowledge, personal knowledge, scientific knowledge, organization knowledge and technical knowledge. All this knowledge is shot through with interests.

Therefore, when we label someone's knowledge as ideology then we are actually labelling their main interests. The elevating of scientific knowledge above other knowledge, especially personal and social knowledge has been adequately called the "American Ideology" (Wilson, 1977).

The biological scientist, for example, in his quest for new information (or knowledge) about cell structure, so that he may test his theories of cancer development, has a strong interest for the results to turn out a particular way. This is not the rational/objective scientist, for to be objective requires no concern over results since the outcome yields information regardless. Data supporting cancer theory would not only profit millions of people in terms of improved health and health related spinoffs, but also benefit that individual research scientist by increasing peer respect, academic promotion, international recognition, salary boost, higher status, etc. In plain terms, the scientist will be validated as a person by those he considers prominent. This validation is a part of human nature. This component of man is non-rational; emotions, values, needs, wants and urges, have all entered these circumstances, indicating that man is both rational and non-rational. Thus, even the cancer researcher is guided by ideological tenets.

Since the American and French Revolutions, "ideologies have been based on the conviction that life here on earth is capable of being perfected by human knowledge and effort" (Kramnick, 1979, p. 2). In most periods of history any such proposition would have been rejected by most people as being absurdly unrealistic. The usual expectation was that people would go on living much as their ancestors had done, "experiencing the various joys and privations to which, as it then seemed, flesh was naturally heir" (p. 2). All this has changed in the past

several centuries. "Advances in industry, science and technology have adorned life with unimaginable amenities, and have gone a long way toward routing man's perennial enemies, disease and starvation" (p. 2). From those days until now, hopes first aroused have been continually nourished by the belief in the inevitability of progress. This belief never ceased to provide successive ideological movements with their primary appeals.

Appropriately, Domhoff (1978) sees this when he describes the ideology process

. . . as involving the formation, dissemination and enforcement of the assumptions, beliefs, and attitudes that permit the continued existence of policies and politicians favorable to the wealth, income, status, and privileges of members of the ruling class (p. 10).

But he goes even further to state that the ideological process would not be able to function smoothly "without at least the resigned acquiescence of a great majority of the population" (p. 169). It should be noted that Domhoff's (pp. 195-196) last point about "resigned acquiescence" may be somewhat exaggerated even by his own standards.

However, bureaucratic ideologies are based on foundations which perpetuate the system. In this case bureaucracy is the system. It is maintained through ideological processes which insure, through various techniques, the continued existence of the organization. The process takes place on a rational level, since economic survival does not require the non-rational (emotion, desires, wants) components of an individual, and thus reduces man to a predictable, narrow human being.

Violence

With a glance at history, one can hardly remain unaware of the vast role violence has always played in human affairs. Unfortunately, the concept of violence has often become intertwined with the term power. To Weber (1947, p. 142) violence has often become intertwined with the term power. To Weber (p. 152) "'power' is the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance." Tawney (1931, p. 229) provides a rather similar definition centering upon the imposition of the will of one actor on another. Tawney wrote:

Power may be defined as the capacity of an individual, or group of individuals, to modify the conduct of other individuals or groups in the manner in which he desires, and to prevent his conduct from being modified in the manner in which he does not (p. 229).

The Nature of Violence

For the purpose of this study, a distinction between power and violence is made. As proposed by Arendt (1972, p. 143), power and violence may be demarcated as follows:

. . . power corresponds to the 'human ability not just to act but to act in concert' . . . Never the property of an individual, power belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together (p. 143).

Violence then is distinguished by its instrumental character. Similar to all other tools, it is designed and used for the purpose of multiplying natural strength. In the most drastic case, violence is one individual against all others, while power is the converse all against one. Also, the former is never possible without instruments, as Arendt

(p. 141) points out. She emphasizes this by stating that,

Indeed one of the most obvious distinctions between power and violence is that power always stands in need of numbers, whereas violence up to a point can manage without them because it relies on implements (pp. 140-141).

Weber also recognized the instrumental character of violence when he declared that Trosky (1958, p. 78) was indeed right in the assertion, "Every state is founded on force." Weber (1958, p. 79) concludes, "If no social institutions existed which knew the use of violence," then the concept of "state would be eliminated, and a condition would emerge that could be designated as 'anarchy,' in the specific sense of this word."

Indicative of this is how our American ancestors pushed across the U.S. continent.

After all, it was by the use of fire-power that we took the North American continent from the original 'Americans' - using the excuse that the U.S. had to expand. The Indians quite naturally resisted the invaders, so the 'savages' had to be eliminated. It was the 'will of God!' (Camellion, 1977, p. 2).

"Power then, may be considered as a potential for action; while violence, the extreme of power, is power in action" (Arendt, 1972, p. 143). Thus one may speak of power as likened to a boxing glove, it has no teeth, that is, until it bites you. A military force, for example, which exists for the protection of a nation can have considerable power in that it possesses the potential to destroy an enemy of the state. During the application of this power, violence occurs. However, a military maneuver to counterpose a threat by assault does not indicate that power is lost in its evolvment to violence. A potential still exists in

an ability to successfully accomplish its mission. As the likelihood of failure approaches, its power (or potential for victory) lessens.

These conceptions of violence may be extrapolated even beyond the physical, observable level. Violence goes beyond what we normally think of as a violent action. In other words, destruction of human lives and private property can be defined as violence, yet so may other events which are not readily observable. The narrowing of a person's "human-ness" or the destruction of his ability to interact with comfort among his peers may be deemed violent in that certain tools (e.g. mass media) may be used to alter a person's psychic, or create confusion through transmission of conflicting values and knowledge. The "mind" thus manipulated, is narrowed by the replacement of social and personal values with commodity or external values. Social knowledge is destroyed or weakened by this transmission of externally directed knowledge, thus a sort of mind manipulation or mental violence has taken place.

Violent Ideology of Western Economics

Western industrialized societies are capitalistic. The capitalistic traits, which are seen to function so clearly in a large corporation, pervade society's social structure to an extensive degree. Any organization, regardless of size or complexity, has had to become profit-oriented in order to assure the system's existence. Perrow (1979, p. 11) argues that failure to maintain sufficient support in the economic arena, will surely result in the failure of that system. Businesses go out of existence every day because of this failure. However, there are organizations which are not "business-directed." Nevertheless, failure even by these systems to keep a sufficient monetary income will result in its

death.

Organizations, because their very existence rests on an economic foundation have begun to elevate the economic aspect above their original social functions. Religious organizations, for example, are established to bring an understanding of "spiritual matters" to people (Glock, 1965, p. ix). These churches now either acknowledge the validity of economics by properly managing their funds or succumb to the fate of many organizations: failure. This means that survival does not depend on the number of individuals "saved" but on the amount of money collected from its members, from donations by sympathetic organizations, and by various fund raising techniques, such as bingo, picnics, luncheons, etc. Books, newspapers, radio, and television advertising are now an acceptable means in some churches "to bring in more people," read another way, "to bring in more money."

However, churches are not the only organization using mass media techniques to support its economic base. Within the last few years, many books have been written on revolutionary warfare in the hope of persuading people into at least a sympathetic position. To name only a few: Episodes of the Revolutionary War (Caribbean) by Che Guevara, 1968, Revolutionary Warfare (Africa) by Kwame Nkrumah, 1968, What is to be Done? (Russia) by Nikolai Lenin, 1969, and Revolution and the Rule of Law (U.S.) edited by Edward Kent, 1971. And still others on techniques of violence: Assassination by Richard Camellion, 1977, The Anarchist Cookbook by William Powell, 17th printing 1978, and Rules for Radicals by Saul Alinsky, 1971.

Private business organizations are by far the most highly "mediaized" of all other bureaucratic systems (Ewen, 1976, p. 18). This is somewhat

apparent, especially when we hear the mere mention of some product, it will often call to mind some catchy tune or scene. "Budweiser is the King of Beers", "Please don't squeeze the Charmin", "You deserve a break today at McDonald's", "You're in good hands with Allstate", and the like. Advertising, in presenting commodities, strives harder and harder to reach more people with every message. "Since in any specific struggle we might be outspent by several hundred times, we needed to be more clever, more creative" (Mander, 1978, p. 23). Capitalism, then, has in affect created a consumer society where a person's status is not based on the individual's ability to socially interact but on commodity worth.

In this sort of system, it is what you own and how much money you make that determines your self-adornment, prestige, or holiness. It follows that many people manage to get beyond their means when one's worth is determined by material possessions. This is seen in the U.S. today and has partially resulted in "the credit crunch" (Pauly, 1980, p. 53).

Another indication of the rise of economics in "modern" societies, is that in 1969 the Nobel Prize for "economic science" was established (Roszak, 1973, p. 1). It was an event that "finally allows the economists to take their place beside the physicists, chemists, and biologists" (p. 1). Justifying the new award on behalf of the Nobel Committee, Professor Lundberg, (1973, p. 1) observed that "economic science had developed increasingly in the direction of a mathematical specification and statistical quantification of economic contexts." Also, today there is no government in any industrial society which does not have its counterpart of the American Council of Economic Advisors, where "economic policy can supposedly be formulated with all the professional precision

attending the discussion of purely technical or scientific questions" (Roszak, p. 2).

At this point organizational system ideology is apparent. Based on corporate liberalism, industrial societies are being propelled ahead with the idea, as demonstrated by Saint-Simon (1814, p. 13), that mankind dominates his own future by managing the present. "Progress is seen as a requirement" so that we may one day arrive at the utopian dream (Ewen, 1976, p. 4). Ideology being associated with shaping and determining human development, is the process which insures this evolving of society and culture. Herein lies the roots of organizational ideology. Economic rationality is the guiding force of western industrial societies. This economic rationality progress and efficiency, and the placement of high value on material possessions. Schumacher (1973, p. 31) acknowledges this in a sharp statement: "the modern economy is propelled by a frenzy of greed and indulges in an orgy of envy, and these are not accidental features but the very causes of its expansionist success." Therefore, in order for an organization to succeed economically, it must adapt this ideology into its own theories and sets of ideas.

The point here is that an economically oriented ideology is a necessary and thus an integral part of bureaucratic organizations. As mentioned at an earlier point, this ideology may be called corporate (or late) liberalism which antedates individual (or early) liberalism. In other words, contemporary organizational ideology has become increasingly rational.

