Reflections on Public Administration

John Merriman Gaus

REFLECTIONS ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

REFLECTIONS ON PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

JOHN MERRIMAN GAUS
Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALABAMA PRESS
Tuscaloosa

First paperback printing 2006

∞
The paper on which this book is printed meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Science—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Gaus, John M. (John Merriman), 1894–1969.
Reflections on public administration / John Merriman Gaus. — 1st pbk. printing.
p. cm.
Originally published in 1947.
Includes index.
ISBN-13: 978-0-8173-5418-3 (pbk. : alk. paper)
ISBN-10: 0-8173-5418-2
1. Public administration. I. Title.
JF1351.G312 2006
351—dc22

2006012160

PREFACE

THE FIRST FIVE CHAPTERS OF THIS BOOK ARE BASED upon lectures which I delivered in the Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration at the University of Alabama during the week of November 26-December 1, 1945. One of the lectures was given at a dinner meeting of the Alabama Chapter of the American Society for Public Administration held in Montgomery, but with the members of the Training Program present also.

My week at the University of Alabama was a most happy one. Dr. Roscoe Martin and his colleagues of the University and especially of the Bureau of Public Administration, the fellows in the program, and the members of the Alabama Chapter all gave me a most generous welcome and quickly made me feel a colleague in their activities; and I had great personal stimulus from seeing at first hand the outstanding work which is being done in public administration in the region, and the challenging problems which have been attacked. I wish to record here my sincere appreciation for one of the finest experiences which I have ever had.

JOHN M. GAUS

University of Wisconsin
June, 1946

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. THE ECOLOGY OF GOVERNMENT 1

2. POLITICS AND ADMINISTRATION 20

3. THE PROCESSES OF POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION 38

4. DEVOLUTION AND FEDERATION 62

5. THE PURPOSES AND PROCEDURES OF CONTROL 93

6. A THEORY OF THE PROCESSES OF GOVERNMENT: DIAGNOSIS, POLICY, AND REVISION 124

INDEX 150

1

THE ECOLOGY OF GOVERNMENT

YOU WHO ARE APPRENTICES IN THE STUDY OF public administration share with me who am older the task of trying to understand the new conditions in our field. Within a single generation, two world wars and a major depression have engulfed mankind. Within the past few months, the successful trial of the atomic bomb has opened the minds of the thoughtful to new possibilities, threats and coercions, and the defeat of Germany and Japan has abruptly presented the problems of peacemaking and reconstruction to war-weary masses of people. They seek release from their tragedies, deprivations and tensions, often in ways that defeat efforts to understand and attack the problems that confront them. To make progress in such a time, we must recruit widely and work as a guild, young and old together, to achieve a co-operative and cumulative effort whether in academic or governmental posts.

It is useful for us to start with the fact of criticism of the public service at a time when it has been so widely extended. The attack is not new. It was well diagnosed by Felix Frankfurter in a lecture which he delivered in 1930 at Yale University. He noted that then, too, the attack accompanied an

expanding reliance upon the thing attacked. "The paradox of both distrusting and burdening government reveals the lack of a conscious philosophy of politics. It betrays some unresolved inner conflict about the interaction of government and society. I suspect that it implies an uncritical continuance of past assumptions about government and society. We have not adjusted our thinking about government to the overwhelming facts of modern life, and so carry over old mental habits, traditional schoolbook platitudes and campaign slogans as to the role, the purposes and the methods of government."[1]

Unresolved inner conflicts, as I have already suggested, too often spill over into ugly social conflicts, too often supply materials for use by the greedy, the irresponsible, the perverted, the rabble-rousers, who pile up future trouble for us all when the opiates of hatred and fanaticism wear off. The abuse accompanying the use of government is therefore worth our examination beyond the benefits we may gain from a knowledge of the errors of government; such an examination may give us light on the wider and deeper problem of man in society, of human relations generally. But for our present purposes, it warns us that the study of public administration must begin with some explanation of why people

[1] Felix Frankfurter, *The Public and Its Government*, The William E. Dodge Lectures on Citizenship, delivered at Yale in May, 1930 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930), p. 170.

burden themselves with something which many of them, at least, resent.

One finds at once that there is a dearth of such inquiries, although reference to and description of the expansion of the functions of government are numerous. They are rarely brought to some conclusion, or interpretation, which conveys fresh insight, or points to fruitful cumulative studies which ultimately may be woven into a widely accepted culture. Too often a generalization about the industrial revolution or the passing of the frontier is made to do duty for more modest but ultimately more detailed and unassailable deductions from intensely analyzed bits of experience.

The effort to relate government functions to the environment is necessary, and the recognition of its validity by various observers and scholars confirms one's own effort. In the same lecture from which I have already quoted, Professor Frankfurter (as he then was) asserts, "Before we can consider the aptness of political ideas or the adequacy of political machinery, the relevance of past experience or the promise of new proposals, we must be fully alive to what might be called the raw material of politics—the nature and extent of the demands made upon the machinery of government, and the environment in which it moves." A. V. Dicey, in search for the causes of the current which he discerned in English policy in the nineteenth century as a movement from laissez-faire to collectivism, suggested that one

explanation is "the existence of patent facts which impress upon ordinary Englishmen the Interdependence of Private and Public Interest."[2] Elihu Root, in his address of acceptance of his election to the United States Senate by the New York State Legislature remarked that "The intimate connection between the people of every locality and of every other state, largely brought about by the increase of communication, the passing to and fro of the trains upon our great railroads, the telegraph and the telephone, the extension of business which knows no state lines, the substitution of great national centers of business for the old state centers of business, the development of commercial and manufacturing and social life along national lines, has forced upon the National Government the performance of a great variety of duties which formerly were performed by the states within the limits of their comparatively isolated communities. . . . This is not a matter of what we wish or what we do not wish; it is not a matter of political program or platform, it is a plain fact to be seen by any one and a fact to be considered."[3]

You will have noted the use by these analysts of government, differing in background and outlook,

[2] A. V. Dicey, *Lectures on the Relation Between Law and Public Opinion in England During the Nineteenth Century*, (2nd ed.; London: Macmillan & Co., 1917), Preface to the Second Edition, p. 53.

[3] Elihu Root, *Addresses on Government and Citizenship*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916), p. 250. (Address of January 28, 1909).

of such terms as "the nature and extent of the demands made upon the machinery of government," "the existence of patent facts," "has forced upon the national Government the performance of a great variety of duties" and "it is a plain fact." In their several ways, these observers are reminding us that there is an explanation of the functions of government in the changes which take place in its environment, changes which coerce us into the use of government as an instrument of public housekeeping and adjustment. It is not enough to look upon government as an instrument of spoils, whether of an economic class or party or factional machine, although it may at any time and place serve such purposes. But there may also be environmental changes so extensive as to require and obtain a response that is public rather than private. It is at this point of analysis that the Frankfurter lecture and the series of lectures by John Dewey published under the title *The Public and Its Problems*[4] become so valuable to the student of public administration. He needs these efforts to explain and make intelligible the confusing shifts in the use of government; he can benefit from these searches for an explanation of the meaning of "public;" and he needs to assimilate and develop his own working ideas of this basic question of functions in order to

[4] (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1927. Reprinted, with a new introduction by the author; Chicago: Gateway Books, 1946).

clarify for busy citizens what is happening. Unless the causes of public administration are clearer to them, they will lack standards to measure and control the resulting costs in taxation and the regulation of conduct. Indifference, cynicism, and at one extreme a kind of nihilism (which characterized one phase of the Nazi technique in German politics) will prevail; and at another extreme, sheer pressure, plunder and racketeering, a spoils system limited only by bankruptcy.

Hence the study of public administration must include its ecology. "Ecology," states the Webster Dictionary, "is the mutual relations, collectively, between organisms and their environment." J. W. Bews points out that "the word itself is derived from the Greek *oikos,* a house or home, the same root word as occurs in economy and economics. Economics is a subject with which ecology has much in common, but ecology is much wider. It deals with all the inter-relationships of living organisms and their environment."[5] Some social scientists have been returning to the use of the term, chiefly employed by the biologist and botanist, especially under the stimulus of studies of anthropologists, sociologists, and pioneers who defy easy classification, such as the late Sir Patrick Geddes in Britain. In the lecture of Frankfurter's already quoted, the linkage between physical area, population, transport and government

[5] J. W. Bews, *Human Ecology* (London: Oxford University Press, 1935), p. 1.

is concretely indicated. More recently, Charles A. Beard formulated some axioms of government in which environmental change is linked with resulting public administration. "I present," he stated, "for what it is worth, and may prove to be worth, the following bill of axioms or aphorisms on public administration, as fitting this important occasion.

"1. The continuous and fairly efficient discharge of certain functions by government, central and local, is a necessary condition for the existence of any great society.

"2. As a society becomes more complicated, as its division of labor ramifies more widely, as its commerce extends, as technology takes the place of handicrafts and local self-sufficiency, the functions of government increase in number and in their vital relationships to the fortunes of society and individuals.

"3. Any government in such a complicated society, consequently any such society itself, is strong in proportion to its capacity to administer the functions that are brought into being.

"4. Legislation respecting these functions, difficult as it is, is relatively easy as compared with the enforcement of legislation, that is, the effective discharge of these functions in their most minute ramifications and for the public welfare.

"5. When a form of government, such as ours, provides for legal changes, by the process of discussion and open decision, to fit social changes, then effective and wise administration becomes the central prerequisite for the per-

durance of government and society—to use a metaphor, becomes a foundation of government as a going concern.

"6. Unless the members of an administrative system are drawn from various classes and regions, unless careers are open in it to talents, unless the way is prepared by an appropriate scheme of general education, unless public officials are subjected to internal and external criticism of a constructive nature, then the public personnel will become a bureaucracy dangerous to society and to popular government.

"7. Unless, as David Lilienthal has recently pointed out in an address on the Tennessee Valley Authority, an administrative system is so constructed and operated as to keep alive local and individual responsibilities, it is likely to destroy the basic well-springs of activity, hope, and enthusiasm necessary to popular government and to the following of a democratic civilization."[6]

An ecological approach to public administration builds, then, quite literally from the ground up; from the elements of a place—soils, climate, location, for example—to the people who live there—their

[6] Charles A. Beard, "Administration, A Foundation of Government", *American Political Science Review,* XXXIV, No. 2 (April, 1940), 232. This was an address before the joint meeting of the American Political Science Association and the then newly-founded American Society for Public Administration.

numbers and ages and knowledge, and the ways of physical and social technology by which from the place and in relationships with one another, they get their living. It is within this setting that their instruments and practices of public housekeeping should be studied so that they may better understand what they are doing, and appraise reasonably how they are doing it. Such an approach is of particular interest to us as students seeking to co-operate in our studies; for it invites—indeed is dependent upon—careful observation by many people in different environments of the roots of government functions, civic attitudes, and operating problems.

With no claim to originality, therefore, and indeed with every emphasis on the collaborative nature of the task, I put before you a list of the factors which I have found useful as explaining the ebb and flow of the functions of government. They are: people, place, physical technology, social technology, wishes and ideas, catastrophe, and personality. I have over many years built up a kind of flexible textbook in a collection of clippings, articles and books illustrative of each, as any one can do for himself. Such illustrations of the "raw material of politics" and hence administration are in themselves the raw material of a science of administration, of that part of the science which describes and interprets why particular activities are undertaken through government and the problems of policy,

organization and management generally that result from such origins.[7]

By illustrating concretely the relation of these environmental factors, a co-operative testing of the theory will be facilitated. The changes in the distribution of the people of a governmental unit by time, age and place throw light on the origins of public policy and administration. At our first census we were a people 80 per cent of whom lived on farms; at our last census, one hundred and fifty years later, 80 per cent of us did not live on farms. Over a third are now living in a relatively few metropolitan areas; but the growth of these areas is not in the core or mother city; it is in the surrounding suburbs, separate political entities, frequently also separate economic-status and cultural entities, yet sharing with the mother city, which is often absolutely declining in population, the public housekeeping problems of a metropolitan organism for which no—or no adequate—political organization exists. Our population is increasingly one with a larger proportion distributed among the older age classes. These raw facts—too little known and appreciated by citizens, which should be at once

[7] The methods as well as the substantive interpretations of Frederick Jackson Turner should be familiar to students of public administration so far as the printed page permits. It was a rich experience to be present as he worked over maps and statistical data of a county, state or region, putting geology, soils, land values, origins of residents, and voting records together for light on the resulting social action.

placed before them in discussing many of our public questions—in themselves explain much about our functions of government. Coupled with factors of place and technology, they clarify many an issue that is usually expressed in sterile conflicts. For example, the old people in the more frequent large family on a farm of a century ago, where more goods and services were provided on the farm, had a function still to perform and a more meaningful place in the lives of younger generations of the family. In a more pecuniary economy, separated from the family-subsistence economy, ignored in the allocation of the work and rewards of an industrial society, the demand for pensions became irresistible.

The movement of people (by characteristic age and income groups) from the mother city to suburbs (as guided by factors of time-space and cost in the journey to work, the dispersal of shopping centers, the search of industry for land space for straight-line production facilitated by paved roads, trucks and distribution of power by wires, and other technological changes, and changes in what we wish for in residential environment) produces its repercussion in the values of land and buildings, in the tax basis for public services already existent in older areas and demanded in the new, in the differential requirements and capacities-to-pay of people for housing (including the site and neighborhood equipment) and in the adjustment of transport and utility

requirements for the ever-changing metropolitan organism.

Thus the factors of people and place are inextricably interwoven. And not merely in crowded urban centers. I have watched the same process of change in sparsely settled areas of farm and forest, and its potent effect on government.

Where there are extensive cut-over areas in the Lake States, where the older farm lands of New England or New York are no longer profitable to agriculture and reforestation is too recent to yield timber crops, in the Great Plains where lands best suited to grazing and with limited rainfall have been subjected to the plough, in the cut-over and eroded lands of the Southern Piedmont, or in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania, physical conditions—the exhaustion of the resource which originally brought settlement—have produced a chain of institutional consequences. Land values and tax payments decline, tax delinquent land reverts to county or state, public schools, roads and other services can no longer be locally financed. Immediate relief through state financial aids or state administered services in turn are inadequate when widespread catastrophic economic depression undermines state revenues. Efforts aimed at restoring a source of production, such as encouragement of cropping timber through favoring taxation or the building up of public forests adequate for permanent wood-using industries, or the restoration of soil, will require a long period of time for

efficacy, and equally require an atmosphere in which political leadership, the careful integration of national, state, local, and individual and corporate policies, and skilled technical personnel can be established and supported steadily. Such an atmosphere, however, is not likely to be present among the frustrate population of such areas, or the better-provided populations of other areas called upon to tax themselves for local units of government in areas which they have never seen or whose problems they do not understand. Thus changes in place, or the use of the resources and products of a place, are coercive in their effect upon public administration.[8]

My own generation has had a great lesson in the importance of change in physical technology in witnessing the adoption of the automobile and the role it has come to play. It may be noted that its widespread use was made possible by the development of paved highways provided necessarily as a public service. Highway expansion and design have been affected by the coercion of political forces created by the physical invention. Groups of automobile users, manufacturers, hotel proprietors, road builders, road machinery and materials suppliers, persons seeking jobs in highway construction and administration

[8] A reverse picture is the sudden demand on the use of ores in the Adirondack region during the world war because of changes in the conditions of ocean shipment. In one remote village a public housing project, to take care of the expanded work force, was a consequence, again, of the catastrophe of war.

and many others, have contended with those using horses, carriage and harness makers and persons opposed to the increased taxation that paved roads would require. The original causes—a combination of physical inventions such as the internal combustion engine and the vulcanization of rubber—get obscured in the ultimate disputes over taxation, jurisdiction, requirement of liability insurance and examination for drivers' licenses, or over the merits or defects of systems of traffic control or the financing of overhead crossings or express highways. The citizen blames "bureaucrats" and "politicians" because the basic ecological causes have not been clarified for him. This process of public function adoption may also be reversed by other changes—as we see, for example, in the abandonment of many publicly financed and constructed canals, when new technologies of transport rendered them obsolete.

Changes in physical technology, however slowly their institutional influences may spread, are more obvious even to the point of being dramatic, to the citizen. But he sometimes forgets the importance of the invention of social institutions or devices, and their continuing influences which coerce us. Thus the pooling and application of the savings of many through the invention of the corporation has set new forces to ripple through the social order, disarranging human relationships and creating new possibilities of large scale enterprise financially capable of utilizing extensive equipment and personnel and creating

new relationships between buyer and seller, employer and employee—from which coercions for a new balance of forces, through consumer, labor and investor standards, have resulted.

You will have noted how interrelated all of these factors are in their operation. Perhaps the subtlest one is that for which I have difficulty in finding a satisfactory term. I have used the words "wishes and ideas." What you don't know, it is said, won't hurt you. I wonder whether this is true. If you do know that some new drug, or method of treatment of disease, will prevent the illness or perhaps death of those dear to you, you will have a new imperative for action, even if that action requires a public program. If you know or think you know that a combination of legislative and administrative measures will safeguard your bank deposit or insurance from destruction, that idea will have a coercive effect upon your political action. If you think that public officials are corrupt, that a tariff act or a regulation of a trade is a "racket," that too will influence the political decisions of your time. If you value material well-being, and if that desire takes so definite a form as a house and yard and garden, there are inevitable consequences in standards of public services that will facilitate the realization of your desire. Down that long road one will find the public insurance of mortgages to achieve lower interest rates and longer-term financing and zoning ordinances.

The originators of ideas and of social as well as physical invention are persons. We students of public administration will do well to study the elements in the influences which Bentham, the Webbs, the city planner Burnham, the health officer Biggs, the pioneers in the New York Bureau of Municipal Research and its Training School for Public Service have wielded. Relevant preparation, longevity, personal or institutional resources for research, sympathetic disciples, frequently some catastrophic situation in which prevailing attitudes were sufficiently blasted to permit the new ideas to be applied, channels of publication and of communication generally, as well as inner qualities of industry and integrity all, or nearly all in some combination, will be found. We each will have touched some one of this kind, perhaps, in our own community; if not a pioneer in original invention, an enlightened civic interpreter, agitator, or organizer. Thus the late Governor Alfred E. Smith had a genius for relating his sense of people's needs, his experience in party and legislative processes and his position as Governor to a political and administrative program in which the special knowledge of many persons was most effectively used in the service of the State of New York.

Catastrophe, especially when leadership and knowledge are prepared with long-time programs into which the immediate hurried relief action can be fitted, has its place in the ecology of administra-

tion. It not only is destructive, so that relief and repair are required on a scale so large that collective action is necessary, but it also disrupts, jostles or challenges views and attitudes, and affords to the inner self as well as to others a respectable and face-saving reason for changing one's views as to policy. The atomic bomb gave to many, perhaps, a determining reason for a change of attitude toward international organization. But I incline to the view that the effects of catastrophe on our thinking are relatively short-lived, and confined to relatively smaller institutional changes, and that older forces flood back with great strength to cancel most of the first reaction. A frightened and frustrate society is not one in which really significant changes will take root, unless careful preparation and wise administration of the relief period are available. The night club fire in Boston in recent years in which so many service men from various parts of the country were killed is a tragic example of one role of catastrophe. In the lurid glare of that fire, weaknesses in building codes and the administration of them were revealed. So many vested interests of materials, construction and crafts center in building codes that they are difficult to keep in tune with invention and changing social needs. The fact that many in the fire were from remote places, and were men in the armed services, gave unusually wide reporting of the tragedy for some days, especially as many victims lingered on in hospitals. One result

of the shock of the catastrophe was therefore action in cities throughout the world to inspect their places of public amusement and survey their fire-prevention legislation and administration. On a vaster scale, the catastrophe of economic world depression led to a varied array of responses through collective action in which there was much similarity despite regional and ideological differences among the various states of the world, since there were also like ecological factors, common to modern power industry and the price system. World wars illustrate the extent to which a large area of collective action is necessarily adopted under modern conditions of total war—and equally illustrate the tremendous pull of older customary views at the close, when the pressure to remove the controls rises, and individuals in office are held responsible for the frustrations once borne as a patriotic offering. Wise and fortunate indeed is that community that has so analyzed its problems and needs, and has so prepared to make use of catastrophe should it come by plans for carrying out programs of improvements, that the aftermath of tragedy finds its victims as well cared for as humanly possible and in addition some tangible new advance in the equipment and life of the community. I have seen some communities which, because they had equipped themselves with personnel capable of fresh thinking, had obtained from depression work-relief programs recreation facilities that were their first amenities.

