

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT ORIGINAL TEXTBOOK SERIES

公共管理英文版教材系列

Public Classics of Administration

FOURTH EDITION
(第四版)

公共行政学经典

Jay M. Shafritz 杰伊·M·沙夫里茨 Albert C. Hyde 艾伯特·C·海德 编

 中国人民大学出版社

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT ORIGINAL TEXTBOOK SERIES

公共管理英文版教材系列

Classics of Public Administration (4E), Jay M. Shafritz (US)

公共行政学经典 (第四版) 杰伊·M·沙夫里茨等 编

Public Management and Administration: An Introduction (3E), Owen E. Hughes (Australia)

公共管理导论 (第三版) 欧文·E·休斯 著

Classics of Organization Theory (5E), Jay M. Shafritz (US)

组织理论经典 (第五版) 杰伊·M·沙夫里茨等 编

Understanding Public Policy (10E), Thomas R. Dye (US)

理解公共政策 (第十版) 托马斯·R·戴伊 著

Public Policy: An Evolutionary Approach (2E), James P. Lester (US)

公共政策导论 (第二版) 詹姆斯·P·莱斯特等 著

本书由以时间为序收录的西方公共行政学各个时期的经典论文、专著和报告中的精彩片段汇编而成，介绍了西方公共行政学者的主要观点及公共行政学各种流派的主要理论，可作为大学本科高年级学生、研究生及公共管理硕士（MPA）的专业英语教材或相关专业教师、科研人员的参考用书。

著作权合同登记号：图字 01-2002-2578号

策 划：刘 晶

责任编辑：罗海林

版式设计：王坤杰

COVER DESIGN BY JIANG HONG STUDIO 2004
装帧设计 / 蒋宏工作室
专为思想做包装的机构

ISBN 7-300-05246-0



9 787300 052465 >

ISBN 7-300-05246-0/D·963

定价：48.00元

4200401923



4200401923



Public Classics of Administration

FOURTH EDITION
(第四版)

公共行政学经典

Jay M. Shafritz 杰伊·M·沙夫里茨 编
Albert C. Hyde 艾伯特·C·海德



D035
620

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

公共行政学经典(第4版)/沙夫里茨,海德著.
北京:中国人民大学出版社,2003
(公共管理英文版教材系列)

ISBN 7-300-05246-0/D·963

- I. 公…
- II. ①沙… ②海…
- III. 行政学-教材-英文
- IV. D035

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2003) 第 123460 号

公共管理英文版教材系列

Classics of Public Administration (Fourth Edition)

公共行政学经典 (第四版)

Jay M. Shafritz 杰伊·M·沙夫里茨 编
Albert C. Hyde 艾伯特·C·海德

出版发行 中国人民大学出版社

社 址 北京中关村大街 31 号 邮政编码 100080

电 话 010-62511242 (总编室) 010-62511239 (出版部)

010-62515351 (邮购部) 010-62514148 (门市部)

网 址 <http://www.crup.com.cn>

<http://www.ttrnet.com>(人大教研网)

经 销 新华书店

印 刷 北京东方圣雅印刷有限公司

开 本 787×965 毫米 1/16

版 次 2004 年 1 月第 1 版

印 张 38.75 插页 2

印 次 2004 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

字 数 686 000

定 价 48.00 元

版权所有 侵权必究 印装差错 负责调换

Preface

Be assured—the editors are not so bold as to assert that these are *the* classics of public administration. The field is so diverse that there can be no such list. However, we do contend that it is possible to make a list of many of the discipline's most significant writers and provide representative samples of their work. That is what we have attempted here. It is readily admitted that writers of equal stature have not found their way into this collection and that equally important works of some of the authors included here are missing. Considerations of space and balance necessarily prevailed.

The primary characteristic of a classic in any field is its enduring value. We have classic automobiles, classic works of literature, classic techniques for dealing with legal, medical, or military problems, and so on. Classics emerge and endure through the years because of their continuing ability to be useful. *The Three Musketeers* is as good an adventure story today as it was in 1844 when Alexandre Dumas wrote it. But how many other nineteenth-century novels can you name? Few have general utility for a twentieth-century audience. It has been no different with the professional literature of public administration. Much has been written, but what is still worth reading today or will be tomorrow? The intent of this collection is to make readily available some of the worthwhile material from the past that will be equally valuable for tomorrow.

