

THE FEDERAL EXECUTIVE INSTITUTE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA: AMID EPOCHAL CHANGES & ON-GOING PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION CHALLENGES

Chester A. Newland¹

Abstract

Transformation of high levels of Public Service from exclusive elitism to general inclusiveness, reflecting epochal changes in American society generally, has been the most visibly sustained aspect of development of the Federal Executive Institute (FEI) throughout its 46 years of operations. Two other interrelated frameworks of change dynamics that remain on-going from earlier Public Administration thinking and practices have also been vital Institute concerns: (1) shifts from dominant centralized, hierarchical, silo structures of expert, positivist authority to behavioral theory and practices of Facilitative Governance, including cross-sectoral developments (but with growing reversions in recent decades associated with ideological extremism and partisan politicization); and (2) extension of the field from near-dominant preoccupation with Executive Branch affairs of government to governance broadly in digital-era contexts. The FEI has been impacted importantly by these developments, and it has contributed to them. Therefore, this paper attempts to analyze the development of the FEI within the framework of changes towards general inclusiveness in the American society. It concludes that the digital era, several decades in development, is now established globally as Epochal. New opportunities abound for multiplication of splendid values and reconciliation with them of varied means for their accomplishment. Challenges are great but many can be overcome in the years to come.

Key words: *Federal Executive Institute, elitism, inclusiveness, governance, digital era.*

¹ Chester A. (Chet) Newland is an Emeritus Duggan Distinguished Professor of Public Administration, University of Southern California and 2nd & 4th FEI Director

Epochal Transformation: From Exclusive Elitism to Open Inclusiveness

Upper reaches of civil and military public services were nearly entirely domains of Anglo males from relatively elite educational institutions and politically connected sources when the FEI was created in 1968. It was among the last of President Johnson's aspirations for a Great Society facilitated by *Inclusiveness*. The Institute was also vitally the handiwork of John Macy, both Civil Service Commission (CSC) Chairman and White House Personnel Advisor to the President. He was a *topmost exemplar* of merit-based, professionally expert, *exclusively elite, senior public service*, as broadly understood by most leaders in public administration in the 1950s and 1960s.

That exclusivity prevailed during FEI's first years. The CSC Bureau of Executive Manpower (as it was aptly named at the time) reported only 1.6% females at the Federal Supergrades 16, 17, and 18 levels in 1969; 1.5% in 1971; and 1.9% in 1974. Minority groups executives totaled 2.7% in 1971 (and 3.6% in a Feeder Group) and 4.7% in 1974 (and 5.1% Feeders).

The reality of such white-male exclusiveness was most dramatically illustrated in one of my earliest sessions after I became a FEI faculty member in 1971. Only one woman—*Linda*—was among the 60+ executive participants. And Linda was a total dummy! She was always ostentatiously seated most visibly on the front row at major meetings, and she was invariably professionally attired, quaffed, and unwaveringly attentive. Clearly, Linda was among troubled beginnings of a gender revolution. The all-male executives in that session had acquired Linda—a department-store mannequin—to express the Institute's dismay with the absence of women and minorities in their ranks and to encourage inclusiveness of the sorts aspired to in Great Society ideals.

Both gender and minorities inclusiveness moved slowly not only in FEI's initial years but through its early decades. Despite extensive efforts during my years as FEI's second director (ended in 1976 by the five-year maximum time allowed at the Institute pursuant to its "Temporary Society Culture" enforced by the CSC at the time),

only one FEI session in those years had as many as six women out of around 65 total participants. Anita Alpern, a powerful Treasury Department (IRS) GS 18, and others (especially FEI Alumni Association members) networked extensively in professional organizations and throughout government to bring about changes. However, as late as 1981, when I was asked to return to FEI, again to be a limited-term director for several months to deal with destructive problems, executive occupations were mostly in fields into which few women or minorities had entered prior to the late 1960s. Federal Service fields that accounted for 81.35% of executive occupations in 1981 were: *Administration*, 32.25%; *Engineering*, 14.2%; *Physical Sciences*, 12.9%; *Other Sciences*, 11.2%; and *Legal*, 10.8%.

