

# DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

## Chapter 1 : Health Care Quotes (99 quotes)

*"Technology, Bureaucracy, and Healing in America is well written in a clear, flowing, and personal style. It is thought-provoking and should stir wide public interest."*—Charles E. Odegaard, professor emeritus of biomedical history, University of Washington.

His ideal-typical bureaucracy, whether public or private, is characterized by: Wilson advocated a bureaucracy that "is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting house are a part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. But it is, at the same time, raised very far above the dull level of mere technical detail by the fact that through its greater principles it is directly connected with the lasting maxims of political wisdom, the permanent truths of political progress. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices". This essay became the foundation for the study of public administration in America. Ludwig von Mises[ edit ] In his work Bureaucracy , the Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises compared bureaucratic management to profit management. Profit management, he argued, is the most effective method of organization when the services rendered may be checked by economic calculation of profit and loss. When, however, the service in question can not be subjected to economic calculation, bureaucratic management is necessary. He did not oppose universally bureaucratic management; on the contrary, he argued that bureaucracy is an indispensable method for social organization, for it is the only method by which the law can be made supreme, and is the protector of the individual against despotic arbitrariness. Using the example of the Catholic Church, he pointed out that bureaucracy is only appropriate for an organization whose code of conduct is not subject to change. He then went on to argue that complaints about bureaucratization usually refer not to the criticism of the bureaucratic methods themselves, but to "the intrusion of bureaucracy into all spheres of human life. The former makes for stagnation and preservation of inveterate methods, the latter makes for progress and improvement. Merton[ edit ] American sociologist Robert K. He believed that bureaucrats are more likely to defend their own entrenched interests than to act to benefit the organization as a whole but that pride in their craft makes them resistant to changes in established routines. Merton stated that bureaucrats emphasize formality over interpersonal relationships, and have been trained to ignore the special circumstances of particular cases, causing them to come across as "arrogant" and "haughty". Elliott Jaques describes the discovery of a universal and uniform underlying structure of managerial or work levels in the bureaucratic hierarchy for any type of employment systems. Number of levels in a bureaucracy hierarchy must match the complexity level of the employment system for which the bureaucratic hierarchy is created Elliott Jaques identified maximum 8 levels of complexity for bureaucratic hierarchies. Roles within a bureaucratic hierarchy differ in the level of work complexity. The level of work complexity in the roles must be matched with the level of human capability of the role holders Elliott Jaques identified maximum 8 Levels of human capability. The level of work complexity in any managerial role within a bureaucratic hierarchy must be one level higher than the level of work complexity of the subordinate roles. Any managerial role in a bureaucratic hierarchy must have full managerial accountabilities and authorities veto selection to the team, decide task types and specific task assignments, decide personal effectiveness and recognition, decide initiation of removal from the team within due process. Lateral working accountabilities and authorities must be defined for all the roles in the hierarchy 7 types of lateral working accountabilities and authorities: They also have a practical application in business and administrative studies.

# DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

## Chapter 2 : The Sociology of Max Weber

*The author presents a thoughtful discussion of the dilemmas facing American medicine and the need for a "new postmodern paradigm." A central concern is the clash between bureaucracy and the Hippocratic theme.*

Most of the definitions seek to link spirituality to anything that relates to the human spirit. Spirituality can call us beyond self, to concern and compassion for others. Fetzer Institute, , p. Humanity in this model is the healthcare givers feeling about the disease. To further elaborate Chapman states that hospitals that follow some sort of religious tradition cannot be said to be churches, however, they do need to portray a higher standard in terms of the services they offer and the principles via which they offer these services. Before we get into the challenges of establishing a healing hospital, it is important to state the premise from which these hospitals were established. Chapman quotes former vice president Hubert H. It is imperative to state here that Healing hospitals are not against any of the modern medicine practices or the technologies and drugs that are use. Healing hospitals seek to integrate spiritual, physical, social as well as psychological. Challenges in Creation of a Healing Hospital Healing hospitals have been known to get very successful results. There is both employee and patient satisfaction, financial performance for these hospitals is better than other non-healing hospitals due to the reduced turnover. Nevertheless, there are challenges that these hospitals have had to face over the years with regard to establishment and growth. This has been due to the difference in their modus operandi in comparison to the regular hospitals. Chapman , postulates that veterans of healing hospitals have had five main challenges when it comes to starting up these institutions. Technology, prescription drugs, business factors, bureaucracy, cynicism and poor leadership. Technology Healthcare Futurist such as Dr. James Canton claim to have technologies that defy the process of aging by turning off certain genes. We should learn to accept death as we do birth and life. Pharmaceutical companies are in a rush to create the latest drug to solve the latest problem. Patients too are in a rush to get these drugs. Business Factors The study and practice of medicine has been reduced to a race of increasing market share between pharmaceutical companies and research hospitals. No amount goes to the loving care that the patients need in the hospitals. The trend has caught up with formerly charitable hospitals that have been turned to money minting factories at the expense of the patients. It is the obligation of the government to pay for its civil servants in order for them to pay taxes that will enable the government to function. Bureaucracy Preoccupation of employees and confusion in the hallways is the nature of regular hospitals. There is a protocol that is followed for every procedure in regular hospitals and it is this that resembles a prison. The nature of clothes that one has to wear, the type of rooms one has to live in while in hospital. All this feel more like prison than a hospital where one should be receiving treatment. The nature of visiting hours is also questionable in hospitals. It resembles that of prisons. When the visiting hours are over the family of the person who is ill are literally chased out of the establishment. Cynicism and Poor Leadership When a person is sick, it is a particular part of the body that is sick. Chapman gives the illustration of a person who has just been raped. This person receives attention for the whole body. However, when a person has a broken leg, all they receive is a plaster and a date when the plaster will be taken out. If the latter received the same care as the former, they would have probably healed faster, but that is never the case. It is about the Good Samaritan. He was beaten up stripped, robbed and left for dead. A few people past him, however, a certain Samaritan did not. He carried him on his own animal and paid for his medical bills. The issue in the above parable is not how much the man spent at the inn but the fact that he showed love to his fellow man. Return to the silence. Building the Healing Hospital in America. Baptist Healing Hospital Trust: Pastoral Care for Complicated Grieving.

# DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

## Chapter 3 : BEMER United States

*Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.*

Specialized division of labor Efficiency According to Weber, bureaucracies are goal-oriented organizations designed according to rational principles in order to efficiently attain their goals. Offices are ranked in a hierarchical order, with information flowing up the chain of command, directives flowing down. Operations of the organizations are characterized by impersonal rules that explicitly state duties, responsibilities, standardized procedures and conduct of office holders. Offices are highly specialized. Appointments to these offices are made according to specialized qualifications rather than ascribed criteria. Some have seriously misinterpreted Weber and have claimed that he liked bureaucracy, that he believed that bureaucracy was an "ideal" organization. Others have pronounced Weber "wrong" because bureaucracies do not live up to his list of "ideals. But Weber described bureaucracy as an "ideal type" in order to more accurately describe their growth in power and scope in the modern world. His studies of bureaucracy still form the core of organizational sociology. The bureaucratic coordination of the action of large numbers of people has become the dominant structural feature of modern societies. It is only through this organizational device that large-scale planning and coordination, both for the modern state and the modern economy, become possible. The consequences of the growth in the power and scope of these organizations is key in understanding our world. On what basis do men and women claim authority over others? Why do men and women give obedience to authority figures? Again, he uses the ideal type to begin to address these questions. Weber distinguished three main types of authority: Traditional Authority Rational-legal Authority Charismatic Authority Rational legal authority is anchored in impersonal rules that have been legally established. Traditional authority often dominates pre-modern societies. Unlike rational-legal authority, traditional authority is not codified in impersonal rules but is usually invested in a hereditary line or invested in a particular office by a higher power Coser, Finally, charismatic authority rests on the appeal of leaders who claim allegiance because of the force of their extraordinary personalities. Again, it should be kept in mind that Weber is describing an ideal type; he was aware that in empirical reality mixtures will be found in the legitimization of authority Coser, The appeal of Jesus Christ, for example, one of the most important charismatics in history, was partly based on tradition as well. Oligarchy Weber noted the dysfunctions of bureaucracy in terms of the impact that it had on individuals. Its major advantage, efficiency in attaining goals, makes it unwieldy in dealing with individual cases. The impersonality, so important in attaining efficiency of the organization, is dehumanizing. Weber was very concerned about the impact that rationalization and bureaucratization had on sociocultural systems. By its very nature bureaucracy generates an enormous degree of unregulated and often unperceived social power. Those who control these organizations, Weber warned, control the quality of our life, and they are largely self-appointed leaders. Bureaucracy tends to result in oligarchy, or rule by the few officials at the top of the organization. In a society dominated by large formal organizations, there is a danger that social, political and economic power will become concentrated in the hands of the few who hold high positions in the most influential of these organizations. Michels was a socialist and was disturbed to find that the socialist parties of Europe, despite their democratic ideology and provisions for mass participation, seemed to be dominated by their leaders, just as the traditional conservative parties. He came to the conclusion that the problem lay in the very nature of organizations. Any large organization, Michels pointed out, is faced with problems of coordination that can be solved only by creating a bureaucracy. A bureaucracy, by design, is hierarchically organized to achieve efficiency--many decisions that have to be made every day cannot be made by large numbers of people in an efficient manner. The effective functioning of an organization therefore requires the concentration of much power in the hands of a few people. The organizational characteristics that promote oligarchy are reinforced by certain characteristics of both leaders and members of organizations.

## DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

People achieve leadership positions precisely because they have unusual political skill; they are adept at getting their way and persuading others of the correctness of their views. Once they hold high office, their power and prestige is further increased. Leaders have access and control over information and facilities that are not available to the rank-and-file. They control the information that flows down the channels of communication. Leaders are also strongly motivated to persuade the organization of the rightness of their views, and they use all of their skills, power and authority to do so. By design of the organization, rank and file are less informed than their "superiors. Therefore, the rank and file tend to look to the leaders for policy directives and are generally prepared to allow leaders to exercise their judgment on most matters. Leaders also have control over very powerful negative and positive sanctions to promote the behavior that they desire. They have the power to grant or deny raises, assign workloads, fire, demote and that most gratifying of all sanctions, the power to promote. Most important, they tend to promote junior officials who share their opinions, with the result that the oligarchy become a self-perpetuating one. Therefore, the very nature of large scale organization makes oligarchy within these organizations inevitable. Bureaucracy, by design, promotes the centralization of power in the hands of those at the top of the organization. Rationalization The rationalization process is the practical application of knowledge to achieve a desired end. It leads to efficiency, coordination, and control over both the physical and the social environment. It is a product of "scientific specialization and technical differentiation" that seems to be a characteristic of Western culture Freund, It is the guiding principle behind bureaucracy and the increasing division of labor. It has led to the unprecedented increase in both the production and distribution of goods and services. It is also associated with secularization, depersonalization, and oppressive routine. In turn, these changes in social structure have changed human character through changing values, philosophies, and beliefs. Bureaucracy and rationalization were rapidly replacing all other forms of organization and thought. They formed a stranglehold on all sectors of Western society: It is horrible to think that the world could one day be filled with nothing but those little cogs, little men clinging to little jobs and striving toward bigger ones--a state of affairs which is to be seen once more, as in the Egyptian records, playing an ever increasing part in the spirit of our present administrative systems, and especially of its offspring, the students. This passion for bureaucracy It is as if in politics. That the world should know no men but these: He identifies rationalization with an increasing division of labor, bureaucracy and mechanization Gerth and Mills, He associates it with depersonalization, oppressive routine, rising secularism, as well as being destructive of individual freedom Gerth and Mills, ; Freund, Why is it that "as rationalization increases, the irrational grows in intensity"? Again, the rationalization process is the increasing dominance of zweckrational action over rational action based on values, or actions motivated by traditions and emotions. Zweckrational can best be understood as "technocratic thinking," in which the goal is simply to find the most efficient means to whatever ends are defined as important by those in power. Technocratic thinking can be contrasted with wertrational, which involves the assessment of goals and means in terms of ultimate human values such as social justice, peace, and human happiness. Weber maintained that even though a bureaucracy is highly rational in the formal sense of technical efficiency, it does not follow that it is also rational in the sense of the moral acceptability of its goals or the means used to achieve them. Nor does an exclusive focus on the goals of the organization necessarily coincide with the broader goals of society as a whole. It often happens that the single-minded pursuit of practical goals can actually undermine the foundations of the social order Elwell, What is good for the bureaucracy is not always good for the society as a whole--and often, in the long term, is not good for the bureaucracy either. De Lorean goes on to speculate that this immorality is connected to the impersonal character of business organization. Morality, John says, has to do with people. Never once while I was in General Motors management did I hear substantial social concern raised about the impact of our business on America, its consumers or the economy" J. Introduced to the American Market in , several compromises between the original design and what management ultimately approved were made for financial reasons. As a result, a couple of the prototypes rolled over on the test tracks and it quickly became apparent that GM had a problem J. Wright, ; R. De Lorean again takes up the story. At the very most, there

## DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

was a mountain of documented evidence that the car should not be built as it was then designed. The results were disastrous. It was designed and promoted to appeal to the spirit and flair of young people. It was sold in part as a sports car. The denial and cover-up led the corporation to ignore the evidence, even as the number of lawsuits mounted--even as the sons and daughters of executives of the corporation were seriously injured or killed. Internal documents were destroyed, and pressure was put on executives and engineers alike to be team players. The result was that despite the existence of many moral men within the organization, many immoral decisions were made. An extreme case of rationalization was the extermination camps of Nazi Germany. The goal was to kill as many people as possible in the most efficient manner, and the result was the ultimate of dehumanization--the murder of millions of men, women and children. The men and women who ran the extermination camps were, in large part, ordinary human beings. They were not particularly evil people. Most went to church on Sundays; most had children, loved animals and life. William Shirer comments on business firms that collaborated in the building and running of the camps: The firm of I. Topf and Sons of Erfurt, manufacturers of heating equipment, won out in its bid for the crematoria at Auschwitz. The story of its business enterprise was revealed in a voluminous correspondence found in the records of the camp. A letter from the firm dated February 12, , gives the tenor: The Central Construction Office of the S. Crematoria 2 and 3 for the camp. We acknowledge receipt of your order for five triple furnaces, including two electric elevators for raising corpses and one emergency elevator. Their product could do the most effective job for the least possible cost, so they got the contract.

# DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

## Chapter 4 : AskMe: Is bureaucracy good or bad?

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

WILSON During its first years, the American republic was not thought to have a "bureaucracy," and thus it would have been meaningless to refer to the problems" of a "bureaucratic state. Though only about 3, at the end of the Federalist period, there were about 95, by the time Grover Cleveland assumed office in , and nearly half a million by The great political and constitutional struggles were not over the power of the administrative apparatus, but over the power of the President, of Congress, and of the states. The Founding Fathers had little to say about the nature or function of the executive branch of the new government. The Constitution is virtually silent on the subject and the debates in the Constitutional Convention are almost devoid of reference to an administrative apparatus. This reflected no lack of concern about the matter, however. Management by committees composed of part-time amateurs had cost the colonies dearly in the War of Independence and few, if any, of the Founders wished to return to that system. The argument was only over how the heads of the necessary departments of government were to be selected, and whether these heads should be wholly subordinate to the President or whether instead they should form some sort of council that would advise the President and perhaps share in his authority. In the end, the Founders left it up to Congress to decide the matter. There was no dispute in Congress that there should be executive departments, headed by single appointed officials, and, of course, the Constitution specified that these would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The only issue was how such officials might be removed. After prolonged debate and by the narrowest of majorities, Congress agreed that the President should have the sole right of removal, thus confirming that the infant administrative system would be wholly subordinate" in law at least" to the President. Had not Vice President John Adams, presiding over a Senate equally divided on the issue, cast the deciding vote in favor of presidential removal, the administrative departments might conceivably have become legal dependencies of the legislature, with incalculable consequences for the development of the embryonic government. The State Department, the first to be created, had but nine employees in addition to the Secretary. The War Department did not reach 80 civilian employees until ; it commanded only a few thousand soldiers. Only the Treasury Department had substantial powers" it collected taxes, managed the public debt, ran the national bank, conducted land surveys, and purchased military supplies. Because of this, Congress gave the closest scrutiny to its structure and its activities. The number of administrative agencies and employees grew slowly but steadily during the 19th and early 20th centuries and then increased explosively on the occasion of World War I, the Depression, and World War II. It is difficult to say at what point in this process the administrative system became a distinct locus of power or an independent source of political initiatives and problems. What is clear is that the emphasis on the sheer size of the administrative establishment" conventional in many treatments of the subject" is misleading. The government can spend vast sums of money" wisely or unwisely" without creating that set of conditions we ordinarily associate with the bureaucratic state. For example, there could be massive transfer payments made under government auspices from person to person or from state to state, all managed by a comparatively small staff of officials and a few large computers. And though it may be harder to believe, the government could in principle employ an army of civilian personnel without giving rise to those organizational patterns that we call bureaucratic. This would require a vast increase in the number of teachers and school rooms, but almost all of the persons added would be performing more or less identical tasks, and they could be organized into very small units e. Though there would be significant overhead costs, most citizens would not be aware of any increase in the "bureaucratic" aspects of education" indeed, owing to the much greater time each teacher would have to devote to each pupil and his or her parents, the citizenry might well conclude that there actually