Our criteria for including a selection was threefold. First the selection had to be relevant to a main theme of public administration. It had to be a basic statement that was consistently echoed or attacked in subsequent years. It also had to be important—of continuing relevance. This leads to our second criterion—significance. The selection had to be generally recognized as a significant contribution to the realm and discipline of public administration. An “unrecognized classic seems to us to be a contradiction. As a rule of thumb, we asked ourselves, “should the serious student of public administration be expected to be able to identify this author and his or her basic themes?” If the answer was yes, then it was so because such a contribution has long been recognized by the discipline as an important theme by a significant writer. While the editors can and expect to be criticized for excluding this or that particular article or writer, it would be difficult to honestly criticize us for our inclusions. The writers chosen are among the most widely quoted and reprinted practitioners and academics in public administration. The basic idea of this book was simply to bring them together. The final criterion for inclusion was readability. We sought selections that would be read and appreciated by people with or without a substantial background in public administration.

The selections are arranged in chronological order over a ninety-six-year period—from Woodrow Wilson in 1887 to Deil S. Wright in 1996. When read in this order, we hope that the collection will give the reader a sense of the continuity of the discipline's thinking and show how the various writers and themes literally build upon each other. This also facilitates introducing the writers' themes as representative of a particular decade. Obviously, many authors can and have spanned the decades with their contributions to the literature of the discipline. Nevertheless, the selections reprinted here should be viewed and discussed in their historical context. While many of the selections might seem quite old to a student readership, do not for a moment think that they are dated. They are considered classics in the first place because of their continuing value to each new generation.

We are pleased that this text is so widely used in schools of, and courses on, public administration. We naturally hesitate to change a product that has proved so useful to our peers. But we had to update it to include important themes of the 1990s. Because of size constraints we couldn't add without also doing some subtracting. Overall we deleted seven of the fifty-one selections from the third edition. However, discussions on the deleted authors (Lilienthal, Long, Seckler-Hudson, Parkinson, Peter and Hull, Wildavsky [on evaluation] and Weiss) were retained in the introductions. We very much regret having had to make these deletions—but we simply had to make room for the ten new selections. Eight of these are in the 1990s (Stivers, Barzelay, Sharkansky, the National Performance Review Report, Kettl, Holzer and Ingraham). We also added selections from the Hoover Commission Report of 1949 and from Alice Rivlin's *Systematic Thinking for Social Action* (1971).

The following individuals were variously helpful in the preparation of this and earlier editions and have earned our thanks: Lawrence Korb of the Brookings Institution; Sam Overman and Robert Gage of the University of Colorado at Denver; Howard McCurdy, David H. Rosenbloom and Bernard Ross of the American University; Katherine Naff and Ray Pomerleau of San Francisco State University; G. Ronald Gilbert of Florida International University; J. Steven Ott of the University of Utah; Delores Foley of the University of Hawaii; Harry A. Bailey of Temple University; Anita Caivara, Breena Coates, Donald Goldstein, Lawrence Howard, Kevin Kearns, Jerome McKinney, Lou Picard, and Harvey L. White of the University of Pittsburgh; Norma Riccucci and Frank J. Thompson of the State University of New York at Albany; E. W. Russell of Monash University, Melbourne Australia; Peter Foot of the Royal Naval College, Greenwich, United Kingdom; Jerry McCaffery of the Naval Post-graduate School; Geert Bouckaert of the Catholic University of Leuven in Belgium; Ari Halachmi of Tennessee State University; Larry Terry of Cleveland State University; Beverly Cigler of Penn State/Harrisburg; Mark Holzer of Rutgers/Newark; and Kenneth Warren of St. Louis University.

We also wish to acknowledge the helpful insight of many past users and experienced instructors, including: Carl Bellone, California State University, Hayward; Richard Chakerian, Florida State University; Donna Cofer, Southwest Missouri State University; Susan Cox, California State University—Long Beach; James Glass, North Texas State University; Andrew McNitt, Eastern Illinois University; Robert Miewald, University of Nebraska, Lincoln; Philip Russo, Miami University; Howard Balanoff, University of Texas; Stephen E. Condrey, University of Georgia; David H. Davis, University of Toledo; Andrew Glassberg, University of Missouri at St. Louis; Donald Kettl, University of Wisconsin at Madison; Greg Protasel, University of Alaska at Anchorage; John Stewart, Pennsylvania State University.