That privileged elite of professionally expert white males in public services reflected America's centuries of legally enforced and/or condoned racial segregation and exclusion of minorities and females from equal opportunities to learn, enter paying jobs/careers, and advance shared standards and practices in search of human dignity. Lyndon Johnson and other advocates of inclusive culture sought epochal change via such efforts as the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Hart-Celler Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965, and extensive programs of the War on Poverty. Most central to long-term alleviation of poverty were not simply the vital welfare programs instituted and extended in the 1960s and beyond but open job/career opportunities, including in public services, and learning via education, training, and other vocational / professional experience to merit workforce inclusion.

Creation of the FEI was a part of that, essential to changing Federal Executive Service from exclusive to achieve professional merit to inclusive with enhanced standards of professionalism and expertise. Doors were to be opened by such methods as *Affirmative Action*, not meritless tokenism, but through disciplines of individual and shared learning, performance, and earned advancement. LBJ relied upon and sought to advance roles of career civilian and military executives more than any other American President. In Vietnam affairs, he became severely criticized at the time and in history for what many considered wrong-headed dependence on policies and tactics of professional military leaders and their political advocates. Meanwhile, however, doors were deliberately opened in those

years for advancement of minorities and women in military service, with such examples as Army Colonel Juanita Roberts as Johnson's personal White House assistant and Colin Powell's preparation for topmost roles. With respect to civilian executive service, LBJ relied similarly heavily on John Macy to sustain and advance merit, even though Macy and the Civil Service Commission adhered generally to merit by exclusion and reliance on traditional elites. Johnson's aspirations were in partial contrast. He was a graduate of San Marcos State Teachers College with initial experience teaching Spanish-speaking Mexican-American students followed by early life-defining administrative service in FDR's National Youth Authority. He embraced as fundamental merit-based public service, as Macy did, including reasonable reliance on traditionally grounded elites. But he strongly opposed traditional Civil Service Commission exclusion of others and failures to advance affirmative means of inclusion of promising and qualified people from among non-elites, including those of diverse backgrounds and cultures. Hopes were that the FEI would become a force for such development, drawing on and valuing highly diverse talents and experience of executives to advance America as racial, gender, and multi-culturally inclusive.

However, as noted above, traditional exclusionary civil service practices remained hard to change. After all, exclusion of corrupt Spoils and Incompetence had been much of the essence of Civil Service reforms since their roots following the Centennial Era. Advancement was built on cherished ideals of elite public service based on a combination of specialized and generalist careerists in leadership positions. Note the depth of this elitist thinking in an example from early history of the Northern Virginia Branch of the University of Virginia, now the highly regarded George Mason University. Two topmost Public Administration leaders, one in Federal service and the other a most distinguished academician, withdrew from the institution's advisory roles when the faculty first sought to undertake graduate level education for high levels of public service. It was generally considered at the time that only a few elite institutions, including the then-all-male University of Virginia in Charlottesville, Syracuse's Maxwell School, Princeton, Harvard, the University of Southern California, and the likes, should provide graduate education in public administration for topmost Federal civilian service. It was considered desirable for "lesser schools"

to train for such public careers as law enforcement, fire services, public works, and even generalist city management, as at Kansas University (where Elmer Staats graduated before completing doctoral study at the University of Minnesota).

Leading books of the 1960s reflected realities, including merits, of traditional elitism while demonstrating needs for changes. David Stanley's 1964 Brookings study, *The Higher Civil Service*, found that, of those at high-levels studied, "Only one of the 363 present employees and three of the 163 former employees are women" (p. 23). John J. Corson and R. Shale Paul's 1966 Committee for Economic Development (CED) book, *Men Near the Top*, sought answers to questions of how to sustain and increase quality among high Federal Service levels. Among executives highlighted was one woman, the Commissioner of Welfare, Ellen Winston, in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—singularly responsible for many LBJ Era changes, including Medicare. This CED book contributed importantly to thinking in support of creation of the FEI. Forces for such action grew with publication in 1967 of a second Brookings study, *Men Who Govern*, by David T. Stanley, Dean E. Mann, and Jameson W. Doig.

