
CHAPTER 1

TWO MODELS OF REFORM

This book attempts to unite a call for active citizenship to the current concern for improving public-agency performance. The method is to analyze a turn-of-the century model of urban reform that depicts the public as owners of its government rather than as customers, the metaphor popular in contemporary reform proposals, and to show how this strong-citizen model leads to the conclusion that establishing an active public is essential to increasing agency efficiency and responsiveness. Active citizenship is defined as people engaged in deliberation to influence public-sector decision-making, animated, at least in part, by concern for the public interest, a concept that each individual may define in a different way. Active citizens shape the political agenda; they deliberate on the ends that governments should pursue as well as evaluating how well particular public-sector programs work now.

We live in a time of great clamor for better agency service. Practitioners and academics discuss reform proposals under the rubric "reinventing government," an apt title because they assume producing a government that works better and costs less comes from structural and procedural change within the government itself.¹ When managers shift rules, the desirable outcomes of government increase without getting into messy questions of politics which are said to only intensify the problem because "[I]n Washington's highly politicized world, the greatest risk is not that a program will perform poorly, but that a scandal will erupt."²

The focus of this reform literature is on how government should work rather than on what it should do. Attempts are made to streamline agencies, privatize programs and relax civil-service procedures and procurement rules. Few people consider the idea that no matter how government structures its tasks or changes its rules and procedures, neither efficiency nor responsiveness will increase significantly until citizens shift their orientation, accept an owner's role and participate in the public sphere, contributing their ideas to improve problem solving. In other words few people question the dictum that reform efforts should center unilaterally on reinventing government rather than also on reinventing citizenship with more stress on the "average" American's participation in public-sector agenda setting.

As a field of inquiry, public administration is no stranger to attempts to increase agency performance. Its emergence as a pragmatic, action-oriented field at the turn-of-the-century was based on a union of the urban reform and scientific management movements both of which envisioned government that would work better and cost less. Throughout the century key members of the public-administration community moved back and forth between academe and federal commissions applying their knowledge to reinvigorate government agencies. Members of the then embryonic public-administration community participated in President Taft's 1912 Commission on Economy and Efficiency, an early federal task force positing that organizational and procedural changes would enhance efficiency.³ They were key players on President Franklin Roosevelt's 1937 Committee on Administrative Management which concluded that efficiency canons required establishing a responsible chief executive with adequate staff support.⁴ Their role has been less significant, however, in some of the federal government's most recent endeavors such as the 1982 Grace Commission and Vice President Gore's National Performance Review Task Force.

The argument of this book is that public administration in its early years took a broader approach to the prerequisites for increasing agency efficiency than is fashionable in the contemporary reinventing government proposals. At least some part of the early public-administration literature saw increased performance as dependent on citizen renewal as well as on internal structural and procedural change. Writers proffered two approaches to increased

efficiency, one primarily managerial and the other political. The first is generally discussed under the rubric of “public-administration principles”; the second can be called a literature on the treatment of agency stakeholders. The first literature addresses managers; the second seeks a lay audience and concerns itself with its obligations. This explicitly political literature assumes that reinventing government is a necessary but insufficient condition for genuine reform. A more efficient government also requires reinventing ourselves, especially our orientation to the public sphere. Citizens must learn to take a greater interest in their communities and become more involved in monitoring governmental performance. Citizen action is essential to creating government that works better whether or not it costs less. Let us briefly examine each literature in turn.

The Principles and Stakeholder Approaches

The first literature, which stretches from Frederick Taylor to Luther Gulick and Lyndall Urwick (roughly from 1895 to 1937) examines the internal mechanisms of public and private organizations with an eye towards establishing principles to increase output/input. It begins with Taylor’s exhortation that management should “rest upon well recognized, clearly defined and fixed principles instead of depending upon more or less hazy ideas received from a limited observation.”⁵ It makes references to work by people such as Harrington Emerson and Henri Fayol who were primarily concerned with elucidating principles of private-sector efficiency but whose organizational dicta were also seen as applicable to the public sector.⁶ (Emerson took his twelve principles of efficiency with him when he became an efficiency advisor to the socialist government of Milwaukee.)⁷ Its widely recognized zenith is a collection of essays edited by Gulick and Urwick in 1937, *Papers on the Science of Administration*.⁸

The second approach, pioneered by turn-of-the-century political Progressives, focuses exclusively on the public sector and on ways to improve efficiency by strengthening the links between bureaucrats and their stakeholders. This literature is also indebted to Taylor but in relation to his methodological belief that administrative problems were researchable and that improvements could

come from comparisons and experimentation. Key participants in this literature associated with New York's Bureau of Municipal Research (BMR) coined a concept of "efficient citizenship" which posited that urban citizens owned their government and as owners had a duty to get involved in city affairs, help organized bureaus get information on political/administrative performance and instruct politicians and bureaucrats in shareholder demands for improvement. The bureau argued that efficiency required both efficient organizations and efficient citizens.⁹ (As we will see in chapter 2, the bureau used an expansive concept of efficiency that tied the word to responsiveness rather than simply to output/input or least-cost.)