Foreword

This is a good time to read the classics of public administration. The field of public administration is under assault by both scholars and the public at large. Public trust in the capability of government to carry out large activities in an efficient, responsive manner remains low. Economists wielding public choice theories lend scientific credibility to the general notion that firms in a competitive market consistently outperform government bureaus. Consultants and various elected officials attack public administration with proposals for "reinventing" government. Around the world, governmental responsibilities are being cut back, privatized, and contracted out, all part of a general movement to limit the scope of public administration.

This anthology reminds readers that much still can be learned by studying the knowledge base of the field. From the early attempts to build up the capabilities of the administrative state to the current efforts to limit them, the field of public administration has assembled an impressive body of knowledge. The effort to collect that knowledge, beginning with the conception of the field more than 100 years ago, has been directed toward one guiding objective: to reform public administration in such a way as to make government a more effective servant of the society it serves.

In the beginning, when scholars like Woodrow Wilson and Max Weber began to investigate developments within the executive branch of government, the central problem facing reformers was a lack of administrative capacity. Government organizations were small, poorly run, and frequently corrupt. They needed to be built up. Public administration appeared as a field of study that sought to reform bureaus and agencies by making their management more professional. A profession, by definition, is a field in which practitioners prepare for their work by learning specialized skills and methods as well as the scientific, historical, and scholarly principles underlying them. Public administration is not a profession like law or medicine where entrance to practice is strictly regulated through special examinations or licensing procedures. It is professional in the sense that it rests upon a body of knowledge not easily obtained through simple on-the-job training. That body of knowledge must be learned. A practicing administrator without such knowledge would be no more successful than a practicing engineer ignorant of mechanics.

This book provides an important guide to the early base of knowledge that supports the practice of public administration. The findings from the early period of study, when reformers sought to enlarge administrative capabilities, are still applicable today. Public administrators still have to organize programs. They still have to give orders. They still have to make decisions. They still have to prepare budgets and they still have to motivate workers in effective ways. A government whose executive officials do not understand these basic administrative skills is not a modern government, no matter how extensively reinvented or privatized it is.

The field of public administration has built up a considerable body of knowledge in its 100 year history that addresses matters such as these. The classics can be found in this volume. Readers can peruse Max Weber's famous essay on bureaucracy and Robert Merton's rejoinder on its dysfunctions. They can review Luther Gulick's advice on the principles of administration and Chester Barnard's insights on informal organizations. They can listen to Mary Parker Follett explain the giving of orders.

They can scrutinize theories of human motivation by A. H. Maslow and Douglas McGregor and the science of incremental decision making by Charles Lindblom. Selections like these are as applicable today as when written many decades ago.

In the beginning, public administration consisted largely of methods such as these. That phase in the development of public administration has ended. Practitioners have turned away from government as behemoth. The build-up phase that gave urgency to so many early theories of public administration is over. Public administration is becoming smaller, lighter, more responsive, and like so many other technologies, more complicated.

When governmental agencies first began to provide public services on a large scale, most persons were content to receive simple assistance. To persons accustomed to a rudimentary lifestyle, the simple services that government delivered were superior to the provision of no such services at all. As societies modernized, the public demanded higher levels of sophistication. This transformed the workings of public administration, just as it altered the technical operation of machines like the automobile. A public administrator skilled only in the old system of management is no more useful than a garage mechanic who only knows how to repair forty-year-old automobiles.

Modern public administrators must learn more. They must learn more sophisticated methods of management and they must learn how to be more responsive to the elected officials and publics they serve. Fortunately, the classics of public administration give advice on these issues as well.

The new public management consists of a variety of devices designed to squeeze more accomplishments out of government agencies. It consists of innovative organizational forms, such as those presented by Warren Bennis nearly thirty years ago. It includes cut-back management, as Charles Levine explained twenty years ago. It contains new methods of decentralization, new techniques for tracking performance, and new procedures for creating teamwork within old governmental hierarchies. Most important, it includes a variety of approaches grouped under the general heading of "re-inventing" government. Those approaches are aimed principally at the creation of incentives, such as competition, that encourage public managers to improve performance. Again, Jay Shafritz and Albert Hyde have collected the most important works bearing on the improvement of governmental administration, many of them published in the past ten years.

