

Eighth Edition

# CLASSICS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Jay M. Shafritz

| Albert C. Hyde

CLASSICS  
*of*  
PUBLIC  
ADMINISTRATION



CLASSICS  
*of*  
PUBLIC  
ADMINISTRATION

**Eighth Edition**

Jay M. Shafritz

*Professor Emeritus*

*University of Pittsburgh*

Albert C. Hyde

*Senior Scholar in Residence*

*American University*



---

Australia • Brazil • Mexico • Singapore • United Kingdom • United States

This is an electronic version of the print textbook. Due to electronic rights restrictions, some third party content may be suppressed. Editorial review has deemed that any suppressed content does not materially affect the overall learning experience. The publisher reserves the right to remove content from this title at any time if subsequent rights restrictions require it. For valuable information on pricing, previous editions, changes to current editions, and alternate formats, please visit [www.cengage.com/highered](http://www.cengage.com/highered) to search by ISBN#, author, title, or keyword for materials in your areas of interest.

**Important Notice:** Media content referenced within the product description or the product text may not be available in the eBook version.



***Classics of Public Administration,***  
**Eighth Edition**

Jay M. Shafritz, Albert C. Hyde

Product Director: Paul Banks

Product Manager: Carolyn Merrill

Content Developer: Amy Bither

Managing Content Developer:  
Megan Garvey

Associate Content Developer:  
Rachael Bailey

Product Assistant: Michelle Forbes

Marketing Manager: Valerie Hartman

Senior Content Project Manager:  
Corinna Dibble

Art Director: Sarah Cole

Manufacturing Planner: Fola Orekoya

IP Analyst: Alexandra Ricciardi

IP Project Manager: Farah Fard

Production Service and Compositor:  
MPS Limited

Cover Designer: Studio Montage

© 2017, 2012, 2009 Cengage Learning

WCN: 02-200-203

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this work covered by the copyright herein may be reproduced, transmitted, stored, or used in any form or by any means graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including but not limited to photocopying, recording, scanning, digitizing, taping, web distribution, information networks, or information storage and retrieval systems, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

For product information and technology assistance, contact us at **Cengage Learning Customer & Sales Support, 1-800-354-9706**.

For permission to use material from this text or product, submit all requests online at **www.cengage.com/permissions**.

Further permissions questions can be emailed to **permissionrequest@cengage.com**

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015939687

ISBN: 978-1-305-63903-4

Cengage Learning  
20 Channel Center Street  
Boston, MA 02210  
USA

Cengage Learning is a leading provider of customized learning solutions with employees residing in nearly 40 different countries and sales in more than 125 countries around the world. Find your local representative at **www.cengage.com**.

Cengage Learning products are represented in Canada by Nelson Education, Ltd.

To learn more about Cengage Learning Solutions, visit **www.cengage.com**.

Purchase any of our products at your local college store or at our preferred online store **www.cengagebrain.com**.