For well over a decade now at the FEI, realities have been of *Women and Men At and Near the Top*. Inclusion of minorities and of foreign-born professionals of expert talents remains more limited than in top levels of business and political leadership. But generally, *public service inclusion has reflected epochal changes in racial and gender roles that have accelerated in the past 25 years, grounded in civic, political, and professional efforts of earlier generations.*

The stand-out exception to changes until recently was strict exclusion of known homosexuals from public services—reflecting social values that remained powerful in much of America until recent decades. President Eisenhower's Executive Order 10450, issued 27 April 1953, excluded "security risks" not only in former political terms but rather stressing character: "Any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, or sexual perversion." While this E.O. did not refer to homosexuality, it was implemented as a suitability test to exclude known gays and lesbians. As Civil

Service Chairman, John Macy wrote to Frank Kameny, an Army Map Service astronomer fired pursuant to the policy: "Homosexuals or sexual perverts are not suitable for Federal employment" (*National Journal*, 25 January 2014, p. 24). As a contrary example to this view, when White House aide Walter Jenkins was forced out due to an alleged homosexual incident, Claudia Taylor (Lady Bird) Johnson had her photograph taken with him and released it publicly. The President followed that with support for Jenkins' private employment in Austin. The Civil Service Commission aggressively continued to pursue exclusion of known homosexuals until the U.S. Supreme Court held the policy unconstitutional in *Norton v. Macy* (1969) and in *Society for Individual Rights, Inc. v. Hampton* (1973). Comprehensive inclusionary policy finally came with the appointment by President Obama of John Berry, a prominently out homosexual, as Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Director. Exclusionary policies continued in military services, with "Don't Ask; Don't Tell" prescribed during the Clinton Administration. However, in the Obama Administration, following broad changes in social acceptance, openly out gays and lesbians were finally accepted in the military.

America's epochal transformation from a White Supremacist and otherwise exclusionary society into a broadly inclusive one since President Truman's racial integration of military services and vast changes in laws in the 1950s and 1960s has been topmost among FEI's contexts. *The Institute was created to facilitate varied and shared capacities of public executives for behavioral and other leadership to deal with such challenges.* Enduring and changing inclusiveness obstacles remain ever-challenging, along with other contexts that require executives to balance needs for stability and vital changes. In short, confounding problems of Temporary Society that were understood in FEI's founding remain ever-present in dynamic constitutional democracy. Public executives must be among foremost facilitators of diverse and shared governance for society's multiplication of constructive values and varied talents and means to their accomplishment. Beyond the epochal American transformation to inclusiveness, these competencies involve two other defining sets of American changes related to FEI experience, each briefly noted next.

FEI in Changing Contexts: Hierarchical Positivism and Facilitative Governance

Decades before FEI's creation, at least since realities learned during and soon after World War Two, American Public Administration had transitioned from singular domination by hierarchical positivism to embrace of rapidly expanding knowledge from behavioral sciences. Among leading studies was the topmost 1960 book by John M. Pfiffner and Frank P. Sherwood, *Administrative Organization*. It examined cutting-edge developments in theories and practices during the period of FEI's creation. The authors' Preface could serve as a powerful framework of the Institute as a creative engine of changing contexts of American Federal Government and of public administration globally:

"Studies of administrative organization tend to cluster at one or the other of two poles. At one end is the traditional framework of job content, job structure, and job relationships—the mechanistic, engineering approach to the problem. At the other end is the human behavioral orientation, in which the sociologists, psychologists, and anthropologists have been most prominent. As a result there has been a need for introductory materials which seek a middle ground between these two contrasting extremes. To provide such materials is the essential purpose of this book." (p. v)

As FEI's inaugural director, Frank Sherwood creatively facilitated a shared search for informed middle ground, recognizing that diversely experienced, highly placed Federal Executives have widely varied talents and much expertise to bring to endeavors. Borrowing from Malcolm Knowles's advocacy of Andragogy befitting adult learning rather than Pedagogy oriented to children, efforts were to create a diverse community of shared and varied learning.