Another important body of knowledge remains. Public administration is more than good management; it is also good government. Public administration is part of the means by which people make and enforce collective decisions about how society is to be run. Collective decisions address issues such as the amount of air pollution that the public will tolerate. They address the redistribution of income and the certification of people eligible to receive it. They determine the means by which criminal acts are defined and deterred. Collective decisions and their implementation differ fundamentally from the buying and selling of goods by privately owned firms.

Public administrators need to understand their role not only as managers of programs, but also as participants in the governing process. Public administrators exercise considerable discretion in their work, from the decisions they make to the organizations they design. They do so under a demanding public eye.

The understanding of public administration as a matter of governance has its roots in the insights of Dwight Waldo and Paul Appleby's works published some fifty years ago. It can be found in classics such as Graham Allison's essay on the differences between public and private management, in

David Rosenbloom's work on the legal basis of public administration, and in the continuing search for an appropriate theory of administrative ethics. Once again, Shafritz and Hyde have collected the most important works in this body of knowledge.

Ideally, practitioners would read widely in preparation for their public responsibilities. They would read all of the classics of public administration in the original texts. Realistically, practitioners do not have the time to do so, especially in an era when schools of public affairs require their students to master other subjects such as statistics and microeconomics. Shafritz and Hyde have performed a great service by assembling the classics of public administration in one accessible volume. In doing so, they have created a classic of their own. No person should attempt to practice public administration without first reading this book.

Howard E. McCurdy
University of Washington
(1995–96)
The American University

Chronological Contents

Part One Early Voices and the First Quarter Century		2
(1880s to 1920s)		
1. The Study of Administration (1887) Woodrow Wilson		14
2. Politics and Administration (1900) Frank J. Goodnow		27
3. Scientific Management (1912) Frederick W. Taylor		30
4. The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States (1918) William F. Willoughby		33
5. Bureaucracy (1922) Max Weber		37
6. Introduction to the Study of Public Administration (1926) Leonard D. White		44
7. The Giving of Orders (1926) Mary Parker Follett		53
 Part Two The New Deal to Mid-Century		
(1930 to 1950)		62
8. Public Administration and the Public Interest (1936) E. Pendleton Herring		76
9. Notes on the Theory of Organization (1937) Luther Gulick		81
10. Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management (1937) Louis Brownlow, Charles E. Merriam, & Luther Gulick		90
11. Informal Organizations and Their Relation to Formal Organizations (1938) Chester I. Barnard		95
12. Bureaucratic Structure and Personality (1940) Robert K. Merton		100
13. The Lack of a Budgetary Theory (1940) V. O. Key, Jr.		109
14. A Theory of Human Motivation (1943) A. H. Maslow		114
15. Government Is Different (1945) Paul Appleby		122
16. The Proverbs of Administration (1946) Herbert A. Simon		127
17. The Administrative State: Conclusion (1948) Dwight Waldo		142
18. The Cooptative Mechanism (1949) Philip Selznick		147
19. The Report of The Commission on Organization of The Executive Branch of Government (1949) Excerpt from The Hoover Commission Report		154
 Part Three The 1950s and 1960s		164
20. Toward a Theory of Budgeting (1952) Verne B. Lewis		178
21. The Human Side of Enterprise (1957) Douglas Murray McGregor		192
22. The Science of "Muddling Through" (1959) Charles E. Lindblom		198
23. Organizations and the System Concept (1966) Daniel Katz & Robert L. Kahn		209
24. The Road to PPB: The Stages of Budget Reform (1966) Allen Schick		220
25. The American System (1966) Morton Grodzins		237
26. Organizations of the Future (1967) Warren Bennis		242
27. Policy Analysts: A New Professional Role in Government Service (1967) Yehezkel Dror		254
28. The Life Cycle of Bureaus (1967) Anthony Downs		262
29. Rescuing Policy Analysis from PPBS (1969) Aaron Wildavsky		275
30. Administrative Decentralization and Political Power (1969) Herbert Kaufman		289
31. The End of Liberalism: The Indictment (1969) Theodore J. Lowi		302