Printed in the United States of America  
Print Number: 01 Print Year: 2015

# CHRONOLOGICAL CONTENTS

---

<b>Part One</b>	<b>Early Voices and the First Quarter Century</b>	<b>ANCIENT TIMES</b>	<b>2</b>
	<b>TO 1920S</b>		
	1. The Analects of Confucius (300 BCE) <i>Confucius</i>		19
	2. On Duties (44 BCE) <i>Cicero</i>		23
	3. Of the Principle of Utility (1780) <i>Jeremy Bentham</i>		29
	4. On War (1832) <i>Carl von Clausewitz</i>		32
	5. The Study of Administration (1887) <i>Woodrow Wilson</i>		35
	6. Politics and Administration (1900) <i>Frank J. Goodnow</i>		48
	7. Problems of Municipal Administration (1904) <i>Jane Addams</i>		51
	8. Scientific Management (1912) <i>Frederick W. Taylor</i>		56
	9. The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States (1918) <i>William F. Willoughby</i>		59
	10. Bureaucracy (1922) <i>Max Weber</i>		63
	11. Introduction to the Study of Public Administration (1926) <i>Leonard D. White</i>		68
	12. The Giving of Orders (1926) <i>Mary Parker Follett</i>		76
<b>Part Two</b>	<b>The New Deal to Mid-Century</b>	<b>THE 1930S TO 1950S</b>	<b>84</b>
	13. Bureaucracy and the Public Interest (1936) <i>E. Pendleton Herring</i>		101
	14. Notes on the Theory of Organization (1937) <i>Luther Gulick</i>		105
	15. Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management (1937) <i>Louis Brownlow, Charles E. Merriam, and Luther Gulick</i>		114
	16. Bureaucratic Structure and Personality (1940) <i>Robert K. Merton</i>		119
	17. A Theory of Human Motivation (1943) <i>A. H. Maslow</i>		127
	18. The Proverbs of Administration (1946) <i>Herbert A. Simon</i>		135
	19. The Administrative State Revisited (1940, 1965) <i>Dwight Waldo</i>		149
	20. Theory Y: The Integration of Individual and Organizational Goals (1957) <i>Douglas McGregor</i>		166
	21. The Science of "Muddling Through" (1959) <i>Charles E. Lindblom</i>		172
<b>Part Three</b>	<b>From JFK to Civil Service Reform</b>	<b>THE 1960S AND 1970S</b>	<b>184</b>
	22. The Road to PPB: The Stages of Budget Reform (1966) <i>Allen Schick</i>		203
	23. Organizations of the Future (1967) <i>Warren Bennis</i>		219
	24. Policy Analysts: A New Professional Role in Government Service (1967) <i>Yehezkel Dror</i>		230
	25. The Life Cycle of Bureaus (1967) <i>Anthony Downs</i>		238
	26. Rescuing Policy Analysis from PPBS (1969) <i>Aaron Wildavsky</i>		251
	27. Administrative Decentralization and Political Power (1969) <i>Herbert Kaufman</i>		265
	28. The End of Liberalism: The Indictment (1969) <i>Theodore J. Lowi</i>		278
	29. Toward a New Public Administration (1971) <i>H. George Frederickson</i>		282
	30. Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning (1973) <i>Horst W. J. Rittel and Melvin M. Webber</i>		295
	31. Systematic Thinking for Social Action (1971) <i>Alice M. Rivlin</i>		307

32. The Implementation Game (1977) <i>Eugene Bardach</i>	318
33. Watergate: Implications for Responsible Government (1974) <i>Frederick C. Mosher and Others</i>	332
34. Representative Bureaucracy (1974) <i>Samuel Krislov</i>	339
35. Intergovernmental Relations: An Analytical Overview (1974) <i>Deil S. Wright</i>	344
<b>Part Four   From Reagan to Reinvention   THE 1980S AND 1990S  </b>	<b>358</b>
36. Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects? (1980) <i>Graham T. Allison</i>	384
37. Street-Level Bureaucracy: The Critical Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats (1980) <i>Michael Lipsky</i>	402
38. Public Budgeting Amidst Uncertainty and Instability (1981) <i>Naomi Caiden</i>	410
39. Public Administrative Theory and the Separation of Powers (1983) <i>David H. Rosenbloom</i>	421
40. Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies (1984) <i>John W. Kingdon</i>	433
41. The Possibility of Administrative Ethics (1985) <i>Dennis F. Thompson</i>	444
42. American Federalism: Madison's Middle Ground in the 1980s (1987) <i>Martha Derthick</i>	453
43. The Organizational Culture Perspective (1989) <i>J. Steven Ott</i>	465
44. From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity (1990) <i>R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr.</i>	472
45. Toward a Feminist Perspective in Public Administration Theory (1990) <i>Camilla Stivers</i>	481
46. The Motivational Bases of Public Service (1990) <i>James L. Perry and Lois Recascino Wise</i>	491
47. Managing State Government Operations: Changing Visions of Staff Agencies (1990) <i>Michael Barzelay and Babak J. Armajani</i>	501
48. From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less (1993) <i>The National Performance Review</i>	514
49. Using Performance Measures in the Federal Budgeting Process (1993) <i>U.S. Congressional Budget Office</i>	522
<b>Part Five   Public Administration in the Twenty-First Century  </b>	<b>532</b>
50. Information Technology and Democratic Governance (2002) <i>Joseph S. Nye Jr.</i>	545
51. Unmasking Administrative Evil (2004) <i>Guy B. Adams and Danny L. Balfour</i>	555
52. The Ethics of Dissent: Managing Guerilla Government (2006) <i>Rosemary O'Leary</i>	567
53. Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers (2006) <i>Robert Agranoff</i>	584
54. Public Value: Theory and Practice : Conclusions (2011) <i>John Benington and Mark H. Moore</i>	596
A Chronology of U.S. Public Administration	609



