

## Exploring Bureaucracy and identifying a Bushy alternative in Do-ocracy

### BMARP5: Link 5 in the Bush Mechanic Action Research Program

#### List of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Historically speaking .....	3
Dick (2005):.....	3
Arendt (1963):.....	3
Myself (2006): .....	3
Overview:.....	3
Defining criteria for classifying bureaucracy - prose .....	4
Criteria of a bureaucracy - itemised.....	6
(2) Hierarchy with.....	6
(3) Regimentation .....	6
(4) Sharply defined ‘lines/channels of control and communications’ .....	6
(5) Operationalisation .....	6
(6) By rules and regulations travelling downwards .....	6
(7) Outcome is compliance and obeisance.....	6
(8) No lateral; no interface communication between silos; no responsibility taken for the need for this, thus .....	7
(9) Thinking (policy) and doing (operations) completely separated .....	7
(10) Categorically enforced specialisations and division of labour.....	7
(11) Novelty seen as failure/loss of central control and designed out.....	7
(12) Little or no innovation.....	7
(13) Power is positional .....	7
(14) Control is quasi-judicially .....	7
(15) Control is punitive and manifest through ‘power over’ controlling agency in a non discursive ‘power with’ manner via:.....	7
(16) Elite excluded.....	8
(17) And bureaucracy becomes tacit.....	8
(18) Very clear boundaries.....	8
(19) The Minister as the customer of the bureaucracy rather than the citizen.....	8
(20) Not Thought Of Previously (NTOp).....	8
Comparing Bureaucracy, the Bushie and Do-ocracy to these 20 criteria .....	9
Power and Bureaucracy .....	10
Bureaucracy and (it’s centrally planned) Interface.....	10
Recent examples of bureaucracy using criteria 8 to justify the “‘its not my job’ to help others” position .....	11

Verdict Erebus .....	11
Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody.....	11
Queensland Health Department .....	11
Justice astray .....	12
Politics abjure.....	12
Bushocracy and other key alternatives to Bureaucracy .....	12
Bushocracy - the Bushy Localist Do-ocracy with strong subsidiarity as a modern equivalent of Isocracy and thus an alternative to Bureaucracy.....	13
Reapplying the criteria by classifying bureaucracies to restructure them .....	14
References.....	15

**List of Tables**

Table 1: Degree of Bureaucracy Matrix .....	9
Table 2: Degree of De-Bureaucracy Matrix .....	14

Paul Wildman (prepared in conjunction with discussions in the Brisbane hot futures group 2005-6)  
[paul@kalgrove.com](mailto:paul@kalgrove.com)  
V 9 20-01-06 comm. 28-06-05  
4500words

## Introduction

In this cumulative article we look to define and delineate this thing called ‘bureaucracy’, and to explore its dead weight on social innovation and finally to identify some alternatives there to. I then seek to determine how ‘bushy’ friendly these alternatives are. This is necessary in our search for a deeper meaning of Bush Mechanic because although the bushy is highly technical (s)he is not bureaucratic. We see this modernist symbiosis of the ‘technocratic’ most developed for instance in the military, health and education areas. In the bush mechanic arena however this is not the case - they are in effect living proof that one can be technical and not bureaucratic.

Please note also here that we differentiate between hierarchy (all around us for instance in nature with its nested fractal systems) and bureaucracy - hierarchy+ regimentation with power over.

## Historically speaking

### ***Dick (2005):***

Puts the origins of bureaucracy some 10,000yrs BCE with the advent of agriculture and the surplus it could provide and thus the generation of a sedentary society that needed admin to operate.

### ***Arendt (1963):***

Places the time that thinking and doing were separated (the classic descriptor of bureaucracy) at around 2500yrs BCE

### ***Myself (2006):***

I place the time that bureaucracy entered the collective western psyche at 2000 yrs BCE. Consider the Roman foot soldier’s salary stayed the same for 300 years at 30 denarii per year (but the soldier got a lot older).