Part Four The 1970s and 1980s	306
32. Toward a New Public Administration (1971) H. George Frederickson	329
33. Systematic Thinking for Social Action (1971) Alice M. Rivlin	342
34. Implementation (1973) Jeffrey L. Pressman & Aaron Wildavsky	353
35. Watergate: Implications for Responsible Government (1974) Frederick C. Mosher & Others	357
36. Representative Bureaucracy (1974) Samuel Krislov	364
37. Organizational Decline and Cutback Management (1978) Charles H. Levine	369
38. Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects? (1980) Graham T. Allison	383
39. Street-Level Bureaucracy: The Critical Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats (1980) Michael Lipsky	401
40. Public Budgeting Amidst Uncertainty and Instability (1981) Naomi Caiden	409
41. Democracy and the Public Service: The Collective Services (1982) Frederick C. Mosher	420
42. Public Administrative Theory and the Separation of Powers (1983) David H. Rosenbloom	432
43. The Possibility of Administrative Ethics (1985) Dennis F. Thompson	444
44. The Seven Deadly Sins of Policy Analysts (1986) Arnold J. Meltzer	453
45. Exploring the Limits of Privatization (1987) Ronald C. Moe	458
Part Five The 1990s Transition to the Next Century	468
46. Toward a Feminist Perspective in Public Administration Theory (1990) Camilla Stivers	481
47. Breaking Through Bureaucracy (1992) Michael Barzelay with Babak J. Armajani	491
48. What a Political Scientist Can Tell a Policymaker About the Likelihood of Success or Failure (1992) Ira Sharkansky	514
49. Using Performance Measures for Federal Budgeting: Proposals and Prospects (1993) Philip G. Joyce	523
50. From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less (1993) The National Performance Review	535
51. Reinventing Government? Appraising the National Performance Review (1994) Donald F. Kettl	543
52. Productivity and Quality Management (1995) Marc Holzer	558
53. Changing Work, Changing Workforce, Changing Expectations (1995) Patricia Wallace Ingraham	567
54. Understanding Intergovernmental Relations (1996) Deil S. Wright	578

Topical Contents

The Discipline of Public Administration

The Study of Administration (1887) Woodrow Wilson	14
Introduction to the Study of Public Administration (1926) Leonard D. White	44
The Administrative State: Conclusion (1948) Dwight Waldo	142
Toward a New Public Administration (1971) H. George Frederickson	329
Public Administrative Theory and the Separation of Powers (1983) David H. Rosenbloom	432
Toward a Feminist Perspective in Public Administration Theory (1990) Camilla Stivers	481

The Political Context of Public Administration

Politics and Administration (1900) Frank J. Goodnow	27
Government Is Different (1945) Paul Appleby	122
Administrative Decentralization and Political Power (1969) Herbert Kaufman	289

Bureaucracy

Bureaucracy (1922) Max Weber	37
Bureaucratic Structure and Personality (1940) Robert K. Merton	100
The Life Cycles of Bureaus (1967) Anthony Downs	262
Street-Level Bureaucracy: The Critical Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats (1980) Michael Lipsky	401
Breaking Through Bureaucracy (1992) Michael Barzelay with Babak J. Armajani	491

Organization Theory

Scientific Management (1912) Frederick W. Taylor	30
The Giving of Orders (1926) Mary Parker Follett	58
Notes on the Theory of Organization (1937) Luther Gulick	81
Informal Organizations and Their Relation to Formal Organizations (1938) Chester I. Barnard	95
The Proverbs of Administration (1946) Herbert A. Simon	127
The Cooptative Mechanism (1949) Philip Selznick	147
Organizations and the System Concept (1966) Daniel Katz & Robert L. Kahn	209
Organizations of the Future (1967) Warren Bennis	242

Human Resources Management

A Theory of Human Motivation (1943) A. H. Maslow	114
The Human Side of Enterprise (1957) Douglas Murray McGregor	192
Representative Bureaucracy (1974) Samuel Krislov	364
Democracy and the Public Service: The Collective Services (1982) Frederick C. Mosher	420
Changing Work, Changing Workforce, Changing Expectations (1995) Patricia Wallace Ingraham	567

The Budgetary Process

The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States (1918) William F. Willoughby	33
The Lack of a Budgetary Theory (1940) V. O. Key, Jr.	109
Toward a Theory of Budgeting (1952) Verne B. Lewis	178
The Road to PPB: The Stages of Budget Reform (1966) Allen Schick	220
Rescuing Policy Analysis from PPBS (1969) Aaron Wildavsky	275