# TOPICAL CONTENTS

---

## THE DISCIPLINE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The Analects of Confucius <i>Confucius</i> .....	19
The Study of Administration, <i>Woodrow Wilson</i> .....	35
Introduction to the Study of Public Administration, <i>Leonard D. White</i> .....	68
The Administrative State Revisited, <i>Dwight Waldo</i> .....	149
Toward a New Public Administration, <i>H. George Frederickson</i> .....	282
Public Administrative Theory and the Separation of Powers, <i>David H. Rosenbloom</i> .....	421

## PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN CONTEXT

Politics and Administration, <i>Frank J. Goodnow</i> .....	48
Administrative Decentralization and Political Power, <i>Herbert Kaufman</i> .....	265
The End of Liberalism: The Indictment, <i>Theodore J. Lowi</i> .....	278
Toward a Feminist Perspective in Public Administration Theory, <i>Camilla Stivers</i> .....	481

## BUREAUCRACY

Bureaucracy, <i>Max Weber</i> .....	63
Bureaucratic Structure and Personality, <i>Robert K. Merton</i> .....	119
Organizations of the Future, <i>Warren Bennis</i> .....	219
The Life Cycle of Bureaus, <i>Anthony Downs</i> .....	238
Street-Level Bureaucracy: The Critical Role of Street-Level Bureaucrats, <i>Michael Lipsky</i> .....	402
Managing State Government Operations: Changing Visions of Staff Agencies, <i>Michael Barzelay &amp; Babak J. Armajani</i> .....	501

## ORGANIZATION THEORY

Scientific Management, <i>Frederick W. Taylor</i> .....	56
The Giving of Orders, <i>Mary Parker Follett</i> .....	76
Notes on the Theory of Organization, <i>Luther Gulick</i> .....	105
The Proverbs of Administration, <i>Herbert A. Simon</i> .....	135
The Organizational Culture Perspective, <i>J. Steven Ott</i> .....	465

## HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

A Theory of Human Motivation, <i>A. H. Maslow</i> .....	127
Theory Y: The Integration of Individual and Organizational Goals, <i>Douglas M. McGregor</i> .....	166
Representative Bureaucracy, <i>Samuel Krislov</i> .....	339
From Affirmative Action to Affirming Diversity, <i>R. Roosevelt Thomas, Jr.</i> .....	472
The Motivational Bases of Public Service, <i>James L. Perry &amp; Lois Recascino Wise</i> .....	491

## THE BUDGETARY PROCESS

The Movement for Budgetary Reform in the States, <i>William F. Willoughby</i> .....	59
The Road to PPB: The Stages of Budget Reform, <i>Allen Schick</i> .....	203
Rescuing Policy Analysis from PPBS, <i>Aaron Wildavsky</i> .....	251

Using Performance Measures in the Federal Budgeting Process <i>U.S. Congressional Budget Office</i> .....	522
Public Budgeting Amidst Uncertainty and Instability, <i>Naomi Caiden</i> .....	410
<b>PUBLIC MANAGEMENT</b>	
Problems of Municipal Administration, <i>Jane Addams</i> .....	51
Report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, <i>Louis Brownlow, Charles E. Merriam, &amp; Luther Gulick</i> .....	114
Public and Private Management: Are They Fundamentally Alike in All Unimportant Respects? <i>Graham T. Allison</i> .....	384
From Red Tape to Results: Creating a Government That Works Better and Costs Less, <i>The National Performance Review</i> .....	514
Public Value: Theory and Practice : Conclusions <i>John Benington and Mark H. Moore</i> .....	596
<b>PUBLIC POLICY AND ANALYSIS</b>	
Of the Principle of Utility, <i>Jeremy Bentham</i> .....	29
The Science of "Muddling Through," <i>Charles E. Lindblom</i> .....	172
Policy Analysts: A New Professional Role in Government Service, <i>Yehezkel Dror</i> .....	230
Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning, <i>Horst W. J. Rittel &amp; Melvin M. Webber</i> .....	295
Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies, <i>John W. Kingdon</i> .....	433
<b>PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION &amp; EVALUATION</b>	
On War, <i>Carl von Clausewitz</i> .....	32
Systematic Thinking for Social Action, <i>Alice M. Rivlin</i> .....	307
The Implementation Game, <i>Eugene Bardarch</i> .....	318
<b>INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS</b>	
Intergovernmental Relations: An Analytical Overview, <i>Deil S. Wright</i> .....	344
American Federalism: Madison's Middle Ground in the 1980s, <i>Martha Derthick</i> .....	453
Information Technology and Democratic Governance, <i>Joseph S. Nye Jr.</i> .....	545
Inside Collaborative Networks: Ten Lessons for Public Managers, <i>Robert Agranoff</i> .....	584
<b>PUBLIC SERVICE ETHICS</b>	
On Duties, <i>Cicero</i> .....	23
Bureaucracy and the Public Interest, <i>E. Pendleton Herring</i> .....	101
Watergate: Implications for Responsible Government, <i>Frederick C. Mosher &amp; Others</i> .....	332
The Possibility of Administrative Ethics, <i>Dennis F. Thompson</i> .....	444
Unmasking Administrative Evil, <i>Guy B. Adams &amp; Danny L. Balfour</i> .....	555
The Ethics of Dissent: Managing Guerilla Government <i>Rosemary O'Leary</i> .....	567