had been a substantial reduction in the amount of "bureaucracy. Max Weber, after all, warned us that in capitalist and socialist societies alike, bureaucracy was likely to acquire an "overpowering" power position. Conservatives have always feared bureaucracy, save perhaps the police. Humane socialists have frequently been embarrassed by their inability to reconcile a desire for public control of the economy with the suspicion that a public bureaucracy may be as immune to democratic control as a private one. Liberals have equivocated, either dismissing any concern for bureaucracy as reactionary quibbling about social progress, or embracing that concern when obviously nonreactionary persons welfare recipients, for example express a view toward the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indistinguishable from the view businessmen take of the Internal Revenue Service. These are not the only problems that arise because of bureaucratic organization. From the point of view of their members, bureaucracies are sometimes uncaring, ponderous, or unfair; from the point of view of their political superiors, they are some times unimaginative or inefficient; from the point of view of their clients, they are sometimes slow or unjust. No single account can possibly treat all that is problematic in bureaucracy; even the part I discuss here—the extent to which political authority has been transferred undesirably to an unaccountable administrative realm—is itself too large for a single essay. But it is, if not the most important problem, then surely the one that would most have troubled our Revolutionary leaders, especially those that went on to produce the Constitution. It was, after all, the question of power that chiefly concerned them, both in redefining our relationship with England and in finding a new basis for political authority in the Colonies. To some, following in the tradition of Weber, bureaucracy is the inevitable consequence and perhaps necessary concomitant of modernity. A money economy, the division of labor, and the evolution of legal-rational norms to justify organizational authority require the efficient adaptation of means to ends and a high degree of predictability in the behavior of rulers. To this, Georg Simmel added the view that organizations tend to acquire the characteristics of those institutions, with which they are in conflict, so that as government becomes more bureaucratic, private organizations—political parties, trade unions, voluntary associations—will have an additional reason to become bureaucratic as well. By viewing bureaucracy as an inevitable or, as some would put it, "functional" aspect of society, we find ourselves attracted to theories that explain the growth of bureaucracy in terms of some inner dynamic to which all agencies respond and which makes all barely governable and scarcely tolerable. Work and personnel expand to consume the available resources. Bureaucracies behave, we believe, in accord with various other maxims, such as the Peter Principle: In hierarchical organizations, personnel are promoted up to that point at which their incompetence becomes manifest—hence, all important positions are held by incompetents. More elegant, if not essentially different, theories have been propounded by scholars. The tendency of all bureaus to expand is explained by William A. Niskanen by the assumption, derived from the theory of the firm, that "bureaucrats maximize the total budget of their bureau during their tenure"—hence, "all bureaus are too large. But since measuring the output of a bureau is often difficult—indeed, even conceptualizing the output of the State Department is mind-boggling—the bureau has a great deal of freedom within which to seek the largest possible budget. Such theories, both the popular and the scholarly, assign little importance to the nature of the tasks an agency performs, the constitutional framework in which it is embedded, or the preferences and attitudes of citizens and legislators. Our approach will be quite different: Different agencies will be examined in historical perspective to discover the kinds of problems, if any, to which their operation gave rise, and how those problems were affected—perhaps determined—by the tasks which they were assigned, the political system in which they operated, and the preferences they were required to consult. What follows will be far from a systematic treatment of such matters, and even farther from a rigorous testing of any theory of bureaucratization: Our knowledge of agency history and behavior is too sketchy to permit that.

**BUREAUCRACY AND SIZE** During the first half of the 19th century, the growth in the size of the federal bureaucracy can be explained, not by the assumption of new tasks by the government or by the imperialistic designs of the managers of existing tasks, but by the addition to existing bureaus of personnel performing essentially routine, repetitive tasks for which the public demand was great and unavoidable. The principal

## DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

problem facing a bureaucracy thus enlarged was how best to coordinate its activities toward given and noncontroversial ends. The increase in the size of the executive branch of the federal government at this time was almost entirely the result of the increase in the size of the Post Office. From 1789 to 1860, federal civilian employment in the executive branch increased nearly eight fold from 4,000 to 36,000, but 86 percent of this growth was the result of additions to the postal service. The Post Office Department was expanding as population and commerce expanded. By 1789 there were 27,000 post offices scattered around the nation; by 1860, nearly 77,000. In New York alone, by 1860 there were nearly 3,000 postal employees, the same number required to run the entire federal government at the beginning of that century. The organizational shape of the Post Office was more or less fixed in the administration of Andrew Jackson. The Postmaster General, almost always appointed because of his partisan position, was aided by three later four assistant postmaster generals dealing with appointments, mail-carrying contracts, operations, and finance. There is no reason in theory why such an organization could not deliver the mails efficiently and honestly: The task is routine, its performance is measurable, and its value is monitored by millions of customers. Yet the Post Office, from the earliest years of the 19th century, was an organization marred by inefficiency and corruption. The reason is often thought to be found in the making of political appointments to the Post Office. Indeed, some have argued that it was the advent of the "spoils system" under Jackson that contributed to the later inefficiencies of the public bureaucracy. The opposite is more nearly the case. The Jacksonians did not seek to make the administrative apparatus a mere tool of the Democratic party advantage, but to purify that apparatus not only of what they took to be Federalist subversion but also of personal decadence. The government was becoming not just large, but lax. Integrity and diligence were absent, not merely from government, but from social institutions generally. The Jacksonians were in many cases concerned about the decline in what the Founders had called "republican virtue," but what their successors were more likely to call simplicity and decency. As Matthew Crenson has recently observed in his book *The Federal Machine*, Jacksonian administrators wanted to "guarantee the good behavior of civil servants" as well as to cope with bigness, and to do this they sought both to place their own followers in office and "what is more important" to create a system of depersonalized, specialized bureaucratic rule. Far from being the enemies of bureaucracy, the Jacksonians were among its principal architects. If public servants, like men generally in a rapidly growing and diversifying society, could no longer be relied upon "to have a delicate regard for their reputations," accurate bookkeeping, close inspections, and regularized procedures would accomplish what character could not. Amos Kendall, Postmaster General under President Jackson, set about to achieve this goal with a remarkable series of administrative innovations. To prevent corruption, Kendall embarked on two contradictory courses of action: Virtually every important document and many unimportant ones had to be signed by Kendall himself. At the same time, he gave to the Treasury Department the power to audit his accounts and obtained from Congress a law requiring that the revenues of the department be paid into the Treasury rather than retained by the Post Office. The duties of his subordinates were carefully defined and arranged so that the authority of one assistant would tend to check that of another. What was installed was not simply a specialized management system, but a concept of the administrative separation of powers. The result was predictable. Endless details flowed to Washington for decision but no one in Washington other than the Postmaster General had the authority to decide. Meanwhile, the size of the postal establishment grew by leaps and bounds. Quickly the department began to operate on the basis of habit and local custom: Since everybody reported to Washington, in effect no one did. White was later to remark, "the system could work only because it was a vast, repetitive, fixed, and generally routine operation. Civil service reform was not strongly resisted in the Post Office; from 1860 on, the number of its employees covered by the merit system expanded. Big city postmasters were often delighted to be relieved of the burden of dealing with hundreds of place-seekers. Employees welcomed the job protection that civil service provided. In time, the merit system came to govern Post Office personnel almost completely, yet the problems of the department became, if anything, worse. By the mid-nineteenth century, slow and inadequate service, an inability technologically to cope with the mounting flood of mail, and the inequities of its pricing system became all too evident. The problem with the Post Office,

## DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

however, was not omnipotence but impotence. It was a government monopoly. Being a monopoly, it had little incentive to find the most efficient means to manage its services; being a government monopoly, it was not free to adopt such means even when foundations, communities, Congressmen, and special-interest groups saw to that. The Department of Defense, since the largest employer of federal civilian officials, has become, as the governmental keystone of the "military-industrial complex," the very archetype of an administrative entity that is thought to be so vast and so well-entrenched that it can virtually ignore the political branches of government, growing and even acting on the basis of its own inner imperatives. In fact, until recently the military services were a major economic and political force only during wartime. In the late 18th and early 19th centuries, America was a neutral nation with only a tiny standing army during the Civil War, over two million men served on the Union side alone and the War Department expanded enormously, but demobilization after the war was virtually complete, except for a small Indian-fighting force. Its peacetime authorized strength was only 25,000 enlisted men and 2,000 officers, and its actual strength for the rest of the century was often less. Congress authorized the purchase and installation of over 200 coastal defense guns, but barely six percent of these were put in place. When war with Spain broke out, the army was almost totally unprepared. Over 100,000 men eventually served in that brief conflict, and though almost all were again demobilized, the War Department under Elihu Root was reorganized and put on a more professionalized basis with a greater capacity for unified central control.

# DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

## Chapter 5 : Tecnology and Society, Impact of Technology Change in Society

*Descriptions of each edition are found in brief where available. Click details & prices to get more information on a book or to find the best prices for the title.*

Is bureaucracy good or bad? Bureaucracy just means that government is run by rules which are enforced by bureaus offices or agencies dedicated to just those rules. The original idea was to establish rules of law instead of arbitrary enforcement, which tended to be corrupt. Dear Jesse Gordon, Not anticipated by the Framers, the bureaucracy now is a fact of modern political life in the United States. Is its existence a threat to democratic political values such as minority rights and majority rule? Bureaucracy used to be a positive word, in the early s during the Progressive movement led by Pres. The Progressives thought that bureaucrats would be rule-driven to replace corruption; appointed by things like civil service rules to replace political patronage; and dedicated to their bureaucratic mission instead of partisan goals. To some extent, it worked. I think that as long as the rules are set up well -- such as at least stating that minorities receive equal treatment -- then bureaucracies can avoid threats to minority rights. The legislature is still responsible for establishing the rules that the bureaucrats follow. Why was bureaucracy rare in the world in years ago and yet it is everywhere today in ,except in the family and the small business? Because the world is more complicated, richer, and communications much easier. Only rich countries can afford large organizations and governments, and the level of education that requires and warrants large enterprises. When human affairs become more complicated there is a greater demand for governmental actions be they defense, social welfare, or public works , and private enterprises will also become larger to respond to more complex demands. And large private and governmental operations are facilitated by modern communications systems. The advent of the telegraph made it possible to tie together large organizations located in many places. Large organizations made little sense before this time because they could not be very effective and could not be used for much useful governmental activity. Modern communications systems also helped commercial activity, which in turn made countries richer and more complicated. Another way to look at it is that the changes of the Industrial Revolution made for more wealth, complications, and sophistication, which both demanded and made possible large organizations. But rarity of bureaucracy in is only a relative thing, generally applicable to what we today call Western Civilization. The Chinese Empires had well developed bureaucracies, as did the Romans and many pre-Columbian Indian civilizations. So there are other factors at play. Hope this short answer helps with a complicated topic, and remember that experts like to be rated. The word "bureaucracy" comes from the French word for desk, where someone would keep the important papers of state. The "bureaucrats", or those who ruled from their desks, were well known in France well before the revolution. In fact, the Bourbons could not have run their country without the guys at the desk, and that goes for every other empire too. Contrary to popular belief, when you go through ancient papers, you are unlikely to come upon something written by Plato or Moses. The vast majority of paper, stone and clay tablets that survive are public records of transactions. Every church in England contains a register of births, deaths and marriages going back to its founding. The Domesday Book compiled by the Normans was just a census of all the wealth of 11th century England. Amazingly, the building described still existed years later, and has now been restored. We only think we have to file more paper and keep more records than we used to. In truth, we used to have to remember most of this stuff as people with writing skills were much in demand. During early British history, matters such as property rights, contracts, birth dates and the like were all determined by examining the memories of the inhabitants. Over the years, as literacy spread, we realized how important record keeping was. Some of the records we keep are probably useless for example, the New Jersey DMV threw out all the copies of vehicle leases it had when it found out no-one had ever asked for them. However, the usefulness of others only becomes apparent with time. Neither did the drafters of the Constitution, which sat in a drawer in the State department until it was moved to the Smithsonian. Explain the roles bureaucrats play as politicians, policy makers, and

## DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

non-political public services. Elected politicians are smart people, but they lack expertise in many of the areas they are supposed to make decisions about. Government handles matters of economics, social policy, crime, roadways, defence and covert intelligence operations - sometimes all on the same day! In addition, back in the early days of the United States, politicians performed many simple government functions personally. The decision to grant patents was made by just three people, one of whom was the Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson. That first year, they granted a handful of patents. Now, the patent office receives and processes dozens of patent applications each day! This runs the full spectrum. George Washington led his own militia into battle during the Whiskey Rebellion, but Lincoln rarely even visited the battlefield during the Civil War, and it would be unthinkable now for Bill Clinton to lead troops into battle, even though they were all "commander-in-chief of the armed forces". Moreover, when elected politicians arrive in Washington or Albany for that matter, they have to be briefed on what their responsibilities are there as yet being no book entitled "Being the President of the United States for Dummies". At last count, the White House Staff alone numbered over Mind you, bureaucrats have their own preferences too. Many departments are in open warfare with each other. Sometimes though, bureaucratic preferences are not only totally opposite to public and elected opinion, they often defy the logic of other experts. Many economists blame Alan Greenspan for making conditions bad for the less fortunate in the United States. By keeping interest rates high to bring down inflation, he also drove unemployment rates up. Mind you, rich people who owned a lot of government bonds Ross Perot anyone? This is something another respected economist, John Kenneth Galbraith, has pointed out. Mind you, its worse in other countries. On the other hand, the Foreign Office is staffed almost entirely by pro-Arab factions Israel embarrassed the Foreign Office by starting a war for independence in , and the F. As such, England almost always votes against Israel in the U. Anonymous rated this answer: This answer is not answering all of my question, all I need is the roles bureaucrats play as politicians, policy makers and non-political servants. While there are many important pieces of legislation before government which are there because of politicians, there is much more that is there because of bureaucrats. Most of these can be termed "housekeeping", but also include important things like copyright law, bankruptcy law, and judicial reform. Bureaucrats generally work on their own initiative to get legislation before the legislature. Otherwise, only the urgent and public would ever become legislation. Bureaucrats deal with the "forgotten" legislation that causes more and more problems the longer it is ignored. Copyright is a good example. With the introduction of the internet and MP3 technology, the government should probably be taking action. Instead, as long as they continue to leave the matter with the courts, things are likely to get more confused, not less.

## Chapter 6 : Bureaucracy - Wikipedia

*Technology, Bureaucracy, and Healing in America: A Postmodern Paradigm (1st Edition)* by Roger J. Bulger, Uwe E. Reinhardt (Introduction), Roger J. (Reinhardt Hardcover, Pages, Published

They transcend local boundaries and touches lives of everyone. Evolution of mankind can be seen in terms of technological evolution as well. Invention of fire and wheel changed the face of mankind. Various historical epochs - hunter-gatherers, agrarian society and industrialist society are distinguished from each other in terms of technological advancement. The technological factors represent the conditions created by men that have a profound influence on his life. Technology is product of civilization. According to Karl Marx even the formation of social relations and mental conceptions and attitudes are dependent upon technology. Veblen has regarded technology as the sole explanation of social change. F Ogburn says technology changes society by changing our environments to which we in turn adapt. This change is usually in the material environment and the adjustment that we make with these changes often modifies customs and social institutions. Technology has contributed to the growth of industries or to the process of industrialization. Industrialization is a term covering in general terms the growth in a society hitherto mainly agrarian of modern industry with all its circumstances and problems, economic and social. It describes in general term the growth of a society in which a major role is played by manufacturing industry. The Industrial Revolution of 18th century led to the unprecedented growth of industries. Industrialization is associated with the factory system of production. The family has lost its economic importance. The factories have brought down the prices of commodities, improved their quality and maximized their output. The whole process of production is mechanized. Consequently the traditional skills have declined and good number of artisans has lost their work. Huge factories could provide employment opportunities to thousands of people. Hence men have become workers in a very large number. The process of industrialization has affected the nature, character and the growth of economy. It has contributed to the growth of cities or to the process of urbanization. In many countries the growth of industries has contributed to the growth of cities. Urbanization denotes a diffusion of the influence of urban centers to a rural hinterland. Urbanization can be described as a process of becoming urban moving to cities changing from agriculture to other pursuits common to cities and corresponding change of behavior patterns. Hence only when a large proportion of inhabitants in an area come to cities urbanization is said to occur. Urbanization has become a world phenomenon today. An unprecedented growth has taken place not only in the number of great cities but also in their size. As a result of industrialization people have started moving towards the industrial areas in search of employment. Due to this the industrial areas developed into towns and cities. Modernization is a process that indicates the adoption of the modern ways of life and values. It refers to an attempt on the part of the people particularly those who are custom-bound to adapt themselves to the present-time, conditions, needs, styles and ways in general. People in the process of getting modernized give more importance to science and technology. The scientific and technological inventions have modernized societies in various countries. They have brought about remarkable changes in the whole system of social relationship and installed new ideologies in the place of traditional ones. Development of the means of transport and communication: Development of transport and communication has led to the national and international trade on a large scale. The road transport, the train service, the ships and the airplanes have eased the movement of men and material goods. Post and telegraph, radio and television, newspapers and magazines, telephone and wireless and the like have developed a great deal. The space research and the launching of the satellites for communication purposes have further added to these developments. They have helped the people belonging to different corners of the nation or the world to have regular contacts. Transformation in the economy and the evolution of the new social classes: The introduction of the factory system of production has turned the agricultural economy into industrial economy. The industrial or the capitalist economy has divided the social organization into two predominant classes-the capitalist class and the

working class. These two classes are always at conflict due to mutually opposite interest. In the course of time an intermediary class called the middle class has evolved. The problem of unemployment is a concomitant feature of the rapid technological advancement. Machines not only provide employment opportunities for men but they also take away the jobs of men through labor saving devices. This results in technological unemployment. The dangerous effect of technology is evident through the modern mode of warfare. The weaponry has brought fears and anxieties to the mankind. They can easily destroy the entire human race reveal how technology could be misused. Thus greater the technological advancement the more risk for the mankind.