Organizational Decline and Cutback Management (1978) Charles H. Levine	369
Public Budgeting Amidst Uncertainty and Instability (1981) Naomi Caiden	409
Using Performance Measures for Federal Budgeting: Proposals and Prospects (1993) Philip G. Joyce	523
Public Management	
Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management (1937) Louis Brownlow, Charles E. Merriam, & Luther Gulick	90
The Report of The Commission on Organization of The Executive Branch of Government (1949) Excerpt from The Hoover Commission Report	154
Systematic Thinking for Social Action (1971) Alice M. Rivlin	342
Implementation (1973) Jeffrey L. Pressman & Aaron Wildavsky	353
Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects? (1980) Graham T. Allison	383
Exploring the Limits of Privatization (1987) Ronald C. Moe	458
Productivity and Quality Management (1995) Marc Holzer	558
Public Policy and Analysis	
The Science of "Muddling Through" (1959) Charles E. Lindblom	198
Policy Analysts: A New Professional Role for Government Service (1967) Yehezkel Dror	254
The End of Liberalism: The Indictment (1969) Theodore J. Lowi	302
The Seven Deadly Sins of Policy Analysts (1986) Arnold J. Meltsner	453
What a Political Scientist Can Tell a Policymaker About the Likelihood of Success or Failure (1992) Ira Sharkansky	514
Program Evaluation	
Systematic Thinking for Social Action (1971) Alice M. Rivlin	342
From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less (1993) The National Performance Review	535
Reinventing Government? Appraising the National Performance Review (1994) Donald F. Kettl	543
Intergovernmental Relations	
The American System (1966) Morton Grodzins	237
Understanding Intergovernmental Relations (1996) Deil S. Wright	578
Public Service Ethics	
Public Administration and the Public Interest (1936) E. Pendleton Herring	76
Watergate: Implications for Responsible Government (1974) Frederick C. Mosher & Others	357
The Possibility of Administrative Ethics (1985) Dennis F. Thompson	444

Writings on public administration go back to biblical times and before.¹ The ancient Egyptians and Babylonians left considerable advice on the techniques of management and administration. So did the ancients of China, Greece, and Rome. Modern management techniques can be traced from Alexander the Great's use of staff² to the assembly line methods of the arsenal of Venice;³ from the theorizing of Niccolo Machiavelli on the nature of leadership⁴ to Adam Smith's advocacy of the division of labor;⁵ and from Robert Owen's assertion that "vital machines" (employees) should be given as much attention as "inanimate machines"⁶ to Charles Babbage's contention that there existed "basic principles of management."⁷

It is possible to find most of the modern concepts of management and leadership stated by one or another of the writers of the classical, medieval, and pre-modern world. However, our concern is not with this prehistory of modern management, but with the academic discipline and occupational specialty that is U.S. public administration.

Calling for a New Discipline on Running a Government

While Alexander Hamilton,⁸ Thomas Jefferson,⁹ Andrew Jackson,¹⁰ and other notables of the first century of the Republic have dealt with the problem of running the administrative affairs of the state, it was not until 1887 that we find a serious claim made that public administration should be a self-conscious, professional field. Accordingly, the first selection is Woodrow Wilson's famous 1887 essay, "The Study of Administration." While it attracted slight notice at the time, it has become customary to trace the origins of the academic discipline of public administration to it.

While Woodrow Wilson (1856–1924) would later be president; first of the American Political Science Association, then of Princeton University, and later of the United States, in the mid-1880s he was a struggling young instructor at Bryn Mawr College for Women. During this time he worked on several textbooks now long forgotten; wrote fiction under a pen name (but it was all rejected); and wrote a political essay that remains his most enduring contribution as a political scientist. On November 11, 1886, Wilson wrote to the editor of the *Political Science Quarterly* to whom he had submitted his article.¹¹ Wilson asserted that he had very modest aims for his work, which he thought of as "a semi-popular introduction" to administrative studies. He even said that he thought his work might be "too slight." Ironically, nearly one hundred years later, the American Society for Public Administration would launch a Centennial's Agenda Project to identify the critical issues for the field and cite the publication of Wilson's essay as "generally regarded as the beginning of public administration as a specific field of study."¹²

In "The Study of Administration," Wilson attempted nothing less than to refocus political science. Rather than be concerned with the great maxims of lasting political truth, he argued that political science should concentrate on how governments are administered. This was necessary because, in his words, "It is getting harder to run a constitution than to frame one."