## 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, and 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 twenty-first-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 most worthwhile material from the past that will be equally valuable for tomorrow.

We had three criteria for including a selection. 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 even 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 general rule, we asked ourselves, “Should the 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. Whereas 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.

Selections are arranged in chronological order. While past editions have started with Woodrow Wilson in 1887, this edition includes four new/old readings, beginning with Confucius in ancient China, that address themes that are essential to understanding the development of public administration as part of state-building. And while *Classics* has always been a collection of readings about U.S. public administration, these four new/old selections are a reminder that before the American experience, there existed other forms of public administration as part of other states: China, Rome, and Prussia, among others.

Our hope is still that when presented in chronological order, 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 on or depart from each other. This also facilitates introducing the writers' themes as representative of a particular era. Obviously, many authors can span (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. Although 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 this edition of

*Classics* has a number of changes. The publishing world has changed and textbooks have been greatly affected by the digital revolution. In some cases, selections we have included in the past were unavailable or the rights to reprint prohibitively expensive. While we are aware that the textbook market is becoming in many ways a rental market, our aim remains to make this book affordable for use in the classroom as both a main resource or as a supplement to other required textbooks. Even more importantly, we hoped that that this might be a book that would remain in the students' professional collection after graduation for future reference and not have to be sold back to help pay down student loans. Even when some previous classics were not available, we have—using fair use doctrine—included a short excerpt on a critical idea, discussed the central theme and included the full reference for the student to find for further reading.

*Classics* is organized in five sections, concluding with the new section for the twenty-first century, which was added in the last edition. It is even more apparent that the pace and scale of political, economic, social, technological, and now ecological change in the environment since 2000 does represent a new era. Consequently, it needs to be discussed as such. The global economy and environment demands a broader, deeper, and truly global perspective on the purpose and design of public administration—whether it is in the United States, the European Union, Russia, China, Brazil, India, South Africa, or wherever. We fully expect that much will be different within our field as American public administration meets global governance issues. Future editions will surely reflect this inevitable movement.

In past editions, we have thanked many of our colleagues and friends for their help in the preparation of the current and earlier editions. The list has grown longer with each edition. We thought for this edition we would simply acknowledge the obvious—that a work like *Classics of Public Administration* is the result of an ongoing conversation with old and new colleagues and increasingly old and new students. It has been our great fortune to have colleagues and friends who have both supported the book and taken the time to educate us about what they feel is truly classic about our field.

Two special notes of appreciation are warranted. Professor Eric Zeemering at Northern Illinois University Public Administration Department has been instrumental in keeping us current on the progress and direction of intergovernmental relations. Professor David Rosenbloom of The American University remains our oldest and most frequent advisor on classics.

Finally, we thank the publishing team at Cengage Learning, including Amy Bither, Carolyn Merrill, Corinna Dibble, Alexandra Ricciardi, and Farah Fard.