During 1907–1914 and shortly afterwards, the phrase efficient citizenship became a buzzword of sorts among people concerned with improving municipal politics. In 1913 an organization working to attract more urban investment borrowed the phrase for its own newsletter extolling the virtues of active citizen-owners.¹⁰ A 1915 city-government text cites bureau work as its source for the observation that the

first essential of efficient administration is intelligent citizenship. In most discussions of municipal reform this is put last on the list, as if it were merely a by-product of charter overhauling . . . That is getting at things from the wrong angle altogether . . . The citizen can no more throw all his civic responsibilities upon experts than the churchman can shift his quest for salvation upon the clergy.¹¹

Another textbook cites the bureau in connection with the hypothesis that

[I]n our effort to improve municipal service, we have been emphasizing too much the responsibility of the public official, and thinking too little about the responsibility of the citizen . . . Good city government can be as severely handicapped through indifferent citizenship as through apathetic administration.¹²

Articles by municipal reformers also discuss this aspect of the bureau's work.¹³

The fate of these two approaches to change has been very different. The principles literature is generally considered the origi-

nating paradigm of the field. Few modern public-administration students read principles works in their entirety but everyone in the community knows they exist and has at least some idea of their fundamental content. Widely-used introductory textbooks, case compendia, and excerpts from historical readings cite Taylor and the essays compiled by Gulick and Urwick.¹⁴

Participants in undergraduate and Master of Public Administration (MPA) programs learn about the structural recommendations proffered in Gulick and Urwick's *Papers on the Science of Administration*. Students are told that the articles in this compilation are a foundation on which the edifice of public administration as a field of inquiry rests. The basic concepts of *Papers on the Science of Administration* become part of their vocabulary. Most learn that the principles literature posits that organizational specialization or division of labor increases efficiency, authority should be commensurate with responsibility, unity of command is crucial, the manager should have a relatively tight span of control.

Of course they do not imbibe this material in a time warp. Along with the classic pre-war concepts, they read excerpts from later authors such as Herbert Simon¹⁵, which are meant to convince them that an overreliance on the immutability of principles is a scholarly and practical dead end. The principles literature offers to tell practicing managers how to maximize output/input, and Simon argues that the advice is not very useful on a case-by-case basis. Specialization is a key precept in the principles literature but the manager's problem is not simply whether to specialize but how to decide the basis for dividing labor. Simon points out that the principles literature does not explain whether geographical or functional division works best in a particular situation—and this type of case-by-case prescription is what the practicing manager wants from a set of dicta.

Simon points out that if unity of command means that only one person can give orders to a given worker, then this principle is incompatible with specialization because a worker may need advice from different experts. The classical literature leaves managers with a choice between following either of two important principles with no guide as to when they should choose unity of command and when they need specialization by functional expertise.

Simon also notes that tight span of control conflicts with keeping the number of hierarchical layers to a minimum. For large

organizations, narrow spans of control lead to excessive red tape, for many decisions have to move up and down among multiple levels which is cumbersome and time consuming. After reading Simon, students do not necessarily forego the principles but they learn to take a more tentative approach to structural questions.

Many students also investigate Vincent Ostrom's somewhat controversial challenge to what he considers the classical theory's unfortunate monocentricity, its axiom that a single center of power will dominate any government and its ensuing preference not to fragment authority, proliferate agencies or duplicate services.¹⁶ Ostrom calls for a theory of democratic administration characterized by polycentricity where people have access to alternative public-sector forums for service provision. His alternative has a bottom-up and heterogeneous character lacking in classical theory. His purpose in citing the pre-war literature (e.g., Gulick and Urwick) is to supercede it but in so doing he keeps alive the tenor of the classical arguments if only as a target for his own vision. The MPA student who reads Ostrom must learn something about Gulick.

