

**Max Weber**

Max Weber, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*, part III, chap. 6, pp. 650-78.

**VIII. Bureaucracy**

**I: Characteristics of Bureaucracy**

MODERN officialdom functions in the following specific manner:

I. There is the principle of fixed and official jurisdictional areas, which are generally ordered by rules, that is, by laws or administrative regulations.

1. The regular activities required for the purposes of the bureaucratically governed structure are distributed in a fixed way as official duties.

2. The authority to give the commands required for the discharge of these duties is distributed in a stable way and is strictly delimited by rules concerning the coercive means, physical, sacerdotal, or otherwise, which may be placed at the disposal of officials.

3. Methodical provision is made for the regular and continuous fulfillment of these duties and for the execution of the corresponding rights; only persons who have the generally regulated qualifications to serve are employed.

In public and lawful government these three elements constitute 'bureaucratic authority.' In private economic domination, they constitute bureaucratic 'management.' Bureaucracy, thus understood, is fully developed in political and ecclesiastical communities only in the modern state, and, in the private economy, only in the most advanced institutions of capitalism. Permanent and public office authority, with fixed jurisdiction, is not the historical rule but rather the exception. This is so even in large political structures such as those of the ancient Orient, the Germanic and Mongolian empires of conquest, or of many feudal structures of state. In all these cases, the ruler executes the most important measures through personal trustees, table-companions, or court-servants. Their commissions and authority are not precisely delimited and are temporarily called into being for each case.

II. The principles of office hierarchy and of levels of graded authority mean a firmly ordered system of super- and subordination in which there is a supervision of the lower offices by the higher ones. Such a system offers the governed the possibility of appealing the decision of a lower office to its higher authority, in a definitely regulated manner. With the full development of the bureaucratic type, the office hierarchy is monocratically organized. The principle of hierarchical office authority is found in all bureaucratic structures: in state and ecclesiastical structures as well as in large party organizations and private enterprises. It does not matter for the character of bureaucracy whether its authority is called 'private' or 'public.'

When the principle of jurisdictional 'competency' is fully carried through, hierarchical subordination--at least in public office--does not mean that the 'higher' authority is simply authorized to take over the business of the 'lower.' Indeed, the opposite is the rule. Once established and having fulfilled its task, an office tends to continue in existence and be held by another incumbent.

III. The management of the modern office is based upon written documents ('the files'), which are preserved in their original or draught form. There is, therefore, a staff of subaltern officials and scribes of all sorts. The body of officials actively engaged in a 'public' office, along with the respective apparatus of material implements and the files, make up a 'bureau.' In private enterprise, 'the bureau' is often called 'the office.' In principle, the modern organization of the civil service separates the bureau from the private domicile of the official, and, in general, bureaucracy segregates official activity as something distinct from the sphere of private life. Public monies and equipment are divorced from the private

property of the official. This condition is everywhere the product of a long development. Nowadays, it is found in public as well as in private enterprises; in the latter, the principle extends even to the leading entrepreneur. In principle, the executive office is separated from the household, business from private correspondence, and business assets from private fortunes. The more consistently the modern type of business management has been carried through the more are these separations the case. The beginnings of this process are to be found as early as the Middle Ages.

It is the peculiarity of the modern entrepreneur that he conducts himself as the 'first official' of his enterprise, in the very same way in which the ruler of a specifically modern bureaucratic state spoke of himself as 'the first servant' of the state. The idea that the bureau activities of the state are intrinsically different in character from the management of private economic offices is a continental European notion and, by way of contrast, is totally foreign to the American way.

**IV.** Office management, at least all specialized office management-- and such management is distinctly modern--usually presupposes thorough and expert training. This increasingly holds for the modern executive and employee of private enterprises, in the same manner as it holds for the state official.

**V.** When the office is fully developed, official activity demands the full working capacity of the official, irrespective of the fact that his obligatory time in the bureau may be firmly delimited. In the normal case, this is only the product of a long development, in the public as well as in the private office. Formerly, in all cases, the normal state of affairs was reversed: official business was discharged as a secondary activity.

**VI.** The management of the office follows general rules, which are more or less stable, more or less exhaustive, and which can be learned. Knowledge of these rules represents a special technical learning which the officials possess. It involves jurisprudence, or administrative or business management.

The reduction of modern office management to rules is deeply embedded in its very nature. The theory of modern public administration, for instance, assumes that the authority to order certain matters by decree--which has been legally granted to public authorities--does not entitle the bureau to regulate the matter by commands given for each case, but only to regulate the matter abstractly. This stands in extreme contrast to the regulation of all relationships through individual privileges and bestowals of favor, which is absolutely dominant in patrimonialism, at least in so far as such relationships are not fixed by sacred tradition.