No longer are those who are part of bureaucratic organizations simply the "captains of industry," they have become, with the aid of technological instruments and science, "captains of our consciousness"

(Ewen, 1976). It may be concluded then, that in modern industrial nations, organizational (system) ideologies, regardless of widely perceived differences, have similar roots. These roots stem from a liberal society which is progressively involved in the process of rationalization of thought.

This ideology serves the system well in that it forces human beings into accepting a perspective which dominates the more socially orientated perspectives of people. Whyte (1956, p. 6) refers to this ideology as the "social ethic." To be less misleading, the ideology could be called an "organization ethic" or a "bureaucratic ethic," for more than anything else it "rationalizes the organization's demands for realty" and gives those who offer it wholeheartedly a sense of dedication in doing so (p. 6). Whyte (p. 6) continues by noting, "in extremis, you might say, it converts what would seem in other times a bill of no rights into a restatement of individualism." This forcing or reduction of social persons, as argued earlier, may be called violence. Specifically, this destructiveness was referred to as mental violence.

Physical and Mental Forms of Violence

The significance of this distinction between physical violence and mental violence is important in an analysis of the ideology of bureaucratic organizations. In the bureaucratic organizations of the industrial state, Mosca (1960, p. 198) observes a shift from the physical violence of the past (anti-war riots, union strike breaking, armed revolution, religious and political wars) to a more covert violence of today, that of mind manipulation (through advertising, propaganda, brainwashing). He referred to this shift as the "evolution of progress in specific

manners and customs" (p. 198). Spencer (1960) also sees this decrease in physical violence:

With the decrease of the aggressiveness shown in acts of violence and consequent acts of retaliation [physical violence], has gone the decrease of the aggressiveness shown in criminal acts at large. That this change has been a concomitant of the change from a more militant to a more industrial state, cannot be doubted by one who studies history (p. 333).

These systems often espouse an ideology of non-violence (there has been an "apparent" reduction in physical violence by large organizations in the last few decades) yet this is merely a ploy to draw one's thoughts away from the increasing mental destruction to such nonviolent aspects. This ploy is indicative of the techniques used to force the minds of individuals into acceptance of that which is directed at them.

Parsons (1969) puts this idea another way as he speaks from what seems to be the management perspective:

The management of an organization must take or be ready to take measures to counteract the centrifugal pull, to keep employment turnover at least down to tolerable levels, and internally to bring the performances of subunits and individuals more closely in line with the requirements of the organization than would otherwise be the case (p. 46).

Accomplishment of this reductionism and dehumanization, by the conversion of the individual to a particular ideological view, can take any one or a combination of three fundamental forms. First, "inducement" or buying, in that rewards for valued performances are instituted. Second, "coercion" or forcing, in that penalties on both a physical and mental level are set for noncooperation. And third, "therapy" or persuasion, in that "by a complex and judicious combination of measures the motivational obstacles to satisfactory cooperation are dealt with" on a level which "goes behind

the overt ostensible reasons given for the difficulty by the persons involved" (p. 46).

Usually the first method employed, is the attempt to convert the person or the masses through forms of influence, persuasion or "therapy." There are many techniques all of which are directed by a specific ideology of conversion; propaganda, brainwashing, and advertising will be dealt with here.

The most widely accepted definition seems to be Lasswell's (1950). He states that:

Propaganda is the expression of opinions or actions carried out deliberately by individuals or groups with a view to influencing the opinions or actions of other individuals or groups for predetermined ends and through psychological manipulations (p. 22).

In industrial societies, "propaganda is called upon to solve problems created by technology, to play on maladjustments, and to integrate the individuals into a technological world" (Ellul, 1965, p. xvii).

This ability to "integrate" the individual into a technical or rational world is important in that it insures the survival of the organization or state employing propaganda. Goebbels (1942) said it well, when speaking on the technique of propaganda, "we do not talk to say something, but to obtain a certain effect" (p. x).

In the midst of increasing mechanization and technological organization, propaganda is simply the means used to prevent these very things from being felt as too oppressive and to persuade man to submit with good grace. Ellul (1956) emphasizes this when he says that:

When a man will be fully adapted to this technological society, when he will end by obeying with enthusiasm, convinced of the excellence of what he is forced to do, the constraint of the

organization will no longer be felt by him; the truth is, it will no longer be a constraint, and the police will have nothing to do. The civil and technological good will and the enthusiasm for the right social myths - both created by propaganda - will finally have solved the problem of man (p. xviii).

In short, not only is propaganda itself a technique (an instrument), it is also an indispensable condition for the development of technical progress and the establishment of a technological civilization.

Brainwashing is a technique for manipulating not crowds, not entire publics, but isolated individuals. It is based on the assumption that every individual has his breaking point. This knowledge has been exploited from time immemorial. Furthermore, it has been found that "the deliberate induction of fear, rage, anxiety, or fatigue markedly heightens the person's suggestibility" (Huxley, 1958, p. 61). If these emotions and fatigue are kept at a high pitch of intensity for a long enough time, the brain goes "on strike" (p. 61). When this happens, new behavior patterns may be installed with the greatest of ease.

Of interest here is the type of brainwashing which does not cause bodily harm, however, both physically non-harming and harming methods have similar affects independent of the doctrines taught. These doctrines may be true or false, wholesome or pernicious, it makes little or no difference. If the indoctrination is given in the right way at the proper stage of nervous exhaustion, it will work. "Under favorable conditions, practically everybody can be converted to practically anything" (p. 63).

Advertising is an instrument of external value transmutation. According to Mander (1978, p. 125), "It lays the standard-gauge railway track from wilderness to human feeling, assisting in the transformation of both

into a unified commercial form." In other words, advertising serves to further the movement of humans into artificial environments by narrowing the conception of "diversity" to fit the framework of commodities while unifying people within this conception. The result is a "singularly channeled mentality," nicely open to receiving commercial messages, "ready to confuse brand diversity with diversity itself, and to confuse human need with advertiser's need to sell commodities" (p. 126).

Specific means of advertising, notes Ewen (1976, pp. 42-43), are predominantly in the form of the mass media, for example, television, radio, newspapers, pamphlets, and magazines. Of these techniques, Mander (1978, p. 132) observes that television is the most pervasive and effective because it appeals to two senses of the human being (sight and sound) instead of one (like books or billboards) and because it requires the least amount of thought. In short, the less a person "Thinks" during an advertisement, the more likely it will be effective.

A second method of converting an individual over to the dominant ideological perspective, is by buying or "inducing" that person through offers of material wealth. Often, this tactic is used after other forms of persuasion have failed. In the news recently has been an age old form of purchasing of people, bribery. According to Webster's Dictionary (1968), bribery is simply the giving of anything, especially money, to induce a person to do something illegal or wrong. In this study, bribery is defined more widely to include the idea of converting someone to a particular ideological position. For example, the Mafia often buys public officials so that those connected with the Mafia can deal more efficiently without judicial interference. For example, "We got judges on the payroll that can straighten it out - one, two, three" says Tommy

Gamindorra (1973, p. 11) of the Joseph Colombo family.

Bribery includes other forms of payoffs to accomplish similar ends. Kickbacks, payoffs, "loans", and appointing of relatives or cronies to lucrative positions in business or government are not uncommon. Closely related to this idea, is that to convert someone, simply hire the individual. At this point the newly hired individual has something at stake (his salary), so he is more likely to support the system. Many "radicals," for example, were hired by businesses during the 1960's to remove their "anti-establishment" rhetoric directed at some company or organization.

The last method mentioned to convert someone to an ideological view, is through "coercion," forcing, or physical means. In other words, force is used directly against those deviating from the dominant view. Again, there are many techniques and only a few will be documented here. For simplicity sake, the forms of force, which were previously defined as violence, will be subdivided into political violence and civil violence.

Violence is coercive only when used instrumentally to control the future actions of people. "Violence is political violence when used to control or influence governmental collective policies or the distribution of power" (Haag, 1972, p. 60). Violence by individuals or groups is political only when it has such social aims. War is perhaps the most obvious case in point. Trained professionals, known as the military, are used by governments to resist invasion, prevent internal insurrection, and to overthrow other governments. Violence, being dependent on instruments, is accomplished, for example, in at least four ways by the military. According to a U.S. Army Field Manual (1975, p. 2) and publication ST 30-40-1 (1976, p. 1), those means are chemical warfare (poisons,

nerve gases, toxins), nuclear warfare (small-scale tactical and "all-out"), biological warfare (bacteria agents and viruses), and conventional warfare (armor, artillery, infantry).

Revolution, or the overthrow of a government from within, contains many aspects of military war. The American Revolution (1775-1783) and the Russian Revolution (1917) are illustrations of this type of internal opposition. Other forms of political violence which deserve mentioning are "terrorism, assassination, guerilla warfare, resistance movements, coups, anarchism, and many more" (Laqueur, 1977, pp. 6-7).

Civil violence portrays non-governmental organizations in dispute with other non-governmental organizations. For example, violent labor strikes have been used against companies to obtain many benefits, better working conditions, and higher wages for the "working man." Destruction of property and deaths have occurred over the conflict between unions and management (Litwack, 1962, p. 82). Oddly enough, both parties have similar goals in mind, that is, to improve their own economic standing. This is a component of the capitalistic aspect of system ideology. Other forms of civil violence are: race riots, prison riots, student occupation and destruction of campus buildings, and looting.

It follows that violence which has come about due to a more rationalized society is the undergirding force behind the ideology of western economics. Also, this violence is legitimated within the organization. Giddens (1979, p. 105) sees this violence, or "transformation" as he calls it, as a particular trait of capitalism which is legitimized within the capitalistic enterprise (p. 105).

Mental violence, however, as defined in this study, is not looked upon by these systems as a form of violence at all, but may be seen as

something "good." This translates to mean that it is supportive of the ideology. For example, in economics the more a person consumes, the more worthy a person he is, the more patriotic he is, and he is even more of a true American.

Consumptionism is the name given to the new doctrine; and it is admitted today to be the greatest idea that America has to give to the world; the idea that workmen and masses be looked upon not simply as workers and producers, but as "consumers." . . . Pay them more, sell them more, prosper more is the equation (Frederick, 1929, p. 22).

Instruments of Violence

Up to this point, violence as an inherent component of system ideology has been set forth. This is seen to be a direct result of the increase of rationalization of industrial societies. At this time, instruments of violence will be dealt with.

Instruments of violence are far more than machines. In other words, they are not derived from just mechanical technology, but from a general technology. This technology can be defined as "any complex of standardized means for attaining a predetermined end" (Ellul, 1964, p. vi). This means more than automobiles, electric lights, computers, nuclear weapons, farm tractors, and pulse-lasers, it also includes the codification of knowledge in business management, the national economy, warfare strategies, intelligence gathering agency procedures, and public administration.