Such an approach as this to our study of public administration is difficult, in that it makes demands upon our powers to observe, upon a sensitive awareness of changes and maladjustment and upon our willingness to face the political—that is, the public-housekeeping—basis of administration. These factors—you may improve upon my selection—in various combinations lie behind a public agency. In their combination will be found the reasons for its existence, and the reasons for attack upon it as well. Only in so far as we can find some essentially public core in the combination can we hope to have an agency free from spoils or abuse of power. The process of growth and formulation of a public policy out of these environmental materials links environment and administration. We may be too responsive to change, or we may fail to achieve our best selves by ignoring what we might do to advantage ourselves by collective action, if we perform this task of politics badly.

"When I pay taxes," wrote Justice Holmes to his friend Sir Frederick Pollock, "I buy civilization." It is no easy task of the citizen in this complicated world to get fair value in what he buys. That task is one of discovery of the causes of problems, of the communication of possible remedies, of the organizing of citizens, of the formulation of law. It is the task, in short, of politics. The task will be more fruitfully performed if the citizen, and his agents in public offices, understand the ecology of government.

2

POLITICS AND ADMINISTRATION

THE HOME AND FAMILY ARE SUBJECTED, WE HAVE seen, to the innumerable coercions resulting from changes in their environment. The changes may seep slowly through the community, as affected by exhausting resources, or fickle fashions, or the rippling out of effects in the use of a new invention; they are registered in prices, tastes, incomes; in the decline of a neighborhood, in mounting noise, or smoke, or traffic. Or they may be sudden and dramatic and cataclysmic, as in a flood, or explosion, a fire, a physical invasion.[1] They beat upon human folk all too often weary, harassed, perplexed; intermittently distracted by the amusements that in turn are blaringly forced upon the appetites and senses

[1] Mr. Bernard Shaw, in his characteristic "Preface for Politicians" to *John Bull's Other Island* (New York: Brentano's, 1908, p. xxvii) remarked that under some circumstances (which he discusses at length) "reforms are produced only by catastrophes followed by panics in which 'something must be done.' Thus it costs a cholera epidemic to achieve a Public Health Act, a Crimean War to reform the Civil Service, and a gunpowder plot to disestablish the Irish Church. It was by the light, not of reason, but of the moon, that the need for paying serious attention to the Irish land question was seen in England. It cost the American War of Independence and the Irish Volunteer movement to obtain the Irish parliament of 1782. . . ."

not for recreation and refreshment, but because they can be made profitable—to some one else. Two thousand and more years ago the earliest writers on politics in the western world argued that only those with leisure could be adequate participants in the public housekeeping, could have the means for tracing out the elements of those problems of the family that required collective public policy and action. For many centuries in what we think of as modern times, political power and functions have been wielded chiefly by those with the means, including time, to participate in public affairs—too often distorted to private ends. It is no accident that with the widening of the suffrage and the rise of popular associations such as trade unions, a major objective in democratic programs has been the shortening of the work day and the extension of free education.

For it should be noted that the rush of complex problems arising out of the coercion of the environment described in my first lecture has become more swift and pervasive as communication has been facilitated by post, wire and air, by printed and spoken word, and by picture. Well does Frankfurter warn, in the lecture I have already drawn upon, that "the mobility of words at the present time brings in its train what might be called the immobility of reflection. . . . The interplay between government and the complicated structure of industrial society demands as never before men of independence and

disinterestedness in public life. . . . A thousand pressures dissipate the energies and confuse the judgment of public men. The tasks society lays upon them make heavy demands upon wisdom and omniscience. Yet most public men are too distracted to acquire mastery of any political problem and seldom feel free to give us the guidance even of their meager wisdom."[2] Lippmann devoted much of his book *Public Opinion* to this dilemma, coining the effective phrases of "the world outside" and "the pictures in our heads" to designate the separation of our private lives from their environmental and ultimately public setting. John Dewey, in his *The Public and Its Problems* describes, in a chapter entitled "The Eclipse of the Public," the evolution of the conditions which have rendered citizenship at once more urgent and more difficult as we change from the relatively self-contained life of farm and village to that of metropolitan complexity.[3]

The increasing tempo of change, well illustrated by the fact that while our first million inventions recorded in the Patent Office were distributed from 1790 to 1911, the second were recorded within the much shorter twenty-three years following, has made the task of understanding and assimilation more difficult. Thorstein Veblen, in his *The Instinct of Workmanship* remarks that, "Whereas at the beginning of this period (300 years ago) the rate of

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 35.
[3] A "must" chapter for our guild.

new discovery and invention was such that the digestion of major change extended over the better part of a century, it has steadily increased until the process of digestion must now be accomplished within a decade. This is something new in history. The better part of a century is a long human lifetime, and within this span, adjustment, both personal and social, is comparatively easy. When the time available for the digestion of a change is reduced to a single generation, then, though individual adjustment is more of a problem, social adjustment is still not too difficult. But once the rate of major change has overtaken the rate of social reproduction, and is down to a half or a third of a generation, a new and formidable problem is introduced. The individual himself is asked to recast his ideas and his attitude once or even twice within the space of his active working life."

We who are now of mature years, have been compelled within our working life to meet changes introduced or dramatized by two world wars and a world-wide depression. We have had to adjust to the use of automobiles and aeroplanes and of the radio, and are entering the era of the atomic bomb.

The same conditions that have increased the tempo have widened and deepened the range of interested pressures upon the citizen. Even if he discovers the fact of change that needs civic attention, he will still face a confusion of appeals as to its explanation and its diagnosis as well as cure. The

more selfish and private the objective of an appeal, it would seem, the more flamboyant its wrappings in patriotic and public colors. Sickening examples have occurred in commercial advertising in the most tragic days of the war—advertising of an "institutional" or "good-will" type, when the goods themselves were not even on the market. We were reminded that our soldiers were risking their lives for the particular nostrum advantageous to the advertiser. How is the citizen to know when the proposed construction is genuinely needed, and when it is spoils for the contractor or the men to be hired? When is the subsidy to go to an adequately safeguarded public object, and when to underwrite an uneconomic commodity or enterprise? Whitman's rage and lament at the people following the leader who does not believe in people is the ironic experience of sensitive and thoughtful people much too frequently.

Nor are the consequences of an easy-going or inadequately explored course of action quickly appreciated or inexpensively liquidated in public affairs. It was in the early eighteen-thirties that Senator Marcy scored his point about the victors and the spoils. It was twenty years later that the then Secretary of State Marcy, confronted with the increasingly complicated problems of our foreign relations and the corresponding need for personnel experienced in their conduct, caused to be introduced into Congress a bill authorizing the establishment in

his Department of a system of "pupil clerks"—one of the earliest moves toward a career service. His political enemies in the Senate were gleeful. "This is the man," they pointed out, "who asserted 'to the victors belong the spoils'!" The remark was brought to him. "But I never said," was his comment, "that the victors should loot their own camp!" During the twenty years, the Senator had had the wit to perceive that a spoils system, far from strengthening a party, defeats the very function of a party to serve as a channel of policy-making and an agency of popular government; after a hundred years it has still to be understood by many, and meanwhile the destructive operation of the practise eats at our civic strength and resources far too much. And this is only one of the many pits that lie concealed in the path of the citizen.

To go home at the end of a busy and harassing day, to find there the place and the atmosphere and the freedom and the desire to devote one's self to a study of the zoning ordinance, the Korean question, the housing bill and the respective merits of the candidates for county office would seem to be a caricature of the life of the citizen. To search out the as yet unformulated and later-to-emerge difficulties latent in the population trends in city and suburb, or the consequences to one's farm operations of the introduction of new commodities in the agriculture of another region or in the shift in relative costs of transportation, would seem to be an

impossibility. Yet out of such questions may emerge future coercions.

And even if we were to diagnose and discover the causes of our discontents with fair promptness, there would remain the wide choice of methods of treatment. Here too we would need more knowledge and experience than we are apt to derive from our private lives, or to have readily on tap. Public housekeeping, politics, policy-making, is not a matter of a single piece of public-household equipment. Some types of procedure and of power and agency are more appropriate than others for a given task. We may usefully attempt some listing here of general types. We may seek to channel, but not prohibit, in a given situation, individual private action by regulation or by offering rewards. Bounties may be a best way to reduce predatory beasts; a fine or imprisonment a best way for reducing reckless driving. Processors who requested inspection of their food processing by government agents so that they might publish the fact on their labels had discovered that regulating the plane of competition may enhance or facilitate, and not destroy, commerce. Would one realize this from most abstract talk about "government regulation"? I doubt it. But the most hardened individualist will accept, and use, traffic regulation when the number of cars per population, and the density of population, reach the appropriate figure. "Human nature" will not have changed, but the channels through

which it can best realize itself, so far as getting about in an automobile, will. Perhaps it would be better to state outright that human nature changes too.

The public interest may be served by the indirect coercions of research and information. City people little appreciate the great network of agencies for agricultural research and for making the new knowledge available for farmers and housewives in the United States—the United States Department of Agriculture, the State Agricultural Research stations, and the Extension Service. Industry uses the Bureau of Standards. The principle here is that of facilitating the advantages of all in a position to use the new knowledge, and through them the entire population, through the organization of research and its dissemination on a scale that could not be duplicated by individuals or voluntary and corporate groups; and secondly to remove the likelihood that the purposes and conduct of the research will not be directed to promote the gain of one part of a competitive group. The fact of direction through government does not guarantee this, but it makes its misuse more easily subjected to scrutiny and criticism. The element of potential coercion remains in that the new knowledge will be ignored only at peril of being undercut by competitors in the market who do use it.

Subsidies, loans on advantageous terms and various types of "benefit-payments" may be employed to achieve a public direction of private action through

methods less painful and distasteful than police regulation. A variant of this is the organizing for an industry of a corporate insurance scheme through government which, once organized, may be nearly or quite self-financing while also achieving public and industry benefits unattainable in the usual competitive struggle. Competition is left, as with regulation, but refocussed on other aspects of the industry where a lowering of the plane on which it is conducted is less harmful or is positively beneficial to the public as consumer and citizen. Thus the insurance of bank deposits, or of mortgages on homes, through a pooling of risks and the accumulation of reserves may win a necessary public confidence not merely beneficial to banks or lending agencies, but absolutely necessary to the maintenance of a large scale banking or house-financing system. The consequence of such programs, however, we cannot emphasize too much in our discussions of the choice of instruments for public housekeeping, is the dependence for success, and indeed for avoiding catastrophic failure and the destruction of popular confidence in government, upon the integrity and the ability of the persons administering the system, and its quality of organization and procedure.

Another kind of program in the armory of the jurisdiction is the public operation of an enterprise, as is exemplified in the enforcement of law, the armed services or the provision of public utilities. Considerations of the dangers of private control and

direction of the armed services, the relatively high proportion of overhead costs in providing "public" utilities (thus creating a natural monopoly) and the difficulty of adequately serving the general public interest in the service through the intermittent intervention of the regulatory process generally influence the choice of this policy. Also the fact that individuals in the community may for various reasons of incapacity be unable to obtain such essentials as food, clothing, housing and medical care within the operations of the market and price system, may lead to the adoption of systems of public operation providing these needs free or at less than market prices. Thus in the field of housing we actually have a variety of instruments employed in public policies, including the regulating of competition in construction through zoning ordinances and building codes, the facilitation of house construction by underwriting the safety of mortgage investment in return for lower interest rates, better standards of site-use and construction, and longer-term financing, and the subsidizing of both privately and publicly constructed and operated housing, the latter for people whose income prevents their entering the market for housing of permitted standards.

Perhaps the most discussed type of public program of recent years is one which contains elements of all those just briefly presented, and yet is no one of these alone. It is the use of governmental fiscal policy, reflected in the budget, for influencing the total

economy of the political unit so as to bring about the desired economic results in production, employment, and the allocation of goods and services. The name of the British economist Lord Keynes is usually attached to this doctrine; but it has roots in many places, most notably, perhaps, in the ideas of the late John A. Hobson, the business cycle theorists, and the revision and developments of some of the ideas of Frederick Taylor. A current proposal in this field of doctrine is the "Full Employment" bill. The issue has its place in the discussions over the Bretton Woods agreement, and the financial negotiations between Great Britain and the United States, since international trade, exchange, currency and investment are so integrally related to levels of production, income and employment. Here again we should note the enormous importance, under any program of this type, of the integrity, knowledge and experience of the agents of the public who would, in legislatures and administrative agencies, have to make the decisions not only on general economic policy in the broadest terms, but detailed daily and hourly decisions determining intervention in the sensitive interdependent political-economic fields.

The citizen, then, has in modern times an enormously difficult task—so difficult that volumes are written on his incompetence for it, and movements are organized to lead him by popular appeal or the threat of force to abdicate any claim to rule. Yet experience shows that his consent must be won if

social collapse is to be avoided; and the apostles of the "leader principle," Mussolini and Hitler, have in their sordid ending made possible a clearer view of the essentially gangster nature of that alternative. As the song says, "There's no place to go but up!"

Let us resurvey the tasks to be performed in the political process—the stuff of politics, of public housekeeping. There are the environmental changes constantly in process, making for possible good or evil in the lives of people, to be discovered and analyzed, generally complex and interwoven in the delicate patterns of custom, institutions, habits. There are the possible ways of adjustment, through government as one of many instruments, the most comprehensive of the social institutions—but with a limited fund of public confidence and comprehension on which to draw. There are the tasks of relating the views, wishes, knowledge of citizens and groups of citizens to the possible programs and instruments of government, through communication, organization, and the party and legislative processes.

The example of the introduction of the automobile and the facilitation of its use by paved highways, to which I have already referred, illustrates the process of government. At first, small numbers of persons were involved—the users of easily frightened horses, the worried pedestrian, the car owner limited in the range of use, the designer who could improve his design if better road-surfacing were available, the manufacturer, dealer and oil and gas dealers eager

for expansion, the resort proprietor and the road builders and materials suppliers eager for new business. Through their organizations they appeal to the general public and more sharply focus their efforts on party leaders and legislators. But any one party leader or legislator will have a number of other issues, with their respective advocates and opponents, to consider also, and all of these will affect their personal views and ambitions and in turn will be affected by them—even to the name to be attached to a bill, or the effect upon one's progress toward the speakership. Nor can they be informed enough about so many competing issues—taxation, schools, poor relief, industrial safety regulation, and a host of others as well as highways—to have the time or background to appraise the adequacy of the detailed and rival proposals. That is one reason why even party organizations, most notably perhaps in England but also in this country, have been establishing some planning agencies or staffs to assist in such decisions, and why the presentation of better balanced and more responsibly prepared data has been increasingly the concern of legislatures.[4]

[4] As, notably, in the legislative reference, bill-drafting, legislative council and short-ballot movements in this country, and the present work of a Joint Congressional Committee on the Organization of Congress. Problems of legislative districting, organization and procedure, the relation of the political executive leadership and civil service to the legislative and planning processes generally, and of party membership, organization and procedure, are the basic technical elements in politics that the student of administration must take into account.

The famous Haldane Report (of the Committee on the Machinery of Government of the British Ministry of Reconstruction, presented in 1918) began with an emphasis on the function of the Cabinet (itself, of course, constituting both party and legislative leadership) of preparing policy proposals for submission to the legislature, and then supervising the work of the departments in applying the policies which had been authorized by Parliament. Our separation of powers system divides the party leadership; but even so, as the Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, presented in 1937, stated, there is the positive necessity for the executive leadership to formulate most carefully for the use of the Congress its recommendations in the light of the administrative experience. Inevitably the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of the two houses have a major responsibility in policy clarification and the balancing of the various sectors of policy, since an adequate financial plan must cover all of the activities of government. This need for the close association, in making these difficult political decisions, of legislative and executive party leaders was perhaps first explicitly stated by Edmund Burke, in his *Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents,* issued in 1770 when the need for formulating a theory adequate to the developments in representative government in Great Britain found their

expression in this classic in our field.[5] "THE DISCRETIONARY POWERS WHICH ARE NECESSARILY VESTED IN THE MONARCH, WHETHER FOR THE EXECUTION OF THE LAWS, OR FOR THE NOMINATION TO MAGISTRACY AND OFFICE, OR FOR CONDUCTING THE AFFAIRS OF PEACE AND WAR, OR FOR ORDERING THE REVENUE, SHOULD ALL BE EXERCISED UPON PUBLIC PRINCIPLES AND NATIONAL GROUNDS, AND NOT ON THE LIKINGS OR PREJUDICES, THE INTRIGUES OR POLICIES, OF A COURT. This, I said, is equal in importance to the securing a government according to law. The laws reach but a very little way. Constitute government how you please, infinitely the greater part of it must depend upon the exercise of the powers which are left at large to the prudence and uprightness of ministers of state. Even all the use and potency of the laws depend upon them. Without them, your commonwealth is no better than a scheme upon paper; and not a living, acting, effective constitution. It is possible, that through negligence, or ignorance, or design artfully conducted, ministers may suffer one part of government to languish, another to be perverted from its pur-

[5] This pamphlet, the "Speech on Economical Reform" and Burke's writings generally are an important part of the accumulated insights into government we students of public administration should draw upon.

poses, and every valuable interest of the country to fall into ruin and decay, without possibility of fixing any single act on which a criminal prosecution can be justly grounded. The due arrangement of men in the action part of the state, far from being foreign to the purposes of a wise government, ought to be among its very first and dearest objects."[6]

We may properly substitute for the word "monarch" the broader and more contemporary term "executive," and expand "ministers" to include the entire civil service. The main point is that Burke has made clear the immense importance of executive leadership as political leadership and for the success of the legislature in performing its function of policy determination. Legislators, like the mass of citizens, must have balanced programs responsibly placed before them if they are to be able to make any other than blind choices. Our real problem is partly one of relating knowledge of administrators who have daily acquaintance with the application of laws to the life of the community, and the recommendations of the political executive heads, more responsibly to the legislative process.[7]

[6] *Works of Edmund Burke* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1839), I, 377. The capitalization is Burke's.

[7] The number of studies of this problem in the operation of the national government (and it is even more serious if on a smaller scale in the states) that have been published in recent years is significant. I refer to those by Elliott, Hessler, Hazlitt, and the Committee on Congress of the American Political Science Association, for example.

And it is also the problem of more adequate recognition and treatment of the analysis within administration of the problems of government, including those of policy. For want of this, legislatures lack services they need in the performance of their own tasks, subjected as they are to the pressure groups and to the shortage of time, knowledge, and some spokesmen capable of providing longer-ranged and more balanced discussions of the medley of issues. On this central function of legislatures, which legislatures only can perform, Burke again, in the same pamphlet, is sensible: "The virtue, spirit and essence of a house of commons consists in its being the express image of the feelings of the nation. . . . A vigilant and jealous eye over executory and judicial magistracy; an anxious care of public money, an openness, approaching toward facility, to public complaint: these seem to be the true characteristics of a house of commons."[8]

It may be objected that this leaves out the ordinary citizen with whose plight I began this discussion. But I believe that improvement of the process of political decision by the legislature and the relation of this to the political chiefs of the executive must inevitably affect favorably the party system, by clarifying alternative policies, and thus improve the opportunities for popular choice between candidates and facilitate the responsible party discipline. This is, however, not enough. Is it possible to associate

[8] *Op. cit.*, I, 395.

the citizen more directly with the administrative process, at the points at which political policy in the form of law gets applied? That may better be considered when we view the administrative process as a whole a little more in detail. But I have devoted these two lectures to the roots of administration because I believe that the administrator, and the student of administration, should always be conscious of the reasons for the existence of an agency and function and the process by which it has come into existence. Granted the importance of the techniques of administration, the tools of the trade, there is always the need to appreciate the substantive problem, the people affected in different ways and with different interests and "pictures in their heads," of the compromises made to achieve a legislative solution—for therein lies part of the administrator's working problem of consultation, explanation and public legislative relations generally, under whatever formal structure of government.