### ***Overview:***

My take on all this is that:

**1. Certainly by 2000yrsBCE bureaucracy had overtaken Democracy (Greek 2300yrsBCE) and Democracy had overtaken Isonomy<sup>1</sup> by 2500yrs BCE**

---

<sup>1</sup> Isonomy is a **form of mutual aid** society with pre-emptive recognition of equal rights represents a society of equals who are deliberative citizens not under any rule rather self-rule so that integrity and artisanship are predominant cp. consumerism and technician-ship. Isonomy possibly separates power and law in that the former comes from mutuality and the latter from personal integrity, whereas anarchy seems to draw both from a common source of rejecting rule by/constituted authority. [Democracy may be seen as the degraded form of isonomy]

In isonomy laws are not seen as rules, black letter law, commands or imposed standards requiring compliance [imposed from below, the side or above or God]. Montesquieu important to both the French and American revolutions does not speak of laws thus but rather as *that which relates*. So that human law is not that which rules or governs but that which relates – establishes the polis – human-to-human – law as relatio. Arendt (1963:302) i.e. the law as mutual social compact given individually in

had over taken Isonomy which existed in Greece for about 100 years. **Indeed one finds no mention of democracy in the bible or Koran - yet it had been around for over half a millennia - proof indeed even then of the slow progress of social innovation.**

2. The Roman Decurion is as Foucault (1979) says the basis for social administration still education, prisons, military and health. In Roman times intriguingly the title had two applications one military (an officer in command of 10 troops) and civil (an appointed citizen member of a local council)
3. At this time bureaucracy moved from administration to control in the sense of demonstrating its military might against say remnants of the matriarchal pre ice age civilisations. For instance without bureaucracy indigenous tribes in Australia could muster at maximum 2000 in the field in the Kimberley's in the mid 1850's where as the Romans could muster 500,000 men for battle some 2000 yrs BCE
4. Bureaucracy became a meme at least 2000yrs BCE
5. Bureaucracy suits stable simplex environments where cause and effect are linear sequential and predictable – fractal geometry, chaos theory and associated living environments are thanos (death loving) to the efficacy of bureaucracy
6. So bureaucracy is, in certain conditions, absolutely brilliant and THE best way of operating

## Defining criteria for classifying bureaucracy - prose

Classic bureaucracy is a tool/algorithm for social organisation in a simplex environment by reinscribing the status quo and may be defined as (1) an algorithm that comprises a (2) hierarchy with (3) regimentation (which is not the same as discipline yet the two are often conflated) based on (4) sharply defined 'lines/channels of control and communications'. Traditionally these lines are vital in the (5) operationalisation (separation of admin and policy) of the bureaucracy with participation being maintained (6) by the algorithm of rules and regulations travelling downwards while (7) outcome is compliance and obeisance in terms of (a) following the lines of communication or (b) form filling inc. category/box compliance inc. strategic planning and 'missioning' etc., tax or infringement payments travel upwards.<sup>2</sup> There is upon pain of punitive<sup>3</sup> discipline (8) no

---

relatio in the sight of ones compadres not in the sight of god (which is the consent form of social contract) but man. Arendt (1963: 171)

<sup>2</sup> For instance Mahatir (then the PM) in Malaysia used this element of bureaucracy brilliantly i.e. each official form has a box to fill in called 'race' he then controls the definition of 'race' and ascribes differing rewards, pass marks etc. to the various responses so that bumiputras (indigenous Malays) get lower pass marks, interest rates on housing etc. In Germany or Rwanda it was the race recorded on ones passport that meant death or life.

<sup>3</sup> Includes direct and indirect coercive means whereby power over is ruthlessly demonstrated often in the guise of beneficent concern. Examples include (1) 'we had to destroy the village to save it' US generals statement in the Vietnam war, (2) as intimidating private chats, (3) bullying (private humiliating and offensive communications), (4) loyalty inversion, (5) maintaining a dirt file on you and, (6) 'throwing the book at you' to find a regulation(s) you may have breached in the past x years, (7) 'sending in the cleaners' having various reviews of the efficiency of your section/Division again to find a mistake in the past x years, (8) in spite of public claims of 'our staff are our most valuable resource' non communication with you when 'the dirty deed is being, or has been done' (such as (9) having a new org chart drawn up without your name or position on it and so on and on, (10) all the

lateral or interface communication or responsibility. Thus (9) thinking (policy) and doing (operations) are irrevocably separated – the greatest schism of modernity is continued.