Wilson wanted the study of public administration to focus not only on personnel problems, as many other reformers of the time had advocated, but also on organization and management in general. The reform movement of the time, which had recently secured the passage of the first lasting

federal civil service reform legislation, the Pendleton Act of 1883, had a reform agenda that both started and ended with merit appointments. Wilson sought to move the concerns of public administration a step further by investigating the “organization and methods of our government offices” with a view toward determining “first, what government can properly and successfully do, and secondly, how it can do these proper things with the utmost possible efficiency and at the least possible cost either of money or energy.” Wilson was concerned with organizational efficiency and economy—that is, productivity in its most simplistic formulation. What could be more current?

In his essay, Wilson is also credited with positing the existence of a major distinction between politics and administration. This was a common and necessary political tactic of the reform movement because arguments that public appointments should be based on fitness and merit, rather than partisanship, necessarily had to assert that “politics” were out of place in public service. In establishing what became known as the politics-administration dichotomy, Wilson was really referring to “partisan” politics. While this subtlety was lost on many, Wilson’s main themes—that public administration should be premised on a science of management and separate from traditional politics—fell on fertile intellectual ground. The ideas of this then obscure professor eventually became the dogma of the discipline and remained so until after World War II. While no longer dogma, his ideas are still highly influential and absolutely essential to an understanding of the evolution of public administration.¹³

The Case for a Politics-Administration Dichotomy

A more carefully argued examination of the politics-administration dichotomy was offered by Frank J. Goodnow (1859–1939) in his book, *Politics and Administration*, published in 1900. Goodnow, one of the founders and first president (in 1903) of the American Political Science Association, was one of the most significant voices and writers of the progressive reform movement.¹⁴ To Goodnow, modern administration presented a number of dilemmas involving political and administrative functions that had now supplanted the traditional concern with the separation of powers among the various branches of government. Politics and administration could be distinguished, he argued, as “the expression of the will of the state and the execution of that will.” We have reprinted here Goodnow’s classic analysis of the distinction between politics and administration. Note how even Goodnow had to admit that when the function of political decision making and administration was legally separated, there developed a “tendency for the necessary control to develop extra-legally through the political party system.”

The Impact of Scientific Management

At about the same time Woodrow Wilson was calling for a science of management, Frederick W. Taylor (1856–1915) was independently conducting some of his first experiments in a Philadelphia steel plant. Taylor, generally considered the “father of scientific management,” pioneered the development of time and motion studies. Today, scientific management is frequently referred to as pseudo-scientific management because of its conceptualization of people as merely extensions of machines—as human interchangeable parts of a large impersonal production machine. Premised on the notion that there was “one best way” of accomplishing any given task, scientific management sought to increase output by discovering the fastest, most efficient, and least fatiguing production methods. The job of the scientific manager, once the one best way was found, was to impose this procedure upon all the workforce. Classical organization theory would evolve from this notion. If there was one best way to accomplish any given production task, then correspondingly, there must also be one best way to accomplish a task of social organization. Such principles of social organization were assumed to exist and to be waiting to be discovered by diligent scientific observation and analysis.

Strangely enough, while Taylor's 1911 book *Principles of Scientific Management*¹⁵ is the work for which he is best known, the credit for coining the term *scientific management* belongs not to Taylor but to an associate of his, Louis D. Brandeis (1856–1941). Brandeis, who would later be a Supreme Court justice, needed a catchy phrase to describe the new-style management techniques of Taylor and his disciples when he was to present arguments that railroad rate increases should be denied before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Brandeis dramatically argued that the railroads could save “a million dollars a day” by applying scientific management methods. The highly publicized hearings beginning in 1910 caused a considerable sensation and vastly expanded Taylor's reputation. Ironically, Taylor was initially opposed to the phrase, thinking that it sounded too academic. But he quickly learned to embrace it. So did the rest of the country. In the first half of this century, scientific management was gospel and Frederick W. Taylor was its prophet.¹⁶

Taylor's greatest public-sector popularity came in 1912 after he presented his ideas to a Special Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate the Taylor and Other Systems of Shop Management. A portion of that testimony is reprinted here. Taylor's comprehensive statement of scientific management principles was focused on what he called the duties of management. These duties included

1. replacing traditional rule-of-thumb methods of work accomplishment with systematic, more scientific methods of measuring and managing individual work elements;
2. studying scientifically the selection and sequential development of workers to ensure optimal placement of workers into work roles;
3. obtaining the cooperation of workers to ensure full application of scientific principles; and
4. establishing logical divisions within work roles and responsibilities between workers and management.

What seems so obvious today was revolutionary in 1912.