\* \* \* \*

The Social Production of Indifference: Exploring the Roots of Western Bureaucracy

Michael Herzfeld

University of Chicago Press, Chicago 1993

2nd ed.

In this fascinating book, Michael Herzfeld argues that 'modern' bureaucratically regulated societies are no more 'rational' or less 'symbolic' than the societies traditionally studied by anthropologists. Drawing primarily on the example of modern Greece and utilizing other European materials, he suggests that we cannot understand national bureaucracies divorced from local-level ideas about chance, personal character, social relationships and responsibility. He points out that both formal regulations and day-to-day bureaucratic practices rely heavily on the symbols and language of the moral boundaries between insiders and outsiders; a ready means of expressing prejudice and of justifying neglect. It therefore happens that societies with proud traditions of generous hospitality may paradoxically produce at the official level some of the most calculated indifference one can find anywhere.

# Attachment B

September 24, 2013

Good evening. My name is Sylvia Barnes, Harvey St  
I would like to thank Vice Mayor Simmons for scheduling this meeting. I also would like to thank  
the City Council members who are concerned enough about this issue to be present tonight: Councilor Simm  
Councilor Reeves, Councilor Van Beurzemom and Councilor Kelley

Several employees would have been present as well but they have told me that they were fearful of retaliation if their managers knew they attended this meeting.

A culture has existed in the City of Cambridge for over 30 years and it is difficult to change it with the same people in place. Mr. Manager, you have been second in command during those years so you can understand why many employees or the public do not believe that it is possible for things to change.

~~First,~~ For employees to file complaints with the Massachusetts Commission Against Discrimination office and to go to court it is not something that should be taken lightly. The City administration and the Personnel department should not label the discrimination complaints as disagreements.

In the Merriam-Webster dictionary:

Disagreement means:

a difference of opinion : an argument caused by people having different opinions about something.

On the other hand,

Discrimination means:

the practice of unfairly treating a person or group of people differently from other people or groups of people

Disagreement and Discrimination do not mean the same thing. If the City Administration believes that an employee has a disagreement with their Manager and that disagreement is ending in court costing the City millions of dollars that alone is a sign that something is not working correctly. It takes guts and money for an employee to go to court and sue an entity like the City of Cambridge who has millions of dollars at its disposal and a Law department staffed with lawyers that can work on discrimination cases during the whole work week. They are currently working on 7 cases? These attorneys should be working on the City's business and not spending their time defending the City in discriminations lawsuits.

I am hopeful that change can come to the City and it is going to take a lot of hard work. The current Council as well as future Councilors have to understand that discrimination in the City of Cambridge is everyone's problem. Especially when the taxpayers are subsidizing that behavior by paying out millions of dollars. In order to eradicate discrimination, you have to admit that it EXIST and not keep denying that it does not. That is not easy for people who have never been discriminated.

I hope that City Manager Rossi keeps his word when he said that he wants everyone to feel that Cambridge is a great place to work. Employees need a sign that you really mean that ! By setting a new tone of respect for all workers no matter what their job title is. They have to see that everyone is giving equal opportunities when it comes to jobs and advancement and not have that go to just the well-connected.

I am looking forward to the day when the City Manager and the City Council agree and work together to truly and honestly state that "**Discrimination of any form will not be tolerated in the City of Cambridge**"!!!

Thank you

SPEECH: CIVIC UNITY MEETING SEPT 24, 2013

Good evening, my Name is Patricia Lewis and I am a life long resident of Cambridge and an employee of the City of Cambridge.

I would like to thank Denise Simmons for continuing to have these meetings and also thank Richard Rossi and the City Council for taking the time to attend these meetings. I really appreciate it.

As we all know we are here to discuss lessons learned from the Melvina Monterio case and how we can prevent this from happening again along with other topics.

I have spoken with some people of color who are employees of the City of Cambridge that feel that they have been discriminated against by their supervisors regarding employment matters, BUT they do not want to come forward to talk about it for fear that they will be retaliated against.

I will briefly tell you about a black female who works for the City who complained to her supervisor (who is Caucasian) about a coworker (who is also Caucasian). She told her supervisor that her coworker was not carrying out his work and giving it to her to do among other things. She met with her supervisor and their supervisor, but nothing was done about it. She went to Affirmative Action and filed a complaint of discrimination, along with some racial remarks that the coworker made like: "I'd rather gouge my eyes out rather than to watch the BET awards".