Changes in social institutions: Technology has profoundly altered our modes of life. Technology has not spared the social institutions of its effects. The institutions of family, religion, morality, marriage, state, property have been altered. Modern technology in taking away industry from the household has radically changed the family organization. Many functions of the family have been taken away by other agencies. Marriage is losing its sanctity. It is treated as a civil contract than a sacred bond. Marriages are becoming more and more unstable. Instances of divorce, desertion and separation are increasing. Technology has elevated the status of women but it has also contributed to the stresses and strains in the relations between men and women at home. Religion is losing hold over the members. People are becoming more secular, rational and scientific but less religious in their outlook. Inventions and discoveries in science have shaken the foundations of religion. The function of the state or the field of state activity has been widened. Modern technology has made the states to perform such functions as -the protection of the aged, the weaker section and the minorities making provision for education, health care etc. Transportation and communication inventions are leading to a shift of functions from local government to the central government of the whole state. The modern inventions have also strengthened nationalism. The modern governments that rule through the bureaucracy have further impersonalized the human relations. The most striking change in modern times is the change in economic organization. Industry has been taken away from the household and new type of economic organizations have been set up such as factories, stores, banks, corporations etc.

# DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

## Chapter 7 : 10 facts about technology use in the emerging world | Pew Research Center

*Healing America: Hope, Mercy, Justice and Autonomy in the American Health Care System* by Bulger, Roger J. ()  
*Integrity in Health Care Institutions: Humane Environments for Teaching, Inquiry, and Healing*

Tweet Liberals love to talk about helping the poor and the middle class, and they are obsessed with reducing income inequality. So why is it that across the country they are pushing one of the most regressive taxes in modern times? These renewable energy standards require that utilities to buy expensive wind and solar power. They then pass these costs onto the poor and working class who get stuck paying the tab. In Sacramento, California, the legislature is speeding ahead with one of the most absurd proposals of modern times by mandating percent renewable energy by This would mean no coal, no natural gas and no nuclear power. Election Fraud In Georgia? The goal of these initiatives is to shut down fossil fuel and nuclear energy production in America. These are industries that supply millions of jobs. We have more coal and natural gas than any other nation and liberals want to shut it all down. It is worth mentioning that today in America about 80 percent of our electric power comes from natural gas, coal and nuclear power. In , about 1 percent of our power came from solar power and about 6 percent from wind. If you want to keep the lights or the air conditioning on at home, or recharge your iPhone or iPad, or keep the factories and hospitals and schools open, we are going to need the reliability of fossil fuels. If we go hog-wild on green energy mandates we may be facing a future of potential routine brownouts and blackouts. That has been the pattern in many nations and localities that have shutdown their reliable fossil fuel capacities. Just look at the disruption and havoc from the loss of electric power from the hurricane in the Carolinas. That was an act of nature. These brownouts would be from an act of government and radical green groups. They will raise electric power costs sharply. The Wall Street Journal reported last week that residents of states like California and New Jersey with strict renewable mandates pay about 25 percent more in monthly electric utility bills than states that let the market place choose the lowest cost forms of power. The folks at the Manhattan Institute looked at green energy mandates from to They found that of the 10 states with the highest electric power costs, eight of them had renewable mandates “ typically 30 percent to 40 percent. Only two of the 10 states with the lowest energy costs had these mandates. The 10 lowest-cost states had electric power costs about half of what is charged in high-cost states. We are talking about hundreds and sometimes thousands of dollars of higher costs every year to homeowners to enrich billionaires like Elon Musk and Tom Steyer. This is Robin Hood in reverse: Rob the poor to pay the super rich. Low-income households spend at least four to five times more out of their incomes in energy costs than do millionaires. All of this is so unnecessary. If wind and solar are truly the energy sources of the future “ with reliability and low costs “ let the market determine that. Why do they need mandates and billions of dollars of federal subsidies to make them work? This is an experiment of imposing high costs on American small businesses, farms and families to pay off wealthy green energy investors. Could anything be more illiberal than this? Exposing the Mad War on Energy. You may have got the impression from announcements like that, and from the obligatory pictures of wind turbines in any BBC story or airport advert about energy, that wind power is making a big contribution to world energy today. You would be wrong. National Wind Watch reports its contribution is still, after decades “ nay centuries “ of development, trivial to the point of irrelevance. Was it 20 per cent, 10 per cent or 5 per cent? None of the above: That is to say, to the nearest whole number, there is still no wind power on Earth. Those people need that energy, but they pay a big price in health problems caused by smoke inhalation. Even in rich countries playing with subsidised wind and solar, a huge slug of their renewable energy comes from wood and hydro, the reliable renewables. Meanwhile, world energy demand has been growing at about 2 per cent a year for nearly 40 years. Between and , again using International Energy Agency data, it grew by just under 2, terawatt-hours. If wind turbines were to supply all of that growth but no more, how many would need to be built each year? The answer is nearly ,, since a two-megawatt turbine can produce about 0. At a density of,