My initial FEI experience highlighted that vital context. As both an in-and-out government executive, civic activist, and itinerate university faculty member prior to arriving in Charlottesville, I had always identified my role as a *teacher*. Other Institute faculty members immediately informed me that, at FEI, I was not to be identified as a teacher but as a *facilitator*. Since I had grown up in Kansas and completed military service mostly in Texas—places

where a facilitator was a behavioral expert who helped bulls and heifers in their sometimes challenging intricacies of procreation—that instruction initially raised professional doubts and troubling questions about my expected FEI roles. But I quickly caught on and embraced FEI's innovative language and effective practices of shared and diverse learning and varied applications. They were, after all, basically like my earlier roles as a teacher in exceedingly dynamic U.S. Air Force and university contexts, but with vastly deeper and broader embrace at FEI of human behavioral factors. From previous work with topmost officials and career executives, I had long understood that my roles (as teacher or facilitator) consisted of helping individuals, groups, organizations, and society generally to achieve constructive successes via self and shared talents and other diverse resources.

Particularly important subsequently in the 1970s and into the 1990s, understanding of Facilitative Government and Governance more broadly that was strengthened at FEI was vital in my professional responsibilities. Facilitative State theory and practice became central, for example, in challenging international development activities. Especially in Polish Solidarity Movement involvements and other efforts leading to and following the collapse of the Soviet Union, facilitative competencies were crucial. Facilitative Governance became a redefining framework throughout over two decades in United Nations efforts in Central and Eastern Europe, Central Asia, and in bits in the Middle East.

These theories and practices were three-fold: (1) Civil Societies, stressing responsible self-governance and diversity/multiculturalism; (2) Global & Local Market Economics and Facilitative Regulation and Support to limit Market Failures, stressing open markets as in European Union and NAFTA and workable regime institutions, such as reserve banks and anti-trust efforts; and (3) Facilitative Governments and Cross-Sectoral Governance (emphasizing constitutional limits and authority; devolution and situational differentiation; and extensive public, private, and personal self-governance).

Importantly, human-behavior dynamics and facilitative-culture disciplines, as advanced earlier by the FEI and vastly expanded upon internationally, also became important in American public administration generally (Newland). However, throughout

the Carter and Reagan Administrations in American National Government, public administration became extensively populated in universities by “free-market” economists and in politics and government by libertarian thought, as at OPM. Market concerns of Facilitative Governance became infused with *laissez faire* doctrine, depicting Government as “the Problem,” as President Reagan said at his inauguration. In international public policies, this was most crucial in International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) insistence on privatization of enterprise throughout former USSR zones in the absence of Rule of Law institutions in support of responsible private enterprise. New Public Management (NPM) became a trendy movement in public administration, advocating a new dichotomy of policy (via partisan political officials) and management (via “Limited Term” responders). The UN Development Programme, with which I was often involved, and the EU’s Technical Assistance (TACIS) program generally resisted such NPM ideology. But in America, such institutions as the University of Chicago, Carnegie Mellon University, the University of Southern California and the U.S. OMB and OPM were joined by vastly more leaders in its trendy embrace.

With respect to how all of this relates to FEI, consider the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, chiefly the creation of Alan (Scotty) Campbell, the Economist Dean of the distinguished Maxwell School of Syracuse University who was Carter’s appointee as Civil Service Commission Chairman and subsequent Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Director. Campbell believed in Economic Man, one of two most crucial theories implemented by the CSRA. Performance, it is *believed*, is driven most basically by self interests (and, therefore, financial bonuses / “merit pay”) more than by public service values. Thus, if so, working for government is primarily a job for personal gain. The second most basic CSRA provision is Presidential Executive Branch Domination of Federal Government (and, subsequently, responsiveness to enlarged partisan politicization) that became especially enlarged in the Reagan Administration under OPM Direction of Dr. Donald Devine.