Practitioners seeking to reinvent government also grapple with the principles literature. Vice President Al Gore's National Performance Review report finds it problematic that current bureaucratic structures and procedures follow a 1930s paradigm stressing large, top down, centralized agencies with rigid hierarchies in which tasks are broken into simple parts each defined by myriad rules. In an earlier day such arrangements stressing specialization and unity of command may have made sense but in today's world they do not work very well.¹⁷

Reinventing government challenges the legacy of the principles era. Gore cites Taylor's work only to conclude that "these approaches now seem to limit productivity rather than promote it . . . Taylor's theories about "scientific management" are no longer applicable in the information age."¹⁸ [The relationship between the principles and the Gore report is reminiscent of an early Heinrich Boll story where the protagonist lands a steady job and achieves an identity of sorts by joining a vaudeville act and becoming the man at whom the knives are thrown.¹⁹ The principles literature has a permanent job as the constellation of ideas against which later writers rebel; it is the metaphorical man at whom the knives are thrown.]

In contrast the efficient citizenship concept has vanished from both academic and practitioner vocabularies. Textbooks may devote one or two sentences to the Bureau of Municipal Research as one of the founders of the scientific study of public administration but no widely used introductory text explains that the bureau stressed the essential role of a committed citizenry in improving agency performance. Jane Dahlberg's history of the bureau barely mentions efficient citizenship.²⁰ The organization's place in public-administration history is built on its budgetary and structural work.²¹ The lack of any modern analysis of the bureau's citizen-owner concept leads some commentators to classify the BMR as an apolitical, technocratic organization.²²

This skewed picture of the bureau is problematic because the efficient citizenship concept offers an alternative to the citizen-as-customer metaphor that is so central to the current reinventing government scenario. David Osborne and Ted Gaebler's *Reinventing Government*, the book that gave 1990s reform impetus, insists that the path to change lies through customer-driven government.²³ Agencies must learn to meet the needs of their customers even though few public-sector organizations historically used that term in thinking about the people with whom they dealt.

In Vice President Gore's National Performance Review, the customer metaphor pops up everywhere. The report opens with the announcement that the linchpin for reform is "a new customer service contract with the American people."²⁴ Administrators are to give citizens the same responsiveness and consideration businesses supposedly give customers. Each agency will have customer-service plans that train public administrators in customer-service skills. These plans will list businesses with which agencies should compare themselves on this crucial dimension so that they can become equal to the best that the private sector has to offer. Customer satisfaction will become a prime criterion in evaluating agency managers and employees.²⁵ An entire chapter is entitled "Putting Customers First."

The customer metaphor crops up in local attempts at reform as well. The International City/County Management Association's latest guide to effective communication tells local agency managers that the customer orientation provides one of the most useful ways

of understanding citizens.²⁶ When IBM's chief executive officer co-authored a book on reinventing schools, he used the customer model to argue against a political approach to school control. Agreeing with the dangers articulated by the National Performance Review, he feared the affect of politics on service provision. Favoring a minimal role for elected school boards, he championed an economic model of schooling which would bring together customers (parents and children) and sellers (the school administrators) and spur improvements.²⁷ A major influence on all these works is an innovative industrial approach to managing quality called Total Quality Management (TQM) with its notion that the organization's first duty is to delight and satisfy customers. TQM posits that to excel companies must ask themselves: Who are your customers and what are their needs?²⁸

The use of a particular metaphor to comprehend political reality is much more than a linguistic conceit. By helping people understand one thing in terms of another, figurative analogies organize thinking patterns. Each metaphor highlights some aspects of the concept to be known and deflects attention away from other aspects.²⁹ When hermeneutical analysis compares architectural monuments to texts, social scientists accept the metaphor even though they know differences exist between buildings and written documents. The analogy is useful because it helps researchers conceptualize that the meanings embedded in stone constructions can be probed with some of the tools designed for document analysis.³⁰ On the other hand, Harlan Cleveland urges social scientists not to use metaphors from physics to describe information; in his view, analogies between data and energy lead to misunderstandings by emphasizing that information is similar to other resources which are, in fact, nonrenewable while information will not dissipate through use.³¹

A metaphor that equates citizens with customers gives one perspective from which to gauge society's needs for performance improvement. Shifting the metaphor can point the way to a focus on overlooked aspects of reality and the consideration of fresh alternatives. A new figure of speech is likely to spark new assumptions about public governance.