Budgeting Reform as a Cornerstone of Public Administration

Perhaps the other most significant early scholar of public administration along with Frank Goodnow (remember that Woodrow Wilson abandoned scholarship for politics) was William F. Willoughby (1867–1960). He was a member of the Taft Commission of 1912, which issued the first call for a national executive budgeting system, and later director of the Institute for Governmental Research, which would become part of the Brookings Institution. He also had a key role in writing the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, which would finally accomplish the objectives of the Taft Commission by establishing an executive budget system at the national level along with the Budget Office and the General Accounting Office.

Willoughby wrote widely on the myriad issues of public administration. He believed that public administration had universal aspects that were applicable to all branches of government.¹⁷ His early public administration text¹⁸ was really the first of a trilogy covering all three branches of government.¹⁹ But it is his early work on budgetary reform that is of special interest. Writing in 1918, he outlined developments that were leading to the creation of modern budget systems in state governments. In an excerpt from *The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States*,²⁰ Willoughby argues that budget reform would involve three major threads: (1) how budgets would advance and provide for popular control, (2) how budgets would enhance legislative and executive cooperation, and (3) how budgets would ensure administrative and management efficiency. Rather prophetic when you consider such everyday headlines as taxpayer's revolts, “Proposition 13” movements, and other forms of expenditure and revenue limitation laws (thread 1: popular control); continued infighting and

increasing gridlock between the executive and legislative branches over budgetary control, deficits, and balanced budgets (thread 2: executive-legislative cooperation); and the effectiveness or lack of it in overburdened budgeting systems in maintaining managerial practices (thread 3: management effectiveness).

These early voices—Wilson, Goodnow, Taylor, and Willoughby—all had profound influences on the development of public administration. To begin with, they identified many of the critical themes that would be permanent parts of the field of study that is modern public administration. But to an even greater extent, they were prophetic voices—writing at a time when government employment and expenditures were still at very minor levels. At the turn of the century in 1900, federal, state, and local governments included slightly more than a million employees combined. Total government outlays were less than \$1.5 billion. By the 1920s, government employment would triple and expenditures would be at just less than \$9 billion.²¹ Modern public administration would be founded on a scope that was without precedent in the United States' brief experience. In short, public administration was to be a field of study, not about a function or an enterprise, but rather about an entire major sector of what would grow to be the largest and most influential economy the world has ever seen.

Public Administration and the New Role of Government

The aftermath of World War I marked the beginning of this change process for public administration. At the conclusion of all previous wars, the U.S. government had quickly returned to basic minimal levels. However, this time the scope and influence of government in U.S. life would not diminish. The United States was changing from a rural agricultural society to an urban industrial nation. This required a considerable response from public administration because so many new functions and programs would be established. The number of paved highways would increase tenfold in the 1920s. Cities would install traffic management systems, and states would impose driving tests. As the population became increasingly urban, vastly expanded programs would be needed in public parks and recreation, public works, public health, and public safety. Public administration as an activity was booming all during the 1920s. The federal government's response to the Great Depression of the 1930s would make public administration all the more pervasive as part of American life.²²

Public administration theorists, such as Dwight Waldo,²³ Vincent Ostrom,²⁴ Nicholas Henry,²⁵ and Howard McCurdy,²⁶ would describe the pattern of development within public administration between the world wars as a "period of orthodoxy." The tenets of this orthodox ideology held that "true democracy and true efficiency are synonymous, or at least reconcilable,"²⁷ that the work of government could be neatly divided into decision making and execution and that administration was a science with discoverable principles. The initial imprint of the scientific management movement, the progressive reform political movement, and the politics-administration dichotomy became central focuses for public administration both as a profession and a field of study.

A critical linkage for the study of administration was its concern, indeed almost obsession, with organization and control. By definition, control was to be built into organizational structure and design to assure both accountability and efficiency. In fact, early management theorists assumed that organization and control were virtually synonymous. Remember that traditional administrative notions were based on historical models provided by the military and the Roman Catholic Church, which viewed organizational conflict as deviancy to be severely punished. When government units were small, less significant, and relatively provincial, the management of their organizations was less consequential. However, as the size, scope, and level of effort increased, pressures for better organization and control mounted. Under the influence of the scientific management movement, public administration became increasingly concerned with understanding bureaucratic forms of organization. The division of labor; span of control; organizational hierarchy and chain of command; reporting systems; departmentalization; and the development of standard operating rules, policies, and procedures became critical concerns to scholars and practitioners in the field.