**Jay M. Shafritz**

*Professor Emeritus*

*The University of Pittsburgh*

**Albert C. Hyde**

*Senior Scholar*

*Department of Public Administration and Policy*

*School of Public Affairs*

*American University*

CLASSICS  
*of*  
PUBLIC  
ADMINISTRATION

# Part One

## EARLY VOICES AND THE FIRST QUARTER CENTURY

| *ANCIENT TIMES TO 1920s* |



Writings on public administration go back to ancient civilization.<sup>1</sup> The ancient Egyptians and Babylonians left considerable advice on the techniques of management and administration. So did the civilizations of China, Greece, and Rome. Modern management techniques can be traced from Alexander the Great's use of staff<sup>2</sup> to the assembly-line methods of the arsenal of Venice;<sup>3</sup> from the theorizing of Niccolò Machiavelli on the nature of leadership<sup>4</sup> to Adam Smith's advocacy of the division of labour;<sup>5</sup> and from Robert Owen's assertion that "vital machines" (employees) should be given as much attention as "inanimate machines"<sup>6</sup> to Charles Babbage's contention that there existed "basic principles of management."<sup>7</sup>

The history of the world can be viewed as the rise and fall of public administrative institutions. Those ancient empires that rose and prevailed were those with better administrative institutions than their competitors. Brave soldiers have been plentiful in every society but they were ultimately wasted if not backed up by administrators who could feed and pay them. Marcus Tullius Cicero, the ancient Roman orator, is usually credited with first saying that "the sinews of war are infinite money."

---

## CHINA: THE FIRST ADMINISTRATIVE STATE

---

This edition of *Classics* seeks to extend public administration perspective by looking further back into history and examining where successful states were created and assessing the role and responsibility of public administration. The truly first classic administrative state was China. As Francis Fukuyama makes clear in his exceptional comparative history of state building: "The Chinese created a uniform, multilevel administrative bureaucracy, something that never happened in Greece or Rome"<sup>8</sup> (p. 92). While this state was "enormously despotic," this centralized bureaucracy held together a group of people accounting for nearly a quarter of the world's population for over two thousand years. The driving force was military. As Fukuyama observes, the chief impetus of Chinese state formation was "war and the requirements of war that led to a consolidation of a system of ten thousand political units into a single state in the space of eighteen hundred years that motivated the trained bureaucrats and administrators" (p. 94).

Etienne Balazs in his work, *Chinese Civilization and Bureaucracy* noted that China was the first real society to create a class of 'scholar-officials' who because of their domination of education were the first bureaucratic elite<sup>9</sup>. He argued that the class of mandarins (as they were known) were generalists whose primary function was to govern. He cites Mencius (Book 3, pp. 249–250) in the Chinese Classics: "Great men have their proper business and little men have their proper business ... some labour with their minds, some labour with their strength. Those who labour with their minds govern others, those who labour with their strength are governed by others."

Reprinted here is a short selection from the Analects of Confucius along with the translator's note explaining Confucius's ideal of government. Confucius, a Chinese teacher and philosopher, lived from 551–479 BCE, but his writings (or 'teachings' is perhaps the better term) were collected, edited, and reinterpreted within the Chinese Classics well after his death. Confucius's pronouncements usually followed a prompt in the form of a question about government, its purpose, and especially its conduct. Confucianism is as much about morality and justice in government as it is a personal code for those who wished to govern.

The reemergence of China as the world's number two and possibly in the next fifteen years the number one economic power has made Confucius's ideas both classic and highly contemporary. A *Wall Street Journal* review of a 2015 book by Michael Schuman, *Confucius: And the World He Created*, offers the following assessment of Confucius's influence through more than two millennia:

“Perhaps no one would be more surprised by his influence than Confucius himself. During his life he had few followers, and his ideas were slow to take hold even after his demise. Eventually, though, by the second century B.C.E., they became prized as ideological scaffolding for strong imperial rule and were adopted as the basis for a national civil-service exam system, a status that Confucius's ideas maintained until the 19th century. For all of their association with authority, though, at different times in China's history the sage's words were also invoked to demand accountability.”<sup>10</sup>

## ROME: THE MODERN STATE AND PUBLIC LIFE

---

If China was the first modern administrative state, then Rome was certainly the first administrative empire. Rome, like Egypt, Persia, and other empires before it, conquered much of the ancient world (well, at least that which centered around the Mediterranean) because it had an organizational doctrine that made its soldiers far more effective than competing forces—and because its legions were backed up by a sophisticated administrative system of supply based on regular if not equitable taxes. The Roman Empire only fell when its legions degenerated into corps of mercenaries and when its supply and tax bases were corrupted. Napoleon was wrong. Armies do not “march on their stomachs,” as he said; they march on the proverbial backs of the tax collectors and on the roads built by administrators. Regular pay allows for discipline. Strict discipline is what makes a mob an army. A disciplined military, obedient to the leaders of the state, is a precondition for civilization. This is the classic chicken and egg problem. Which comes first—effective public administration or an effective military? The rise and fall of ancient Rome proved that you could not have one without the other.