It is generally agreed, according to Kumar (1978, p. 220), that the great innovations and industries of the nineteenth century were the work of inspired and talented tinkerers, many of whom were indifferent to the fundamental scientific laws which underlay their inventions. "Science

and technology have progressed along different paths, and at different rates, the former usually lagging well behind the latter" (p. 220). However, toward the end of the nineteenth century, the gap between the two began to disappear, with science increasingly governing the nature and pace of technological innovation. The scientist of yesteryear has also begun to disappear because no longer does he identify a problem, think it through, fashion an abstract idea of solution, create a device, machine, or specific idea, test the "invention," analyze the results, and then distribute the results; today he plays a reduced role by applying himself (as directed to do so) "to only a fraction of the problem" (p. 221). Thus, the scientist has become a technician.

Most Americans, notes Mander (1978, p. 43), whether on the political left, center, or right, "will argue that technology is neutral," that any technology is merely "a benign instrument," a tool, and depending upon the hands into which it falls, it may be used one way or another. Many say that there is nothing that prevents a technology from being used well or badly. In other words, nothing inherent in the technology itself. These assumptions about technologies will be considered incorrect and to be an ideological stance in themselves.

Mander (1978) makes this very same point by use of several examples:

If you accept the principle of an army - a collection of military technologies and people to run them - all gathered together for the purpose of fighting, overpowering, killing, and winning, then it is obvious that the supervisors of armies will be sort of people who desire to fight, overpower, kill, and win, and who are also good at these assignments: generals. If you accept nuclear power plants, you also accept a technological-scientific-industrial-military elite. Without these people in charge, you could not have nuclear power. You and I getting together with a few friends could not make use of nuclear power. If you accept the existence of roads laid upon the landscape, oil to run the cars, and huge institutions to find

the oil, pump it and distribute it. In addition you accept a sped-up life style and the movement of humans through the terrain at speeds that make it impossible to pay attention to whatever is growing there (pp. 43-44).

So the existence of the technology determines many aspects of the society. Also, one technological process cannot exist without the other, which "creates symbiotic relationships among technologies themselves" (p. 45).

Thus the basic form of technology "determines its interaction with the world, the way it will be used, the kind of people who use it, and to what ends" (p. 45). Technology is far from being "neutral."

CHAPTER III

CONCEPTUALIZATION OF THE THEORY

Introduction

The theoretical framework of this study views social processes, institutions, bureaucracies, ideologies, society, community, and organizations from a social perspective. From this perspective, an understanding of and the bringing to light of the fundamentals underlying social processes are desired. Man is seen as a social creature and is the focal point of this theoretical viewpoint.

It is emphasized that the present study is neither meant to be a critical attack on any institution, whether it be social, economic, or political, nor to judge any other theoretical viewpoint. The purpose is to make clearer the nature of bureaucratic ideology from a perspective which has received limited attention. Indeed, the study of individual and organizational ideological interplay at this level is scarce. Admittedly, this raises problems with regard to the basis of this deficiency in that the shortcomings may be induced from bureaucratic ideologies themselves. For this reason it seems that these problems are of legitimate theoretical concern at the sociological level as well as at the social psychological level.

This chapter has the goal of developing a theoretical model which will assist in understanding mankind in an industrial culture. In doing so, it will show the effects of an increasingly rational society on

social man and then clarify the violent nature of bureaucratic ideology which so readily lends itself to a rationalization process. This explanation will begin with a comment on social man.

Theoretical Framework

The Use of Knowledge

Man is a symbolic creature (Mead, 1934, p. 249). Being able to symbolize, "people have the ability to create and sustain a culture, communicate with other human beings and with themselves, acquire knowledge" and a vast proportion of other things which make people a truly social being (Blumer, 1966, pp. 536-537). Therefore, social relationships are a two-way process, a reciprocity, or a give and take concern.

Persons also have both a rational, objective, calculable side to them, and on the other hand, they retain a non-rational, subjective, unpredictable side. In other words, people have an observable character about them which may be objectively described and somewhat accurately communicated to fellow human beings. This rational character is only a part of the whole person. People have emotions, wants, and desires which cannot be accurately detailed nor objectively reported without significant loss of truthful content. Simply, man has a non-rational component.

Much of the way man acts in his environment is based upon knowledge acquired through learning experiences, socialization, cognition, or even through a spiritual consciousness. There are, then, many forms of knowledge which are acquired in diverse manners. Political knowledge, spiritual knowledge, social knowledge, personal knowledge, technical knowledge, and economic knowledge are examples of this variety. People

possess this knowledge and use it in numerous ways, as in understanding their world of enlargement of the self (Horkheimer, 1972, p. 27). Consequently, knowledge is centered around interests which involve the person, his group, his community, and his society.

Knowledge, however, is not only used by people in a social context, but by entities larger in size and different in makeup than individuals. Parents, for example, may use what they learned as part of a family to instruct their own children in the responsibilities and techniques of raising a family (Smart, 1976, p. 38). Hence, knowledge is used in social relationships, one way being to control the social relationship. Parents may use a child's past behavior as a guideline for imposing restrictions such as an early curfew. A corporation in the oil industry will make use of the knowledge gained in other oil extracting procedures to build, maintain, and insure the proper management of a new oil derrick. Consequently, knowledge can be used to control people.

Any kind of knowledge may be used to control whether it be religious, social, economic, industrial, and so forth. But knowledge can be used to free persons, as from environmental restraints. Knowing that a fire may be started with the proper use of flintrock and dry moss, and that warmth comes from fire, could prevent harsh cold weather from making one uncomfortable or even avert illness. Thus knowledge, in its instrumental make up, includes the concept of power or at least potential power.

Effects of Industrialization and Bureaucratization

Seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth century philosophers noted a radical change in their society (Kumar, 1978, p. 59). Many of these philosophers often catalogued this social evolution by breaking the

process into stages. What seems common to their thought was a concern specifically with "industrial," set against "non-industrial" society. The conviction grew that there was a "logic" to the process of industrialization, bringing about "common basic structural characteristics in all societies that underwent the process" (p. 62).

These philosophers lead to contemporary attempts to discern the underlying characteristics of industrialism. As Wrigley (1972, p. 226) puts it with a wide range of corroborating statements, industrialization "is said to occur in a given country when real incomes per head begin to rise steadily and without apparent limit." Associated with this are certain core components of the industrial system: "major and continual changes in material technology; the marketing of men's labor; the concentration of workers in single enterprises; and the existence of the entrepreneur" (Kumar, p. 65).

Characteristic of the non-economic (social, political, and cultural) effects of industrialization are:

urbanism as a way of life; population growth and mobility; a decline of community; a division of labor and an increase in economic class consciousness; and the family declines in numbers and moves from extended to nuclear (p. 66).

Also, it seems that politics are being controlled more and more by economics, organizations are becoming even larger and more integrated (centralization), and that the movement loses the individual in such a grandiose scheme.

Industrialism's main thrust, then, involves the political, the social, and the economic but with the economic factor elevated in a hierarchy which represents the values of a power elite. Profit becomes more important than people. Due to this elevation of economics, says

Kumar (p. 101), industrialization has eliminated, for all practical purposes, all other viable alternatives to the pursuit of a multi-dimensional individual.

Primacy of economics is a manifestation of an even deeper-lying tendency in industrial society: the drive towards the rationalization of all spheres of life. Given the fact that perhaps the most significant aspect of rationalization was "its transformation of attitudes towards economic life, it had as much claim to be the cause of industrialism as its effect" (p. 102). Having helped to give birth to industrialism, it became fused within it and was later carried by it. Kumar (p. 102) concludes that "to become industrialized is to become rationalized."

However, the economic substance of the concept rationalization should not be given too much weight. Freund (1968), for example, has perhaps overemphasized the idea. To him,

. . . rationalization is the organization of life through a division and coordination of activities on the basis of an exact study of men's relations with each other, with their environment, for the purpose of achieving greater efficiency and productivity (p. 18).

More generally, Weber (1930) applied the concept to a "studied and increasingly mastery over the environment, both natural and social," in which the essential tools were those of "observation, experiment, measurement, and calculation" (p. 58). The tendency to rationalization could be observed in all areas of modern culture.

Yet a problem exists notes Kumar (1978, p. 104), in that "rational means have a tendency to invade and undermine the quest for the attainment of substantive [non-rational] means." The irony is that the rationalized means, which, more than ever before, were supposed to free the individual for the pursuit of more diverse ends, ended up "by

enslaving him to their supposedly neutral techniques and technology" (p. 105).

At this time, the question that should be asked is: Who pays for industrialization? The social individual pays. One cost is that people are thrust into distinct economic classes. But there are more than economic costs (Hummel, 1977, p. 220). The more emotional person pays more than a dull person and the more creative, innovative person pays more than a routine person. People are fragmented since they have now become a resource to the system. Emotions, needs, and other subjective aspects of man have no economic value. A woman's worth in the home is considered nil because her productivity is measured in dollars by "industrial standards."

Social man is moving in a dire direction, to industrial man. Rational/non-rational man becomes merely rational. This may be seen as a struggle, that is, the struggle is for who will control the "definition of the situation," the elite or the masses. For who ever defines the situation, also controls the situation. Thomas (1918, p. 22) said that there will always be a conflict between system "definition of the situation" and an individual's "definition of the situation," between individuals, the local community, and the industrial system. This warfare is constant and occurs at all levels: between man and man, between man and woman, between nation and nation, between man and nation, and so forth. The industrial system will win out most of the time because of its access to objective science and the means of disseminating filtered information.

The attempt is not to understand people, but to define for people

their needs, then to condition them to accept those needs. Also, there has been an expectation of a continual increase in the standard of living with the advent of industry (Ewen, 1976, p. 29). If these expectations do not materialize after sacrifices to get them are met, then some social conditions must come about to rectify this condition. Suicide, child abuse, political rebellion, murder, rape, and mental psychosis are only a few possibilities.

This substitution of commodity needs may be called socialization. Commonly, socialization is defined as the "basic social process through which an individual becomes integrated into a social group by learning the group's culture [values, ideals, etc.] and his role in the group" (Theodorson, 1969, p. 396). Adding to this, Giddens (1979, p. 129) notes that socialization is never anything like a passive imprinting by "society" upon each "individual." From its very earliest experiences, the person is an active partner in the "double contingency of interaction and in a progressive involvement with society" (p. 129). Also, socialization should be understood as referring to the whole life-cycle of the individual.