very roughly, 50 acres per megawatt, typical for wind farms, that many turbines would require a land area greater than the British Isles, including Ireland. If we kept this up for 50 years, we would have covered every square mile of a land area the size of Russia with wind farms. Remember, this would be just to fulfill the new demand for energy, not to displace the vast existing supply of energy from fossil fuels, which currently supply 80 per cent of global energy needs. Do not take refuge in the idea that wind turbines could become more efficient. There is a limit to how much energy you can extract from a moving fluid, the Betz limit, and wind turbines are already close to it. Their effectiveness the load factor, to use the engineering term is determined by the wind that is available, and that varies at its own sweet will from second to second, day to day, year to year. As machines, wind turbines are pretty good already; the problem is the wind resource itself, and we cannot change that. Mankind stopped using it for mission-critical transport and mechanical power long ago, for sound reasons. As for resource consumption and environmental impacts, the direct effects of wind turbines – killing birds and bats, sinking concrete foundations deep into wild lands – is bad enough. But out of sight and out of mind is the dirty pollution generated in Inner Mongolia by the mining of rare-earth metals for the magnets in the turbines. Wind turbines, apart from the fiberglass blades, are made mostly of steel, with concrete bases. They need about times as much material per unit of capacity as a modern combined cycle gas turbine. Steel is made with coal, not just to provide the heat for smelting ore, but to supply the carbon in the alloy. Cement is also often made using coal. A two-megawatt wind turbine weighs about tonnes, including the tower, nacelle, rotor and blades. Globally, it takes about half a tonne of coal to make a tonne of steel. Now if we are to build , wind turbines a year or a smaller number of bigger ones , just to keep up with increasing energy demand, that will require 50 million tonnes of coal a year. Forgive me if you have heard this before, but I have a commercial interest in coal. The point of running through these numbers is to demonstrate that it is utterly futile, on a priori grounds, even to think that wind power can make any significant contribution to world energy supply, let alone to emissions reductions, without ruining the planet. As the late David MacKay pointed out years back, the arithmetic is against such unreliable renewables. The truth is, if you want to power civilisation with fewer greenhouse gas emissions, then you should focus on shifting power generation, heat and transport to natural gas, the economically recoverable reserves of which – thanks to horizontal drilling and hydraulic fracturing – are much more abundant than we dreamed they ever could be. It is also the lowest-emitting of the fossil fuels, so the emissions intensity of our wealth creation can actually fall while our wealth continues to increase. That is an engineerable, clean future. Everything else is a political displacement activity, one that is actually counterproductive as a climate policy and, worst of all, shamefully robs the poor to make the rich even richer. Tell us what you think in comments below!

# DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

## Chapter 8 : Spirituality and its Association to the Healing Hospital paradigm | JEREMIAH GAKURU - their

*Technology, Bureaucracy, and Healing in America: A Postmodern Paradigm* by Roger J Bulger, MD starting at \$  
*Technology, Bureaucracy, and Healing in America: A Postmodern Paradigm* has 0 available edition to buy at Alibris.

The terms "bureaucracy," "bureaucratic," and "bureaucrat" are common. A cyberocracy could be a bureaucracy changed by computers. Bureaucracy can be found in earlier times in the Roman army, though it is prominently visible in the large-scale administration of agencies of the modern state. The German state created by Bismarck, was a model bureaucracy in both its armed forces and civil administration. According to Weber the creation of the modern state of Germany had only been possible because of the development of a disciplined state bureaucracy and a bureaucratized standing army. Max Weber gave attention to bureaucracy and saw this form of social organization becoming dominant in modern society due to the commitment to the value of rationalization. Weber praises bureaucracies for their efficiency and predictability, but he feared that people would become too controlled by them. The growth of formal bureaucracy was seen in the 19th and 20th centuries. For organizations the bureaucracy represents an important modern technology of control. A significant body of evidence suggests that bureaucratized organizations provide greater career rewards to women than do less bureaucratized organizations. The results of this study suggest ways in which bureaucracy can empower the participation of women in organizations. The management literature implies that the impact of representative bureaucracy is contingent on organizational strategy. The theory of representative bureaucracy suggests that organizations perform better if their workforces reflect the characteristics of their constituent populations. Our empirical evidence on English local government is inconsistent with the basic theory of representative bureaucracy. Congress and the Bureaucracy as Unlikely Bedfellows: Who Controls the Bureaucracy?: Hammond and Jack H. Knott, Michigan State University In the past 15 years a scholarly debate has developed in the United States over the question "Who controls the bureaucracy? Morone, Brown University Americans are developing a distinctly bureaucratic health care regime. This article explores the ramifications for both the politics of health care and the practice of medicine. Bureaucracy, Imagination and U. Examines rationales for the concept of bureaucratized imagination. Examination of rationality and value-neutrality in science, bureaucracy and planning. The Brazilian civil servant: University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, A central concern is the clash between bureaucracy and the Hippocratic theme. What gives bureaucracy a bad name? Is it bureaucracy in itself, or the ghosts in the system? Helping Hand or Grabbing Hand? State Bureaucracy and Privatization Effectiveness J. David Brown, John S. We examine the relationship between state bureaucracy and the impact of privatization on firm productivity. For the field of representative bureaucracy to progress, scholars need to develop a consistent definition of this term and ways to operationalize and measure representative bureaucracy. Industries fear barrier to reform, bureaucracy, will stay Redl, Christopher, Publisher: Reduced funding for government agencies and limiting the hiring of policymakers are seen to eliminate bureaucracy. Whitford, University of Kansas The possibility of the political control of the bureaucracy depends on bureaucratic structure. Organizational Subcultures in a Soft Bureaucracy: Fry, Jeannie Gaines The proposition that soft bureaucracies project a rigid exterior appearance while masking a loosely-coupled set of interior practices. Politics, bureaucracy and social networks: Bureaucracy and School Performance Kevin B. Street-level bureaucracy and family group decision making in the USA by: The relationship between street-level bureaucracy and FGDM. The Revealed Preferences of a Government Bureaucracy: A Clash between Bureaucracy and Science? Scientists at the frontiers of research are often disturbed by the threat that they themselves may have to conform to standards or that they may have to use standards which curtail their freedom of action. Rowling eliminates many of the progressive defenses of bureaucracy. The most omission is the elimination of the democratic defense. Meier, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. Bureaucracy Neutrality in Politics: The relationship between bureaucracy and politics in Indonesia always fluctuates. This dissertation endeavored to see to what extent the neutrality of bureaucracy

## DOWNLOAD PDF TECHNOLOGY, BUREAUCRACY, AND HEALING IN AMERICA

in the local political contest, that is, the election of local leaders post the New Order regime.

### Chapter 9 : Technology, Bureaucracy, and Healing in America: A Postmodern Paradigm

*The Brazilian civil servant: a typology of bureaucracy - Clarice Gomes de Oliveira. This paper builds on Downs' typology of bureaucratic officials to analyze Brazilian public servants. Technology, Bureaucracy, and Healing in America By Roger J. Bulger. 97 pages. University of Iowa Press, Iowa City, \$*