3

THE PROCESSES OF POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

STUDENTS OF ADMINISTRATION HAVE TO BECOME familiar with sneers at "questions of mere structure and process," or "mere details of organization;" sometimes we all of us indulge in them. And it is necessary, as I have been warning, to remember that the root of the problems with which we deal are in substantive issues and the environment which produces them. But the issues become overt, the law gets passed, through a mingling of human efforts. Whether the issue is clearly seen, whether the law is appropriate to it, depends upon the quality of thinking that is made available, of the strength of the leadership, of the—I had almost said structure, organization and process!—of the ways in which the varied attitudes, bits of knowledge, desires, ambitions are brought into some working relation so that some agreed conclusion is reached. It is to be hoped that the conclusion, the law, will have some organic relationship to the factors which set in motion forces leading to its passage. Whether it does can be determined best at the time of its application, when the decision of the legislature is confronted by the indifferent facts to which it was

addressed. Will the health law reduce, when applied, the spread of disease? Will the new express highway relieve, or intensify, the traffic problem? Were the regulations facilitating the consumer, or creating a destructive reaction against all efforts to improve the marketing process?

Thus it is not only the professional administrator, or groups such as the American Society for Public Administration or fellows or interns who have a stake in problems of process and structure. Upon the quality of organization, the possibilities of effective, responsible, representative government may depend.[1] Perhaps we appreciated this better earlier in the century. From about 1905 until World War I, there were several political movements in this country which centered largely on problems of structure and process. They constituted a search for responsible political leadership, as in the short ballot movement, or Wilson's assumption with the Governorship and the Presidency of party leadership, symbolized, in the greater office, by his personal appearance before Congress. Nor has this search for the forms and processes which will best serve representative government been confined to this country, especially in the period between the wars. The Inter-Parliamentary Union published memoranda on the problem

[1] And the reverse is true. Recent evaluations of the lives of Fascist and Nazi leaders illustrate how the suppression of party and legislative channels of policy making serve to conceal the looting, brawling and intrigue that went on behind the facade of the "leader principle."

in 1927, and discussed the legislative-executive organization and procedure at its London Congress of 1931; while at Madrid, in October 1933, its Twenty-ninth Congress passed a resolution in which it was stated, after rendering homage to the representative system, that "The Twenty-ninth Congress, conscious that the parliamentary system must of necessity adapt itself to the rapid evolution of national life, draws the attention of the national groups to certain improvements which might be made in the present working of the system . . ."—and there follow proposals relating to parliamentary organization and procedure as it effects the stability and political responsibility of the executive, especially in budget matters and the preparation of policy generally.[2]

But we are at present undergoing one of those periods of reaction against the executive; and this reaction has been partly expressed in attacks upon something not clearly defined but termed planning. Terms are so tricky and elusive that we need to push our job analysis of the processes of policy and administration further. For it is in the detail of application of policy to concrete situations, as Frederick Taylor pointed out with chapter and verse in his studies of industrial management, that we are

[2] The resolution is published in full with suggestive comment in an article entitled significantly "The Technique of Liberty" by B. Mirkine-Guetzevitch, in the *Political Quarterly*, V, No. 1 (January-March, 1934), 111-122.

able to see better the importance of structure and process to the reaching of our original objectives. Let us carry the analysis of the example of highway policy into the administrative phase.

Internal combustion engines and vulcanized rubber, we have seen, lead to paved highways—or at least set in motion forces which press for them. The avenue is one of compromise among programs calling for the use of the limited resources of the community, allocated by budgets. A law is passed. How, now, shall the Executive proceed?

The setting up of a new department, let us say in one of our state governments, to administer a new function authorized by the statute at once raises questions on which presumably there is a good deal of experience and perhaps organized data to draw. Other departments will have experience in the recruitment of personnel for different types of positions, some of them needed in the new organization; other departments will have experience in the purchase, testing, storage, and transportation of materials, and the keeping of records concerning them; in setting up financial records, so that authorized funds can be known, expenditures against them controlled and classified, and audits facilitated; in the distribution of work by special skills required, or by areas requiring unified consideration and the integrating of the two types of approach to the total job; in the design and construction of buildings; in the preparation and publication of reports

and bulletins for different groups of potential readers; in the drafting of rules under the authorization and direction of the statute. In an administrative organization of some size in which these various tasks have been broken down to units appropriate to the quantitative and qualitative nature of the job, some special agencies will have been created to serve the old departments in these matters, to be available for service to the new, to serve also the head or heads of the executive who are politically responsible for the conduct of all the agencies, and to enforce those general rules of the game, or house policies, or standards and safeguards of honesty and economy in operation, which the legislature through statute or even the constitution-making authority by constitutional provision has required.[3] Thus the auxiliary services, designed to aid both the substantive departments and the politically responsible executive chiefs and the legislature in these areas of administration, come into existence.

The addition of another department further increases and complicates the work of the executive chiefs, however, not alone in these specialized fields. It becomes another ingredient in the complex of programs whereby collective action of the public is brought to bear on the private lives of individuals and groups. Any existing equilibrium and adjust-

[3] There are such provisions in the Constitution of the United States, as Article I, Section 9, relating to appropriations and financial reports.

ment will now be upset by the addition of this new and largely unknown factor. Our economy, our plexus of social relations, may be considered as a rubber ball, or a pan of water. Poke a finger in, and readjustments of however subtle a form, of whatever difficulty of measure, will take place—the ball will bulge somewhere to offset the poke, the water will rise a little everywhere. So with our example of a state government to which a new function is added. The demands of departments with programs relating to education, poor relief, militia, care of the insane, prisons and reformatories, regulation of industry, commerce, banking, and insurance, the regulation and licensing of trades and professions, the conservation resources must make room, in the budget and in the allocation of interest and support for legislation, for the new highway program. To be sure, economies are not static, and paved highways may add greatly to income over their cost; they may, through car license fees and gas taxes, avoid any invasion of existing sources of revenue—but even then they affect their older associates, because the obvious relationship of car use to paved highway must be compared by the citizen with the more subtle benefit to him from insurance regulation or the work of a state historical society, for both of which he may be taxed.

But a more difficult problem of relationship exists. The highways, after all, go somewhere. Where should they go? What is the relationship of the land

use of the state, of population trends, to highway location? Certain choices are relatively easy. Two major urban centers will get a connecting road; certain major local and regional centers will get connected with the larger urban centers. Towns in which more influential party and legislative leaders reside will not be forgotten.[4] But what of the longer view, and the deeper and wider survey of the area—the basic factors of soil, land cover, minerals, that indicate long-time occupancy for a self-supporting and prosperous population? What relation should the road plan have to the land uses of areas most suitable for forests for lumber and recreation, where population should be sparse (people are fire hazards), where recreational uses should dictate perhaps only lighter summer-visitor roads and those located so that wilderness values will not be destroyed? Or to the location of central consolidated schools? Again, how should the timing of land purchase and construction be related to the state's financial policies, the existence of unusually great and extended unemployment, and the prices of materials? Should labor be obtained from the prisons? Should the roads be constructed by private builders under contract, or by the department directly with its own

[4] One state in which I once lived found the pulling and hauling and changing of routes in the efforts of the legislature to decide these questions so disastrous politically and so time-consuming that it wrote into its constitution a detailed road plan agreed to by the exhausted leaders.

construction organization? Should a separate road police be maintained?

Thus a job analysis of the apparently simple and single function of providing highways reveals the interrelation of decisions in that field with those of other departments. Yet each department tends to be self-contained in its thinking. Its objectives, standards, codes, materials, techniques conspire to insulate the outlook of its personnel, and to build a kind of jealousy of jurisdiction into its attitudes toward its colleague departments. Its rare co-operation with them will be marked by a tacit agreement to present a united front in the struggle for increased appropriations or at least to resist importunate legislative or citizen meddling in matters of policy.

Yet we have seen how desperately the citizen and his elected agents need careful evaluation, not of a single problem alone but of related and interconnected problems. Estimates of expenditure, and their immediate supporting data, have relatively little meaning by themselves. Interpretation of their part in the total program of public activity and expenditure is required to enable the layman to pass judgment on his government, the legislator on the executive, the executive chiefs on the departments. It was at least a partial recognition of this fact that lay behind the short ballot and city manager movements thirty years ago, that prompted such books as Croly's *Progressive Democracy,* and even had a

part in the early twentieth century phase of the revival of city planning. We were groping for some means—and it had to be found through organization —for expressing the essentially organic nature of the administration of all the activities of a given jurisdiction. The fact that a city gives visual and sometimes dramatic expression to this organic quality[5] was perhaps one reason why the city manager and city planning movements have been, broadly speaking, more fruitful than the short ballot movements in our states. The fact also that all activity requires financing has made the budget movement at least potentially a movement for the better appraisal, formulation and integration of administrative policies, and in the hands of a few governors it has been useful as a work as well as financial plan. The techniques employed in World War II have given us the term "combined operations." It is the visualization, interpretation, and evaluation of all the activities of a jurisdiction as a combined operation by the executive chiefs to the legislature and the citizens which is their prime political function.

Now this cannot be done by a very busy governor supplied with a few clerical helpers and one or two secretaries drawn from his campaign organization or his county-seat law office. Nor can he rely on a few *ad hoc* "brains trusters" recruited from a neighboring

[5] As do also certain landscapes such as in the Great Plains, or the Central Valley of California.

college or corporation office.[6] Nor can he safely rely exclusively upon officials from one of the departments, since a part of his problem is the obtaining of outlooks that are wider than those of the departments. Yet he must know of and be able to utilize their resources, and so must be in touch with their alert and knowledgeable people.

The answer seems to be—again pushing forward our job analysis—the creation for the civilian chief of the general staff comparable in function to that invented for military administration—provided we can learn from experience of the possible values and dangers of such an organization. Taylor worked out this answer in his analysis of industrial management and recommended a "planning department." The British evolved, after costly experience, such a device for crossecting not only departments but even separate parts of the Empire, in their Committee on Imperial Defense,[7] with its secretariat, out of which grew the Cabinet Secretariat instituted by Prime Minister Lloyd George in the first World War and continued to the present day. The first World War

[6] Although critics of the use of academic personnel forget that they are about the only persons who as a profession are presumed to be free from commitments to the various hungry pressure groups.

[7] Lord Hankey, the first Secretary of the Committee, in his Lees Knowles Lectures at Cambridge University in 1945 entitled *Government Control in War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1945), has described the evolution of this institution and its relations to the Cabinet. This is a very useful little book—a "must"—for the student of administration.

was the occasion for emphasizing in this country as well this essential but hitherto largely concealed need for staff aids to the executive heads. Frederick Cleveland and the other pioneers in the New York Bureau of Municipal Research had noted the need earlier. The expansion of war activities and agencies led Woodrow Wilson to call upon Edwin F. Gay of the staff of the War Industries Board (of which Bernard Baruch was chairman) to supply him with a weekly over-all "conspectus" of the state of operations. Significantly, Gay's unit was termed the Division of Planning and Statistics.[8]

The continuing need, in peace or war, by the chief executive of staff assistance is evidenced by an observation concerning the Presidency of the late David F. Houston, who was for many years Secretary of Agriculture in President Wilson's Administration, and who in the conduct of his own Department revealed a concern for the role of organization and process in the achievement of substantive goals. "It is a question in my mind," he wrote, "whether the President can long continue to be the formal head of the government, the chief of his party, and the leader of Congress. It may be a task too great for any human being to stand up under; Congress will resent his attempt to lead it. He must at least have the Presidency better organized. He should have as his first aid one of the ablest men in the country,

[8] The term "planning" came from Gay's friend Henry Dennison, a disciple of Frederick Taylor.

and under him three or four men of exceptional ability, one to see that problems affecting a number of departments are dealt with promptly and in the right fashion, one to establish the necessary contacts with Congress and the public, including the press, and the other to supervise the executive offices. The President should ask Congress to authorize him to do this and to give him money enough to pay a respectable salary to each of them, that is, a salary of from $25,000 to $40,000."

Secretary Houston's diagnosis and proposals are not detailed, but he did recognize the existence of a functional, and therefore organizational, problem. It was not solved by Mr. Hoover's three secretaries, authorized by statute, nor Mr. Roosevelt's "brains trust," farmed out to or tucked away in various operating departments, where their organizational position in a department was bound to clash with the personal general staff functional relation to the Chief Executive. There was experiment with an "Executive Director" of a "National Emergency Council"—the post was characteristically dubbed by the newspaper writers as that of "Assistant President," so little did they grasp the nature of the problem; and finally a Committee on Administrative Management was appointed to survey and report. You are familiar with that report, for as a major landmark in our field and because of the repute of its authors it at once became a part of the assigned

readings of all students of administration.[9] The proposals there for a White House staff, including the provisions for administrative assistants, are in my opinion the strongest in the report and long overdue. Perhaps we political scientists are chiefly responsible for not having clarified long before the nature of the tasks of a chief executive.

But the institutionalizing of an organization and procedure that had of sheer necessity been forced informally and personally in earlier years through kitchen cabinets, "intimate" advisers (such as Mark Hanna, Colonel House or the like) or brains trusts, has yet to take root. The various parts of the Executive Office of the President in the relatively short time since the issuance of the Order on which they were based in September 1939,[10] have had different fates. The White House Office has its Administrative Assistants, but no clear institutional character or wide-spread departmental acceptance of them is apparent; the Bureau of the Budget is the one that seems to have achieved actual growth both in root structure and in acceptance of its more posi-

9 L. Urwick, the English authority on scientific management, in a recent volume (written with E. F. L. Brech) entitled *The Making of Scientific Management,* includes it as an example of the spread of scientific management ideas into government. (London: Management Publications Trust, 1945), pp. 155-164. The President's Committee on Administrative Management, *Report of the Committee.* Government Printing Office, 1937.

10 Significantly, a few days after the outbreak of World War II in Europe.

tive and general function by both executive and legislative personnel. A period of war and the death of a President make severe tests on the life of institutions in the stage in which infant mortality occurs. Thus the National Resources Planning Board was abolished by legislative action—perhaps because the earlier style of city planning boards is not the model to follow for staff organization. It was not clear whether its reports were clarifying recommendations of policy by the politically responsible Chief Executive, already carefully explored and agreed upon by the relevant operating departments, or rival claimants to them for legislative and popular favor, outside the normal process of appraisal and evaluation of administrative experience. The Office of Reports never won legislative favor, was merged in a war agency, and has been lost to sight.

Among our state governments, there is anarchy among departments, long carefully fostered by many because diffusion of department leadership and responsibility was thought to be conducive to democracy. Checks and balances, weak governments, departments with popularly elected heads or under commissions with a membership whose terms overlap so that no single appointing officer can normally select a majority within a single term of his own office—all these reflect a period in which the executive was looked upon as the agent of a power external to the mass of citizens—of a king across the sea, a privileged group in the early republi-

can state capitals or seaboard commercial and financial centers, or, later, an agent of a corrupt and equally privileged factional machine.[11] Interests desirous of weak and ineffective state governments, in ironic alliance with supporters of weak government as "democratic," have resisted the movement to give our state governments organization more appropriate to their tasks. But the chief difficulty, I believe, comes from the indifference of people to politics and government, especially at the state level, and their ignorance of the elements of effective and responsible organization and procedure in government. The spoils and racket aspects of collective action, the use of public government for private advantage, the lack of knowledge of inspiring examples of well-governed communities in which the public agencies are an essential to and enhancement of the provision of necessities, comforts and amenities for the lives of individuals, families and neighborhoods—all these, as well as the inadequacies of us political scientists in research and teaching,

11 Elihu Root's famous characterization of the latter period in his speech supporting the short ballot program presented to the New York State Constitutional Convention of 1915 will be recalled. "Then Mr. Platt ruled the state; for nigh upon twenty years he ruled it. It was not the governor; it was not the legislature; it was not any elected officers; it was Mr. Platt. And the capitol was not here; it was at 49 Broadway." *Addresses on Citizenship and Government* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916). ("Invisible Government," speech on the Short Ballot Amendment, August 30, 1915. The quotation is from page 202; the speech begins on page 191.)

help to explain our delay, despite our boasts of efficiency as a characteristic of our people, in achieving political maturity.

It would be unjust if I were to leave the impression that these were and are the only reasons why relatively little advance has been made in state government. There are many who believe that true advance comes through the strengthening of the autonomy of substantive departments, and their protection from the interference of governors. They believe that the persons directly affected by a substantive function will stand guard over departments and drive off the spoilsmen, seeing to it that men and women acquainted with the subject and satisfactory to the subject-matter interest groups are placed in power in the department, both on the governing boards and in the responsible operating positions. Those holding these views are often among our most "high-minded" and "socially-minded" people, and in the short run help bring about advances in the field of their particular interest. But I am not at all sure whether in the long run they are not more harmful to representative and democratic government than the factional spoilsmen. I would not like to live under a building code administered by a joint board of contractors and building trade union officials; or have my public medical services, or admission to professions or crafts, exclusively controlled by doctors or other specialists. To be sure, I do not like my building

code administered, either, by a corrupt spoilsman; but in the long run it is easier to oust him, than to oust from the minds of people the idea that life is a series of special bits of knowledge and interest, and that there is no corporate responsibility for evaluating and deciding concerning the government of the community. But even if one accepts the pluralist and "corporative state" ideas of these advocates of government by substantive specialists, there will remain all the greater a task in our state governments of reconciling the conflicting claims of the separate autonomies within a single state budget or annual session laws. Thus general staff services free from departmental loyalties will be all the more needed by governors or their substitutes.

I say substitutes, because a small group of critics of the short ballot principle have argued that the line of real advance toward more responsible state government is to move toward a cabinet system in which the political chiefs of the executive would be leaders of the dominant group in the legislature. With this group of critics I am in much symapthy, and I believe the most valuable thing that could happen in American state government would be for several states of different characteristics (as to region, population and perhaps legislative structure and process) to experiment with cabinet systems, especially, perhaps, in combination with a single legislative chamber. But here again, we have seen in the English example, this is no bar to the

recognition of the general staff job as a part of the job of executive direction and organization. In fact, I believe we would have made greater progress in administrative organization and procedure if legislative leaders were more responsible for both the application of the laws they enact and the evaluation of administrative experience for the revision of existing legislation. Furthermore, there would be a tendency to improve the conditions of and draw more confidently on administrative staffs as "their own."[12] I believe that the confidence sometimes given by a legislative committee to its secretary or counsel (sometimes practically a permanent official in budget and taxation committee positions) is evidence of this probable improvement that some kind of cabinet system would bring. But the main point is that here also the research, investigatory, and appraising tasks as applied to special department programs and experience, from a task-force, combined-operations point of view, remain to be provided by a cabinet secretariat of some kind.

But we have deserted our highway example too long! Not only was a law passed, but a department was set up and divisions and regional offices established. At last, at a specific point in the landscape, a shovel bites into the earth, because a road has been

12 One sometimes hears legislators refer with suspicion or disparagement to auxiliary or general staff types of agencies and personnel as "the Governor's," or "the President's," and hence as, despite personal qualities, agencies not to be trusted by them.

planned, finances provided, men hired, materials purchased, a route surveyed and purchased, and blue prints covering width, depth, curves and slopes prepared. The road—let us say from Birmingham to Montgomery—is built. Its plans reflect the existing knowledge of automobile design—power, speed, weight; the numbers in use; the relative qualities and costs of materials; and the route to be followed as dictated by engineering and political considerations. The road is completed. The process of government has come 'round at last to complete a circle, and now returns to the original invention, the automobile, and presents it with a paved highway on which to operate.

But the situation is not fixed. The existence of a surfaced highway has presented the automobile designers with a new factor permitting, let us say, greater power at less weight and cost and fewer stresses. A lowering of cost is therefore possible, and a lowered price which recruits a wider range of buyers. Nor is this all; many people residing in Birmingham and Montgomery decide that it will now be possible to live outside the city, adjacent to the new highway, and yet continue their employment, cultural and other relations in the city. And so, shortly, the new road is humming with more numerous and more high powered cars, except where it is invaded near the cities by cars parked by residents, including delivery trucks. Suburban bus lines are established to serve the new residential areas.