Thus (10) categorically enforced specialisations and division of labour vertically and horizontally abound. Meaning communication is basically one way – down and not lateral. We have all heard of the complaint/justification/duty statement that ‘one Department does not know what the other is doing’ or ‘**its not my job**’ (to dodge lateral responsibility), and ‘**I wasn’t told**’ (to dodge management responsibility) this is a pre-eminent characteristic, (11) nor is there any novel ‘discovery’ information/innovation other than that requested on feedback and strategic planning forms, travelling upwards, and thus (12) little or no innovation unless top down and often ‘restructuring’ (is seen as innovation).

Furthermore (13) power is power over not power with i.e. positional cp. relational and (14) control is quasi-judicially precedent focused as stipulated in policy (15) (a) overwhelmingly directed at controlling agency or individual people not structures, and is (15) (b) punitive with rewards seen as the absence thereof [pinching folk for what we did wrong yesterday not rewarding us for what we will do right tomorrow], and enforced through 15 (c) non discursive either | or compliance <sup>4</sup>(e.g. either your for me or against me – President Bush re. Iraq) however (16) generally the elite are not bound by the bureaucratic rules they create for underlings; (17) tacit bureaucracy<sup>5</sup> are the memes behind the ostensible ‘teams’, social innovations, even the way the ‘requisite’ articles

---

while the HRD department is frothing out missives on mission, challenges ahead and messages from the CEO.

Many of these have a legitimate side, so as ever it is ‘shades of grey’ and ‘horses for courses’; however bureaucracies being non-transparent, based on power-over while ruthlessly reshaping individual agency into compliance are, some would argue, purpose built for processes such as bullying.

Workplaces will always have individual instances of bullying what this footnote seeks to show is that bureaucracies have a structural predilection to such behaviour and in many ways themselves in modern democracy they themselves can be seen as a form of (intentional subcutaneous) structural bullying.

<sup>4</sup> This is Aristotle’s theory of the excluded middle wherein A cannot be not A in that if there are two sets represented by overlapping circles (circle A and circle B , then any overlap (e.g. in the middle when the two are slid towards one another) of the circles is simultaneously A and not A – either [and] not either A |or| B. Compliance can be seen here is non discursive that is it is not subject to rational discourse/discussion, is operationalised through the justice system which itself is punitive and steeped in the theory of the excluded middle e.g. guilty |or| innocent in this sense compliance becomes submission

<sup>5</sup> Email Exchange - (PW 30-06-05) Gotcha - a sort of tacit tacit bureaucracy behind conscious teams design Ciao paul (Bob Dick 29-06-05) Hello comrade. You write ...(PW 29-06-05) I am interested in your view of what I call the anchor structures or tacit holonic memes in that for instance I have experienced teams as you describe yet they were always anchored in a bureaucratic system and it would break through any time it choose - there was this sort of shimmering holon which we all lived in that pervaded all our space yet at times eg for teams we pretended it was not, or actually were not conscious that it was, there the teams embedded in the broader social holon of bureaucracy (PW)  
Yes, I think that's the point. Beyond a certain size we don't know how to build non-bureaucratic organisations. So we graft teams on to what is still an essentially bureaucratic structure. Until we devise different structures this will be a problem, I reckon. We carry too many bureaucratic memes in the form of unreasoned beliefs. So we invest power in the bureaucracy more than in the teams. Understandably, and as you've noticed, the bureaucracy then keeps intervening, reinventing itself and undermining our best hopes for change

voluntary community associations are written etc.. All this results in (18) very clear non permeable boundaries between inside and outside i.e. 'the other' (19) the customer is the minister/head of the bureaucracy/corpor'n'ation e.g. the customer of the health Department is the Health Minister<sup>6</sup>, and finally (20) Not Thought Of Previously (NTOP).