In this way, industrialization may be thought of as a process of socialization. Yet this is socialization in terms of psychic manipulation or in terms of a "para-social" process because the social learning process does not take place between people. Values are created externally to people and one's own values are converted into what the few elite want. These "processed" values are material or market oriented.

In short, the focus of people is on goods in the market. Ewen (1976, p. 179) observed that buying gives you status, self-adornment, prestige, holiness, etc. Individuals should have a "social self" but

they are beginning to look at themselves as "commodity selves." If you consume these goods, "then you're a good social person" (p. 179). The elite are no longer merely "captains of industry" (material directors) but they have become "captains of consciousness" (mental directors). They now direct the consciousnesses of the masses.

To illustrate this, one need only look at the few essentials for man's survival. Food, clothing, and shelter are the basics. All other products that are considered unnecessary for life and health are luxuries. When these luxuries become "essentials," then social values have been destroyed and commodity values substituted. This is violence to social man because of the substitution of external values for social values. For example, if all the liquor, television, drugs, and automobiles were taken away, then time would not only be boring, but impossible for the consuming masses.

To accomplish such a feat, these processed values require a vast communication network for distribution (Mander, 1978, p. 31). Mass media techniques are tailor-made to assist in redefining the situation since it reaches vast numbers of people with the same message. Mass media's "definition of the situation" is unrestrained by social processes and may be motivated by power, profit, or ideology. Either way, the real is being replaced by the artificial (apparent reality). The artificial is sold to us in a "gloss" form by getting people to listen to their story long enough that there is some degree of control (p. 27). Humans, because they like to reduce things to simplistic, single factor terms or models, readily take in this "gloss." "Modern" man is becoming less and less social since he has been shut off from social reality much more than "primitive" man.

The contemporary scientist is also trapped in the struggle for control of the "definition of the situation." Gotz (1978, p. 218) describes this situation in making the point that the "industrialization of research has become a well-nigh universal trend." In other words, science is just a special interest of industry since it can be used to improve the grasp it has over individuals. As a result, science is economically channeled through selective funding (grants, scholarships, fellowships), contributions, and by more indirect means such as controlling appropriations and allocations. As a result, the scientist is becoming less of a "scientist" in the traditional form. They have become more technical since they no longer are involved in the whole process of seeing a problem, thinking it through, finding a probable solution, and then testing this solution (p. 218). Now the technical scientist performs a detached function such as only testing probable solutions.

As a tool of industry, science has done exceedingly well. The goal of science is prediction and control of nature. Today, social harmony, progress, and individualism are not seen as emanations from a benevolent and rational order, but as "social products that had to be created through institutional management" (Rossides, 1978, p. 6). But people are also a part of nature, therefore, they are also being controlled.

Science and technology are no longer confined in their use to the industrial level but permeate the social, cultural, and religious level. Social functions have been rationalized in a value hierarchy. Americans have had scientific, organizational, and technical knowledge elevated above all other forms of knowledge. This elevation of certain forms of knowledge, in particular rationalized bureaucratic economics, over social knowledge, is indicative of the violence of contemporary organizational

ideology.

Hence, the institutional "definition of the situation" controls opportunity, materials, and the like. This can be seen in advanced forms of industrialization which forces "equality" as a prerequisite of participation. The Equal Rights Amendment, Equal Opportunity Employers, and racial "quota" systems are indicators of this power. The person must conform to this "equality," and so each individual is reduced to a defined equality. The real question is: Is equality in the person or in the system's definition? Obviously, it is in the system, so the "equality" is not a real equality. Thus a person's "definition of the situation" - that is, people are different, some are smarter, others less skilled, some have opportunities, people are unique - is negated.

Social "definitions of the situation" are also rejected. This becomes apparent as social systems increasingly become institutionalized or formalized. If the social is not useful to industrial system's bureaucracy, then it is negated. Slowly in the beginning, then at ever increasing speed, bureaucracy replaces the individual's primary group and social institutions. Persons now will have to appeal to the system, outside of the social group, for direction. A case in point: marriage is a social bond which requires of the participants "duties" and gives them certain "rights." If one of the participants, the wife for example, appeals to an external authority, the law, because the husband violated one of her rights in the relationship, then no longer do they have a reciprocal, give and take relationship. Human relationships are two-way, and when this process is interrupted by a system one-way procedure in order to control, the social bond dissolves. Hence, the appeal to a rational external authority to mediate in a social bond, destroys the

bond.

If such an appeal to support a participant's right in a social bond was supported by the external authority, then people will be subject to control in the most intimate aspects of their lives. It is interesting to note that the above situation is not fictional. In 1979, Mary Rideout took her husband John Rideout to court in an attempt to have him punished for "raping" her. Apparently she wanted the courts to tell her husband what he could and could not do in his own bedroom. If the relationship was indeed under significant strain, then a social solution could have been involved, divorce by mutual consent.

In order to understand the effects of bureaucracy on social man, it will be necessary to point out some of its more salient features. First of all, bureaucracy is a construct, however, it is real in that individuals are affected by its consequences. Thus power resides in this abstraction. Weber (1956, p. 79) noted that obedience is maintained by the system primarily through "fear." In order to control people, it is best to motivate them through love. But this is difficult at best. Fear, however, is easily induced and therefore more readily utilized.

Furthermore, to assist in shaping the beliefs, attitudes, opinions, and behavior of the underlying population, certain methods, legitimated by the system ideology, are employed. An ideological process is necessary, according to Domhoff (1978, p. 169), because "discontent exists and because public opinion does not naturally and automatically agree with the opinions of the power elite." The behavioral sciences are instrumental in supporting the system's manipulation of the individual (Ewen, 1976, p. 82). Sociologists and psychologists have become the "children" of bureaucracy, for it is they who study the non-rational aspects of man

for use by the power elite.

The masses are pressured by the social sciences to adjust to the bureaucracy's ideology (p. 82). This conforming by persons to bureaucratic ideology is usually brought about by psychic manipulation, which can destroy loyalty at the personal, family, religious, community, and national level. Techniques of social control (advertising, propaganda) are purchased by these bureaucratic organizations. This psychological and social "levelling affect" serves to reduce creative individual thinking and produces passiveness in the individual. Unfortunately, few people have the capacity to resist these psychic manipulations (Jung, 1964, p. 84).

The Essence of Bureaucratic Ideology

An ideology involves theories, concepts, beliefs, and sets of ideas which are associated with the idea of shaping and determining historical and social development (Theodorson, 1969, p. 195). Contemporary theorists (Feuer, 1975; Urry, 1975) have expanded this concept to include the notion of values and myths.

According to these theorists, ideologies are distorted. Urry (1975, p. 176) writes that "results from the intrusion of values that are derived from particular beliefs or preferences." Here, a differentiation is often made between value-laden works (ideological in nature) and value-free works. Ideologies also involve the idea of myth. The myth, a byproduct of special interests, "is wrapped in scientific and theoretical language so as to validate the theoretical content of the ideology" (Feuer, 1975, p. 1). In other words, the ideology will try to show itself deducible from the laws of existence.

As noted earlier in this chapter, there is a conflict or warfare for who will control the "definition of the situation." This warfare is guided by interests and goes on at all levels; people against people, nations against nations, organizations against people, and so on. An ideology is considered simply a "lever" or argument intended to persuade opposing views. This is accomplished through ideologies which masquerade as a clearer understanding by pointing to flaws in other ideas.

As a "conversion process" to change ideas into social levers, it is assumed that ideologies have several distinguishing characteristics. First, ideologies are not committed to the truth, but are committed to control. Second, ideologies deal with power, such that they have an effect on individual values, even major values. Third, ideologies are torn from a larger belief system. And finally, ideologies are validated through reference to the system of beliefs in which they were derived.

The Violent Nature of Bureaucratic Ideology

Bureaucracy in its modern form, as Weber (1968, p. 22) saw it, constitutes the creation of a new world of human interaction. But bureaucratic action is not the same as social action. "Social action opens up the entire range of meanings and needs that relevant others try to convey" (Hummel, 1977, p. 5). In human life, people relate to one another primarily through the meaning each attaches to his or her actions, that is, a meaning which the other tries to understand.

The ideology of bureaucracies have the function of insuring the continued existence of the organization. In other words, the ideology is caught up in the defense of a bureaucratic world. It is in this sense that Weber (p. 987) wrote, "Bureaucracy is the means of transforming

social action into rationally organized action." But "rationally" organized action" can only mean, in this context, action that is logically coherent with the goals of the bureaucracy.

Yet often human goals are not encompassed by the bureaucratic ideology. Hummel (p. 5) concludes that "such goals and needs standing logically outside the goals and needs of the bureaucratic organization are, in the system's terms," "illogical" and therefore "irrational." Persons possess a full repertoire of human needs. These are often interrelated, but the bureaucratic organization is designed to satisfy only one or a few of them. Hummel (p. 7) referred to this as the "paradox of needs."

This paradox is brought about through a rationalization process. Bureaucracy has a "principled hostility to all 'irrational' considerations of person or place, religion or kinship" (Kumar, 1978, p. 106). It has adhered strictly to rationally constituted rules and formal procedures of execution. And according to Kumar (p. 106), it was consequently the "highest expression of the rationalizing tendency in industrial society."

As Weber (p. 956) summarized them, the norms of bureaucracy are primarily composed of a rational character. In contrast, the traditional values of social life that serve as guiding and binding norms are, in the words of Habermas (1971, p. 96), "justice and freedom, violence and oppression, happiness and gratification, poverty, illness and death, victory and defeat, love and hate, salvation and damnation."

Hummel (p. 45) goes so far as to claim that "bureaucracy replaces society." Originally, bureaucracy was only a tool. It was designed to link those who had something to give with those who expect to receive, as distinct individuals. Today, bureaucracy has moved from a "bridge"

intended to link a person with his fellow citizens to "machinery" that separates them. The bridge has become a chasm.

Bureaucracy, according to Hummel (p. 48), separates human beings in two ways. First, it separates individuals from other individuals with whom it was supposed to provide a link. Human relationships cease to be personal, emotional, and social and begin to be impersonal, "rational," and machine-like. And second, bureaucracy effects a further separation, that of individuals from themselves. This is accomplished through its ideology because people do not readily accept a reduction in their social selves.

The destruction of social man, by means of psychological and sociological levelling, serves to reduce individuals to resources to be manipulated; to a commodity to be sold, bought, and resold, and to a rational or "mass" man to be seen as something of less worth than the system. Man has been truncated to a remnant of a human being.