The multiple ripples of influence and coercion set in motion by the new highway (and I have mentioned only a few of the more obvious) begin to be registered in a mounting rate of traffic accidents. Greater power and speed and numbers than the designs anticipated; traffic jams on the routes into the heart of the cities; "ribbon developments," as the English call them, where the amenities sought by the people moving to the suburbs are lost; mounting overhead costs for service in the new areas—or higher household costs for the lack of public water, sewer, fire and police protection, site and neighborhood planning.

The mother city, meanwhile, the core of the metropolitan organism whose geographic resources of varied types had called the whole urban growth into existence, must maintain its services, still used by the suburban expatriates, although on a tax base affected by their departure. Yet the highway that had been agitated for, legislated for and administered for is there as authorized. Had something been forgotten?

I suppose one can't forget what one has not known; yet a general principle can be remembered, or learned. The collective act, the highway program, a response to an environmental change, the automobile, itself becomes a new factor in the environment. A part of the job of administering a program, therefore (and I emphasize this because we too often overlook it), is the recording and

appraising, in the operating department, of the administrative impact and influence. At first, to return to our example, the traffic accidents may be taken for granted. But a more observant engineer or a local citizen may begin to note their clustering at certain points—at curves, or crossings, or approaching a row of garishly lighted road houses. The time of day may be a relevant factor. In time, local officials are asked to report what facts they can; maintenance engineers are asked to report on grades, widths, curves, slopes. And then perhaps one operating official is assigned to analyze such data to see if there are implications which might be helpful in the location and design of roads, the control of abutting land uses, lighting, the qualifications of drivers, and any other possible policies. At that moment, staff services to aid the operating officials, research and advisory in nature, not confined to any one division in their jurisdiction, have been born. As their findings proceed upward and across the organization, they begin to influence the views of higher officials who will be going before the executive chiefs and legislative committees with budget estimates and proposals for amendments in legislation affecting their work. Some proposals, such as those relating to control of land use or of lights in advertising or the licensing of drivers, may affect other departments or wide political considerations. Their data must be able to withstand heated attacks upon "bureaucrats," and "power-mad feeders

at the public crib." But they will be doing for the public as a continuous job what the public can do for itself only sporadically and usually at catastrophic moments when thinking is often distorted by emotion—recording and evaluating by old and new devices the interrelation of environment and the collective action of the community.[13]

Granted that this is an over-simplified picture, if you please, an idealized picture, the facts at the center of this analysis of administration can be duplicated for function after function. The inert application of the statute, with no imaginative effort to follow its consequences, results in disharmony and maladjustment; and the institutionalizing of imagination through records and research, enables us to perform the task through training average men instead of waiting for the rare genius of insight.

Like the instituting of auxiliary services for personnel or purchasing, the establishing of general staff services also brings dangers and complications. No one has stated them more shrewdly and sharply than the late David Lloyd George, when, in his *War*

[13] The role of these staff officials in the planning process, it should be noted, may be one of recommending against an extension of collective action, although in many attacks on "planners" it is assumed that they invariably seek to expand the functions of government. It is often the staff officials who are in the best position, with administrative experience and research as the bases of their observations, to point out that a proposed highway or a commodity subsidy will be unjustified from a longer and wider point of view.

Memoirs, he described the typical problem of relating general direction with staff services supplying expert knowledge. Commenting on certain commanding officers, he remarked: "That type, in a narrow trench which had to be held at all costs, would have been invaluable; commanding a battlefield that embraced three continents their vision was too limited and too fixed. It was not a survey, but a stare. It was not that they were incapable of seeing anything except what was straight in front of them, it was that they refused to look at anything else and counted it a dereliction of duty to turn their eyes in any other direction. . . ."[14]

But as against the narrowness of outlook of the operating official, there is the danger of lack of acquaintance with operating problems by the staff officer. "Unfortunately, the General Officer who prepared the plans for attack after attack across kilometres of untraversible quagmire, and the general who had control of what was by a strange irony called 'intelligence,' and whose business it was to sift the information that came in, and to prepare the reports upon which plans were based, never themselves got near enough to the battlefield to see what it was like. They worked on the basis of optimistic reports in the shelter of a remote chateau, out of sight of the mud and far from the sound of the deadly clatter of the machine guns."[15]

[14] David Lloyd George, *War Memoirs* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1937) VI, 13.

[15] *Ibid.,* IV, 421.

No, the planning process is not an easy one; but it is essential. And the more so where the collective interventions affecting the same acre and the same person may come from a local, a county, a state, and a national government. At every step in the process of policy, in groups of citizens, in parties, in legislatures, among the executive chiefs, and down the line of operations to the ultimate application of the law the improvement of the thinking and deciding process is a necessity, and from the nature of government much of this burden should fall on those placed close to and within the operating agencies, yet not wholly committed to their particular present methods, attitudes and codes.[16]

But you will protest that we are making the system too complex, with too much red tape. Can we escape this vast elaboration of organization and process?

[16] Nowhere is this problem better stated and wiser suggestions proffered than in *Federal Administrators,* by Arthur E. Macmahon and John D. Millett (New York: Columbia University Press, 1939), especially in the "Preface" and "Part I—The Organs of Leadership;" and in Paul Appleby's *Big Democracy* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1945). More "must" books for fellows in public administration!

4

DEVOLUTION AND FEDERATION

THE FACT THAT THESE DISCUSSIONS ARE A PART OF a program which has the word "regional" in its title is significant. You who are fellows in the program will, before its completion, have been in residence at three universities, Alabama, Tennessee and Kentucky, and will have been interns in the Tennessee Valley Authority or some other public agency in the Southeast.[1] You are participating in the oldest of American political tasks—of public housekeeping through a federal system. But that federal system is not static. The existence of a new type of agency, a watershed authority, illustrates the capacity for change which our constitutional system possesses. The use of new terms, notably in studies produced at centers such as the University of North Carolina and Vanderbilt University, and at

[1] Since the delivery of these lectures I have had the pleasure and profit of reading *New Horizons in Public Administration,* (University, Alabama: University of Alabama Press, 1945), the symposium of lectures delivered in the Southern Regional Training Program in Public Administration at the University of Alabama in the fall of 1944. The lecture entitled "The Administrative Resources of a Region: the Example of the Tennessee Valley," by Gordon R. Clapp, General Manager, Tennessee Valley Authority, is particularly relevant to the questions I am discussing here. It may be found at pp. 79-95.

institutes and conferences in the University of Virginia within the past two decades, reflects the continuity of some important problems. The fact that there is variety in the use of such terms as "regionalism" and "regions" and debate over "sectionalism" is a challenge. Donald Davidson's *The Attack on Leviathan* and Howard Odum's and Harry Moore's *American Regionalism,* both published in 1938 and embodying studies carried on over many years, should both be known to you; and some day one of you may trace from a round table discussion at a summer institute at the University of Virginia in 1931 over which Louis Brownlow presided and at which the then Governor of New York spoke, policies of regional development which were soon to be known as New Deal.

You may recall that John C. Calhoun, when he discussed our federal system and defined a constitutional government, referred frequently to "interests," by which he apparently meant attitudes and objectives originating in a person's vocation, such as the commodity he raised or processed, or the commercial or professional services he sold. He argued that geographical circumstances in the United States cause a rough and approximate coincidence of such interests with the states. Climate in the Southern states, for example, favored the growing of cotton; and hence the representation of the area tended also to be the representation of an interest—that of the cotton growers. Similarly in New England,

conditions were favorable to manufacture. A later American historian, William E. Dodd, entitled one of his books on the South "The Cotton Kingdom." Representation of citizens on the basis of area may not, however, be coterminous with vocational interest; and Frederick Jackson Turner,[2] who found in sections a factor equal in importance for the interpretation of our history to the influence of the frontier, pointed out in his pioneer studies of these questions the existence of sub-sections, of the role of states as areas of compromise and adjustment of conflicting internal area spokesmen, and of problems which Calhoun had failed to explore or had found it inconvenient, for his purposes, to admit. There was more to South Carolina, even, than a cotton interest; and to contrast an agrarian South with an industrial North was to ignore many stubborn facts.

We have a duty and an opportunity, as students of administration, to take a fresh appraisal of this oldest of American constitutional problems, one which was central to our Revolution and to our Civil War. For with the widening of functions and of the discretionary power of administration, the problem of adjusting the parts to the whole, the sections to the nation, the national policy to the local and individual varieties of situations they are designed to affect is administrative as well as constitutional and legislative. The expansion of our

[2] *The Significance of Sections in American History* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1932).

economy on a national and international scale has created a new ecology for this problem, an ecology that apparently differs so sharply from that of the eighteenth century that there are some who argue that our federal system is out-moded, and that regional and sectional forces are being liquidated by the spread of nation-wide and even world-wide cultural standardization. Forty years ago Turner had written, in a paper entitled "Is Sectionalism in America Dying Away?," "I make the suggestion that, as the nation reaches a more stable equilibrium, a more settled state of society, with denser populations pressing upon the means of existence, with this population no longer migratory, the influence of the diverse physiographic provinces will become more marked. They will exercise sectionalizing influences, tending to mould society to their separate conditions, in spite of all the countervailing tendencies toward national uniformity. National action will be forced to recognize and adjust itself to these conflicting sectional influences."[3] But many argue now, especially in the light of events in the past fifteen years, that it is the vocational interest group of the type represented in the National Recovery Administration, or the national farm and labor organizations, which must be the basic unit in politics and which indicates the potential actual emergent federal system. The states, it is claimed, no longer are adequate units of representation or of government

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 287-314. The quotation is at p. 313.

generally; on the one hand they fail to reflect significant areal, that is, regional, factors; on the other, they do not conform to the basic economic patterns.

I believe that this dispute is relatively unrewarding in part because there is not much agreement upon terms. Many of our words carry connotations which present-day users wish to avoid—such words as "sections" and "sectionalism." The words "region" and "regionalism" which have been used more frequently in the last twenty years lack a reasonably precise meaning which is widely accepted. The discussion of the federal system is handicapped by the ghosts of old conflicts over constitutional interpretation, supposed party policies on the issues involved in such conflicts, and constitutional theories extemporized to conceal or give respectability to attitudes that it is feared might lack popular appeal. But perhaps most serious of handicaps is the difficulty of understanding just what the drift of legislation and administration is doing to our political system as a system and as a whole. That is a situation which should challenge us students of administration, and especially you who have this enviable opportunity not only to see a new development in regional government at first hand, but also to work with scholars in administration in three different universities in neighboring states all of which have been influenced by the Tennessee Valley Authority program.

We think of the expansion of the functions of the national government during the past fifteen years as unprecedented. It comes as a shock to find serious observers of tendencies in American government expressing alarm at the growth of activity at Washington before the first world war. In the speech delivered in 1909 from which I have already quoted, Elihu Root balances a recognition of its causes in the new communications and economy of the nation with a warning of dangers:

"But there are two dangers coming from this same development. One is the danger that the national government will break down in its machinery through the burden which threatens to be cast upon it. This country is too large, its people are too numerous, its interests are too varied and its activity too great for one central government at Washington to carry the burden of governing all the country in its local concerns, doing justice to the rights of the individual in every section, because that justice can be done only through intelligent information and consideration. And the mass of business that is now pressing upon the legislative and executive and judicial branches of our Government in Washington seems to have come about to the limit of their capacity for the transaction of governmental business.

"The other danger is the danger of breaking down the local self-government of the states."

It will seem strange to some that such views were held in 1909, when they have been expressed in the days of the New Deal, and now again with renewed strength at the close of the second world war, as peculiarly applicable to our own times. For the government of which Root spoke, relative to that of

today, was one of limited agencies and functions. I have been told by an older career officer of a department which in 1939 had about eighty thousand employees that he remembered a farewell reception to the outgoing department head when the Wilson Administration was taking office in 1913, at which the payroll clerk stood by the Secretary and was able to give him the name of every employee who came down the line! The outcry at the expansion in powers, functions and numbers of officials is heard throughout our history. And yet the factors mentioned by Root are real problems of administration. The size of the country (including, in consequence, differences in physical conditions), the number of citizens, the variety of conditions to which general national policy has to be applied, and the sheer amount of business to be dealt with at the center by all branches of government remain problems in government. They explain the efforts in the past two decades to improve the organization and procedure of the courts, the "administrative management," and the legislature. They have fathered a considerable literature, including David Lilienthal's recent discussion of the problems in his book on the T.V.A. Much governmental policy inaugurated in the past twenty years requires some active understanding and even active participation by individual citizens if it is to be effective; and the separation in distance between him and the legislating body and the responsible national administrative officials may

be serious. The prohibition of traffic in intoxicating liquors, the making and enforcing of commercial and industrial codes, the effectuating of soil conservation and grazing programs, the selection of men for military service and the rationing of limited supplies illustrate the problem.

I do not here discuss the general theories which have arisen concerning this problem, such as those of constitutional interpretation discussed by Calhoun and central to important Supreme Court decisions, or of syndicalism and guild socialism and pluralism which were so challenging thirty years ago; although the time is perhaps right for their fresh evaluation. I am here concerned with some of the administrative experience from which any new evaluation of the general theories will have to be supplied with data if it is to be more fruitful. I will remark, however, that there has been more experience with the problems of vocational or interest representation in government in this country in the period between the world wars than elsewhere, because of the N.R.A., the A.A.A., the Taylor Grazing Act, and other legislation. When I remember how much we studied pluralist theories of the state thirty years ago, and searched eagerly for relevant experience in the Middle Ages or the doctrines of French Syndicalists or Russian Bolsheviks or Italian Fascists, I find some amusement and regret in our bookishness and lack of imagination. The Russian and Italian institutions turned out to be extreme forms of party

machine government, while our own experiments, for example with consumers' counsels as in the Bituminous Coal or Agricultural Adjustment agencies, or with the problems of representation of an industry in the National Recovery Administration, are of unique value to the student of political institutions.

But I must resolutely, if regretfully, put aside any effort here to reappraise older political theories and indicate rather some administrative developments that modify the older conditions surrounding our federal system. Contrary to much discussion of the question, these developments reflect a genuine attempt to bring the administration of national policies —policies that are national because of the coercions of an economy geared to national markets, investments, purchasing power and tax resources—into closer relation to area and group attitudes, knowledge and participation. Both rural and urban areas have been affected. The potential wealth of the national domain was a natural source of the development; the Morrill Act of 1862, whereby grants of land were given to the states for the support of colleges of agriculture and "the mechanic arts" was followed a quarter of a century later by cash grants to agricultural experiment stations as well as the land grant colleges, and in another quarter of a century by grants for extending the resources of these institutions through an adult education system to the citizens locally. The same principle was applied to

forest protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, to the construction of highways, to maternity protection, to vocational education and rehabilitation, and most recently to extensive welfare services.

The grant-in-aid system, accompanied as it is by the requirement of state administration of the grants, far from centralizing government in this country has influenced its dispersal among the states, and within them among the counties. It is partly for this reason that some who are interested in the attack upon difficult urban problems welcome a new form of federal procedure in the allocation of grants for the construction and management of housing directly to a municipal housing agency. The reason for this lies in the disadvantage that our cities suffer in representation in state legislatures, as compared with rural districts, under many state constitutions; as well as in the failure of state legislatures to redistrict even when state constitutions require such redistricting in conformity with changes in population. This evil, sufficiently serious as a problem of government to attract discussion by John Locke in his "Second Treatise on Government" as a denial of fundamental natural rights and to constitute a major cause of the movement for the British Reform Act of 1832, has aided in preventing our cities from obtaining adequate treatment of their problems in state legislatures. Their revenues are restricted, the income of their citizens is taxed by state and national

governments and distributed disproportionately to rural areas, and their powers and areas are not revised in the light of the development of organic metropolitan governments to provide the much needed policies and services. The interest of party and factional machines, the cultural cleavage of rural and urban societies, the particularism of suburbs characterized by income and social group homogeneity, and the lack of adequate knowledge and public reporting of fundamental population, land use and related changes and problems combine to hamper an effective recognition of, let alone attack upon, these problems. Both national and state grants in aid, in fact, may be awarded in such a way as to foster the continuance of units, both state and county, of a size, wealth and nature generally that are incapable of serving as effective instruments of the policy ostensibly sought in the act. The removal of the financial responsibility may remove at the same time a spur to the citizens of the local unit to reconsider the organization and functions of their government. The House of Representatives at Washington is actually a better reflector of the relative strength of rural and urban population of some states than their own state legislatures, because of the constitutional provisions I have mentioned. Under these circumstances, it is understandable that many municipal officials find that the appeal to "states rights" is not likely to result in a more sympathetic and understanding treatment of their

problems in their own state capitals than they usually receive.[4]

Another new form of federal relationship is that between the Soil Conservation Service and the Soil Conservation Districts, which are not necessarily co-terminous with other local units of government and to which national co-operation proceeds without the intercession of a state agency. And in other programs affecting land use or rural life, national action in the past fifteen years has called local activity and participation, or at least collaboration of committees selected on the basis of county or other local units, into existence, as in farm credit, farm security, tenant purchase, and grazing regulation programs. So numerous were these programs proceeding from the national agencies to the local farm, forest or range that in a single department, the United States Department of Agriculture, a general staff Office of Land Use Coordination was created to attempt to prevent contradictions and conflicts in policy-making at the center that would be a source of trouble at the point of ultimate application. The National Resources Commitee, later re-christened the National Resources Planning Board, struggled with this problem on a wider front. Partly to facilitate its consultative relations with the state

[4] The dispute over the administration of national grants for local airports illustrates the point. The cities naturally wish the grants to come direct, since the function is almost completely local; the states seek to have the grants made to a state agency, to be channeled by it to the cities.

planning boards which it had helped to inaugurate and to whose support it contributed, but partly also because of the existence and rapid growth of regional offices of national agencies, it established regional offices.

Regional offices have come to be important parts of the federal system; we may properly include them with the expanded grant-in-aid systems, and the national-local relationships, as significant developments of federalism in the United States in the present century. While one reason for their establishment has been that of the more convenient and economical location of national officials in relation to states with which their departments have working relations, as well as to the field operations of their departments, another has been the desire to have a representative of a national department closer to areas of some characteristics relevant to the application of a policy. This has been resented by some state officials, who claim that behind such moves is a desire to by-pass a state agency. Thus, the regional agricultural products research laboratories, which were not located adjacent to land grant experiment stations where some of the national Department of Agriculture research is conducted, are cited as evidences of such a policy. The fact is, however, there are important subjects assigned to national departments to administer that do not have a regional pattern which coincides neatly or at all with state lines, and that do need some unified treatment

throughout an area. That is true of the Great Plains, for example, or of the cut-over region of the Great Lakes and of Northern New England and New York. Historic reasons, and political reasons, may dictate the continuance of the use of less efficient and economical regionalizing through the states as units; but even then there is a case for establishing some regional administrative office by a national department for the commodity or type of problem region through which some common attack through all of the states whose area includes some portion of the region may be facilitated.

This is not the place to pursue so complicated a question, which will need detailed exploration for a particular commodity or problem and a particular area. Here we add one other new type of unit, that established in the national government to administer a national policy in a particular region. The Reclamation Service, established to operate west of the 100th meridian, and the Tennessee Valley Authority are examples. It should perhaps be emphasized that these are not efforts at decentralizing national powers and functions to state and local governments. Their powers and assignment come from the national government. One is related to a vast area because of a very general characteristic of limited water resources requiring, as Major John Powell pointed out in 1879, special governmental policies; the other to a river system, part of a larger one, which had long received national attention. But here again, as

with regional offices of national departments, with which they have a kinship, they may in the manner in which they are administered, through their relations with the state and local governments concerned, evolve new types of procedures in and make contributions to our federal system.