Laissez faire regimes justified as Facilitative Government and Dispersed Governance translated into contracting out imperatives. Under guises of civil service personnel reductions as cut-back

government despite vastly expanded budgets in many situations, throw-backs to mechanical, engineering modes of outsourced performance have characterized some important procurements. Realities stretch far beyond such negatives, however. Outsourcing was old, long preceding OMB's A-76 that originated on such practices during the LBJ Administration. With changed government and private-sector roles and conditions from the 1960s forward, however, it vastly expanded and is now a principal way of organizational being in private for-profit enterprises, non-profit activities, universities, governments—almost whatever and wherever.

Contemporary Contexts: Outsourced Government; Disaggregation & Conjunction

Coincident with epochal **Digital Era Sciences and Technologies** and accompanying perpetual-motion rhythms of social, economic, and political complexities, for-profit and non-profit enterprises are now commonly empowered as preferred performers of government-provided functions. Government agencies, such as OPM, that share in provision of legally required or sanctioned functions, increasingly appear as *non-directly-appropriated-fund cost centers* in an “every tub must float financially on its own bottom world.” That is similar to old practices in many universities and other contracts-supported research institutions that contain varied money-earning activities within separated silos while centrally skimming shared overhead (often large, some doubling “service” charges). With growing imperatives for collaborative efforts among formerly distinctively specialized and separated disciplines, this old “divide and conquer” organizational funding style of centralized control from the top is no longer suited to many highly advanced research and development institutions, whether universities, for-profit businesses, or governmental organizations. However, silos and skimmed funding to support centralized domination persist, along with outsourced performance of functions.

Consider the outsourcing example of the FEIAA 2014 Executive Forum, scheduled for 20 May. The opening speaker will be John Kamensky, Associate Partner with IBM's Global Business Services and Senior Fellow of the IBM Center for the Business of Government, following his 24 years of public service. Since 2005, he has been among the most involved and impactful Fellows of the

National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA). For many more years, he has been active in the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA). The afternoon Keynote Speaker at this year's Forum will be Warren Blank, the Founder and President of *The Leadership Group*, a private training and development firm out of North Carolina and Florida, and a regular Adjunct Professor for many years at FEI. Realities are that such expertise appears difficult (or nearly impossible) to sustain within today's Federal Civil Service, although it can be encouraged and nourished, as by the FEI. Also among realities, such external expertise may displace internal organizational competencies for dynamic creativity and accomplishment.

Outsourcing similarly characterizes vastly more of the Executive Branch of the U.S. Federal Government. Among the most widely known examples today is the extensive contracting out to for-profit private enterprise of national security performance, as by Edward Snowden, employed 2009-2013 by Del, Inc., a privately owned multinational computer technology company based in Round Rock, Texas. While Snowden is now notorious as a secret-documents leaker and the NSA has failed miserably in keeping public trust, the long history of dispersed responsibility for performance of vital governmental functions earlier earned mostly sustained respect. Recall, for example, the *Manhattan Project* in nuclear energy developments during World War Two that relied around 95% on outsourcing. Remember also how the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) similarly earned popular and political support and scientific / technical acclaim while drawing on universities and mostly for-profit business enterprises for well over 90% of performance.

Conjunction of public and private responsibility, as in the Manhattan Project and NASA examples, is essential in challenging affairs of advanced civilization. **Authority** to match such shared responsibility—often awesome—is an enduring challenge of constitutionally democratic and responsible private-enterprise culture.

That essential match has been found in important measures historically through exercise of professionally disciplined, highly diverse, and shared expertise functioning in balance with responsible

social, economic, political, and legal-systems institutions. Those were realities behind successes of the Manhattan Project and NASA: Career Executive Service included the likes of Donald Stone, Jim Webb, Elmer Staats, and Dwight Ink, working topmost in **Nexus** with responsible political officials in Congress and the Executive Branch. Early FEI participants in eight-week sessions included Charles Bingman (FEIAA Founder from Session One) and Anita Alpern (IRS GS18) as well as some presidentially appointed officials, including George Hartzog (Park Service Director) and Georgiana Sheldon (DOD and CSC Commissioner). Joe Bartlett (Marine General and GOP Clerk to the House) was among a few Congressional staff executives, and he remained active for years in support of career / political and Congressional / Executive Branch connectedness through FEIAA and the Institute. While some such matches of Public Service careerists and political officials survive, they are no longer the Federal Government standard. Disastrous consequences include far more than the Snowden Affair. Consider the astonishingly defective roll out of the Affordable Care Act, relying for essential digital technologies on private, for-profit business enterprise—a significant part based outside the United States.