This levelling affect is a violence which goes beyond the physical observable level. In other words, destruction of human lives and private property can be defined as violence, yet so may other events which are not so readily observable. The narrowing of a person's "humanness," creation of fear, or the destruction of an individual's ability to interact comfortably among his peers may be deemed violent. The "mind" has been manipulated by replacement of social and personal values with commodity or external values. Social knowledge is destroyed or weakened by this transmission of externally directed knowledge, thus a sort of mind control or mental violence has taken place.

The significance of this distinction between physical violence and mental violence is important, for in bureaucratic organizations, there

has been a shift from the physical violence of the past to a more covert violence of today, that of mind shaping (mind control). Bureaucracies now espouse an ideology of non-violence, yet this is merely a ploy to draw one's thoughts away from the increasing mental destruction by such "non-violent" ideologies. This ploy is indicative of the techniques used to force the minds of the masses into acceptance of that which is directed at them.

Contemporary organizational ideology is one-way bureaucratic routinized thought which is taken as truth and destroys the intellectual foundations of two-way social thought. Where the social person enjoys a "multi-dimensional" mind, he is channeled to "one-dimensional" mindness, and where the person is a whole "social" being, he has been reduced to an "industrial" man. To use symbolic interactionist terminology, where a person is composed of both an "I" and "me", he has been chopped to the "me".

The key to understanding the violence that social man experiences, is that man is increasingly being reduced to fit a so-called functional rational mold produced and disseminated by bureaucratic ideologies which have reduced society to a market place and social man to a commodity. Concepts of reason which have originated in science and in work and in labor contexts now imperil social tradition, custom and family, friends and locale.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

Due to the theoretical nature of this study, a qualitative approach to research was used in obtaining the desired information, to construct a theoretical frame of reference, and to add support by guiding the informal interviews given and the review of literature. In short, the method utilized, so as to yield a viable theory, is essentially heuristic in that it was designed to discover the underlying principles bureaucratic organizations use to accomplish their stated goals.

As applied to research, the chief notion behind the concept qualitative, is "holistic." In short, the whole situation is taken into consideration as opposed to a piecemeal or "molecular" design. The assumption behind this principle is that a person or social group has a totality that is distinct and unique and cannot be understood by studying merely the individual elements or "atoms" composing the whole.

Also distinctive of this idea of qualitative research, in contrast to quantitative research, is that the former presupposes an active, interpreting nature of man, not an acted upon or passive man. Qualitativeness deals with the more subjective aspects of people. Having already proposed that human beings, as a social entity, are much more than what can be seen or objectively described, it then follows that a method designed to include such a holistic approach will avoid problems encountered

by formal empirical research.

Hence, this study ventures to discover the "reality" of the situation, not to impose reality on a situation. The emphasis, then, is to move from perceived reality (concreteness) to a theory (abstractness) along a course of inductive logic. Because this study deals with understanding, as opposed to prediction or control, the task will be to form a particular perspective, not absolute "truths."

The principle point to make here, is that qualitative procedures are used to avoid restricting the course of investigation. Restrictions may come in many forms, but to examine the bureaucratic structure or large organizations, in particular the ideologies which guide them, such restraints as a reduction to numbers or "cause and effect" conditions must be avoided. Using this reasoning, research into bureaucratic ideology was conducted on several levels. These methods are based on the above idea, that in order to understand social and non-social processes, the investigator must be able to integrate knowledge with an analytical thinking process in order to obtain an overall theoretical scheme of wholeness.

Methodology

This study began as a theoretical work and remains such. However, the entire study does not come from theoretical works. Several informal interviews with individuals in prominent management positions were conducted to add credence to the theoretical model. There was also much literature, which dealt with specific organizations, that was utilized. This is consistent with the holistic approach to formulate understandings about complex human endeavors.

Literature

An investigation of literature began with two books. The first book (Ewen, 1976) traced the historical development of advertising and the remaining book (Mander, 1978) argued about the negative effects of television on people. A theme in these books was that a small number of persons, an elite, are able to manipulate the public into behaving in a specified way, into purchasing manufactured products or services which may or may not be wanted; into thinking along planned pathways, as in having personal values changed to system's values; into feeling positive about commodities, corporations, television, advertising, etc. and into feeling negatively or passively about other people's emotions, outside groups or nations, specific political figures, and numerous social needs. This led to a look into some of the specific procedures practiced by these elite to control individuals by virtue of power derived through the bureaucratic structure of economically oriented organizations.

Much of the information published and distributed, about these manipulative procedures, is not outstanding enough to provide readily available sources. However, "investigative reporting" carried out by newspaper journalists, free lance reporters, university students, and other individuals devoted to "exposing" the government, military, and economic sectors of this society, have added greatly to an understanding of "how" controls are carried out. Furthermore, bureaucratic organizations themselves have distributed much material intended both for dispersing to the public and for organization personnel only. This was invaluable in helping substantiate the social perspective utilized. And finally, literature which dealt with organizations, but of a less specific nature, were instrumental in adding to an understanding of these

organizations. This material was more often than not, sociological or psychological in nature.

Interviews

Informal interviews were conducted in order to compare the results with the theoretical framework proposed in Chapter III. It was considered important to add human experiences to a study which is abstract in content.

Considerable research into the literature was conducted, as well as the construction of a theoretical framework, prior to any interview. Consequently, a thorough understanding of the aims of this study was achieved before beginning any attempt to interview.

A social perspective was developed in advance of contacting persons for the interview, because obtaining management personnel who were substantially advanced in the bureaucratic hierarchy was predictably difficult. The interview method was utilized in addition to written literature since it is the most frugal for gathering answers to important questions on such matters as career, organizational ideology, and personal philosophy. The primary benefit of the interview was the ability to confirm an organization's ideological perspective in a direct manner from an individual intimately involved with a specific organization.

During the interview process, care was taken to refer to the conference as a "conversation" rather than an "interview" to put the individual at ease. The conversation was prearranged to be held in the official's office at a time convenient for both the researcher and the person being interviewed. In addition, the author did not use a specific

ordered list of questions or topics because this amount of formality could have stifled the individual interviewed and therefore restricted a free-exchange of ideas sufficient enough to bar access to underlying ideologies.

However, moderate control over the course of the interview was deliberately exercised. This control was maintained informally to insure a consistent theme. Specifically, each person interviewed was initially asked about the criteria used in daily decision-making at his particular level of management. Once a preliminary idea was framed about the criteria, an "ideal" form of the decision-making process was put to the interviewee for consideration. This was done to make sure misconceptions of ideological foundations did not develop.

The interviews themselves were held with eleven individuals from a variety of organizations in four states: Missouri, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas. The organizational positions of these individuals are: (1) and (2) General Chairmen of the United Transportation Union, for conductors and for trainmen, (3) Superintendent of the Missouri-Pacific Railroad, (4) Assistant Commander of the U.S. Army 49th Armor Division, (5) retired commander of a U.S. Army artillery battalion, (6) General Manager of Chesapeake and Houston Terminal Railroad, (7) Senior Vice-President of Business Men's Assurance, (8) owner, K-9 Radar Security business, (9) senior Security Manager, K-9 Radar Security business, (10) senior City Commissioner of Stillwater, and (11) Tulsa Chief of Police.

Dates of the interview were between 22 August and 1 December, 1979. Each person interviewed was a white male between the ages of 47 and 63, and had been affiliated with that organization for a minimum of 22 years. All of these men are presently considered to be highly located within

the management structure. An exception to this is one individual that is three years retired from the U.S. Army.

There was no significant difference in any of the eleven interview encounters. All interviews went smoothly and each man seemed to be satisfied that he had given the author of this paper another outlook on management decision-making.

Analysis

This analysis will attempt to relate the literature and informal interviews with the theoretical framework so that the nature of bureaucratic ideologies may be further detailed. This will include the idea that as western societies increasingly become bureaucratized, rationalized, industrialized, and liberalized; the result is an ever narrowing of social man. This narrowing is violent to man and is an inherent component of organizational ideology.

There are three basic propositions contained in the paper which relate to organizational ideologies within western industrial societies. The following examination will indicate how each of the propositions are intrinsically interrelated and how each is supported by the literature and/or interviews.

Proposition I

The first proposition advanced, is that within western societies, organizational (system) ideologies have similar roots. In demonstrating this proposal, it is necessary to more thoroughly understand the features of ideology. Once the concept ideology is discerned, western society's social philosophy will be traced to the beginnings of capitalism in what

is now considered to be western "industrial" society.

Although the term ideology has been used in a variety of ways, it may be thought of as being associated with the role of ideas in shaping and justifying particular interests. In other words, an ideology is a system of logical ideas that in reality are a justification for the vested interests of a particular social class. This involves the idea of social change.

Ideologies may be considered to be distorted in that they are torn from a larger belief system. For example, the sixteenth century saw the beginnings of a multi-faceted religious movement called Protestantism. It took specific form under the leadership of men who differed greatly (e.g., Martin Luther, Michael Servetus, John Calvin), but all of who believed in the autonomy of the individual and in the Bible without any need for intervention by the Roman Catholic Church. From Protestantism was torn a complex of Calvinistic-Puritanical ideas and norms which stressed the positive value of diligent work at an occupation that is socially and individually beneficial. Also stressed were frugality in living style and in the use of time, with adversity as a test of individual character. This complex of ideas and norms, called the Protestant ethic, is ideological in its origins, in its involvement with vested interests, and in its being associated with shaping social development.

Ideologies, then, can be thought of as arguments intended to persuade opposing views. In this respect, ideologies are powerful, and not so much committed to the truth, as to control.

Sixteenth century Europe also saw the rise of a new form of economic system. Capitalism, as it is called, has been generally characterized by competitive conditions and concentration of wealth and power.

Capitalism was accompanied by the rise of a social philosophy known as liberalism.

The idea underlying liberalism, is that human beings, operating in large part independently, can achieve both a theoretical and a practical mastery of the social and natural world (Rossides, 1978, p. 4). This rational liberal philosophy was not restricted solely to the economic sector of society but also permeated all social institutions: the family, the church, the educational system, etc.

During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, early capitalism, along with liberalism, shifted to a corporate capitalism. This later form of capital is associated with centralization, urbanization, formal rationality, and even a more pronounced concentration of wealth. The new liberalism which emerged with the on rush of industrialism, gradually began to replace the doctrines of natural rights and laissez-faire in the previous liberalism. Now it was seen that rational management in industrial societies was required to direct social life to prevent the pitfalls, hazards, and liabilities of the more "primitive" societies.