## **Criteria of a bureaucracy - itemised**

Classic bureaucracy is a tool/algorithm for social organisation in a simplex environment by reinscribing the status quo and may be defined as:

### **(1) An algorithm**

That is based on classic Newtonian concepts of a linear mathematical relationship cause effect and control and comprises a

### **(2) Hierarchy with**

### **(3) Regimentation**

Which, is not the same as discipline yet the two are often conflated, based on

### **(4) Sharply defined 'lines/channels of control and communications'**

Sharply defined 'lines/channels of control and communications', traditionally these lines are vital in the

### **(5) Operationalisation**

Through the separation of admin and policy sections in the bureaucracy with participation being maintained,

### **(6) By rules and regulations travelling downwards**

By the algorithm of rules and regulations travelling downwards while,

### **(7) Outcome is compliance and obeisance**

In terms of:

(a) Following the lines of communication or

(b) Form filling inc. category/box compliance inc. strategic planning and 'missioning' etc., tax or infringement payments travel upwards. There is upon pain of punitive discipline, with

---

<sup>6</sup> I was present as Director of a Division of the Employment and Training Department in 1992 when this happened to this particular Department – as an outworking of a cabinet all of government decision. Management meetings when from a vague resemblance of discussion about various issues on a relatively non-hierarchical basis to noting the Ministers itinerary and ensuring there were grants for him to hand out on the way. This change was parallel globalisation and happened in short period of a month. The we went from bring public servants to ministerial adjuncts. Clearly now the minister could 'let it be known' that when he was travelling to place (electorate?) y he wanted a grant to hand out. An audit would show nothing amiss here.

**(8) No lateral; no interface communication between silos; no responsibility taken for the need for this, thus**

No lateral or interface communication or responsibility taken for co-ordination/symbiosis between department silos. Yet in a complex/fractal environment this is absolutely essential - vertically and horizontally. Thus,

**(9) Thinking (policy) and doing (operations) completely separated**

Thinking (policy) and doing (operations) are irrevocably separated – the greatest schism of modernity is continued and entrenched,

**(10) Categorically enforced specialisations and division of labour**

Consequently categorically enforced specialisations and division of labour vertically and horizontally abound. Meaning communication is basically one way – down and not lateral. We have all heard of the complaint/justification/duty statement that ‘one Department does not know what the other is doing’ or ‘**its not my job**’ (to dodge lateral responsibility and to enforce the either | or division), and ‘**I wasn’t told**’ (to dodge management responsibility) this is a pre-eminent characteristic,

**(11) Novelty seen as failure/loss of central control and designed out**

Nor is there any novel ‘discovery’ information/innovation other than that requested on feedback and strategic planning forms, travelling upwards, and thus

**(12) Little or no innovation**

Little or no innovation unless top down and often ‘restructuring’ (is seen as innovation). Furthermore

**(13) Power is positional**

That is power over not power with i.e. positional cp. relational and

**(14) Control is quasi-judicially**

Control is quasi-judicially precedent focused as stipulated in policy thus

**(15) Control is punitive and manifest through ‘power over’ controlling agency in a non discursive ‘power with’ manner via.:**

(a) Overwhelmingly directed at power over - **controlling agency** viz. individual people rather than establishing facilitative structures, and is

(b) **Punitive** with rewards seen as the absence thereof [pinching folk for what we did wrong yesterday not rewarding us for what we will do right tomorrow], and enforced through

(c) **Non discursive** either | or compliance (e.g. either your for me or against me – President Bush re. Iraq) however

**(16) Elite excluded**

The elite are not bound by the bureaucratic rules they create for underlings;

**(17) And bureaucracy becomes tacit**

Tacit bureaucracy are the memes behind the ostensible 'teams', social innovations, even the way/lens the 'requisite' articles voluntary community associations are written etc.. All this results in

**(18) Very clear boundaries**

Very clear non permeable boundaries between inside and outside i.e. 'the other'. Thus little or no multi-skilling

**(19) The Minister as the customer of the bureaucracy rather than the citizen**

The customer is, in the Westminster model, the Minister/head of the bureaucracy/corpor'n'ation e.g. the customer of the health Department is the Health Minister, and finally

**(20) Not Thought Of Previously (NTOP).**



# Comparing Bureaucracy, the Bushie and Do-ocracy to these 20 criteria

In the following section we assess the bush mechanic in accordance with these 20 criteria. In this regard please see Table (1) below.