George Frederickson was one of the first to critique the customer-centered model for using an inappropriate metaphor.³² He

argues that citizens are not the customers of government; they represent its owners who elect leaders to represent their interests. A customer-centered model puts citizens in a reactive role where they are limited to liking or disliking services and hoping that the administrators will change delivery if enough customers object. Owners play a proactive role; they decide what the government's agenda will be.

Before the public-administration community accepts a customer-centered model it would be useful to compare it with a model of citizenship that stresses ownership. Looking at such a model does not address all of the problems that have been raised in relation to reinventing government. Another type of analysis would be needed to explore whether the reinventing government scenario thwarts legislative control of policy making by allowing agencies to unilaterally decide how to satisfy customers.³³

The customer-owner comparison does allow seeing if a different way of looking at citizen roles leads to new emphasis on the changes that are necessary to improve government performance. It addresses the following questions: Should reform center almost exclusively on trying to change structure or will all attempts to significantly improve efficiency and responsiveness fail without a reinvigorated citizenry? Should we target proposals for change exclusively to the agencies (who will know how to help their customers) or should we also try to change the ways we socialize the population at large so that citizens are more likely to accept a conscious role as owners of the public enterprise? What proposals for change would it make sense to target to the public at large to help reinvigorate their role?

Unfortunately, the major contemporary reform prescriptions tend not to elaborate owner metaphors.³⁴ This lacuna in the modern literature is one reason exploring the Bureau of Municipal Research's work is useful for critiquing reinventing government. Comparing the much debated customer model with the bureau's idea of citizen-owners shows that the earlier concept provided a much more expansive public role. It envisioned citizens who were active rather than passive; it tried to foster a public that possessed a concern for communal needs rather than a conglomerate of individualistic consumers, each with a monochromatic interest in fulfilling his or her own individual desires. The efficient citizenship

model not only posited the necessity of supporting an enhanced public role, it also identified strategies for producing citizens who would want to act like owners. Studying this model provides one path for uniting a call to active citizenship with a concern for better government.

Efficient Citizenship: Rise and Fall

Although the concept of efficient citizenship has vanished from the contemporary public-administration dialogue, it was once an acknowledged signpost for the more radical proponents of urban reform. People using the term insisted that genuine reform entailed managerial (structural/procedural) and political (stakeholder) change.

Between its 1907 incorporation and 1914, calls for an active citizenry were a key part of the Bureau of Municipal Research's work. That efficient citizenship played a seminal role on the organization's agenda emerges clearly from studying the writings of the bureau's founders and analyzing the organization's miscellaneous publications which appeared under the heading, *Efficient Citizenship*.

Let us imagine a person who knows nothing about contemporary public-administration textbooks and has before himself or herself articles from 1914. A natural assumption would be that modern authors would treat the efficient citizenship concept in similar fashion to the principles literature. The concept would be challenged and in certain respects supplanted by later work but public-administration students would learn something about its contours. That this pattern of discussion and amendment has not been fulfilled, that the efficient citizenship concept lost all place in public discourse requires explanation. In this case the explanation is thoroughly political. The concept was discarded because it pulled the organization in a direction that was too radical for a prominent donor. As the narrative will show, examining the politics of this concept's demise is important for understanding the practical implications of active citizenship; the story of the model's fall helps to pinpoint the type of enemies the notion of citizen-owners can produce.

Efficient Citizenship and Extrinsic Influences

An analysis of efficient citizenship's rise and fall requires answering certain questions in the sociology of inquiry. These questions include: Why do academics and practitioners stop using a concept in the absence of specific empirical justification for dropping it? Do people in a field simply forget about or disregard certain concepts that were important to their predecessors or do formal and informal incentive systems exist that make it politic not to mention idea X or hypothesis Y at certain times? Who gets to choose which ideas are kept at the front of discourse?

Philosopher of science Stephen Toulmin argues that an intellectual community develops on three levels: the discipline (the ideas themselves); the institutions through which the ideas are transmitted; and the individuals who develop and transmit the ideas.³⁵ Textbooks trying to chart the history of public administration as a scholarly enterprise concentrate on the first level; they record objective shifts in ideas between eras (e.g., they will tell students that early writers believed in small spans of control; modern authors tend to favor different spans depending on the environment). Very little attention is given to social context—to the extradisciplinary agendas of the people and the institutions that develop ideas and how extradisciplinary prioritizing affects scholarly discourse. Little is made of the way that the social atmosphere influences change in ideas or of the social negotiation skills that writers need to understand which ideas are likely to gain a positive reception in the various communities with which they interact.