Today's divisively partisan politics nationally and globally impacted business enterprise, lacking shared ethical and legal grounding, make workable matches of shared responsibility and commensurate authority—the historic ideal of Public Administration—illusory at best. However, the search for such responsible accomplishment remains essential to American society. And precisely due to troubling changes in conditions since FEI's founding 46 years ago, the Institute needs to remain in the struggle. Especially through the FEIAA, it does. Thankfully, it has participated increasingly effectively in **America's epochal transformation to an inclusionary culture from earlier centuries-long exclusionary practices.**

Ways and means of contributing to solutions of today's other great challenges warrant understanding and informed participation by Federal Executives. And FEI can continue vital contributions in these, even though some promising executive-workforce conditions that were a blessing when the Institute was created are now absent. If skeptical, remember that today's great blessing of *Inclusive*

Public Service was absent during FEI's early years—and **We did Overcome!**

Two sets of enduring understandings among effective public officials and career executives remain vital among many workable ways and means of public-service effectiveness. These are well understood by topmost contemporary thinkers, fashionably termed **Disaggregation** and **Conjunction** in today's Digital Era. But they have been situationally practiced together by most highly effective careerists and political officials throughout dynamic advances in Business and Public Administration. Basically, these are twin practices analyzed as Differentiation and Integration by Harvard Business Professors Paul R. Lawrence and Jay W. Lorsch in Contingency Theory that prevailed when FEI began operations. It was not new then. Situational performance was explained by Mary Parker Follett in the 1920s and practiced by Chester Barnard in the 1930s. It was of the essence of the Manhattan Project and NASA's Moon Walk and other accomplishments. Lyndon Johnson was a political genius in understanding and employing these contingency means and ends as Senate Majority Leader and as President. Donna Shalala, HHS Secretary throughout the Clinton Presidency juggled responsibilities in sustained nexus with careerists and politicians, drawing on deep understanding of how to disaggregate challenging complexities for differentiated handling by specialized expertise and energies. She then called upon diverse experts with twin knowledge and skills to integrate findings and forces for accomplishment.

Disaggregation / Differentiation has been most deeply researched and thoughtfully analyzed in recent years by Anne Marie Slaughter, Princeton University Distinguished Professor and former Woodrow Wilson School Dean and also Foreign Policy Deputy in the U.S. Department of State during the first years of the Obama Administration. In her 2004 Book, *A New World Order*, Slaughter explained realities of decades and even centuries of advances in globally shared Rule of Law by disaggregation of sovereignty into such diverse elements as Law of the Sea, International Postal Service, etc. matched with development of workably differentiated institutions. In short, these are ways and means to get needed work done internationally, recognizing that a generally comprehensive Rule of Law is beyond valued differences among varied cultures

globally. Federal career executives and political officials need to understand and employ such understandings domestically as well for shared accomplishment of many vital responsibilities.

Conjunction/Integration has been most succinctly analyzed recently by H. George Frederickson, Kansas University's Distinguished Stene Professor of Public Administration. He focuses on metropolitan local-government realities of jurisdictions distinctly separated by laws and politics but in vital need of shared infrastructures and many conjoined operations. By election and/or appointment, local government officials remain bound within their separate jurisdictions, but successes depend on getting needed work done collaboratively irrespective of borders. This understanding is vital in Federal service as well. Connectedness is increasingly imperative not only among agencies and intergovernmentally but among public and private entities cross-sectorally. Failures among security providers to "get it together" outside their silo walls were revealed in the 911 World Trade Center, Pentagon, and hostage plane terrorism over Pennsylvania. Continued deficiencies in needed integration are due in significant part to vital importance of differentiation. Balancing those requirements—matching disaggregation for multiplication of constructive values and specialized expertise with conjunction for collaborative accomplishment—remains at the heart of responsible political and career public service.