Spencer (1960, p. 292) expressed this movement in the advancement of society from "militant" to "industrial." While living in England during the nineteenth century he saw the "advantages" of an industrial society, such that

. . . there was evidence that the decline of international hostilities associated as it is with the decline of hostilities between families and between individuals, is followed by a weakening of revengeful sentiments. This is implied by the that in our own country the more serious of these private wars early ceased, leaving only the less serious in the form of duels, which also have at length ceased: their cessation coinciding with the recent great development of industrial life (p. 333).

As brought out in Chapter II, this philosophy has penetrated all sectors of human institutions. However through increased rationalization, one sector has become more valued. The economic sector has been placed at the apex of a hierarchy of needs. Organizations perceive themselves as having little chance for survival unless economic factors are taken into consideration. Although these organizations were originally designed for the benefit of people, the dollar quickly became the goal.

In the opening decades of the twentieth century, Ewen (1976, p. 139) has noted that "businessmen realized authority in the family could be controlled to provide a conduit to the process of goods consumption." The fact that "childhood was increasingly a period of consuming goods and services made youth a powerful tool in the ideological framework of business" (p. 139).

When the idea of economic management, to prevent societal and community breakdown, is removed from the larger belief system of liberalism, its ideological characteristics are evident. This reevaluation of economics, which has pervaded the capitalist era and increasingly so in more recent times, features another attribute of ideology. That is, ideologies themselves are cloaked in scientific and theoretical language for the purpose of validating the contents of the ideology.

The concept of ideology, Habermas (1971, p. 98) argues, did not just come into being with the rise of bourgeois society. "It is actually only relevant to the conditions of public debate forged by that society" (p. 98). He tries to make the case that science and technology become bound up with ideology. In doing this Habermas supports the idea that ideologies are cloaked in science or other legitimizing devices to insure the system's survival.

Ideologies first come into being by replacing traditional legitimations of power. This is accomplished by appearing in the mantle of modern science and by deriving their justification from the critique of ideology (p. 99).

Berg (1979, pp. 115-116) makes a similar point when he suggests that businessmen either are disposed both to deny that they are powerful and to seek to "ground" their admittedly significant roles in society "in terms that will clothe them with legitimacy."

The point of the above discussion, is that an industrial society is guided by an ideology which assures survivability of society's organizations through means which are grounded in science and technology. Berg (p. 6) sees this as industrialization, or in his words, as "an expression of a complex of forces that are really rooted in the processes of modernization." In this study, the concept of rationalization is equivalent to Berg's "modernization." To him, "modernization" means the "increasing of secularization of belief systems and the growing role of the scientific mode of thought" (p. 7). Also, as pointed out earlier in this chapter, ideology disproportionately values economics over other social norms. This is characteristic of liberal philosophy which is based on the belief that each person's welfare should be insured by institutional management. This institutional management is frequently economic in nature. Hence, organizational ideologies are rooted in liberal philosophy which emerged with capitalism in the western societies.

Proposition II

The second proposition proposes that these organizational ideologies contain an aspect of violence which is inherent to and legitimated within the organization. As a concept, violence will be further detailed. This

will be explained in the light of the properties of ideologies, some properties which have yet to be discussed.

It has been shown that western industrial societies have organizations which are guided by ideologies that are economic in nature. That is, the ideologies are supportive of attempts to elevate the economic sector over other social sectors of people's lives. This elevation results in the destruction of social norms and values and substitution of system norms and values (economics). This destruction of social man serves to narrow a person's "humanness," and creates passiveness, primarily by removing man from social situations.

There are several ways a person may be removed from social situations. One of the ways that will be used for illustration, is through watching television.

In Chapter III, advertising was shown to be a common technique utilized by an elite to assist in disseminating their ideas to the public. This was done primarily through television. Mander (1978), one time president of a celebrated advertising agency, commented on this observation: "I grew more and more impressed with the effect that the mere possession of money has upon the kind of information that is dispensed through the media" (p. 18). Specifically he noted that only the rich buy mass or national advertising, and "they do this to become richer" (p. 19).

Mankiewicz (1978, p. 7) goes so far as to postulate that "television stations are trusted by more Americans than any other institution." More than a "majority of the American people believe that television is the most believable source of news; newspapers are in a distant second place with only about 20 per cent" (p. 7). Even assuming that Mankiewicz's

estimates are high, the ramification of such a large number of people watching the same thing at the same time, is enormous. In other words, entire societies may be directed by a small group of people.

At least three conditions of modern existence have occurred which are related directly to the destruction of social man. First, human beings "no longer trust personal observation, even of the self-evident, until it is confirmed by scientific or technological institutions" (p. 54). Humans are one of many interlocking parts of the worldwide ecosystem. These processes are now exceedingly difficult to observe due to the loss of traditional knowledge. And third, humans have become passive creatures who are unable to perform diverse modes of thinking. These conditions combine to limit our knowledge and understanding to what we are told. They also leave us unable to judge the reliability or unreliability of the information we go by.

To find an example of these ideas, one may look at the following letter written to Abigail Van Buren, the Dear Abby syndicated column, on June 14, 1975:

DEAR ABBY: This may sound crazy, but I need your advice. I am divorced and the mother of a 4-year old boy named Ronnie. We were at home recently when an armed intruder confronted us. The man wanted only money and promised not to hurt us. We both explained to Ronnie that Mommy would have to be tied up for a while. He seemed to understand. After I was bound and gagged, Ronnie was told to watch TV for about 20 minutes and then he could help me or call for help. Abby, my son spent the next three hours watching TV. I finally worked through the gag, to tell him to go next door for help. Could Ronnie possibly have some hostility toward me? "Tied Up"

A reduction of a social person is a form of violence in that it destroys the individuals "humanness." In the above column, Ronnie's ability to help his mother was overwhelmed by a machine. Even at four

years of age, Ronnie has lost part of his social ability.

The previous examples are given to demonstrate the possibility that social norms and values have been replaced by other norms and values. These "other" norms and values, when distributed on a large scale, are put forward by the mass media vehicle (particularly television). Only those who possess sufficient amounts of money are able to have their ideas "advertised" through the mass media. For example, "in 1977, one minute of prime television time was worth \$125,000" (Mander, p. 19). Perhaps something of this nature is what prompted Liebling (1978, p. 19) to say "Freedom of the press is limited to those who own one."

To a larger and larger extent, people's minds are being occupied by information of a purely commercial nature. The reason for spending enormous sums of money for only a few seconds or a few inches of advertising can only be to get richer. It follows that the large-scale organizations using advertising must be guided by the idea of economic survival. These ideas are ideological in nature and were pointed out earlier in this chapter. An attempt was made to discover ideologies during the interview process.

When confronted with the idea that his organization's primary reason for making a "high-level" decision was economic, the general manager of the Chesapeake and Houston Terminal Railroad in Houston agreed. "Safety, efficiency of operation, and satisfaction of our customers are of the utmost concern, however, profit is the underlying thrust behind these three factors." A Stillwater city commissioner said that "making popular decisions insures you more leverage in future relations with citizens and businessmen," but "decisions which are economically beneficial will keep you your job."

Others generally supported the notion that economics was the dominant factor in how they made daily decisions. This is indicative of the rational character decision-making actions. The assistant U.S. Army commander emphasized his unit's mission was the goal in which he was given responsibility. "Training of these troops is my business, however, we cannot do the job without the proper equipment or pay for these young soldiers." He went on by adding that "without money my division could not operate for very long, but without soldiers, it wouldn't operate at all." The Tulsa Chief of Police said basically the same thing, yet went one step further to add "that although money is necessary, my officers are essential to law and order in this city."

One technique used in the interview process to determine how accurate the proposition, that organizations are guided by an economic ideology, was, the following statement was made: "Let me sum up what you have just told me - economic efficiency is the main consideration in your decision-making." Of the eleven, four individuals answered in the negative, but qualified their responses with the qualifier that economics was important, just not "the" primary factor. Those responding this way were both military men, the city commissioner, and the police chief. From these responses, the fact that organizations have multiple goals, is obvious.

Organizations are, according to Etzioni (1969, p. 135), "social units oriented toward the pursuit of specific goals." In this sense they can be conceived as tools which gain meaning and direction from their function. This is important because organizational goals are tied to the decision-making process.

Simon (1969, p. 162) points out that it "might be well to give up

the idea that the decision situation can be described in terms of a single goal." Instead, it is more reasonable to speak of a whole set of goals. The assistant division commander pointed to this in his statement that several factors were required before his responsibilities could be carried out.

However, the problem with determining organizational goals depends upon the level of abstraction a researcher is willing to tolerate. For the purpose of this study, only very general goals will be examined. Several of these goals are: efficiency, growth, profit, survival and progress. Goals of this nature are closely interrelated and can be summarized under an economic heading. Thus a very general goal of large organizations is one which is economic. It follows that organizational ideologies and economic goals are related and thus legitimated in the organization. They are legitimized because failure to handle economic issues could force the organization to become less efficient, stop growing, lose money, regress and then eventually die.

Since these organizations adopt ideologies for what they apprehend to be survival reasons, they have acknowledged the supremacy of economics. Knowledge on religious and social matters is perceived to have little use in the realm of a rational system of material exchange. This indicates that organizational ends (economic survival) have become more important than organizational means (serving the needs of the public) of achievement. Organization's original goals were to support people, however, it can be seen that the goals of supporting people are being slowly replaced at an ever increasing speed by monetary aspects. This is a "levelling affect" as discussed previously. Thus violence is legitimated within the organization by organizational ideology.

Proposition III

The third and last proposition states that violence is both physically and mentally destructive to social persons.. Mental violence is the destruction of social man through the increase in a rationalization of thought. This increase in rationalization, is seen in the economic ideologies of large organizations which have narrowed man by replacing social norms and values with externally-directed norms and values. A discussion of mental violence has been appropriately dealt with in the above proposition.

However, physical violence may also take place within an organization and may be legitimized by that organization. Physical violence is the bodily destruction of human beings or the damaging of private or public property. The logic underlying this idea of legitimization is the same ends dominating means argument as above for mental forms of violence.