**Table 1: Degree of Bureaucracy Matrix**

Criteria	Rec-fish1	Govt Dept2	Hot f3	Bushie	Do-ocracy
1. Environment assumed – simplex, complicated, complex, chaotic/incoherent	✓	✓	x	x	x
2. Hierarchy	✓	✓	x	x	✓
3. Regimentation	✓ (1/2)	✓	x	x	xx
4. Channels	✓	✓	x	x	x
5. Ops (admin & policy) separated	✓	✓	x	x	xx
6. Algorithm = Rules, regs & punish ↓	x	✓	✓ (1/2)	x	xxx
7. Outcome compliance ↓ not service → or product info ↑	✓	✓	x	x	xx
7. a) lines of communication					
7. b) forms to fill in	x	✓	x	x	x
8. No lateral communication/interface 'its not my job' or 'I wasn't told' or 'either   or'	✓	✓	xx	x	xx
9. Thinking   Doing	✓	✓	✓ (1/2)	xx	xxx
10. Vert & Horiz division of Labour	✓	✓	x	xx	x
11. No search for novelty/innovation	✓	✓	xx	x	xxx
12. Only innovation is top down often 'restructuring'	✓	✓	x	x	x
13. Power over not power with	✓	✓	x	✓ (1/2) (power over task)	x
14. Control is quasi judicial compliance and:	x	✓	x	x	xx
15. Control is	x	x	0 (yet for liberation)	✓	✓
15. a) people's agency not structure focused					
15. b) punitive inc. bullying, coercive (overt & covert)	x	✓	x	x	x
15. c) non discursive either   or compliance	✓	✓	x	x	x
16. These controls not binding on elite	x	✓	x	x	x
17. Tacit bureaucracy a lens for solutions	✓	✓✓	xx	✓ (1/2) maybe by default	x
18. Clear boundaries	✓	✓	x	x	x
19. 'The' customer is ↑ i.e. the minister not the people ↓ or →	✓ (1/2) jumble	✓✓	x	x	x
20. NTOP					
Total	16 ✓; 6x	23 ✓; 1x	02 ✓; 22x	02 ✓; 21x	02 ✓; 31x

**Source:** P Wildman (2005) 1 Recfish a recreational fishing NGO - name obscured, 2 A Government Department I had worked in for some 15 years till the mid 1990's, 2 Hot Futures a citizens discussion group which have met ever fortnight since 2001. fStrength of coding ✓ - double, (single) full and half & x full X and half x so there are six strengths. \* State Employment and Training Dept mid 90's. \*\* shed usually simplex yet recognised operating environment for the exemplar project is complicated [20 Macro criteria comprising a total of 23 criteria overall]

**Scores:** the aim is NOT to score 0, indeed in a mimetically bureaucratic society, such as ours, this would be a recipe for death as chaos would prevent any innovation - one would need another taxonomy for a 'creative' artificer social organisation (this is beyond the scope of this paper), simultaneously the aim is NOT to score 20 or more as this is also death from complete periodicity. The aim is to minimise the score while retaining spectral reserve i.e. flexibility in diversity: Remember to operate as humans we need structure, categories and boundaries yet Structure ≠ bureaucracy though it is one form of structure. Scores: 3-6 incipient bureaucracy; 6-9 mild bureaucracy; 10-13 typical bureaucracy; 14-17 heavy bureaucracy, 18+ thantos (Gestapo type) bureaucracy.

## **Power and Bureaucracy**

Power then is codified by control, unquestioning upwards, loyalty to 'management' and as we explore below policing of interface and sine interface at the ground of base layer officer level is proscribed interface becomes one dimension of power over in that to communicate across departments one has first to go up to senior management then across then down to ones counterpart officer.

For instance it is reported that in many military organisations for instance Japan's during the Second World War – orders were not explained to subordinates, officers did not discuss anything with their men – only issue orders which had to be obeyed to the letter. Unit did not communicate or interface with unit other than in order to implement the order from above. In this way through compliance in the classic bureaucratic sense the Japanese senior command had very little information on the success of its strategies or for that matter the usefulness of its weapons.

## **Bureaucracy and (it's centrally planned) Interface**

In a planning sense the central planner issues tasks which then organises and regulates interface. And it's not the job of 'operatives' to make lateral connections or concerns or to voice them in short interface doesn't matter. Well this may have worked for the inventors of bureaucracy the Romans when the task was straight forward e.g. take that town and the people to do it were under your direct control and the technology of war and social conditions were relatively stable. Around the 3<sup>rd</sup> CBC a Roman foot soldiers salary stayed the same for 300 years at 30 denarii per year (but the soldier got a lot older). Nowadays the world does not stay stable for 30 days let alone 30 years, as with the motto of the armed forces 'ours not to reason why ours but to do (as told from above) and die.'