Concluding Reflections: Reconciling Ideals and Realities

Transformation to *generally inclusive Federal Civilian and Military Services* from extensive racial, gender, and other exclusions has been FEI's biggest contextual change in the 46 years since its creation. Epochal changes in American culture and institutions, of which these Public Service developments have been key parts, should dispel or at least moderate skepticism and provide inspiration for other needed advances. Struggles remain between mechanistic and centralized positivism and behaviorally informed facilitative governance and diverse creativity as organizational frameworks. These struggles have intensified following increased extremism in politics, religions, entertainment, and individual and group self-indulgences. Even ossification of extremes appears in packaged prescriptions in education and training conferences and institutional

venues, drawing on glitzy digital technologies to inculcate trendy formulations as “executive learning.”

Reconciling ideals and realities discussed above has almost always been challenging—including in creation, survival, and developments of FEI. During my first period as Director, 1973–1976, forced changes included formal elimination of the Institute’s impressively outstanding Advisory Board, chaired by universally respected Roger W. Jones, 43+ year Federal official with moderate GOP credentials, including service as Deputy Secretary of State, Deputy OMB Director, and CSC Chairman. The GAO’s Elmer Staats was also among advisors who provided splendid insights. Congressional action requiring detailed reporting of virtually all aspects of utilization of such advisory bodies was applied government-wide, making their use impractical.

Also highly disappointing during that period, extensive University of Virginia efforts to provide a permanent FEI facility on its grounds failed, despite thoughtfully expert collaboration in planning by the University’s Chief Architect and FEI Deputy Director Pat Conklin and FEI Administrative Officer Mike Carmichael’s informed liaison with both CSC and UVA. The CSC insisted on having a large parcel of UVA land for development of a much larger, general training operation with the Institute merged within it. Also upsetting, though more understandable given perspectives of Client Agencies to which I personally went to “sell shares” to attend programs, the FEI was compelled to reduce its principal Sessions from 8 to 4 weeks. While CSC Chairman Bob Hampton sought vigorously to protect “academic freedoms” of the Institute, bureaucratic entanglements and dependencies were ever-present, as was typical in my experience elsewhere in government and universities.

My second service as FEI Director was understood topmost at OPM to be probably limited to 15 to 18 months of struggle for the Institute’s survival. The reserve-fund surplus of a bit over \$730,000 when I departed four-years earlier had evaporated, and a deficiency of over \$1 million (Big Money back then) in the revolving fund was due to legally questionable CSC uses for personnel investigations requirements. A public scandal would have done no good; professional correction might. Most urgently, the FEI facility was

about to be placed in escrow to be sold to General Electric. Despite earlier termination of FEI's Advisory Board, Roger W. Jones took the lead and we contacted GE's CEO, Reginald H. Jones, who stopped the purchase. The facility owner was understandably dismayed. He wanted to get rid of FEI and sell the place or, at the least, find profitable alternatives. Serious threats included efforts to relocate the Institute, including a proposal by North Carolina's Senator Robert Morgan to move it to Rocky Mount, NC, then an isolated town with limited access. New York's U.S. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, with whom I had been a bit involved in study of Federal Labor-Management Relations (EO 10988) and in archival development of the LBJ Presidential Library in the 1960s, had become Chair of Senate Public Works. He took the lead with Virginia's Senator John Warner and Congressman Kenneth Robinson, Charlottesville's 5th District Representative, to scuttle that. Following my meeting with Congressman Levitas' House Public Works staffer, Nancy Vitali, and other House experts on 24 June 1980, Pat Moynihan briefly convened Senator Childs's Appropriations staffer, Mike Hall, and others, including one other OPM executive and me, on 25 June 1980 to demonstrate support for FEI to continue operations in Charlottesville. In celebration, the FEI soon got two bushels of apples delivered personally by the Congressman from the Robinson Family's orchards. North Carolina Senator Morgan lost reelection.