An example of this physical violence occurred between May 1933 and July 1937 when there were some 10,000 labor strikes. In the United States these involved no less than 5,600,000 workers (Litwack, 1962, p. 119). During this period companies that employed union labor, used many tactics to persuade the workers to return to the job: contracts, blacklisting, strike breaking, bargaining, and so on. Often an increase in wages and benefits for union workers was desired and upon refusal by a company to pay, a "strike" would result. The companies, in order to refrain from paying extra wages, realized that if the strike could be broken, then members would return to work. Sometimes this was handled by contract. Both union workers and company managers realized that each would economically suffer in a no work period such as a strike. At other times, companies would hire "strike breakers" to harass, threaten, and

physically harm workers on strike. At times, men were killed in the process.

Union violence is only one of many forms of physical violence that may be carried out against persons. For example, wars have been waged for a variety of purposes. One has only to look into the United State's past for 200 years to see eight major military involvements: the Revolutionary War, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish American War, World War I, World War II, Korea and Vietnam, not to mention the many Indian wars. Even today there is a constant threat of nuclear holocaust and it is indeed a rare nation which does not experience assassination, terrorism, guerilla warfare, civil war, or vigilantism.

Racial genocide is not so uncommon any more, as in Vietnam and Cambodia. This is often accompanied by physical torture and starvation. Other forms of violence which people experience or, at least, hear about constantly are: suicide, homicide, and rape. Police riots, union riots, student riots, and race riots are similar actions by large bodies of persons.

The purpose of this study, however, is not to detail physical violence but to give a more thorough theoretical treatment of mental violence. Since this paper's emphasis is on a theoretical perspective, further elaboration on physical violence is not needed. Nevertheless, the above examples should provide an idea of the extensiveness of physical violence to human beings.

Summary

The review of literature, supported by several interviews of management personnel, lends credence to the notion that within this society,

there is an ever increasing rationalization of thought and activity which is manifested in present organizational ideology, bureaucratization, industrialization, and liberalism. This organizational ideology leads to a narrowing of social persons by elevating economics to a level of prominence. Economic knowledge is now seen to be superior to social knowledge, religious knowledge, scientific knowledge, personal knowledge, and the like. Narrowing of humanness, or levelling, is considered violent because it is destructive to the social attributes of man.

In the analysis, ideas formulated from the literature and interviews were integrated to add to a theoretical framework derived in Chapter III. Also, three basic propositions were suggested to assist in framing an understanding of this study's logic. The proposals were: (1) organizational (system) ideologies have similar roots, (2) these system ideologies contain an inherent aspect that is violent and legitimated with the organization, and (3) this violence is both physically and mentally destructive to human beings. These were seen to be indicative of an increasing rationalization of thought in "industrial" societies.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study began by noting that several social theorists have predicted an end to ideology in western industrial society and that these nations have "progressed" beyond the times when human emotion and whim control the forces guiding mankind. Simply, rational thought will steer society to a realization of a utopian dream. Economic power sectors within the society support this idea which is principally maintained through bureaucratic organizations.

The ideology of corporate capitalism has been distilled from the enlightenment and positivistic science rationality that man can control nature, and therefore himself. The ideology of late liberalism views this control as social harmony, progress, and individualism. Characteristically these ideologies are being forced on social man by large organizations.

The purpose of this study was to outline different ideological techniques that are viewed as violent in nature, which serve as ideological frameworks underlying diverse bureaucratic organizations: government, religion, corporations, terrorists, labor, police, left wing and radical groups. These techniques are seen as a means for the elevation of economic values over social values, resulting in the destruction of social man, which is viewed as violence.

Indicators of this social violence are "addiction" to alcohol, chemical drugs, sex, and television, increasing crime rates, divorce, and inflation, and the loss of community and family powers. In view of these indicators, the need for study in this area was perceived. An analysis of the historical development of capitalism and its rational liberal views served as the groundwork for understanding the techniques of violence used to destroy the social standing of human beings.

A review of literature focused upon the processes of industrialization, bureaucratization, ideology and violence. Industrialization, in western societies, was seen to be in part a result of capitalism and a social philosophy known as liberalism. In the late eighteenth century to early nineteenth century, capitalist society was changing from an agricultural and small-scale commercial economy to a large-scale industrial capitalist economy. At the same time, the social philosophy was changing from an early laissez-faire liberalism, characterized by individual liberty and political-legal equality, to corporate liberalism where economic values were elevated over social values and where social products were created through institutional management.

In the latter phase of corporate liberalism, large organizations in the United States replaced social values with money value. Without this monetary emphasis, systems perceived destruction as the only alternative. Thus, organizations which were originally designed for persons, became caught up in system survival and self perpetuation.

Industrialization, then, is viewed as a general term which includes not just the transformation of the productive forces of society through machine technology and a factory system, but it also constitutes urbanization, secularization, the rationalization of thought, institutions,

and behavior, and many changes in politics, culture, and family life (Kumar, 1978, p. 59). Bureaucracy was defined as a type of hierarchical organization which is designed "rationally" to coordinate the work of many individuals to accomplish large-scale tasks. Terms associated with bureaucracy are: reliability, formal rationality, formalistic impersonality, precision, etc. Also, several fundamental features of bureaucracy were elaborated: (1) although bureaucracy is a construct, an abstraction, people are effected by its consequences. Thus power resides in the abstraction; (2) as bureaucratic rationalization increases, knowledge of the employed individual about the purpose of what he does decreases (Mannheim, 1940, p. 59); (3) organizational ideologies are techniques for shaping the beliefs, attitudes, and opinions of the masses, and (4) thus bureaucracies destroy reciprocal social processes and replace them with one-way nonsocial processes for control.

Bureaucratic processes are thus viewed as dehumanizing and depersonalizing, and as producing a psychological and social levelling affect.

The term ideology is associated with the debate over the role of ideas in shaping and determining historical and social development. Several examples of "modern" ideologies given were: Liberalism, neo-Marxism, feminism, conservatism, Communism, Democracy, and the like. Ideologies are considered to be distorted and value-laden through the incorporation of "invariant myths."

Thus ideologies are conversion processes, used by bureaucracies to change people's behaviors, thoughts, and feeling by forcing an alignment with an "invariant myth." Persuasion, purchase, and physical force are three modes of conversion which are violent in nature.

Violence was distinguished from the concept power in that the

latter "always stands in need of numbers, whereas violence up to a point can without them since it is dependent upon implements," (Arendt, 1972, pp. 140-141). Power is a potential for action, while violence is the extreme of power, power in action.

Yet violence is more than the destruction of material things and human lives; it is the destruction of a person's ability to socially interact or the narrowing of one's "humanness." This takes the form of social and personal values and knowledge being replaced with commodity values and knowledge.

The theory was next conceptualized based upon the literature reviewed. The perspective was neither meant to be critical of any institution, nor judgemental of any other theoretical viewpoint, but to make clearer the nature of bureaucratic ideology.

The methodology employed in this paper was qualitative research based on data from the literature which was primarily from "investigative reporting," original organizational printed material, and abstract works on organizations. Informal interviews were also conducted to compare the theoretical conclusions to a concrete setting.

The analysis related the literature and informal interviews with the theoretical framework. This included the notion that industrial countries increasingly become bureaucratized, rationalized, industrialized, and liberalized; a steady narrowing of social man. The analysis was accomplished by an examination of three interrelated propositions dealing with organizational ideologies. The first proposition stated that organizational (system) ideologies have similar roots. The second proposition stated that these system ideologies contain an aspect of violence which is inherent to and legitimated within the organization.

And the last proposition declares that this violence is both physically and mentally destructive to human beings.

Conclusion

It has been prophesized that the end of ideology in western industrial societies is imminent. Also, there are those who perceive society moving toward their dream of utopia where ideology will cease to exist. These perspectives were deemed ideological upon an analysis of the characteristics of ideology and upon examination of the historical development of current social philosophies and capitalism.

This was accomplished through an investigation of the distinctive qualities of man and by demonstrating the soundness of three propositions concerned with system ideology. Man, being a social creature, possesses many forms of knowledge which are used in a variety of ways. An individual may utilize knowledge to increase control over another person or a group in social relationships. However, individuals are not the only entities which make use of knowledge; large organizations also employ particular forms of knowledge.

It is the use of specific knowledge by large organizations, guided by liberal ideologies, which are economic in nature that constitute the core of this study.

Ideologies, as conversion processes, serve to reduce social man to economic man by the elevation of economic knowledge over other forms of human knowledge. Economics are emphasized by organization because without this rational management of cash flow, failure or deterioration is perceived to be the sole result. Belief in and support of these myths makes organizational success possible and man can be controlled,

manipulated, and treated as a commodity.

Also, these ideologies contain an aspect of violence which is inherent to and legitimated within the organization. The ideological thrust is to force people to accept an idea as absolute truth, regardless of reality. Hitler accomplished the feat of convincing several million Germans that the Jews were the cause of worldly problems. This forcing is destructive and thus is violent to social man. Because of the destructive nature of system ideology, violence is an integral part of the ideology and therefore inherent to the organization. This violence is legitimated since without its uses, organizations perceive survival to be impossible. Furthermore, organizations do not refer to this mental violence as violence but as "advertising," "influencing," "convincing," "encouragement," and any other term which avoids a negative connotation.

This violence is both mentally destructive and at times physically destructive. Bureaucratic ideology is always mentally violent due to the characteristics of ideology; specifically a levelling affect. Often this violence takes a physical form when people are killed (as in union strike breaking and international war), wounded (as in police riot control procedures), or property is destroyed or damaged (as in random terrorist bombings).

Limitations

Theoretically, this study was limited primarily by the perspective employed. An attempt was made to integrate concepts which range from micro to macro. A theory which uses a social perspective will have difficulty handling all areas of complex organizations. This limitation was recognized early and a viewpoint that attempted to incorporate both

the micro and macro perspective was constructed.

Adding to this problem was the fact that the literature found in the process of research was extremely diverse in terms of polarized perspectives. Only rarely did literature support the idea that all organizations possess ideologies which are violent. Just as problematic, as a lack of literature on mental violence, is the abundance of research material on physical forms of violence, so that a balance was difficult to achieve.

Methodologically, several limitations exist. Since this study concerns the ideologies of all large organizations in the United States, then it should be necessary to study a representative number of them in order to adequately support the many abstract theoretical assertions formulated. But that was beyond the scope of this study. Many organizations are "secretive" in nature and would be dangerous to the researcher, for example: the Weathermen, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), several chapters of the Klu Klux Klan, some religious sects and cults, Satan worshippers, and vigilante groups, so these could not be included.