An analysis geared to include all three of Toulmin's levels would explore ideas in a social milieu where people have numerous intellectual and nonintellectual reasons for accepting or rejecting concepts. Rationales would include how acceptance/rejection affects a person's ability to meet his or her own needs and the organization's ability to sustain its entire agenda. This type of analysis would show how social evaluation influences interpretation and acceptance of specific knowledge claims.

A field of inquiry's ideas can rise or fall for *intrinsic* (i.e., intellectual) or *extrinsic* reasons.³⁶ In the first case, people transmitting a concept realize that it cannot explain the phenomenon under

study. In the second case analysts perceive that rewards to their own careers are not forthcoming when they embrace concept X.

Accepting the importance of the extrinsic dimension means highlighting the social context within which ideas are produced. Social context in turn has internal and external dimensions.

The internal dimension relates to incentives offered within the field of inquiry itself and often manifests itself in academic politics and infighting. Neophytes who want to learn a discipline spend at least several years exploring a body of established knowledge. Inevitably they acquire personalized preconceptions about which approaches to problem solving are most likely to bring rewards from people highly placed in the field. After this socialization they may believe they have little to gain from treading in waters held in low esteem by a mentor even if they are convinced those waters hold interesting and viable knowledge paths. They drop a concept not because they see its logical flaws but rather because they do not discern that using it will help their careers.

The external dimension relates to incentives offered by sources outside the discipline, a major issue being the impact of donors. Research and writing often require outside support from organizations or individuals who stipulate that they will only fund certain kinds of projects. Consciously or unconsciously writers may steer their proposals in directions favored by sources proffering support. Other ideas are not pursued even though they may be equally useful for expanding the discipline's boundaries.

In one of the few analyses to examine the impact of funding on the development of public administration as a field of inquiry, Alasdair Roberts shows that the Rockefeller philanthropies contributed to entrenching the often criticized politics/administration dichotomy. He argues that the expansion of the public-administration community between 1927 and 1936 was dependent on funding from Rockefeller philanthropies that were sensitive to public complaints about their involvement in politics; the politics/administration dichotomy was a rhetorical device to deflect such criticism and allow the foundations to support administrative projects.³⁷

Roberts notes that the American public distrusted John Rockefeller and the power he might wield through his charitable giving. Rockefeller failed to get a national charter for his Rockefeller Foundation when he tried in 1909 and only received a New York State

charter in 1913.³⁸ These setbacks made him leery of sparking controversy by supporting advocacy work on contentious questions. The year 1914 was a particularly bad time for his public reputation; in April of that year the infamous Ludlow Massacre occurred where guards murdered families of striking workers at a Rockefeller controlled company in Colorado.

What Roberts does not explain is how well placed was public distrust of the power his charitable giving might bring. Prior to the 1920s the Rockefeller interests did use their wealth to punish organizations that differed with them on political issues. Rockefeller functionaries—using the family's money as a club—were willing and able to tell writers in the public-administration community how to structure their approach to reform—which concepts to stress and which to discard with an eye to limiting approaches that stressed popular participation over the role of experts.

The argument of this book is that pressure from the Rockefeller philanthropies killed efficient citizenship as a major item on the BMR agenda. The concept was a key part of the organization's approach to reform before 1914 and virtually absent afterwards. The bureau restructured in 1914 under pressure from the Rockefellers and eliminated as an organizational player the one individual who insisted that the original vision on citizen participation had to remain intact.

Efficient citizenship did not succumb as a component of reform principally because it showed intellectual weaknesses. Philosophical and practical objections can be leveled against the citizen-owner concept; as the book shows later both the customer and owner metaphor are logically flawed. But intellectual argument did not kill efficient citizenship. This exciting, innovative idea was pushed out as too radical and inflammatory by opponents who wielded money rather than logical analysis as their weapon of choice. That other writers did not take the concept up after the BMR discarded it could be tied, at least partly, to the public-administration community as a whole depending on Rockefeller funding throughout the 1920s and 1930s. As Alasdair Roberts notes, "No important part of the public administration community was untouched by the (Rockefeller) philanthropies."³⁹

Public administration has suffered from this demise. From the turn-of-the-century to our own time the field has enjoyed a rich,

uninterrupted history of debating agency structures both from the perspective of recording actual patterns and searching for improvements. This intergenerational legacy has produced a sophisticated literature on organization theory.