It was already clear by late Summer 1980 that President Carter could not be reelected and that Ronald Reagan would become President. That facilitated professional networking with Reagan's transition leaders, Ed Meese and others, both before and following the November 1980 election. For strictly limited part time, I scheduled myself to assist Ed Meese at the Presidential Transition Headquarters on M Street and then at the EOP, not in my role as FEI Director but as incoming ASPA National President and as a NAPA Fellow serving officially on the Academy's Presidential Transition Panel. Ralph Bledsoe, a Senior FEI Faculty Member, 1973-1980, joined Dwight Ink, Chuck Bingman, and me in those efforts. Ralph had earlier served as Director of the University of Southern California's Sacramento Center, where was involved with Governor Reagan and Ed Meese. As the Presidential Transition developed, Ralph was selected to become Secretary to the highly important Reagan Cabinet Council on Domestic Affairs.

Appointment of Don Devine as OPM Director could not be prevented, and he was sworn in on 23 March 1981. OPM scheduled his Director's Reception on April Fool's Day, and I participated. Most importantly for FEI, Loretta Cornelius, a prominent professional of a respected Virginia political / GOP family and a USC Public Administration doctoral student, was appointed Deputy OPM Director with specified authority for all FEI oversight. Ed Meese arranged that. Meanwhile, throughout this troubled period, FEI's outstanding administrative staff and full-time professional faculty and expert adjuncts (mostly distinguished UVA resident faculty members) kept the Institute on course. A vital aspect of that blessing was that Bob Matson was splendidly prepared to become the Director, relatively free to devote his high expertise to substantive executive-development programming.

That experience is summarized in conclusion here to emphasize that one should not be naive about challenges of Reconciling Ideals and Realities. Troubles sometimes abound. Contexts change. Situations can commonly be altered. Sometimes not! Today, the American political parties and elections system is seriously fractured if not dangerously broken, as U.S. Senator Bill Bradley concluded as early as the 1980s. The Great Recession from 2008 to whenever continues to be reflected in damaging joblessness and in growing extremes separating *Haves and Have Nots*. Remains of NPM ideology continue to be powerful in some Public Administration venues and politics.

Yet, the **Digital Era**, several decades in development, is now established globally as Epochal. New opportunities abound for multiplication of splendid values and reconciliation with them of varied means for their accomplishment. Challenges are great but many can be overcome, as in the Epochal Transformation to Inclusiveness that has redefined America. **These are promisingly challenging times for FEI. When have they not been?**

References

- Corson, John S., and Shale Paul, *Men Near the Top* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, Copyright by the Committee for Economic Development, 1966).
- Frederickson, H. George, "The Repositioning of American Public Administration," *PS: Political Science & Politics*, (December 1999), pp. 701-711.
- Kirchick, James, and Timothy Naftali, "The Arc: From Frank Kameny to John Berry, a half century of change in what it means to be gay in government service,": *The National Journal*, Vol. 46, No. 3-4 (25 January 2014), pp. 24-26.
- Knowles, Malcom S., *The Modern Practice of Adult Education* (New York: Association Press, 1970).
- Lawrence, Paul R., and Jay W. Lorsch, "Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol. 12, No. 1 (June 1967), pp. 1-47.
- Newland, Chester A., "Politics of Transition from the Administrative to a Facilitate State," in James P. Pfiffner and Douglas A. Brooks, eds., *The Future of Merit* (Washington: The Woodrow Wilson Center Press; and Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000).
- Newland, Chester A, "The Facilitative State, Political Executive Aggrandizement, and Public Service Challenges," *Administration & Society*, vol. 34, no. 4 (September 2003), pp. 379-407.
- Newland, Chester A, "Facilitative Governance Organizations and Networks: Disaggregated & Offloaded Government and Aggregated Response to Onloaded Stress," *Public Administration Review*, vol. 66, no. 3 (May/June 2006), pp. 470-473.
- Pfiffner, John M. and Frank P. Sherwood, *Administrative Behavior* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1960).
- Sherwood, Frank P., *The Early Years of the Federal Executive Institute, Theory, History, and Reflections* (New York and Bloomington: iUniverse, Inc, 2010).
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie, *New World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).
- Stanley, David, *The Higher Civil Service* (Washington: Brookings, 1964).
- Stanley, David, Dean E. Mann, and Jameson W. Doig, *Men Who Govern* (Washington: Brookings, 1967).