Yet it is this lateral linking at ground level that is so much part of and serious efficacious action in complex and complicated environments such as every day life and, if I may say, the 'ordinary' lived life of a citizen. Ground level of the ordinary citizen is where the policies of the elite policy planners outwork themselves.

## **Recent examples of bureaucracy using criteria 8 to justify the “its not my job’ to help others” position**

I still find the following situations intriguing in terms of how can perfectly competent, well meaning individuals fail so comprehensively to think let alone act laterally.

### ***Verdict Erebus***

(1) 1979 – **Aviation** - Erebus here Background reading for the RCADIC paper. The results of a Royal Commission into the crash of Air New Zealand's DC-10 flight (TE 910) into Mt Erebus in the Antarctic - on the 27th November 1979 - killing all 257 on board. Mahon (1985). In the ensuing Royal Commission no one not even the royal commissioner himself thought that hey the pilot should have been looking for big rocky things pointing up. The pilot was following co-ordinates coded into the flight controller and the plane was on auto pilot. It's just that the co-ordinates were changed before the flight took off, by ground control without telling the pilot. In short the pilot if he were alive today could well have said '**it wasn't my job** to (a) check the co-ordinates or (b) to look out for big rocky things pointing up with the latter would have to be the most classic case of interface I can imagine. And bureaucratically speaking he would be right'.

### ***Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody***

(2) 1989 - ADIC – **Aboriginal Deaths In Custody** – it was found that one reason for the deaths was not overt violence on the part of the arresting officers but rather that the interface between the arrested indigenous person and the jail cell were never considered. Almost without exception the 'crimes' were and are basic offences i.e. alcohol abuse and related violence. Interface both interface-cultural i.e. withdrawal from the community in this sense was simply horrific and outside tribal systems of justice as well as interface-logistical i.e. hanging points within cells. The key recommendations of this \$500m Royal Commission involved mandating interface i.e. cameras in jail cells, 24 hr suicide watch, videoing interviews etc. all this to address the bureaucratically correct view that it **wasn't the job** of prison officers expressly to watch for people hanging themselves or places where they could.

### ***Queensland Health Department***

(3) 01to07-2006 – **Health** - In Queensland in a provincial coastal hospital over several years to early 2005 upwards of 100 people were killed by a particularly incompetent doctor. In the subsequent Royal Commission it turns out that many workers were seeking interface horizontally and vertically to warn of the murderous activities of the particular doctor however they were ridiculed and told to go and do their job i.e. comply or they would 'suffer' the consequences. In one particularly outstanding instance a senior medical officer when asked why he had not alerted authorities of the deaths said '**it was not my job**'. Note he knew of the deaths and was expressed concern therefore but it was not his job!!

## ***Justice astray***

(4) 2004/5 – **Justice** - Ms. Di. Fingleton – The Queensland chief magistrate who was jailed for seeking to influence a witness when she sought to discipline a subordinate magistrate over supporting a colleague who was appealing against her (Fingleton's) decision to transfer her to the Mt. Isa circuit as arguably there was and is a shortage of professionals e.g. magistrates, doctors, solicitors etc. in the bush. The chief justice of Queensland when interviewed about the immunity indicated that he was aware of this but **did not consider it his job** to inform the trial judge in this regard. Admittedly he later 'modified' his story to be he did not consider the immunity from prosecution for Judges and Magistrates to apply in this case.

## ***Politics abjure***

(5) 07-2005 – **Politics** - The Premier of Queensland indicated that the combination of major blunders by various departments eg Justice, Main Roads (laying a dangerously slippery type of bitumen), and Health was an instance of the Departments failing their ministers. He added somewhat belated and secondarily 'and the people of Queensland'. Consequently the purpose of bureaucracies is to serve the people at the top not the citizens at the bottom. People's, indeed innocent citizens, deaths did not disturb him primarily; it was the failure of the bureaucracies to serve their ministers that disturbed him. He expressed an intention to expect more from the Departments. So he is in effect arguing that it is **not his job** nor his ministers but the bureaucracies to serve the people of Queensland.