No comparable literature on active citizenship exists. Stirring cries for more participation come from political philosophers. Some of them celebrate the Greek conception of the polis as the sphere of freedom.⁴⁰ Hannah Arendt relates that Americans of the revolutionary period knew that public freedom meant having a share in the public business; late eighteenth-century Americans did not consider public participation a burden but rather a source of happiness that they could receive nowhere else.⁴¹ Benjamin Barber celebrates strong democracy which he conceives of as politics in the participatory mode with citizens subjecting conflicts of interest to "a never-ending process of deliberation, decision and action."⁴² But these philosophers do not link their proposals to concrete issues of agency improvement. When Frederickson argues that citizens are agency owners rather than customers he cannot refer to a long list of public-administration works that explicate the importance of the different metaphors. A person who wanted to present efficient citizenship as a challenge to reinventing government would have to go back and read the original Bureau sources to understand their underlying insights. Such reading in historical sources is the central strategy behind this book which investigates a long moribund concept as a springboard for reconstructing an owner-citizen role and seeing how it influences change proposals. A key rationale for the historical exploration is that the public-administration community should understand the implications of both customer and owner metaphors before it chooses either as its guide to administrative reform.

This analysis provides a good example of how historical ideas can illuminate modern issues by throwing a different shade of light on them. Examining the Bureau's work shows what can be lost by neglecting old ideas—a loss that is poignant even though most modern readers are likely to find the older literature somewhat naive in its authors' expectations from the average citizen.

The point of exploring the model is not to sell it in toto to a contemporary audience but rather to show a different insight on the relationship between citizens and administrators and how this

point of view might contribute to improving governmental performance. In addition by showing how the concept of efficient citizenship was eliminated the book contributes to exploring the role of extra-intellectual forces (particularly money) in determining which ideas receive publicity and become central to the community's discourse. As the analysis will show the bureau's administrators were somewhat naive about the affect of money on the progression of ideas. Discussing the role of funding agents in setting intellectual agendas may prevent the modern public-administration community from succumbing to the same naivete.

Several analyses of turn-of-the-century Progressivism suggest it was a middle-class movement that tried to diminish the political role of the poor.⁴³ Because the bureau is associated with the Progressive cause, some people may think it perverse to use the concept of efficient citizenship to argue for a more expansive citizen role. It is therefore important to realize that in the 1906–1914 era, bureau leaders often took political stands that opposed what the modern public-administration community considers typical Progressive reforms when these changes substituted elite decision making for policy determined through normal municipal channels. The bureau insisted that decisions about urban utilities and transportation should be made through city elections rather than by state public-service commissions.⁴⁴ It favored large, heterogeneous, activist big-city school boards appointed by the mayor rather than small, elite boards that delegated extensively to professional superintendents.⁴⁵

Although, in practice, middle-class people were the prime audience for the bureau's message (as they are the primary audience for books on reinventing government), the BMR writers intended the owner metaphor to apply to every citizen—rich or poor, WASP or ethnic, male or female.⁴⁶ In this book the concept is investigated in the expansive mood in which it was conceived.

The book is divided into two parts. The first is historical in nature, examining the development of the efficient citizenship concept and its reception in its own era. Chapter 2 describes the formation of the Bureau of Municipal Research and lists some of its accomplishments. Chapter 3 explores the genesis and implications of the efficient citizenship concept. Chapter 4 analyzes a controversy about school governance that engulfed the bureau beginning

in 1911; it demonstrates the concrete, political positions that the efficient citizenship doctrine led the organization to take and the enmity this approach spawned in people advocating a more restricted citizen role. Sometimes a philosophy's essence emerges most clearly through the type of enemies it attracts; the case study shows clearly the difficulties efficient citizenship poses for people who want experts controlling the public agenda.

The second part of the book relates the efficient citizenship idea to current attempts to reinvent government. Chapter 5 compares customer and owner metaphors and shows the active, community-centered nature of the latter; it analyzes how the BMR's owner metaphor shifts the locus of action from the agency to the public. This chapter also looks at the vexing question of whether it is realistic to expect modern citizens to adopt an owner's orientation. It concludes that we cannot expect to counter widespread alienation without first changing the way society educates people to assume a citizen's role and provides them with usable information on public affairs.

The last chapter offers two strategies for moving towards a polity in which citizens can assume an owner's stance. The first strategy centers on education and builds on the concept of service learning. The second proposes that cities treat citizens at least as well as corporations treat shareholders and produce a user-friendly annual report that is mailed to all households. Both are set on a foundation of ideas that the bureau advocated before 1914.