I have been approaching this listing of new forms of federalism from the view of the national government. Suppose we look at them, and the older system of which they are a part, from the point of ultimate application—let us imagine, from a piece of land from which the forest was cleared and which has grown up to scrub pine, here in Alabama, or to poplar in Northern Wisconsin; or a stretch of the plains in the western Dakotas ploughed up for wheat, gone tax delinquent (like the other lands we are imagining!), and preferably to be brought back to grassland for grazing. And let us imagine, too, some lots and shabby buildings in the blighted rim about the downtown section of a city, some now-open land beyond the boundaries of the city which a "developer" is having surveyed for streets and house lots, on which he will construct FHA mortgage-insured houses to sell (in "normal" times) at about $8,000. Here are some concrete points from which to view our federal system in possible operation.

Our forest or range land-owner, or raiser of wheat, cotton, or dairy cattle, has an immediate farm management problem of planning the best use of the acres within his own fences. His state agricultural

experiment station may have tested knowledge to help him (although its efforts may have been centered on the problems of other types of land and commodities because of the pressures of the more important farm organizations, local chambers of commerce and other groups in the state). The county agricultural agent may be available to help his community farm groups make use of the new knowledge, and the county home demonstration and 4-H club agents may also be reaching and influencing his family. All these, we should note, grew out of and are financed by national-state co-operation. Reports on markets, on what his fellow farmers are planting, similarly may be available by radio from national-state services, and national marketing services may be available to help in the maintenance of commodity standards. His membership in a soil conservation district will involve him in the making of rules which he will be under obligations to observe in his own practises, aided by technical services from a national Soil Conservation Service and from the agricultural engineering work at the state experiment station, whose findings will be conveyed through an extension specialist as well as the county agent.

But beyond his own fences lie the forces and coercions of price in the market, condition of roads, local taxes on his land and equipment, the number of fellow-citizens in his local township and county sharing the costs of local government and using its services, and the productivity of the areas in the

same unit. If there is need for greater capital outlay to improve that productivity or to finance his operations, there is the network of national farm credit agencies operating frequently through co-operative organizations, (thus linking both a vocational and areal type of federalism). If the area is in transition, if it needs to shift to another type of use (let us imagine from farming to forestry)—a very long-time adventure with ultimate benefits coming to a later generation and widely diffused among perhaps far-flung consumers and taxpayers—how is the transition to be financed for the present individual operator? Where is the source of income for maintaining not only the present families, but the local road and school services, to say little of institutional care for the handicapped, for example?

Such tangible problems force us to turn away from the sterile debates over centralization and states' rights to a more homely and literally more earthly task of putting together the pieces of powers, functions, resources and knowledge which will enable us to pull ourselves up by the boot-straps of genuine federal collaboration involving local, state, regional, national, yes, and international agencies. First of all, every local unit needs its basic survey of its resources, and mapping of lands with indication of their best use, to be derived by the detailed knowledge of the local people plus that of the trained and experienced specialist in soils, water, forestry and

similar relevant fields that the larger resources of career services in states and national agencies only can supply. A zoning of lands, with reservation to best use to prevent farming, for example, where experience and knowledge prove failure, tax delinquency and relief, to be inevitable, will supply a base also for reasonable outlay of roads and schools. A shift of taxation from general property taxes to taxes on the forest crop, coupled with state aid to local forests that are located in relation to state and national forests so as at least ultimately to supply a permanent forest crop, may encourage a wiser and more profitable use of forest resources and a permanent base for wood-using industries. High schools serving a larger area and population may be able to supply a wider range of educational facilities that equip the students for more varied vocational opportunities, and even offer encouragement to the establishment of better balance in local economic enterprise.

All such possibilities, however, are contingent on the existence in local communities of self-knowledge of resources and courage and insight in the diagnosis of problems; the existence in state and national agencies of technical skills and administrative capacities that can be placed at the disposal of the local community, and procedures whereby the policies of each level government operating in a given locality will be deliberately fitted with the others in formulating, for each function, some unity of

operations and policy so far as is humanly and institutionally possible. The work of the Northern and Southern Plains Co-ordinating Committees of the United States Department of Agriculture is a tentative beginning in such an effort to co-ordinate on the level of a national agency the activities of several bureaus so that they will work more in harmony with regional conditions and various local and state agencies. The Tennessee Valley Authority prides itself on a policy of working through local and state agencies in many of its programs. Under the threat and coercion of war conditions, including bombing by the enemy, Great Britain established regional areas with commissioners at the head of each, charged with making all the resources of each region available for dealing with catastrophic problems. Even the local fire-fighting services, in such a changed ecology, were mobilized as a national defense unit. The point I would urge is that no problem of any consequence which affects our local communities or national strength can be solved, or seriously attacked, in this country unless the resources of every level of government operating in a given area are mobilized to supplement (not supplant) each other.

The emergence of an expanded public program relating to housing within the past fifteen years proves the same point for urban communities. I refer not only to that phase of the program (a minor one) whereby the construction and operating of housing projects by a local public housing authority

established under state laws is largely financed by the national government, but to the insurance of mortgages by a national agency and the provision of a banking reserve system for home loan associations. Such improvement of the financing of houses has already had a part in the further suburban sprawl of our metropolitan regions of every size, a movement likely to become a torrent in the renewal of building in the post-war decade. The effects of this movement are already important, and are likely to transform the nature of our municipal problems, organization and procedure, coupled as they are with policies of slum-clearance and rehousing. The trends in redistribution of population include dispersal throughout an entire metropolitan region, bringing severe strains on the finances of the core municipality immediately with the decline in tax base from the blighting of older areas and the ultimate as well as immediate costs of reproducing in suburbs and "rurban" fringes capital outlay for public works and traffic arteries to serve the resulting dispersed population. National-state highway programs, and the possibility of national grants for aid in the purchase and replanning of blighted areas illustrate the need here as well as in agricultural and forest land use policy of a nice collaboration of national, state and municipal officials. Airport planning and construction may also be cited. Officials of state leagues of municipalities, the American Municipal Association and the National Conferences of Mayors

as well as of individual cities have now to serve as ambassadors to Washington departments and their regional offices as well as state agencies.

Sixty years ago the political scientist John W. Burgess made an interesting prophecy. "The two natural elements in our system are now the Community and the Nation. The former is the point of real local self-government; the latter that of general self-government; and in the adjustments of the future these are the forces which will carry with them the determining power. The commonwealth government is now but a sort of middle instance. Too large for local government, too small for general, it is beginning to be regarded as a meddlesome intruder in both spheres—the tool of the strongest interest, the oppressor of the individual. This has been its history in other lands and other times; and the mere fact that it professes to be popular here, while it has been princely or aristocratic elsewhere, will not save it from the same fate.

"Putting together all these principles, facts and tendencies—physical, ethnological, historical, legal and political—how can we any longer declare the cardinal doctrine of our system to be 'an indestructible union of indestructible and immutable states'? Are we not dealing in mere abstractions when we say so? Are we not giving away an exaggerated Platonism in our political philosophy—attempting to substitute ideas *for* things, instead of seeking to find ideas *in* things? Are we not grinding out an old tune,

from which the melody has long since departed? In a word, have we not completed our Federal era and attained the natural condition of a real national system—conditions which not only permit it but require it? And if this be true, in any degree, with regard to our present status, will it not be so in a much higher degree fifty years from now? It seems to me that it must. It seems to me that, in the twentieth century, the commonwealth will occupy a much lower place in our political system, the Nation a much higher, and the municipalities a much more distinct and independent sphere. . . . My object is not, at this time, to inspire belief, but to excite skepticism; and if I have accomplished this in a single mind, I am content: for I shall have aroused in that mind the spirit of independent research in politics; and, according to my scholastic arithmetic, one capable and conscientious inquirer counts for more than a hundred disciples."[5]

There is a useful germ of truth in Burgess' "skeptical" diagnosis, and his concluding appeal for "independent research" concerning our federal system was as wise as it is today still relevant. The national government has under conditions which, as he wrote, "require it," been employed more for the tasks of public housekeeping, and the municipalities as well. But so, too, have the states; we often forget

[5] "The American Commonwealth: Changes in Its Relation To The Nation," *Political Science Quarterly*, I (March, 1886), 12 *et seq.*

how much their functions have widened, and frequently under the stimulus of action which we have taken through our national government. Indeed, their improvement is a question of urgency to the local governments, and for the relief of the national. In too few are the governorship, and the higher directive posts generally, taken seriously by citizens as means for genuinely effective leadership in raising the standing of living. Too many lack the most fundamental and elementary political institution of a just system of representation in their legislatures. But improvements in personnel and procedure have been developing, partly under the spur of grant-in-aid systems, partly from the participation of their officers in professional societies, partly from the influence of research and educational organizations and including the increased instruction in government in state universities, and partly from the devoted and courageous work of individuals and civic organizations. We forget the immense responsibilities which the states have, for example, in programs for the handicapped, whether in mind, body or estate; for local government; and for a great variety of public works. Let me quote again from Elihu Root's speech to the New York State legislature. "If the powers of the states are to be preserved and their authority is to be continued, the states must exercise their powers. The only way to main-

tain the powers of government is to govern."[6] They have an immense opportunity, now that we have destroyed so much treasure in two wars and a depression, to survey their natural resources and formulate policies for their wise use; to safeguard and forward the health and education of their people, and insure care for those that are handicapped; and to adjust their forms, procedures and areas of local government to facts of land use, population densities and transportation.[7]

I suggest that you become familiar with the excellent studies of local government in the light of these fundamental factors of land use and population and of evolving programs of the national and state governments relevant to them that are coming not only from the older governmental research agencies in the cities, but also from the agricultural experiment stations, the United States Department

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 252.

[7] Professor William Anderson of the University of Minnesota, remarks in a recent article entitled "State-Local Relationships: Past, Present and Future" (issued by the Governmental Research Association) that "To me it seems very clear that local governments organized as they now are, and under present laws, are unable to get themselves out of some of their worst difficulties. The state alone can put them on the road to reconstruction. It is obvious, however, that the states have in large part neglected their responsibilities for local government. It may be necessary to get a new type of state legislature and a new attitude in both governors and legislatures, if the necessary steps toward reconstruction are to be taken." The article, a brief one, is packed with valuable summaries of recent tendencies and suggestions of lines of attack on problems.

of Agriculture, the National Housing Agency, and the bureaus of public administration and similar agencies attached to the state universities and other institutions of higher education.[8] The younger scholars of today will have an opportunity during their lifetime to clarify the conditions affecting our federal system and to shape its evolution during this formative period.

But there is another kind of federalism that has been taking shape during this century. When, our state and national governments began to establish regulatory commissions and other agencies through which the necessarily general provisions of statutes were to be given more precise application, the problem of obtaining the technical knowledge necessary to effective rule-making was an urgent one. It was not only that a trained and experienced career service had to be built—and that takes time—but also the knowledge, experience, and positive participation of the industry or trade regulated needed to be utilized. Councils drawn from membership in them, sometimes recruited from particular categories such as those of employer and employee, were established to assist in the drafting of standards to be used

[8] *Black Belt County,* issued by the Bureau of Public Administration of the University of Alabama, is an outstanding example of such studies. The Council on Intergovernmental Relations has begun to publish some of its observations concerning its field studies of government in selected counties. It is making valuable pioneer studies of the relation of all levels of government affecting a particular area.

in the application of the general principles embodied in the statute. Sometimes the enforcement of codes as well as their detailed drafting was placed in commissions whose members were drawn from the regulated profession, trade or business. With the growth of trades unions and collective bargaining, and of the influence of ideas of scientific management which pointed to the value of common attack on mutual problems by an entire industry or trade, concepts of economic government, of "vocational" representation as an alternative or supplement to traditional forms of "political" government appeared. The more enthusiastic advocates foresaw "parliaments of industry," and the provisions in Article 165 of the Weimar Constitution of the German Reich for economic councils seemed to announce the coming if not of guild socialism, at least of something akin to the Webbs' "Constitution for a Socialist Commonwealth." Back of these ideas and movements there was, among other lines of thought, a reaction against political bureaucracy, and a belief, or at least a hope, that "the servile state," the concentration of power, could be replaced by a new kind of check-and-balance system, more up-to-date than that of the eighteenth century in that it would be rooted in the new economic system.

Something residual in this thinking carried through the depression to influence such legislation as the National Industrial Recovery Act; state

powers and functions were not adequate for meeting the critical economic situation, yet it was hoped to avoid a further expansion of national functions through the traditional forms of commissions and bureaus. The more powerful motive was probably the desire of particular vocational groups, through their national organizations and bureaucracies, to borrow the national political power in order to eliminate some of the uncertainties, insecurities and variables which were driving many managers to the wall, and widening the public consequences in unemployment, the collapse of prices, and the hurried liquidation of resources, as in lumbering or mining. Of the economic theories implicit or explicit in these programs affecting agriculture, finance, coal and industry generally, I am here less concerned than with the question of the extent to which such efforts at solving the administrative problems of our government by devolution of their substantive tasks to vocational governments is successful. I think that it is fair to conclude that there is less enthusiasm and more scepticism now than fifteen years ago, partly because we have discovered that there was more in the idea of a public interest as something as real as and more important than any partial vocational interest than many thought. I observed some experiments of this kind within a single state fairly closely and from the inside; and I was struck with the fact that the longer the vocational group continued, the more there tended to emerge those

persons who possessed a public and political capacity for taking larger and longer views and for reconciling divergent interests; and hence there emerged also a clearer recognition of the reasons and the need for support of those more orthodox types of government agency and bureaucracy which some had assumed to be out-moded. The public agencies were stimulated to a more alert and imaginative effort from the pointed interest of the new organizations, and by the infusion into their procedures of new personnel from the vocational groups and the incorporation into the attack upon public problems of new recruits from among those who had been viewed as a kind of natural and inevitable enemy.

These were civic gains. But the employment of vocational-types of units of government, such as in the AAA, the NRA or the Bituminous Coal program, does not enable us to avoid the problems (which ardent advocates once prophesied we could avoid) of determining fair representation, the protection of minorities, the prevention of abuse of power against either the consumer or other groups outside the vocation, and perhaps most important of all of relating policy in one vocational field to those in others. These are old problems in the long evolution of representative government and of efforts to achieve a democratic political system. We use the term "interest" glibly; but it is a very difficult thing, we have found, to define it in a specific place and time. We speak of the "agricultural

interest," or the "farmer interest," or "the interest of labor." But the farmer interest on examination turns out to be a very complicated collection of interests of persons in particular commodities (among them there may be a little agreement), operating in particular areas and under varying conditions of climate or transportation, selling in different markets, and receiving very different incomes. Within the decade, the national labor organizations, already very loosely federated through the American Federation of Labor, were complicated further by the rise of the Congress of Industrial Organizations. The NRA soon bristled with organizations and procedures for representing consumer, labor and small-business "interests" in the processes through which "industry" was to "govern itself." The effort to achieve some public order in the bituminous coal industry, through a fixing of wage and price rates that was to be under constant investigation of an autonomous consumers' counsel, was soon found to involve a staggering complexity of rates and variety of conditions.

Devolution by function, or interest, would seem to require, then, a most careful statement in the statute authorizing such delegation of the objectives to be sought, the detailed description of the agency to be employed, the defining of eligibility to membership and participation, the forms and conduct of election (which probably should be conducted by a public agency, as illustrated by the role of the

National Labor Relations Board), and the procedural and substantive safeguards for minorities and for the public generally, and including complete publicity on expenditures. In a sense, we are back to our older form of decentralization to constituent area units under a federal system as specified in a written constitution. We may gain by the functional devolution a recruiting of fresh energy and intelligence, and a broadening of the base of consent and understanding, and these are very valuable.

I asked, at the conclusion of my last lecture, whether we could escape the "vast elaboration of organization and process" which modern government entails. Not, I conclude, through decentralization or devolution. Thereby we only shift the problems of government to another point. Admittedly we may make gains in doing so; but actually we probably complicate and enlarge further the role of legislation, administration, and adjudication. There is no royal road, or short cut, to the solving of our problems of public housekeeping—save in major reversals of long-time environmental changes, a retreat from power industry and the application of science to human affairs. The use of decentralization and devolution for the wider participation in the making of policy within the discretionary administrative powers, for the enlistment of men and women of knowledge and responsibility for the public service, and for the application of law at points closer to the relevant conditions to which the

law must apply, can be justified in their own right. And the resulting wider participation in government brings also a means of control which we had for a brief period in the simpler and less populous communities of a century or more ago. But control is a part of our inquiry that requires a more comprehensive treatment.

"Our duty is," wrote Woodrow Wilson, "to supply the best possible life to a federal organization, to systems within systems, to make town, city, county, state and federal governments live with a like strength and an equally assured helpfulness, keeping each unquestionably its own master yet making all interdependent and co-operative, combining independence with mutual helpfulness. The task is great and important enough to attract the best minds."[9]

[9] "The Study of Administration," *Political Science Quarterly,* II, No. 2 (June, 1887), 221. This article was reprinted in the same journal, LVI, No. 4 (Dec., 1941), with an interpretive discussion by Lindsay Rogers.

5

THE PURPOSES AND PROCEDURES OF CONTROL

WE ARE APT TO THINK OF THE WORD "CONTROL" as expressing a negative, forbidding, preventive and even punitive attitude or action. The distrust of government of which we took note in the first lecture naturally engenders a search for devices whereby it may be limited. Such attitudes and actions are natural. The policies of government are presumably directed toward public ends, and represent the compromising of many groups and individuals; yet the legislation, administration and adjudication is by public officials who are also individual persons, and persons are only too liable to be selfish or uninformed or incompetent.[1] The debates in Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787 and the public discussion which centered in the Constitution proposed by that Convention illustrate the importance which almost all of the leaders in the work of constitution-making attached to the problem of preventing the abuse of public power by the persons who as office-holders would wield it.

[1] Calhoun in his day, John Dewey in ours, made this a starting point for important sectors in their respective political philosophies.

They were aware of the tremendous temptations which power brings to individuals and groups of individuals, as many provisions in the constitution evidence.

And yet they did provide, in the important Article I, Section 8, the "power to govern." Recognizing the weakness of man to whom power is given and the necessity of winning over the jealous and suspicious state political machines, they also recognized that the purpose of establishing a government must be capable of being achieved. Our dilemma of distrust and yet of utilization of government is not new. And with all the ecological change, the problem of reconciling the power of a community to act in its interests through government and of focussing the exercise of that power upon public objectives and through broadly accepted methods remains the most important one in our politics. The relative decline in the availability of natural resources, however, the increase in our population, and the increase in the complexity of our political and administrative institutions make control a very difficult problem both as a general policy and in technical detail.

The most helpful approach to an understanding of it is to investigate the purposes of controls other than the basic, original one of the functions of government itself. If, that is, you establish an agency to provide for the adjudication of disputes and the enforcement of the decisions rendered in this ad-

judication, that is in itself the original control for the judges and police—a function assigned to the positions which they hold and which (and it alone) gives them just so much power as the public needs them to have to perform that function. The first and most basic control of government is the clear statement of the purposes and functions for which it is to be used, a statement which is the heart of a constitution. It will be a "standard to which the wise and honest can repair."

But such statements are necessarily general. They need to be translated into more specific terms. And the translation will be made by legislators, administrators and judges who are human beings with differences in their interpretation of what these purposes and functions are.

Probably the first student of politics to diagnose this problem for the representative system of government that was evolving in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was Edmund Burke. The controversies which developed around the effort of George III to recover for the king as a person a range of discretionary power free from the control of ministers and their allies in Parliament are the background for his pamphlet entitled "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents."[1] Burke also saw that the representatives must have some relationship to one another and to the citizens if their powers were to be exercised in such a way as to be ultimately,

[1] See the quotation on p. 35, above.

at least, comprehensible to and controllable by the nation. Hence he becomes the first to recognize the necessity for parties and to clarify their function while recognizing frankly the dangers of their abuse. "I do not wonder," he admits, "that the behavior of many parties should have made persons of tender and scrupulous virtue somewhat out of humor with all sorts of connection in politics.[2] I admit that people frequently acquired in such confederacies a narrow, bigoted, and proscriptive spirit; that they are apt to sink the idea of the general good in this circumscribed and partial interest. But, where duty renders a critical situation a necessary one, it is our business to keep free from the evils attendant upon it; and not to fly from the situation itself. If a fortress is seated in an unwholesome air, an officer of the garrison is obliged to be attentive to his health, but he must not desert his station. Every profession, not excepting the glorious one of a soldier, or the sacred one of a priest, is liable to its own particular vices; which, however, form no argument against those ways of life; nor are the vices themselves inevitable to every individual in those professions. Of such a nature are connections in politics; essentially necessary for the full performance of our public duty, accidentally liable to degenerate into faction. Commonwealths are made of families, free commonwealths of parties also; and we may as well affirm,

[2] Note Burke's employment of the word "connection" (as also "confederacies") as equivalent to "party."

that our natural regards and ties of blood tend inevitably to make men bad citizens, as that the bonds of our party weaken those by which we are held to our country."[3]

The basic job of the legislature is to state as clearly as possible the purpose and objective which it wishes an administrative agency to apply to specific situations, and to follow through by its budget review and other devices of investigation to determine whether that purpose and objective is guiding the administrators. This is a substantive and essentially political control. It should result in canalizing energy and power toward goals based upon a widely popular consent reflected in party support that lies behind and connects the legislative majority that has enacted the statute. Thus out of the control of the purse-strings has come the device of the budget as a master plan of government activities for a given period. In this sense legislative control (and this is true, as we shall see, of other forms of control) is not merely negative, but positive and assertive of goals and purposes, deviations from which by administration should be corrected.