## **Bushocracy and other key alternatives to Bureaucracy**

The following are some parameters and options for re-designing collectives to be non bureaucratic:

1. Self managed mutual-aid citizen groups coming together without using majoritarian democracy e.g. sociocratically <http://www.sociocratie.nl/>
2. Open and transparent communication based on FOI
3. Extensive ethics of citizenship training for everyone
4. Respect for Agency
5. Respect for Structure
6. Respect for balance between Agency and Structure
7. Reduction of the working week to 30 hrs to allow each citizen to have one day for this citizen deliberation
8. Demarchy el ar Burnehim (1985) - demarchy is a functional not spatial system of self help governance - a combination of democracy and anarchy for governance functions
9. Localist<sup>7</sup> Do-ocracy<sup>8</sup> with subsidiarity<sup>9</sup> in short Bushocracy

---

<sup>7</sup> **Localism** describes a range of political philosophies which prioritise the [local](#). Generally they support local production and consumption of goods, local control of government, and local culture and identity. Localist politics have been approached from many directions by different groups. Nevertheless, localism can generally be described as related to [Regionalism](#), and in opposition to [Centralism](#). It is primarily a [rural](#) movement

<sup>8</sup> Many volunteer communities also run as **Do-ocracies** without any ties to the Libertarian party or politics. In Free and Open Source Software projects in particular the phrase "talk is silver, code is gold" is used as a simple way to describe a Do-Ocracy. The phrase means that while discussion of features or

## ***Bushocracy - the Bushy Localist Do-ocracy with strong subsidiarity as a modern equivalent of Isocracy and thus an alternative to Bureaucracy***

The Do-ocracy approach employs an underlying dynamic of acceptance of all inputs aimed directly at outcome and everyone being equally subject to the guidelines to facilitate this; more accurately, a reliance on mutual co-operative effort to get things done, and they have to be made in this light. I consider it a manifestation of feminist leadership which may well relate to women's inherent ways of relating to each other.

The Do-ocracy requires a commitment to communication; valuing the inputs of others a strong enthusiasm for implementation and wherein the implementers of the approach cannot come from a standpoint of authority, but rather of commonality. In this sense in some regards the **do-ocracy may be regarded as the 21<sup>st</sup> century version of Isonomy**. So a Do-ocracy values the implementation of the action plan as prime and those inputs directly related to this are valued over 'talk' or head knowledge V's hand knowledge.

The Do-ocracy also requires an ability to integrate horizontally across 'silos' between components of separately nested systems. This is a psycho-cybernetic soft systems approach to social organisation.

This then is the bushy alternative to bureaucracy.

---

bugs or ideas in the project is useful, actually implementing the talk is far more important. The practice is also fairly common whenever volunteers are working towards a project together.

The lack of a formal command structure or compensation for the work means that each person works on what interests them creating a format of a Do-ocratic (exemplar) project. Although deriving from a materialist philosophy with emphasis on the instrumental rather than the substantive - the Do-ocrats argue that too much time is wasted in bureaucratic and legalistic red tape wrangling and not enough time is spent in actually 'doing' anything worthwhile so that here is the link to the substantive e.g. the artificers global problematique.

Wikipedia could be seen in some ways as an isocracy.

<sup>9</sup> **Subsidiarity** is the principle which states that matters ought to be handled by the smallest (or, the lowest) competent authority. The [Oxford English Dictionary](#) defines subsidiarity as the idea that a central authority should have a subsidiary function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level. The concept is applicable in the fields of government, political science, cybernetics and management. Subsidiarity is, ideally or in principle, one of the features of federalism.

The principle of subsidiarity holds that government should undertake only those initiatives which exceed the capacity of individuals or private groups acting independently. The principle is based upon the autonomy and dignity of the human individual, and holds that all other forms of society, from the family to the state and the international order, should be in the service of the human person.

Subsidiarity assumes that these human persons are by their nature social beings, and emphasizes the importance of small and intermediate-sized communities or institutions, like the family, the church, and voluntary associations, as mediating structures which empower individual action and link the individual to society as a whole. "Positive subsidiarity", which is the ethical imperative for communal, institutional or governmental action to create the social conditions necessary to the full development of the individual, such as the right to work, decent housing, health care, etc., is another important aspect of the subsidiarity principle.