Another problem pertaining to access, is that most organizations bar approach to the "inner circle" or to the power elite who govern. Large corporations or conglomerates are particularly responsible for this restriction or for making approach to the "inner circle" too expensive in terms of time and money. This study, therefore, included those who were extremely "high" in an organization because they were accessible, although they were not at the apex of the hierarchy. "Contacts" to assist the researcher in gaining entry were difficult to find for entree to high management and were not found at all for acquiring

admittance to the elite.

For similar reasons access to private memos (formal or informal), "closed" meetings, "retreat" encounters, and luncheons was not possible in but rare instances.

Finally, the scope of such a project precludes an in-depth study on important issues. The broad array of literature is enormous in some sections of the study, in particular on some important issues which created a situation where much material could not be read and analyzed. However, this approach was considered necessary to gain an overall theoretical view and a more general understanding of the processes involved within the ideology of bureaucratic organizations.

Recommendations

A closer investigation of the effects of particular manipulative techniques on primary as opposed to secondary group interaction would be a notable contribution. Also, the consequence of these controlling techniques upon both the traditional extended and nuclear families should be further investigated. For example, a deeper look into advertising techniques, the people who are responsible for the construction of such creations, and in particular those who are purchasing these techniques and the reasons behind the procurement.

Large organizations in addition to corporations should be carefully studied for the content of their ideologies and for the techniques preferred so that specific ends are obtained in such an examination.

It is suggested that an understanding of the effect on intellectual abilities of conversion techniques would be of great benefit. If television, advertising, or any other ideological procedure designed to

convert persons could be "empirically" and "scientifically" demonstrated to be detrimental to the "mind," then perhaps more individuals would become aware of the danger in the destruction of certain forms of human knowledge. This "raising of consciousnesses" may be seen as something of a positive contribution of all of the social disciplines.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alinsky, Saul D.

1972 Rules For Radicals. New York: Vintage Books.

Anderson, Jack and George Clifford

1973 The Anderson Papers. New York: Random House, Inc.

Arendt, Hannah

1972 Crises of the Republic. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Aron, Raymond

1967 "The Industrial Society." quoted in Krishan Kumar, Prophecy and Progress. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.

Becker, Howard S.

1950 "Sacred and Secular Societies." Social Forces, 28: 361-376.

Bell, Daniel

1961 The End of Ideology. New York: Collier Books.

Berg, Ivar

1979 Industrial Sociology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Blumer, Herbert

1966 "Sociological Implications of the Thought of George Herbert Mead." American Journal of Sociology, 71: 535-544.

Camellion, Richard

1977 Assassination: Theory and Practice. Boulder, Colorado: Paladin Press.

Che Guevara, Ernesto

1968 Episodes of the Revolutionary War. New York: International Publishers.

Comte, Auguste

1853 The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte. trans. Harriet Martineau. London: J. Chapman.

Domhoff, William G.

1979 The Powers That Be. New York: Vintage Books.

Ellul, Jacques

1964 The Technological Society. trans. John Wilkinson. New York: Vintage Books.

1965 Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes. trans. Konrad Kellen and Jean Lerner. New York: Vintage Books.

Etzioni, Amitai

1969 A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Ewen, Stuart

1976 Captains of Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Feuer, Lewis S.

1975 Ideology and the Ideologists. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Freund, Julien

1968 The Sociology of Max Weber. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.

Frederick, Christine

1929 "Selling Mrs. Consumer." quoted in Stuart Ewen, Captains of Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Gamindorra, Tommy

1973 "Black-Robed Mafia." quoted in Charles Ashman, The Finest Judges Money Can Buy. Los Angeles: Nash Publishers.

Giddens, Anthony

1979 Central Problems in Social Theory. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goebbels, Joseph

1942 Der Angriff, Aufsätze aus der Kampfzeit. Munich: F. Eher Publishers.

Gotz, I. L.

1978 "Television." quoted in Frank Mankiewicz, Remote Control. New York: Ballantine Books.

Gouldner, Alvin W.

1970 The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology. New York: Equinox Books.

van den Haag, Ernest

1972 Political Violence and Civil Disobedience. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Habermas, Jurgen

1971 Toward a Rational Society. Boston: Beacon Press.

- Helmer, Olaf
1967 "Prospects of Technological Progress." a RAND Corporation Paper (August), 151-159.
- Hobbes, Thomas
1947 Leviathan. New York: MacMillan Company.
- Horkheimer, Max
1972 Critical Theory. trans. Matthew O'Connell, New York: The Seabury Press.
- Hummel, Ralph P.
1977 The Bureaucratic Experience. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Huxley, Aldous
1958 Brave New World Revisited. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Jung, Carl
1964 Man and His Symbols. New York: Dell Publishing Company.
- Keat, Russell and John Urry
1975 Social Theory as Science. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kramnick, Isaac and Frederick M. Watkins
1979 The Age of Ideology-Political Thought. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Kumar, Krishan
1978 Prophecy and Progress. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, Ltd.
- Laqueur, Walter
1977 Terrorism. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Lasswell, Harold D.
1950 "Propaganda and Mass Insecurity." Psychiatry, 13 (August): 284-285.
- Lenin, V. I.
1969 What is to be Done? New York: International Publishers.
- Lewis-Wren, John
1970 "Faith and the Technological Future." Futures Magazine, 22 (September): 290-298.
- Liebling, A. J.
1978 "Introduction" quoted in Jerry Mander, Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television. New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks.

Litwack, Leon

- 1962 The American Labor Movement. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Locke, John

- 1928 Selections. New York: Scribner's Company.

Loomis, Charles P. and J. Allan Beegle

- 1975 A Strategy for Rural Change. New York: Schenkman Publishing Company.

Lundberg, Erik

- 1973 "Introduction" as quoted in E. F. Schumacher, Small is Beautiful. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Mander, Jerry

- 1978 Four Arguments for the Elimination of Television. New York: Morrow Quill Paperbacks.

Mankiewicz, Frank and Joel Swerdlow

- 1978 Remote Control. New York: Ballantine Books.

Mannheim, Karl

- 1940 Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction. New York: Harcourt, Brace Publishers.

Martindale, Don

- 1960 The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Marx, Karl

- 1958 "Manifesto of the Communist Party." quoted in Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.

Mead, George Herbert

- 1934 Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Michel, Robert

- 1915 Political Parties. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Mills, C. Wright

- 1951 White Collar: American Middle Class. New York: Oxford University Press.

- 1956 The Power Elite. New York: Oxford University Press.

- 1960 Images of Man. New York: George Braziller, Inc.

Mosca, Gaetano

- 1960 "The Ruling Class" quoted in C. Wright Mills, Images of Man. New York: George Braziller, Inc.

Nkrumah, Kwame

- 1968 Handbook of Revolutionary Warfare. New York: International Publishers.

Pareto, Vilfredo

- 1934 "Political Economy." quoted in George Homans and Charles P. Curtis, Jr. (eds.), An Introduction to Pareto. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- 1935 "Treatise." quoted in Arthur Livingston (ed.), The Mind and Society. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Powell, William

- 1971 The Anarchist Cookbook. Secaucus, N.J.: Lyle Stuart, Inc.

Redfield, Robert

- 1947 "The Folk Society." American Journal of Sociology, 52: 293-308.

Reich, Charles A.

- 1970 The Greening of America. New York: Random House, Inc.

Rossides, Daniel W.

- 1978 The History and Nature of Sociological Theory. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Company.

Roszak, Theodore

- 1973 "Introduction." quoted in E.F. Schumacher, Small is Beautiful. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Saint-Simon, Henri de

- 1964 Social Organization, The Science of Man, and Other Writings. trans. F. Markhan. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Schumacher, E. F.

- 1973 Small is Beautiful. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Simon, Herbert

- 1960 "A Critique of Organizational Theories." quoted in Amitai Etzioni, A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- 1969 "On the Concept of Organizational Goals." quoted in Amitai Etzioni, A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Smart, Mollie S. and Laura S. Smart

- 1976 Families: Developing Relationships. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, Inc.

Spencer, Herbert

- 1958 First Principles of a New System of Philosophy. New York: DeWitt Revolving Fund.

- Sumner, William Graham
1906 Folkways. Boston: Ginn and Company.
- Tawney, R. H.
1931 Equality. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Thomas, William I. and Florian Znaniecki
1918 The Polish Peasant in Europe and America. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Timasheff, Nicholas S. and George A. Theodorson
1976 Sociological Theory. New York: Random House.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de
1961 Democracy in America. trans. H. Reeve. New York: Schocken Books.
- Toennies, Ferdinand
1957 Community and Society (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft). trans. Charles Loomis. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
1976 "Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft." quoted in Nicholas Timasheff and George Theodorson, Sociological Theory. New York: Random House.
- Trosky, Leon
1958 "Politics as a Vocation." quoted in Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), Max Weber: Essays in Sociology. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Walters, Robert
1979 "No Enemies Needed." Stillwater Newspress, 28 December: p. 8.
- Weber, Max
1930 The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. trans. Talcott Parsons. London: Unwin Books.
1947 The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. New York: Oxford University Press.
1954 Max Weber on Law in Economy and Society. trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press
1956 Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sociologie und Sozialpolitik. trans. J. P. Mayer. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd.
1968 Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich (eds.), trans. Ephraim Fischhoff. New York: Bedminster Press.
- Whyte, William H., Jr.
1956 The Organization Man. New York: Simon and Schuster Rockefeller Center.

Wilson, H. T.

1977 The American Ideology. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Wolin, Sheldon S.

1960 "Organizational Theories: A Critique." quoted in Amitai Etzioni, A Sociological Reader on Complex Organizations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Woodward, Helen

1926 "Through Many Windows." quoted in Stuart Ewen, Captains of Consciousness. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Wrigley, E. A.

1972 "The Process of Modernization and the Industrial Revolution in England." The Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 3 (Autumn) 221-230.

VITA²

Douglas Reid Satterfield

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: BUREAUCRATIC IDEOLOGY: A FORM OF VIOLENCE

Major Field: Sociology

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Monticello, Arkansas, May 22, 1952, the son of Mr. and Mrs. C.E. Satterfield.

Education: Graduated from Cooper High School, Abilene, Texas, in May, 1970; received Bachelor of Arts degree in Sociology from Texas Tech University in August, 1978; enrolled in master's program at Oklahoma State University, 1978-79; enrolled in doctoral program at Oklahoma State University, 1979 to present; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1980.

Professional Experience: Computer programmer, Texas Tech University Computer Center, 1973-74; research assistant, department of sociology, Texas Tech University, 1973-74; graduate teaching assistant, department of sociology, Oklahoma State University, 1978-80; tutor, department of computer science and department of sociology, 1979-80.