Obviously the exercise of this legislative control

[3] *Op. cit.*, I, 422, 423. I think this passage has a kind of manly and mature quality that we need to possess and use in our approach to government as against the whining and cowardly avoidance of participation, and decrying of political responsibility in which too many people have indulged as a kind of "escape from freedom." I emphasize again the value of Burke to students of government.

should reflect a knowledge of the conditions of administration on the part of the legislators, and a willingness to reveal and explain on the part of the administrators. It is this which makes the organization and procedure of legislative-administrative relationships so important a part of the process of government as a whole. The widening of the functions of government, the increase in their technical nature, and the more rapid tempo of events have complicated the problem because they have made necessary the placing of a greater discretionary power in the administrators. It is more important than ever before, if government is to be employed successfully in the attack upon our problems, for trust and confidence to be legitimately present in this relationship. The British have attempted to solve this problem by making the leaders of the majority party in the House of Commons the heads of the administration; but there remain unsolved questions, under this arrangement, of more adequate participation of the members and of the possible abuse by a Prime Minister and Cabinet of their political power in protecting a minister and department from the disapproval of majority opinion in the House of Commons which is forced to acquiesce for party reasons. In our national and state governments the fact that our chief executives as well as the legislatures are subjected to popular election theoretically affords, through the operation of the

party system, a common source of authority, power and purpose. The fact is, as we know, that our parties are not sufficiently cohesive and disciplined to supply such a basis for mutually sympathetic relations between legislative members and the chief executive. In either system, however, the nature of this relationship makes it necessary to have each major department directed by persons selected primarily for their abilities and qualities of political leadership, so that on the one hand they may interpret prevailing sentiment in the exercise by their departments of discretionary powers, and on the other effectively interpret administrative knowledge and needs to the party and legislative policy makers. Even at its best in both systems, the process of government must include reasonably adequate relations of confidence between legislative committees and the career civil service.

Thus the question of effective legislative organization and procedure in the exercise of legislative control is of importance to the student of public administration. Reference was made to this importance in the Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, and it is under scrutiny by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Organization of Congress. In recent decades the importance of the question was exemplified in the senatorial debates over the nominations by President Coolidge of Charles B. Warren and by President

Truman of Henry Wallace to Cabinet posts. The issue (and Burke's phrases will be recalled) was not as to past actions of these men which would challenge their personal rectitude, but over the policies which would guide their employment of the discretionary powers of their departments. Thus the confirmation power of the Senate, the powers of legislation whereby departments are created and powers and functions assigned to them, the hearings and investigations of committees—most notably those conducted by the Committees on Appropriations—constitute the major tools whereby our national legislature may control administration by defining its functions and procedures, by investigating its use of them, and by restating and amending them in the annual appropriation acts. The use of these tools is less effective and skillful, from the point of view of the public interest in contrast to private and sectional interests, than it should be, since the patchwork of local, state and national party organizations and procedures and the kind of personality fostered by the nature of our political career opportunities do not facilitate responsible corporate party government.[4]

The defining of public policy, and the scrutiny of the way in which administration is applying and refining that policy, is also undertaken by other

[4] Since these lectures were delivered, the Report of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress (79th Congress, 2d Session, Report No. 1011) has been issued.

institutions and procedures than those of popular referendum, party program and activity, and the action of legislatures. Advisory and consultative committees drawn from the citizens generally or from groups presumed to have interests entitled to special protection or possessing special relevant knowledge of the problem dealt with under the particular legislation involved are frequently authorized by legislation or established upon the initiative of an administrator. We have gone farther than this in some fields, and made various kinds of committees a part of the organization by which the discretionary powers are applied to particular local or commodity or other special situations within the general statute. Professional examinations, industrial safety codes, farm credit, the National Industrial Codes, the local administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Soil Conservation Districts, Grazing Districts, the National Selective Service, Rationing Boards—these are examples of the employment of this principle in national and state legislation and administration. The career administrator must share with these committees or councils the exercise of his delegated powers; his departmental and professional concepts must be convincing to persons not of a departmental or professional training, and more sensitive to the consequences of public action to the private citizen. The dangers involved are obvious—indeed they were dramatically set forth in the opinions of Justices Hughes and Cardozo in

the Schechter case. The special interest (whether vocational or local) representatives, or the ordinary lay citizen, may take too narrow and selfish a view of the problems; and what is less widely appreciated, they may even have a less adequate knowledge of their own local or other special situation than the permanent official. There is a great deal of sentimental nonsense that gets spoken or published about the knowledge of the local community and its needs and resources by persons who happen to live there. As a matter of fact, far too few communities contain many such desirable citizens, for the average person knows too little about the public affairs of his community, and the same point can be made about persons with respect to their vocation. And yet this very fact makes the association of local citizens or persons chosen because of their participation in a process or vocation desirable wherever possible, since such association is educative—both of them in the wider applications of a problem and the operation of agencies which are ultimately their own, and of the permanent officials in the outlooks, attitudes and knowledge possessed by the local citizens whose understanding of and consent to programs is important for their success. The inadequacies of our party system as a means of recruiting abler personnel for politics warrants in itself the employment of these other forms of political participation, especially as it relates the policy-makers drawn from the civil service directly

to the lay citizen more closely and effectively than does our usual legislative-executive relationship.

Given a clear statement of political objective, responsibly formulated by party leaders, well drafted, debated, enacted; given integrity and knowledge in its application by a competent administrative personnel whose political chief has political strength and a skill in relating political wisdom to the direction of the department; and given citizen association with the exercise of delegated and discretionary powers, the problem of control is largely solved. This is a large order, and there are loaded phrases, such as "competent administrative personnel" that will make you restive and eager to question. I will return to that. Here I would point out that the American interest in control has centered more in the employment of an independent judiciary for challenging both the substantive powers of government and procedure as well. Our Constitution gave to Congress, in Article I, Section 8, the "Power to Govern," we recall; and that Constitution then limits the exercise of those powers both substantially and procedurally in Section 9 of the same Article and in various amendments, and thereby establishes both political control over administration and—by Chief Justice Marshall's interpretation of Article VI (foreshadowed by Alexander Hamilton's interpretation set forth in one of his Federalist Papers)—judicial review of administrative action. That review necessarily (because of these constitutional limita-

tions) will inquire whether the statute which the administrative agency claims as the authority for its action confers powers which were within the constitutional authority of Congress to confer and whether in its application of this policy it observes the "rules of the game"—"due process of law." You have been introduced, in your studies, to the fact that there is an immense literature in this field, composed of case law and of treatises and texts and controversial discussions. It is not easy to disentangle the arguments rooted in a dislike for a particular substantive policy or tendencies in public policy from those which are based upon a genuine concern for just and equitable administration of whatever policies have been legitimately adopted by representative law-making authorities.

In both Great Britain and the United States the expansion of public activity in the past twenty years has inevitably been opposed by many who seize upon weapons from the armory of judicial review manufactured for purposes of insuring fair procedure and use them to defeat or postpone the application of substantive policies. I believe that some of the forms of opposition to the policy of regulating holding companies or providing for collective bargaining were of this order. On the opposite extreme, but sharing the same basic contempt for the procedural as contrasted with the substantive aspects of judicial review, are the zealots who believe that the nature of government has been

fundamentally transformed in recent decades, that all organs of government should be dominated by a single objective determined by a single elite of a single party, and that "you have to be tough." Undoubtedly in an extremely urgent situation, you do; in a garrison state the military must take over. But in the long run, a wider range of experience and consent is needed if we are to have representative government and policies that are ecologically defensible.

For what, after all, is the purpose of these rules of the game to which we pay at least lip homage? Why give to potentially interested citizens notice of your intention to take action? Why should an agency be required to hold public hearings, and give opportunity for presenting testimony, and make public the rules or conclusions that are adopted, and present substantial evidence supporting them? To say in reply that it is in order to be fair, in order to observe the "rights" of the citizen should lead only to the further question, why be "fair," why should there be "rights"? To reply further, as some have done, that they are possessed by man in a state of nature leads to still a further question, why should these be considered inherent attributes of man by nature? We cannot evade the task of thinking through this issue to the difficult but basic ultimate job analysis, again, of government and of men as citizens in a community. All these things, when one approaches the question again from this point

of view, are important because these are the conditions under which he contributes best to solving the problems, shared by him, of living in a community, which is the lot of us all. Under such rules we best evoke, gather and appraise the knowledge and experience of people needed to insure the best application of discretionary powers in the application of the particular policy at stake. The unjust treatment of a single citizen in the application of a health regulation jeopardizes the effective action of government for every purpose in the community in two ways, at the very least. It sends distrust and cynicism rippling out in ever widening circles among the citizens, and thus undermines confidence in what should be their own instrument, one which in an emergency may be desperately needed for greater tasks. And it lowers the morale and self-respect of every other officer, making the whole the kind of instrument which the cynical have been claiming it to be.

I have dwelt upon these general features of control in the interest of insuring fair observance of the basic procedural moralities of the community at the expense of discussing the more technical questions involved, such as the extent of intervention by courts, whether there should be special courts for administrative cases (as in France, for example, or such as our own special courts for tax and customs cases), and whether the government as a whole or by departments should be suable as a corporate

being (as we provide in special courts of claims). But there are excellent discussions of these matters in recent reports, books and articles. Thus every student of administration should at least know about the Report and Monographs of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, whose chairman, Walter Gellhorn, has discussed these questions most usefully for us all in his James Schouler Lectures at Johns Hopkins University.[5] You may put these documents, and the periodical literature they and earlier discussions have stimulated, beside the British document, the Report of the Committee on Ministers' Powers. You will do well to acquaint yourselves with the general principles of the French system of administrative law. Fifty years ago Frank J. Goodnow introduced the French and German systems into the study of political science in this country, incidentally indicating thereby the wider and richer approach to problems of public law which the student of comparative government can and should bring, and which should always characterize our profession. The lawyers have ignored or failed to appreciate the importance and value of this continental tradition, perhaps because of a failure to note that neither the common law nor the legislature is the only effective and useful form of control over administration. In fact, by establishing some more economical and effective procedures for

[5] Walter Gellhorn, *Federal Administrative Proceedings* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1941).

obtaining some treatment of injury from acts of government (as through Courts of Claims) and by establishing some special review tribunals for cases arising from administration (as, for example, customs and tax cases) we are, from the necessity created by volume of business as well as a desire to obtain more substantial justice, following in paths already marked out on the continent of Europe. This is a sensible rejection of the more parochial and in-bred position of the majority of lawyers; and political scientists, particularly those in the field of public administration and comparative government, have a duty to press their studies and recommendations further. As a matter of fact this development frees the higher tribunals for their more appropriate task of "trying the trial," of sampling, now and then, the adequacy of procedure adopted in administrative agencies, particularly with the increasing power of organized interest groups and their bureaucracies at our various capitals, since they have greater opportunity and more pointed and sharply focussed concern to follow the course of projects through the channels of administrative action.

One development in administrative procedure that links two of the basic forms of control over administration, judicial and executive, is the increased attention given the analysis of administrative procedures, especially of the "quasi-judicial" type, by the law officers of executive departments and consultative, investigatory and advisory commissions

appointed by them or by chief executives. This tendency in itself reflects the growing consciousness of the problem, and its inclusion in the researches and instruction of law school faculties; many law teachers, perhaps most, have now had some experience in government, and are more acquainted with administrative processes and the role, importance and quality of career civil servants. Thus Walter Gellhorn, the chairman of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, was a member of the faculty of the Law School of Columbia University and has had administrative experience as well. The Office of the Solicitor of the United States Department of Agriculture has an important influence on the formulation and scrutiny of procedures used in the many regulatory activities of the Department, and has brought teachers of law into the Office as research consultants to reappraise these procedures. The achievement of the ends sought through government in a way most conducive to enlisting not only the passive consent but the active contribution of knowledge and wisdom of citizens as well as their agents is the goal of all our work in this sector of the problem of control. That is why students of administration should welcome the development of these preventive forms; the analysis of the problems by legal scholars, their employment and that of lawyers generally as consultants to the law offices or government agencies, and on studies such as those made by the Attorney

General's Committee or the similar study undertaken in New York State by order of Governor Lehman. It is at this point that I again urge the importance of relating such procedural studies to the substantive problems of government; that is, to the conduct of government in dealing with specific objects such as commodities (milk, cotton, apples) throughout the entire process of their production, processing and distribution, or the establishing of a minimum plane of competition among industrial concerns in such a way as to give more adequate protection from industrial accident or disease to the participants. An ounce of prevention, in the way of preliminary analysis of the problem before procedure-making, is worth a great many pounds of subsequent judicial review, as courts have themselves urged in many cases, and there is ample scope for creative work of great social value in such preventive scholarship for the students and practitioners of public administration as well as lawyers and in co-operation with them.

Control by the courts is likely to be control after the event, and preventive largely in the sense of a warning to administrators of "Don't do it again that way," and "Go back in this particular case and start over again," or "Do it as we here suggest." Executive controls are most important for their positive development and enforcement of standards and safeguards in the actual operation of substantive departments. The real test of the value of a person-

nel, purchasing or finance agency is in the improved quality of operation of a highway or health or navy department. Such value is obtained through the direct collaboration of the auxiliary service with the substantive agency, as in obtaining a higher quality of personnel for a position, or through aiding the chief executive in formulating general standards which contribute to morale throughout the service and in supplying objective and impersonal reports on the operation of the substantive departments. They are therefore, as we have seen, auxiliary (or should be) in that they aid the substantive department and also the chief executive, the legislature and all higher political agencies representing the political community. There is a tendency for them to become semi-autonomous in a large organization, and to serve as guardians of standards in the daily operations which cannot come in any regular way beneath the scrutiny of mayor or president or legislative committee. Sporadic and sampling investigations by special legislative or executive bodies (sometimes for "fishing," partisan and factional purposes rather than to safeguard standards contributing to democratic and representative government) may help to keep a large organization alert and "on its toes." But in organizations of any size, the very development of such standards has become a task requiring long experience and expert acquaintance with technical problems. The preparation of descriptive specifications for positions or materials

to be used in recruitment, purchase and budgeting, of policies of reporting which will relate the needs for informing the lay citizen to most appropriate utilizations of printing, photography and radio, cannot be left to the accident of dramatic and episodic investigations of corruption that compete for a time with murders or sports and then fade away. Nor can a chief executive give any substantial part of his time to these aspects of administration. The auxiliary services tend therefore to become semi-autonomous in their daily operations. They have become increasingly professionalized. Employment management has widened into personnel administration; budget staffs employ varied types of "administrative analysts" and "economists" and "economic analysts" as well as accountants; societies compete for the defining of the true "planner." The bad side of all this is the danger of isolating the detailed conduct of public affairs from the substantive needs that citizens seek to achieve through government, through the overelaboration of technique, jargon and procedure in matters where the lay citizen is less willing than in medicine, for example, to admit their necessity. The auxiliary agency may become more concerned with its own procedures and authority than with genuinely facilitating the work of the substantive departments and the effective relating of the chief executive to them. If the health department needs a new desk, it is right that its head should not have

to spend his time, better devoted to health work, in learning all one should know about desks and where and how best to buy them and get them delivered at the proper time and place and their quality tested in the light of what was sought. But it is equally true that the health department should be able to get this desk reasonably quickly, and that when it arrives it should be appropriate to its needs. The chief executive should find that the existence of the purchasing department does genuinely improve the quality of goods obtained, does remove favoritism and corruption in purchases, and does justify through lowered costs or better goods the expenditure of time and money and the added steps in operation entailed. In short, as we have seen, the job of the auxiliary service is to auxil. And as we have also seen, with the increase in the size of an administrative unit these executive controls, based ultimately upon a legislative and political policy, can be effectively exercised only by and through a full-time expert agency.[6]

Improvement in executive control will probably

[6] Thus the long moral and political movement for purifying our representative system by removing appointments to government position from the control of party and factional and personal machine organizations led to preventive legislation, such as the Pendleton Act, which can be enforced only through the continuous operation of an agency operating on the firing line within the administrative process. Hence the importance of a civil service recruitment agency and system, an office of accounts, a purchasing department, and similar auxiliary services.

come not through obtaining power to intervene more closely in the detail of substantive operations. We are already piling up top-heavy layers of personnel and paper-work in such matters as personnel recruitment, budget preparation, and audit. Improvement is already apparent as we move from the earlier more negative, moral and political emphasis on keeping the rascals out and discovering the crook who got in, to the positive relating of operations of government to improvement in procedures generally throughout the community, and the development of research affecting the education of those who are recruited to public offices and the atmosphere in which their careers develop. There is already a tendency and a desire in many central auxiliary services to move from detailed review of substantive department operations to a sampling technique to insure that statutory requirements are being observed, and to a research and experimental pilot operation type of relationship aimed to stimulate and inform. The spread of auxiliary services within operating departments and bureaus, and the formation of inter-departmental councils of auxiliary officials such as directors of personnel, make this devolution to the operating departments possible.

Thus the closest, most influential form of control at the stage of preparation of administrative action is in my judgment that of executive agencies of the auxiliary type—and I would include the general staff

that the chief executive and department head must draw about himself to aid in the formulation of his decisions; and that will include personnel from the auxiliary agencies because of their knowledge and their freedom from departmental or bureau prejudices and limitations of outlook. I must risk the heretical statement that a good budget staff and a good personnel office will do more to preserve the liberties of the people than a good court, because they will be in operation long before a potential wrong is done. I hasten to add that they are not alternatives, but, as I have tried to argue, supplementary; we in our tradition have too long ignored the one in our emphasis on the other, and it is not true tribute to courts and judicial control to do this. We should not have to roll up the huge apparatus which can best produce a Schechter Case to perform tasks of improving procedure that can be performed by consultants in the office of a departmental solicitor.

There was perhaps a time when the discussion of control could have closed with the enumeration of legislative and political, judicial and executive control to insure the honest carrying out of duly authorized policy, just procedure, and economical and efficient standards of operation. But there are now more clearly discernible supplementary approaches to these objectives, and indeed an enrichment of them. There is the possibility of influencing

directly and personally, in part, as it were, from within, the attitude of the official toward his job. Professional standards and ethics may seem external; yet they operate on the thought and feeling of the individual, opening new vistas of action and objective, creating a warmth of personal association in a corporate enterprise. Closely related to this influence, yet a separate and growing element, is the association of masses of citizens in the conduct of administration through services on committees and informally through assimilating the new rules of the game and codes of competition into their own individual ways of action. A widening area of governmental policy now depends upon voluntary co-operation, or individual support of public programs; and an important arm of administrative action is now that of influencing, through informational services of varied types, such action. Administration merges at these points into information—information from the administrative agency as to available services and as to useful knowledge, as, for example, in Agricultural Extension, Soil Conservation, or maternal aid programs; or information back from the citizen to the civil servants as to attitudes or knowledge essential to the successful enforcement of policy, as in National Selective Service, Office of Price Administration, Grazing Administration or city planning and zoning policy.