## Reapplying the criteria by classifying bureaucracies to restructure them

**Table 2: Degree of De-Bureaucracy Matrix**

Criteria	Govt Dept*	Bushie	Reconstructed Criteria	HotF	Do-ocracy
1. Environment assumed – simplex, complicated, complex, chaotic/incoherent	√ (simplex)	0**	Complicated	√	√
2. Hierarchy	√	x	OK in sense of holon/sociocracy	√	√
3. Regimentation	√	x	Co-ordination of semi-autonomous teams (12 max per team)	0	√
4. Channels	√	x	Channel options two way & lateral	√	√
5. Ops (admin & policy) separated	√	x	Action Learning & staff rotation to link	√	√
6. Algorithm = Rules, regs & punish ↓	√	x	Heuristic (one size does not fit all)	√	√
7. Outcome compliance ↓ not service → or product info ↑ (a) lines of communic (b) forms	√ 6(a), 6(b)	x	Service to customer and master-lease type form (fill out once)	x	√
8. Mechanical systems design principle - No lateral communic/interface 'its not my job' or 'I wasn't told'	√	x	Soft systems psycho-cybernetic design principle - matrix management to facilitate lateral links	√	√
9. Thinking   Doing	√	xx	Action Learning sets to link	√	√
10. Vert & Horiz division of Labour	√	xx	Rotational matrix/task forces	√	√
11. No search for novelty/innov	√	x	CIP – Corporate Innovations Policy	√	√√
12. Only innov is top down often 'restructuring'	√	x	Skunk works	√	√√
13. Power over not power with	√	x	Power with	√√	√
14. Control is quasi judicial and:	√	x	Control is intentional & entelechyic	√	√
15 a) people's agency not structure focused	√	x	Agency liberated within context of respect for commonalities e.g. collectively developed rules/ethics	√√	√
15 b) punitive inc. bullying, coercive (overt & covert)	√	x	Transparency, openness & info flow	√	√√√
16. These controls not binding on elite	√	x	Binding – walk their talk	√	√
17. Tacit bureaucracy a lens for solutions	√√	√ (1/2) maybe by default	Regular reflections to see if this is developing & extirpate	√	√
18. Clear boundaries	√	x	Semi permeable boundaries	√	√
19. 'The' customer is ↑ i.e. the minister not the people ↓ or →	√√	x	The customer is who pays (has the says)	√	√
20. NTOP			NTOP local		
Total	22 √; 0x	01 √; 20x		20 √; 0lx	20 √; 00x

**Source:** P Wildman (2005) Strength of coding √ - double, (single) full and half & x full X and half x so there are six strengths. \* State Employment and Training Dept mid 90's. \*\* shed usually simplex yet recognised operating environment for the exemplar project is complicated

**Scores:** the aim is NOT to score 0, indeed in a mimetically bureaucratic society this would be a recipe for death, simultaneously the aim is NOT to score 20 as this is also death from complete periodicity. The aim is to minimise the score while retaining spectral reserve i.e. flexibility in diversity: Remember to operate as humans we need structure, categories and boundaries yet Structure ≠ bureaucracy though it is one form of structure.

3-6 incipient bureaucracy; 6-9 mild bureaucracy; 10-13 typical bureaucracy; 14-17 heavy bureaucracy, 18+ thantos bureaucracy

### Observations:

It is possible to design soft cybernetic systems [Beer (1973-74)] such as do-ocracy to redress many of the weaknesses of bureaucracy.

## References

Arendt, H. (1963). *On Revolution*. London: Penguin. 350 pgs.

Beer, S. (1973). *Fanfare for Effective Freedom: Cybernetic Praxis in Government*. Brighton Polytechnic: Brighton. p. 24pgs.

Beer, S. (1974). *Designing Freedom*. London: John Wiley & Sons. 100pgs.

Burnheim, J. (1985). *Is Democracy Possible? An alternative to electoral politics*. 1985, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Dick, B. (2005). *Whatever happened to bureaucracy? And why does it matter?* in *Industrial and Organisational Psychology Conference*. Marriott Resort - Gold Coast - Queensland: 30-06-2005 to 03-07-2005: Interchange Press.

Dick, B. (2003). *Whatever Happened to Bureaucracy? Why we have moved to team structures, why they often don't work, why we can't go back, and what we can about it*. Brisbane: Interchange. 80pgs.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and Punishment: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books. 333.