Around the same time she sent an email to a different supervisor (who is Caucasian) expressing her concerns regarding how she was treating her. After she sent the email to her supervisor, she was accused of "threatening her supervisor". This accusation was not true and the matter disappeared without her receiving disciplinary action.

While Affirmative Action was doing his investigation she went to him and ask: "if I am not satisfied with your investigation can you guarantee me mediation"? He said that he could not say one way or another, but would have to do an investigation first. She went to the City's Human Rights Commission and asked if they would help her to seek mediation and they said that "they would be going against the City" so they could not help her. They told her to go back to Affirmative Action. She then went to her Union Local 25 and asked for mediation and they said that they do not handle discrimination cases. She asked her Shop

Stewart if she could use the Union Lawyer. Her Shop Stewart said that she could have a Union Lawyer, but they would not advise it because that Union Lawyer would be going against the City. So she went back to Affirmative Action who was still investigating along now with personnel because Affirmative Action told her that personnel and their agency work together. She met with them and waited for their findings. They never got back to her regarding their finding of her discrimination complaint.

Her supervisor continued to discriminate against her along with the 2nd supervisor who said that she threatened her. She again met with Affirmative Action and Personnel to discuss the problems. They never concluded their investigation with her nor was she afforded mediation.

She took her claims of discrimination and filed charges against her supervisors with MCAD and EEOC. MCAD even went to the City for her and asked them if they would be interested in having mediation. The City declined MCAD's offer for mediation.

Please keep in mind that prior to her filing for discrimination with Affirmative Action and Personnel, she was an employee of the year recipient, received a promotion and a salary increase all in the same year. She was and is a good employee.

This is a perfect example of an employee of color who brought up charges against her supervisors for discrimination. She went through all agencies asking for help, asking for mediation and never ever receiving either one so she had no choice but to go to MCAD and EEOC.

There are some questions here to be answered. Why does the City not have "mediation" as an option for settling discrimination cases? How many discrimination cases has Affirmative Action settled through mediation? Has there been any discipline action to the supervisors for discriminating? What about the City's Human Rights Commission? How many discrimination cases have they settled from residence of Cambridge who are City workers? Union Local 25? Is it true that they do not handle discrimination cases?

Could you please comment on these questions? If not tonight, maybe someone from these agencies could come at the next meeting and comment.

**CIVIC UNITY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA**

**September 24, 2013 at 6:00 PM**

**“The Civic Unity Committee will conduct a public meeting to continue discussions on lessons learned as it pertains to the Monteiro case and to discuss how to ensure that the City effectively addresses employee grievances and concerns.”**

**I. Public Comment**

**II. Overview Of Conclusions Reached at Last Meeting (Vice Mayor Simmons)**

*The last meeting took place on July 17, 2013*

- Our discussion again touched upon the recognition that it is unacceptable to allow employee grievances to go unaddressed for extended periods of time. It is imperative that the City establish a policy of ensuring that any grievances or concerns must be addressed as soon as possible. There is also a sense that the established avenues for airing grievances may not be entirely effective; it would therefore be beneficial to explore the establishment of some sort of Employee Grievance Panel.
  - Mr. Rossi also stated that he will make a concerted effort to have an open door policy, and he will work to see that no grievances are allowed to go unaddressed for extended periods.
- Multiple participants strongly supported the City establishing a formal system for reporting, tracking, and logging its internal grievances. This will provide us with a better sense of how many grievances are being filed, what types of grievances are being made, how quickly they are addressed, and whether or not they appear to be adequately resolved.
- We recognized that the City Council and the City administrators may be too close to the situation to be the best judges of our own practices, policies, and procedures. We determined that it would be beneficial to hire an outside consultant or organization that specializes in reviewing municipal government practices in order to review our “internal culture,” and to determine whether modifications are required.
- We concluded that it would be beneficial to consider hiring an outside consultant to take a critical and comprehensive review of the City’s methods of addressing and resolving employee grievances. This consultant would be tasked with drafting a report on what must be changed, recommending specific modifications to policy and procedures, and determining how to best implement these changes.
- We also concluded that this will likely be a lengthy process, and we understand that there is no value in merely undergoing a cosmetic exercise of holding one-time training sessions for City employees. If the City is to undertake this process, we must do so in a thoughtful and deliberate manner, in order to make certain that Cambridge offers the best possible work environment to all its employees.

**III. Report Back and Updates From City Manager On Any Progress Made Since Last Meeting**

**IV. Open Floor: Items That Other City Councilors Wish To Discuss...?**

**V. WRAP UP**