Beard's sixth and seventh maxims are reflective of this fact, a fact that opens to the mind of the

thoughtful student of public affairs the vista of much governmental policy of the future:

"6. Unless the members of an administrative system are drawn from various classes and regions, unless careers are open in it to talents, unless the way is prepared by an appropriate scheme of general education, unless public officials are subjected to internal and external criticism of a constructive nature, then the public personnel will become a bureaucracy dangerous to society and to popular government.

"7. Unless, as David Lilienthal has recently pointed out in an address on the Tennessee Valley Authority, an administrative system is so constructed and operated as to keep alive local and individual responsibilities, it is likely to destroy the basic wellsprings of activity, hope and enthusiasm necessary to popular government and to the flowering of a democratic civilization."

The founding of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research in 1905-6, and subsequently its establishing in 1912 of the Training School for Public Service, is a symbol of a new approach in this country to public administration. That change has been foreshadowed by the founding earlier of the settlement movement and the National Conference of Charities and Corrections and the National Municipal League; while from Jefferson's time there had been explicit or latent a doctrine of the responsibility of the state, through its university, for providing an education for its future public servants. The latter conception was vague, until pioneers such as Graham in North Carolina and Van Hise in Wisconsin set in motion policies that were to sharpen it. But the New York Bureau in its

pioneer policies and attitudes brought sharply to a focus the question of training and giving civic support to a new type of career civil servant. Influences which it initiated were to mingle in the next twenty years with those derived from the Frederick Taylor disciples in the scientific management movement. There followed with the spread of the governmental research idea a fostering of professional organizations of city managers and other groups of public officials. The Public Administration Clearing House and its neighbors at 1313 East Sixtieth Street in Chicago, with their secretariats, publications and activities generally, the national, state and local organizations of civil servants,[7] the tremendous range and variety of professional and craft organizations among civil servants, are proof that public employment is no longer an accident of a little-respected political jobbery maintained for private ends. Millions now have a stake in a system so organized and administered that there may be a career open to personal effort and talent. The qualities and standards which they will bring to their work will be those of their homes and schooling as modified by their corporate professional standards and the policies of departments. More than in the past, there is opportunity for a contribution by the educator, whether in school or university or in-service training program in gov-

[7] Luther Steward, for many years President of the National Federation of Federal Employees, was a major contributor to the personnel classification legislation adopted by Congress.

ernment itself, to help clarify objects, open the mind to the responsibilities that serving as an agent of the public brings, and encourage the coincidence of ambitions for a successful career with the advance of government as an instrument whereby we may improve our lot.

Clearly the improvement in our education, and in the relating of our educational institutions to the recruitment process (notably at the close of secondary, college and graduate programs) is a most important contribution to effective control over administration in the public interest. Against this view, there may be charges of aristocracy. I reply, supported by concrete experience under the National Youth Administration and Army Specialized Training Program policies, that we must press constantly for making those educational opportunities more widely available. It is in the interest of the whole community and of a true democracy that we do this, for two reasons: only thus will those under handicaps of poverty or other external conditions have their chance, and only thus can the community tap every source of ability for the great and intricate problems of public housekeeping that confront us at home and abroad. Education viewed as a continuing process from youth to retirement, whether through earlier schooling, such graduate programs as this in which we are participants, through conference and discussion, through sharing in professional and community organizations, is decisive in its

importance for instigating and supporting those inner controls which the individual, often alone on the firing line, must exercise in a world in which our very existence is dependent upon countless agents and deputies of the public. The social worker whose "case" is a delinquent child or a tuberculous patient, the bank examiner reviewing the balance sheets, the inspector of a restaurant kitchen, the consul examining an applicant for permission to emigrate to the United States, the park attendant cleaning the grass sward in preparation for the next holiday swarm, need in that hour of fatigue and discouragement a final inner belief in the significance of what they do as agents for us all, and the surrounding support of the professional standard of their fellows.

The view that government is a matter of police coercion is inadequate. The mutiplying of services has made the individual citizen, despite the totalitarian nightmares, a participant. Even where no formal procedures and organization enlist him in the more obvious aspects of the administration of the laws, his consent and indeed his positive contribution of knowledge and even mere attitude are necessary for successful government. I have seen this to be true in small village communities, where face-to-face relations are easy; but I have noted it as well in cities, where a groping toward some kind of neighborhood life even under the most difficult conditions asserts itself, and where in some of the new public housing estates, or in the block organizations estab-

lished in the Civilian Defense program it has sometimes flourished. Actually our communities are often honeycombed with civic organizations which are either in close touch with relevant government officials or could be brought into such a working relationship with some imagination and guidance to the benefit of all concerned. I have cited in these lectures examples of the formal organization of advisory local groups as adjuncts even to national agencies, as in various types of agricultural administration where the local application of national policy is perhaps more clearly apparent. In other fields, citizen association is perhaps more effective through technical and professional organizations. But in all of these the experience can and should be two-way affairs: neither a lecture on what the law is and what the citizen must do, nor a scolding of the official dictated by a pressure parochialism. The very prejudices and mannerisms of either "side" become a part of the raw material that the other must examine and appraise and relate to the objects to be obtained.[8] Sometimes a "public relations" officer of an administrative agency, alert to diagnose

[8] Thus the effort to whip up a "home rule"-based antagonism in a local community to state or national officials is often futile, as against a careful formulation of home needs, of state and national powers that may be utilized along with local effort, to meet those needs, and a consequent focussing of efforts and pressures on those particular policies within the scope of each. The history of the AAA and the relating of national policies to local circumstances is full of illustration of this problem.

the audience he wishes to reach in the releases from his office, will take back from his field trip data which will affect the exercise of discretionary powers by the entire organization. Students of opinion surveys are forging a two-way process and technique whereby attitudes too individualised to be caught in the larger meshes of party and electoral contests, can be made to serve the improvement of administration.[9]

No: force, physical force, is not enough. The world has moved into a dependence upon a widely based consent, inevitable because of our interdependence. Have you ever waited for the red light to change to green late at night at a remote crossroads? Why do you wait? Is it really because you fear the prison cell, or because the nature of our life builds these new habit patterns into ourselves? What you and I have a responsibility for attempting, in our work, is the inventing and improving of devices whereby this new relationship of public agent and community can be most economically and creatively achieved. Here, too, in the clarifying of the role of citizen in administration are new fields to explore.

Thus controls which seem to have been bred in a philosophy of rejection and fear of government are now needed for their positive function of clarification of objectives and focusing of effort upon legitimate goals, of insuring the winning of the

[9] Rensis Likert and Harold Lasswell are among the pioneers in this development.

confidence and knowledge of all citizens concerned in an issue, of insuring honest and economical and effective operation. But this is not enough. We must go further and encourage that kind of professional and personal attitude toward the job that will operate from within the individual person who is the public official, and will help to fuse his private satisfactions with his public duties. And we must facilitate the exchange of knowledge and attitude of official and community upon which the successful administration of so many public policies is dependent. Some have called this kind of political society "the service state," or "the administrative state," as contrasted with an earlier "police state." In such a society, whatever term we may give it, administration ultimately is education.

6

A THEORY OF THE PROCESS OF GOVERNMENT: DIAGNOSIS, POLICY, AND REVISION

A POLITICAL THEORY IS LESS OF A PERSONAL luxury than it might have been in 1900. The inclusion of greater numbers of persons in political activity and the increased dependence of populations on the results of this activity make our individual and group ideas of ends and means of public housekeeping more important. Such ideas influence our decisions and acts. Because of them we support, by votes or shooting, persons and policies. The decisions and acts have long led to policies that affect our standard of living and for many, life itself, because they have to do with health services, for example, or war. New forms of war, embodying doctrines of race or class, and new forms of armaments, such as the jet propulsion plane or the atomic bomb, have increased the urgency and importance of decisions and policies.

The five foregoing lectures were an attempt to analyze, with a group of graduate students preparing themselves for public service, what are the most important problems and developments in public administration. The analysis leads to the conclu-

sion that administration is intermingled with the entire process of government, and with the environment in which the people affected by the government exist. In this final chapter I shall attempt to relate this diagnosis and conclusion to a kind of work program in politics. I therefore, call this essay—for it is a true essay, being an attempt, an effort, and subject to more and better knowledge and greater wisdom—"a theory of the process of government." I suggest by the further words "diagnosis, policy, and revision" the points in the process of government at which our experience with administration suggests that earlier theories, or work programs, need to be reappraised and better ones invented.

An important characteristic of political science in the period between the wars was a recognition of the limitations on the capacity of the citizen to perform his civic function and the increasing difficulty of the political problems with which he was confronted. Walter Lippmann's *Public Opinion* was perhaps the first substantial discussion of this question in the post-World War I United States.[1] This was an inquiry into the external and internal handicaps upon the effort of the citizen to participate in politics intelligently as democratic theory indicated it was his function, right and duty to do.

[1] Graham Wallas has influenced Lippman and his generation by his earlier *Human Nature in Politics*—as he has continued to do with his further writings.

What is that public opinion which was supposed to be the basis for governmental policy and a guide to public officers employing discretionary powers on behalf of the citizens to whom they were presumably responsible?

In exploring these questions Lippmann and those who set to work in this frontier area of political science were not so much raising new questions as bringing new knowledge to old ones. Applied psychology was developing in such fields as the selection of personnel[2] and the formulation of examinations of all kinds, advertising, and the study of eugenics. Psychiatry and psycho-analysis were fields of growing importance not only in medicine, but in interest to laymen. The propaganda of national states, the expansion of newspaper circulation and news coverage (especially in foreign news), the formation of newspaper chains and the increase in the cost of operating a newspaper, the clash of factions and parties that accompanied the break-up of several empires (China, Russia, Turkey, Austria-Hungary and Germany) were recognized by the discerning as complicating further the conduct of citizenship. Charles E. Merriam was perhaps the first of the political scientists to perceive that a new

[2] The great increase in man-power needs in World War I and the necessity for a rapid selection of the young men potentially best qualified to become officers for the enormously expanded army alike gave opportunities for an extraordinary application of applied psychology in the new field of employment management and in the invention and application of tests.

stage in our science was at hand, in which we should work with the psychologist and anthropologist.[3] The coming of opinion polls, the analysis of the influence of radio broadcasts, the appearance of new journals devoted to the publication of studies of public opinion and applied anthropology, the introduction of "program surveys" in administration, researches in political leadership and the life of communities such as the Lynds' studies of "Middletown," have widened and deepened our political science and have forced a reconsideration of the "equipment of the citizen" for his duties.[4]

For duties he has. The coercion which changes bring in the environment was illustrated in the first lecture. The exhausing of a resource or some other upsetting of the natural environment, the redistribution of population by age or place, the introduction of new physical or social inventions, the seepage of new ideas, tastes, wishes, the dramatic catastrophe, the expertness and leadership of groups and persons, working in all sorts of combinations, frequently

[3] Note his inaugurating with Gosnell the studies of political participation, with Lasswell studies in political behavior, and with a number of scholars the civic education studies.

[4] Mrs. Margaret Cole in her *Beatrice Webb* (New York: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1946), refers to Mrs. Webb's "habitual under-valuation of the emotional forces in politics" and states that "All their lives the Webbs were insufficiently aware of the deeper currents of irrational popular opinion." One is tempted to say that today too many lesser social scientists are on the other hand inclined to under-value reason and disparage the judgment of ordinary people.

subtly and unnoticed until their consequences force attention, may become so widely coercive as to require collective action. Taken together, these factors are the ecology of government. In them administration as well as politics has its roots.

Yet can one be sure that a proposal which is advanced on the ground that it meets effectively one of these changes is a wise proposal? Therein lies the task and difficulty of the citizen. Has he the time, the knowledge, the opportunity to explore causes and to draw upon comparative governmental experience, to act wisely?[5] The wise action, the policy, cannot under the modern system of interdependence well up out of unexamined daily experience of individuals; it comes from careful diagnosis of many and sometimes remote situations. And yet in spite of interdependence and the handicaps of individuals in the exercise of their citizenship, the only excuse for the policy is the serving of their needs, the relieving of the coercions which injure them.

Failure to solve this problem may be due to a lack of integrity and ability of the agents of the citizen—themselves as voters, their legislative representatives, their judges and other civil servants; or it may be due to a lag in the adjustment of their institutions to the environmental changes. Thus we now live in

[5] Particularly if a bribe to pocket our pride accompanies the proposal, such as a subsidy or the assurance that he is one of the master-class with lesser breeds to push around.

a country in which more than half of the people live in a physical setting determined by man-made standards—the arrangement of space in cities, the bringing of water, the removal of wastes, the channeling of movement in streets. No one, however, would argue that we have as yet created, especially in our larger metropolitan cities, adequate solution to these problems. I doubt, too, whether we would assign the fault for this to the lack of integrity and ability of our agents. It is rather that this development has taken place without our being aware of it and its causes and the means whereby the evil consequences might be avoided or mitigated and the good consequences enhanced.[6]

Diagnosis of these environmental coercions, and of forces in operation which are moving toward coercions, is therefore a point at which layman and expert need to labor together for improvement. That fact has been recognized in the rise of governmental research institutions. A simpler society might, it was once believed, record civic stresses and strains and obtain their treatment through the elected representative. A simpler version of a utilitarian philosophy embodied the view that a citizen would feel and think about a condition that was oppressive and join with other citizens, known

[6] It may be argued that it is due rather to the fact that those who suffer the most evil consequences are without the power to change these circumstances. But the entire population suffers, often unaware of the causes and of possible methods of relief.

to him as neighbors, to obtain a remedy. If we can no longer accept this view as covering our civic life today, it is not because we sneer at what we might entitle naivete. The community of such face-to-face relations was lost, as Dewey has argued; that earlier public has been eclipsed. For the events causing the injury are remote, or complex, or concealed; and the citizen himself distracted, and no longer sharing the kind of neighborhood life that provides him with means close at hand which he may employ with confidence.

And yet this situation does not represent a sharp break with the past, and there are gains as well as losses to record. The modern state first emerges as a clustering of powers and functions around a great landlord and his largely private household servants, about whom there is also an atmosphere of supernatural authority. Its history is not so much a tale of limiting powers, as of the channeling of those powers and the substitution of a wider basis for the policies which will direct their discretionary use. For a period of time, and on important occasions, progress indeed has come from the suppression of rival powers so that there might remain a supply of powers to govern. True progress lay in preserving such power, but modifying its use; and in the wider recruitment of participants in government, so that they became less and less servants in a king's household, and more the agents of a widening electorate and public servants educated in the professions

which the community needs for the diagnosis of its problems and the preparing of data for its policies.[7] A democratization of the lines of career into the bureaucracy is as important a part of the movement for democratic and representative government as the widening of legislative and judicial powers.

The claimed sovereign powers of ruling dynasties in the early modern states have changed ownership in the course of time. By evolution or revolution[8] internal power has shifted to elective legislatures, parties, judges, civil servants. The external sovereign power is only beginning to be modified, although shifted to the whole national state, by similar institutions. On the world level we are under the urgent necessity for institution-and-procedure-building and invention of all the types—administrative, judicial, legislative, professional and civic-educative—which have appeared in the internal governance of states. But the world over, as compared with the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, people in the twentieth century have no one to revolt

[7] For a brief statement of the significance of the bureaucracy in the evolution of the modern national state, see Carl J. Friedrich, *Constitutional Government and Democracy* (Boston: Little Brown & Co., 1941), ch. II. The student of administration should explore studies in administrative history such as those of Tout and his school or Walter Dorn, as a corrective to over-emphasis on judicial and legislative factors.

[8] The difference in the timing of this as between Great Britain, the United States, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, China and Japan explains much modern—including contemporary—history.

against but themselves. They are up against the task of invention and creation.

The administrative history of the modern national state has been less reviewed and interpreted than the general political and constitutional history; but the pioneers in that study have much that is useful, even essential, to us in our inventing and creating of better institutions and procedures. The data is sometimes a challenge to our traditional views and a corrective to our prejudices. Let us note, even if briefly, two major questions—the disposition of the central powers of government, and the function and status of the administrator.

The extent of the powers of kingship in the early modern state was never clearly defined; ambitious persons in that office pushed the idea of residual powers ample for the attack upon all problems relevant to the state (which might mean family affairs) as far as the largely private resources would maintain their exercise. Against this view there were rival claimants, notably the other great landed families and the ecclesiastical hierarchy,[9] who found theoretical weapons in the customs and theological

[9] I necessarily omit, in this very general discussion, such refinements as rival groups within the church, rival churches, rival groups among the nobility, etc. These refinements, characteristic of any one episode, do not affect the general development. They may be observed in operation today among societies now in the stage of emergence from feudal institutions through the rise of central monarchial dynasty machines, as in South Arabia. In Iran the process is complicated by the intervention of neighbors!

teachings which supported a theory that there were rights that were more fundamental than those of the king to absolute and unlimited authority. They sought to enforce these through courts applying customary and canon law. When the monarchs needed more income to finance the services which they claimed they were rendering the whole national community (which was long only a potential public, since it was often less conscious of its membership in a common nation than in a local province),[10] and sought aid from the landed families and the emerging commercial towns (and, later, the colonies), a new problem of great importance to institutional development was presented. Would the landed families and the merchants bargain for limitations on central power, or for a share in its use? Both policies were employed. One resulted in the practise of limiting the powers of government by the assertion of prior rights natural to man before he enters into a political organization; the other resulted in a gradual taking over of the powers of what was less and less viewed as a person, and

10 Note, for example, how the separatism of Spanish regions has persisted to our own day, and continues to play its part in civil strife. The marriage of Ferdinand and Isabella did not suffice to establish political union. It is perhaps significant that Stalin was Minister of Nationalities in the early years of the Bolshevik government, and that he and the party machine have tried to prevent the continuance of national minority movements in the U.S.S.R. by policies of cultural autonomy. Political integration is apparently enforced through the party machine.

more and more entitled a "Crown," by those who were coming into the possession of political influence —landed families, merchants, manufacturers, and later the entire male and female population within age and residential qualifications. The instrument through which this has been accomplished is a complicated party system that in the English evolution of what Woodrow Wilson called "perfected party government" focusses in a small number of party leaders in the legislature, whose work plan is concentrated in an annual budget. The American variation branched off from the British under conditions of colonial self-consciousness of a corporate national difference from the mother country, and at a time when the stress on limitation on the power of government was strengthened by the presence of very rich natural resources and varied career opportunities. Even with these influences, the fathers of the American Constitution stressed the rights of the citizen that must be obtained through government quite as much as rights which the citizen might claim against government. The powers assigned to Congress in Article I, Section 8, have enabled us to organize nationally for defense, the regulation of economic activities and the national welfare generally; Section 9 and Section 10 of the same Article established limitations of the national and state governments, respectively, which would make the abuse of power by those in office at least more difficult. Government always presents this

problem of balancing powers sufficient to enable a community to deal with its common problems on the one hand, with measures which will prevent or limit the evil effects of the abuse of power by the community's representatives on the other.

The rivalry of these two tactics is still to be observed. It is fundamentally not a question of absolute dogma, but of the ins versus the outs. When you are out of power, you want to limit the powers of those who are in; but your zeal (or rather, that of your wiser and shrewder leaders) will be cooled by the consideration that you want to leave a loophole through which you can respectably undertake the same activities when you in turn achieve power. Absolute and complete anarchists and collectivists are rare.

The bearing of this on our present politics is that the same struggle over the powers of the Crown reappears. Does the President, for example, possess prerogative and residual powers—or the President and the Congress in combination? Variations on this theme are presented by the eddies and currents of rivalry within the parties reflecting regional and other "interest" factors, the jealousy of the Senate and the House for corporate power and prestige as against the President, and of personal ambition of party leaders. Since I am primarily concerned here with the administrative experience, I concentrate on one factor alone, the second of the two

major questions on which, I have suggested earlier, administrative history throws light.

We learn from administrative history that the ancient question of the limitation and control of central powers claimed by the early monarchy has continued down to the present; and that its present form is one in which parties, and not persons or dynasties, are at the center of the conflict. But we have also seen that as the functions of government have widened in our interdependent societies under the coercions of the environment, constitutional and statutory authorization of activity and function necessarily leave considerable, some would argue increasing, discretionary and delegated power to the executive officials, since they are continuously in operation and possess (or should possess) the resources in knowledge and experience needed to apply the general principle to the localized situation. Does this mean the development of centralized personal power? If so, do we not confront an impossible dilemma, from which the only possible escape is the return by deliberation or catastrophe through atomic bomb warfare to a pastoral, forest, or agrarian face-to-face society of small thinly populated communities? Is the "leader principle," despite its apparent identity with the leadership of a bootlegger's or pimp's gang, dictated by the forces of large-scale industry and the escape from freedom of a distracted "public"?

Light is thrown on this institutional problem by the history of the king's household in various national states, and indeed by what is happening in various parts of the world today.[11] Monarchs were persons, true; they were landlords living off the revenues of their estates, with meager collections from early and primitive beginnings of systems of public revenue. But as the conception of the king as having general functions of a national public nature began to emerge, and as he began to undertake wider activities for the sake of added revenue, power and prestige, his dependence on his personal servants increased. The head of his stables had to provide for equipping and maintaining a cavalry force; the head of his wardrobe had more than a personal household to supply—his duties extended, perhaps, to the supply of an army; his secretary had increasing paper work connected with local officials, for example, or suppliants for some favor; his chancellor (originally a private chaplain) had an increasing amount of legal work to "process" and handle—all because there was not enough time or knowledge available for the king as a person. And so, these officers, and the seals which were a sign of official authentication of the documents which they sent forth, "go out of court," as the phrase occurs. That is, quite literally they moved out of the palace to other quarters because of the increase of business and—

11 Burke diagnosed the question in his "Speech on Economical Reform" in 1780.

important also to our argument—because more and more of their work no longer went to the king but was handled finally (except for the most important questions of policy) by these servants.

As these positions increased in powers and the possibility of profit from them, they were prizes. Naturally powerful nobles and prelates desired to hold them. Those trained for the church had obvious qualifications supplied through natural selection and education. But in the long run, such selections tended to atomize the central powers of the Crown, just as an ambitious Cabinet member may embarrass a President or Prime Minister. And so we find the more discerning monarchs—those of the early Ottoman Empire, the Tudors, the abler German princes—developing a career open to talents, and some of them establishing training schools where able young men not of the groups of landed nobles eager to keep down the central power might be educated for the public service.[12] This career personnel was bitterly resented by the feudal aristocracy. Sidney Fay, in his study of the Hohenzollern household, notes that they were re-

12 Frederick II established the University of Naples for this purpose; the Papal bureaucracy was trained chiefly at Bologna; the University of Paris supplied the French monarchy with personnel; the Palace School supplied the Ottoman bureaucracy; many of the German universities trained the personnel of the princely bureaucracies in "cameralism"—that is, for service in the "chamber."

ferred to sarcastically by the aristocracy as "new men." It was not that they had never "met a payroll," but that they were not of the landed nobility! But the point I would emphasize here is that the sheer nature and complexity of the problems of government that emerged with the widening powers and functions of the mercantilist-cameralist state (what Walter Dorn calls the "Leviathan State") made monarchy as a personal rule impossible; power shifted to a career bureaucracy, tempered with review in the ordinary and special courts—the latter viewed with jealousy (still present!) by the lawyers.

When the ultimate discretionary and policy powers of the monarch and dynasty were taken over by party leaders, public offices suffered the fate (against which Stein in Prussia and Burke in England struggled) of becoming spoils. Throughout the last century there has been the slow recognition by the new governing classes of mercantile and manufacturing towns at first, by a few more enlightened participants in agricultural and other natural resource activities, that public officials of integrity and experience and knowledge were more valuable to them than the use of appointments for the private benefit of party and factional machines. That lesson is being studied today by the more numerous organizations of workmen and consumers. Its implications for the problem of control we examined

in an earlier lecture.[13] Broadly speaking, the groups and leaders through whom and to whom final control over policy was shifted hold the key posts of political direction in the administrative system, and must perforce accept the same tendency of the civil service to professionalize itself. Running water is said to purify itself. Administrative history illustrates the tendency of personal political power in a monarch to be lost to agents of the most substantial social classes in the community and to a professional bureaucracy. The lesson to us is therefore to concentrate our effort at political improvement at the point of the political agents—the party leaders of administration and legislation—and the recruitment, education and training of the bureaucracy, and at procedures whereby their work and policies may be revised in the light of experience.

The argument from administrative history has brought us back to the same point indicated by the argument from the perplexing status and tasks of the citizen. The citizen needs help in his job of being a citizen in the clarification of problems and the responsible formulation and presentation of policies which he may choose for dealing with those problems. Just as a king or the groups who replaced kings in the wielding of control needed agents, so

[13] I refer to the fact that the public servant must operate within the political boundaries set by a democratic society through its many types of organizations, and that, as Beard states in his axioms, the basis of education and recruitment must be thoroughly democratic.

do the mass of citizens. The city dweller needs to have qualified persons acting on his behalf, for example, in diagnosing population and land use trends in the city and its environs; the farmer needs to have agents acting on his behalf analysing commodity markets or plant diseases or highway routes or freight rates. Both need a clearer picture of the policy consequences of a vote for the rival candidates who come before them asking for support in elections to local, state and national legislatures. The creation of bureaus of municipal research, voters' leagues, neighborhood associations and similar organizations illustrates the recognition which more discerning citizens have given to the problem which confronts them; they represent an effort at providing a means outside the regular government yet designed to affect the governing process through informing the voter. The same type of citizen has pressed to introduce a comparable service within the organization and procedure of government in the establishing of city plan agencies for the purpose of studying the problems of urban development and preparing plans for future development.[14]

Unfortunately the term planning has come to have with too many citizens the connotation of

[14] For a general review of the development of planning procedures throughout government in the past fifty years see my essay entitled "The Planning Process in Government" in *Problems of The Post War World,* edited by Thomas C. McCormick (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1945).

collectivism. The term, or some more suitable one, is needed to convey the process of diagnosis of problems, preparation of policy and appraisal of the resulting application of policy which as we have seen is so greatly needed if the citizen as well as his agents is to have some more intelligible picture and more responsible choice of political action made possible. Improved planning processes, in fact, may lead to more collective action in one field (as, for example, a more economical development of suburban lands and their equipment with public services in relation to those of the mother city), and a rejection of collective action in another (a proposed canalization of a stream urged by some groups in the area, but revealed to be uneconomic, or a pension scheme that is found to be actuarially unsound).

The chief problem in this development at present is to get such agencies attached closely to the political leadership, so that they participate naturally in the policy process as trusted and indispensable aids to that leadership and not as erratic particles following their own whims or as rival claimants to public attention. The programs enunciated in the Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management and now that of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress are in part addressed to this problem. Both urged, respectively, the better equipment of the President and of the Congress (especially of its committees) with staff

aids. Unfortunately they did not come at the same time, and the treatment of aids in the policy-making process did not get consideration as a comprehensive problem involving both legislative and executive leadership. Of course there are great institutional difficulties, centering in the separation of powers theories, to such an integrated treatment. The failure of the National Resources Planning Board to win acceptance by Congress is proof of that. But the fact that the aids to the President were institutionalized as the Executive Office of the President, that the Joint Committee is recommending a sharper focus of the legislative process by concentration of committee work, the establishing of a legislative cabinet and the staffing of committees proves also that we are right in designating these points of diagnosis of problems and preparation of policy as the crucial and strategic ones for any adequate theory of government in its organization and structure today.

Here again present development is supported by administrative history. The monarchy simply could not remain a person; when his personal and dynastic interests came up against the widening of participation in the nation in policy making, it, too, became institutionalized. Kings called leaders of various interests, and persons occupying major posts, into councils. For a period, these were selected largely on the choice of the king; but the pressure upon him to call upon those who could carry weight, whether

of knowledge and administrative experience or of support from important regional or other interests, had sooner or later to be recognized. The work might still be done in his name; he might read his speech from the throne, and there might still be His Majesty's Stationery Office. But the words were the words of a party politician, and the Office would be run by career civil servants.

So, too, with presidential utterances, committee reports, and, in fact, the words of the party politician read by the King from the throne. They represent the participation of many persons, in and out of the formal government. The docket which receives the signature of the department head is fat with the memoranda of and citations of fact and precedent of a dozen civil servants.[15] One comes across the phrase in British administrative history, "The Great Seal was put in commission." So too, and permanently, with the powers of the Monarchy, the Crown; and with the legislative and executive leadership, and the preparations for their use.

This fact, which is not widely appreciated, was strikingly illustrated in World War II when the immense expansion of government functions and agencies centered, for executive direction, in the Presidency. Presidency, rather than President as person; in addition to the units in the Executive

15 The German administrative code institutionalized even the color of the pencil marks to be used by the readers, each level in the hierarchy having a relevant color, to expedite its scrutiny.

Office (organized under an executive order significantly enough in September, 1939, and equally significantly containing the provision for an Office of Emergency Management), there came the new position (after our entrance into the war) of the Chief of Staff, and later those of the Office of Economic Stabilization and of War Mobilization. An executive order carries the signature of a single man, but embodies the participation of administrative assistants, secretaries, the Bureau of the Budget, officials of substantive departments, the Department of Justice, and members of the Kitchen Cabinet. Washington reporters speculate in their columns (or more frequently confidentially inform their readers) as to which adviser inserted what sentence or word. Even the nomenclature of the earlier days of the executive institutions of the modern state is employed, and we speak of "the palace guard" and "palace favorites."

And so again, too, the private secretary and the private intimate become public facts and affect politics, and politics affect them. They are appointed or dismissed for political reasons.[16] They are again "going out of court;" some of the units

16 On this point the selection of secretaries by Presidents Hoover, Roosevelt and Truman (to refer to those appointed since the increase in secretarial posts by a statute passed on the eve of Mr. Hoover's entrance into office) is instructive. A secretary is the key figure at all levels in the evolution of administrative leadership in all organizations, economic, political, ecclesiastical.

in the Executive Office of the President are already housed under another roof, and others in quarters at the end of the wing most removed from the President's office. The recent outcry over the proposed structural changes in the White House reveals the uneasy adjustment between the various roles played by the President—as symbolic chief of state resident in a dwelling that has itself become a symbol, and as a busy political and managerial leader, requiring staff aids close at hand for the innumerable conferences which occupy his working day.[17]

The part of the process of government which I have termed revision might be treated as an aspect both of diagnosis and of policy. In the diagnosis of a problem, the well-informed person, citizen or layman, will take account of existing public policy affecting the problem and perhaps start his inquiry with it and the possibility of revising it to meet the problem. He will, in the formulation of new policy, return to a consideration of existing policies and their revision. But the functions of government have so expanded and intermeshed that the continuing review of programs and studies looking to their effectiveness in operation and the revision of the legislation, organization and operating policies affecting them may properly be emphasized. Thirty

17 Prime Minister Churchill's remarks on the plans for the rebuilding of the House of Commons emphasize the relation of physical design to political functions and institutional development.

or forty years ago administrative surveys and the preparation of city plans were undertaken as isolated episodes for special occasions, when some revelation of corruption or special extravagance, or the enthusiasm of some citizen or group of citizens, initiated the bringing to the state capital or to a city a special and itinerant staff of "planners." The change to the present view that administrative reorganization or city planning is a continuous process, and one to be incorporated in the administrative process itself, is an important step in advance. In fact we should go further, and rid our minds of the notion that "planning" in the sense of the revision of existing policies and procedures is exclusively the assignment of a separate and special "planning" or "research" or "procedures" unit. The entire personnel of an agency or a unit of government should be encouraged to see their job as including a share in the appraising of what they are doing and how it is being done. Some of the most important findings made in the youthful sciences of management and administration and industrial relations point to the value to the human being and to his relations with the organization and groups of which he is a part of such an attitude; Miss Follett called this approach "dynamic administration;" Ordway Tead calls it "creative administration." And it has wide political importance.

I refer to political importance because a reaction against the expansion of government is again at hand.

It is by no means due entirely to resentment at some particular activities that have been undertaken. It bears some likeness to the eighteenth century attitudes. It is believed that the bureaucracies are too swollen, that the attitude of the bureaucrat is too smug and too concentrated on security of tenure and automatic increases and promotions. The recruitment has been from too limited a portion of the population; staff and auxiliary services have been recognized as necessary, but in establishing them we have multiplied steps to be taken and forms to be filled, and have become sceptical of the resulting jargon and patter. Millions of young men bring back from the armed services a view that any public operation is wasteful, and that complex organizations are full of shelters for the mediocre or the intriguer. Greater millions of men and women have come from war industries with a similar attitude toward the relations of government, industry and labor organizations. Granted the fact of ignorance, limited knowledge and similar factors which make such attitudes less valuable as sources of substantive knowledge of government, they are nevertheless very important as influencing the action of these persons as citizens.

That is why I believe that the revision of policy by the administrative personnel in working relations with citizen groups is so important. I discussed this as a phase of control in the last lecture, and therefore will not elaborate the point here. To yield to

cynicism is to give up the hope of reasonable guidance of institutions in the Great Society, and to limit the development of human personality. We should support, and not betray, the pioneers in the long evolution of better instruments of government and policies that more adequately reflect the resources of our environment. We can study and draw inspiration from their work; we can study our own environment, not alone for the immediate improvement of details in our own procedures, although that is important, but to widen with our fellow citizens the sense of belonging and participation which is the best antidote to confusion and defeatism. Despite the understandable reaction against the expansion of government functions and the problems brought with it, we seem to be embarked upon a further use of government in such fundamental substantive fields as food, housing, and health, both physical and mental. A clearer theory of government, as well as improvement in detailed application and procedure, is all the more an essential part of the equipment of students of and participants in public administration. A diagnosis of our present problems and a study of the history of the modern state alike support this conclusion and contribute to our equipment for the task.

INDEX

Administrative history, 130 ff.
Administrative law, 107, 110
"Administrative state," 123
Aristocracy, 119
Baruch, Bernard, 48
Beard, Charles A., 7, 116, 140 n
Bentham, Jeremy, 16
Bews, J. W., 6
Brains trust, 49, 50
Brains trusters, 46
Brownlow, Louis, 63
Burgess, John W., 82, 83
Burke, Edmund, 33, 34 n, 36, 95, 96 n, 97 n, 100, 137 n
Cabinet system, 54, 55
Calhoun, John C., 63, 64, 93 n
Cardoza, Benjamin, 101
Career service, 25
Catastrophe, as a factor, 9, 16-18
Change, ecological, 14, 94
  environmental, 5, 7, 20, 22-23 31, 91, 128
  in rural areas, 12-13
Checks and balances, 51
Churchill, Winston, 146
City manager, 45
Cleveland, Frederick, 48
Coercion, 13-27, 57, 71, 77, 120-122, 129
Collective action, 17, 42, 52, 57, 59, 116
"Combined operations," 46, 55
Control, 93 ff.
Coolidge, Calvin, 99
"Corporative state," 54
"Creative administration," 147
Criticism of government, 1, 40, 58, 119
Davidson, Donald, 63
Decentralization, 91
Devolution, 62 ff.
Dewey, John, 5, 22, 93 n, 130
Dicey, A. V., 3
Distrust of government, 1, 2, 93, 94
Dodd, William E., 64
Dorn, Walter, 131 n, 139
"Dynamic administration," 147
Ecology, 6 ff.
Economic government, 87
Elaboration of organization and process, 61, 91
Environment, 3-6, 20, 21
Executive Control, 110-115
Executive Leadership, 35
Expansion of government, 3, 64, 67, 68, 104, 144
Fay, Sidney, 138
Federalism, 76, 86
Federal system, 62, 63, 65, 74, 83
Fiscal Policy, 29
Frankfurter, Felix, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 21
Gay, Edwin F., 48
Geddes, Sir Patrick, 6
Gelhorn, Walter, 107, 109
General staff, 47, 48, 54, 59, 49, 61
George, David Lloyd, 47, 59, 60
George III, 95
Goodnow, Frank J., 107
Grant-in-aid system, 71-72, 74, 84
Guild socialism, 87
Haldane Report, 33
Hamilton, Alexander, 103
Hanna, Mark, 50
Hitler, Adolph, 31
Hobson, John A., 30
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, 19

Hoover, Herbert, 49, 145
House, Edward M., 50
Houston, David F., 48, 49
Hughes, Charles E., 101
Industrial management, 40, 47, 50 n
Interest representation, 63, 69, 89-90, 101-103
Invention, 22, 41
Jefferson, Thomas, 117
Judicial control, 103-110
Keynes, John M., 30
Kingship, 131-132, 135, 143
Legislature, 35, 36, 68
Legislative control, 97, 99, 100, 111
Legislative leadership, 55
Lehman, Herbert, 110
Lilienthal, David, 8, 68, 117
Lippmann, Walter, 22, 125, 126
Local government, 85
Locke, John, 71
Marcy, William L., 24
Marshall, John, 103
Merriam Charles E., 126
Moore, Harry, 63
Morrill Act, 70
Movement of People, 11
Mussolini, Benito, 31
National government, 75, 76, 84
National-local relationships, 73-76
National state, 132, 137
Odum, Howard, 63
Organization and procedure, 55
Party leadership, 33
Party system, 36, 102
Pendleton Act, 113 n
Pensions, 11
People, as a factor, 9-12
Personality, as a factor, 16
Place, as a factor, 11
Planning, 32, 40, 141-142, 147
Police regulation, 28
Political control, 97
Political leadership, 35, 39, 142
Political processes, 31
Pollock, Sir Frederick, 19
Population, 10
Population trends, 25, 44
Powell, John, 75
Procedures, 26, 41
Processes, 38
Processes of government, 31, 41
"Program surveys," 127
Public housing, 80
Public operation, 28-29
Rate of change, 22-23
Regionalism, 63, 66, 74-75, 80
Regulation, 26, 43
Research, 27
Revision, 146-149
Rights, 105
Root, Elihu, 4, 52 n, 67, 68, 84
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 49, 145 n
Schecter Case, 102, 115
Scientific management, 87, 118, 50
Separation of powers, 33
"Service state," 123
Shaw, George Bernard, 20 n
Short ballot, 32 n, 45, 54
Smith, Alfred E., 16
Social conflict, 2
Sovereign powers, 131, 135, 136
Spoils, 24, 52, 139
Spoilsmen, 53
Spoils system, 6, 24-25
Staff services, 54, 59
State government, 41, 51-54, 75
States' rights, 72, 78
Syndacilism, 69
Taylor Grazing Act, 69
Taylor, Frederick, 30, 40, 47, 48 n, 118
Tead, Ordway, 147
Technology, as a factor, 9, 11
  Physical, 13-14
  Social, 14-15
Training for public service, 138
Truman, Harry, 100, 145 n
Turner, Frederick Jackson, 10 n, 64, 65
Veblen, Thorstein, 22

Vested interests, 17
Vocational interests, 88
Vocational representation, 87, 89
Voluntary co-operation, 116
Wallace, Henry, 100
Warren, Charles B., 99
Webb, Sidney and Beatrice, 16, 87, 127 n
Wishes and ideas, as factors, 9, 15
Wilson, Woodrow, 40, 48, 92, 134

"In his classic *Reflections on Public Administration* Gaus wrote perceptively of the 'ecology' of public administration and its relationship to the rise of the administrative state. . . . He recounted how crises and changes in people, place, physical technology, social technology, and philosophy in the first half of the 20th century led citizens repeatedly to look to government for relief. . . . Politicians, in turn, created or expanded the powers of public agencies."

—Robert F. Durant, "Politics, Paradox, and the 'Ecology' of Public Administration"

"Gaus was the first to use Edmund Burke's ideas to directly tie politics with administration."

—A. U. Haque, *Journal of Management History*

John Merriman Gaus earned his Ph.D. degree in Political Science from Harvard University, taught at Amherst, the University of Wisconsin, and Harvard, and is considered one of the founding fathers of the discipline of public administration. He served as president of the American Political Science Association, and among his other books are *The Frontiers of Public Administration, Political Science Back Home: Service in Action,* and *Great Britain: A Study of Civic Loyalty.* A number of fellowships, lectures, and prizes have been established in his honor.

ISBN 0-8173-5418-2
90000
9 780817 354183

The University of Alabama Press
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0380
www.uapress.ua.edu