Early bureaucrats in ancient Rome and modern Europe wore uniforms that paralleled military dress. In contrast, the household servants of rulers traditionally wore livery. It indicated that the wearer was not free but the servant of another. Government administrators are still considered servants in this sense; they are public servants because they, too, have accepted obligations that mean they are not completely free. Indeed, until early in the twentieth century many otherwise civilian public officials in Europe—most notably diplomats—had prescribed uniforms.

Both victorious soldiers and successful managers tend to be inordinately admired and disproportionately rewarded as risk-takers. True, the specific risks and rewards are different; but the phenomenon is the same. They both may have to put their careers, and sometimes significant parts of their anatomy as well, “on the line” to obtain a goal for their state or organization. Notice again the military language, for “the line” originally referred to the line of battle where they faced the enemy. This is why line officers today are still those who perform the services for which the organization exists. This is the direct link between the Roman centurion and the fire chief, hospital director, or school principal. Life on the line is still a daily struggle.

But Rome's contribution to public administration and state building was based on more than its superior military and engineering prowess. Rome defined and debated the social and legal principles of government and citizenship. The Roman state was deeply concerned with justice, social responsibility, morality and legitimacy. And while history gives the Roman heads of state the limelight, political scientists and public administration pay attention to Cicero. The treatises and speeches of the Roman ex-counsel—arguably Rome's foremost philosopher and educator—were legendary. His dialogue, *The Republic*, examined and defended the roles and objectives of political organizations, the need for justice in society, and the demands on those who managed the affairs of the state. A second great work—*The Laws*—expounded on the principals of natural law.



Reprinted here is an excerpt from Cicero's best known work, *On Duties*. Written in the last year of his life as a letter to his son, it would be his final effort (he was murdered on orders of Mark Antony shortly after the assassination of Caesar in 44 BCE) to spell out and defend the ideals of public behaviour and the responsibilities of citizens and more importantly those in public life who would be engaged in administering the affairs of the state.

## EARLY THOUGHTS ON PUBLIC POLICY AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT

---

It is possible to find most of the modern concepts of management, leadership, and public affairs in other writers during the classical, medieval, and premodern worlds. Two final selections are offered for examination as “pre-classics.” The first—from Jeremy Bentham—helped set the stage for our understanding of what public policies governments should pursue and how they should make policy choices.

Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) was a British philosopher, jurist, and social reformer. His most important book, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, published in 1780, contains a section called “On the Principle of Utility” where he explains how this should shape efforts attempted to better society. Essentially, he argued that governments should seek to do the greatest good for the greatest number of people. Institutions should strive for an optimal level of welfare—in that an action must meet the test of showing the performance of which “will be more productive of pleasure than pain, more productive of happiness than unhappiness”—than of any alternatives.

This test of public policy - that laws proposed and policies formulated to enact those laws show “the greatest happiness for the greatest number” included two other dimensions. First, policies had to explain “who benefits.” Obviously, this test would have significant political ramifications, especially in any society where inequality was rampant. A second aspect demanded real measurement using social facts and data. Simply liking or disliking a policy proposal, especially because of political persuasion, was not sufficient—there had to be some determination of effect. Bentham's work launched Utilitarianism—the school of thought that would be more fully fleshed out in the next century by John Stuart Mill (1806–1873). Mill is best known for his seminal work *On Liberty* which debates the limits of control over the individual that can be legitimately exercised by the state supposedly acting on behalf of society.

A final reading is offered that shows public policy in another light. Carl Philipp Gottfried (or Gottlieb) von Clausewitz (1780–1831) was a Prussian general and military theorist who was arguably the best-known theorist on modern war and strategy. Although the linkage between the development of modern public administration and military development is an important theme, the excerpts from his classic work *On War* (1832) deal with a very different set of problems of administrative matters—what we call today “information uncertainty and implementation.”

Clausewitz first advises that the “fog of war” magnifies both sides of the problems of information. First, there is the problem of knowing whether what we think we know is actually true—when often it is false. Then there is the issue of trusting one's own sense of judgement about whether to act and how. A hundred years later, Simon and Lindblom and others would confront the issue of how much information decision-makers can handle. Clausewitz's great chasm between conception and execution has only grown wider in our new century of big data and analytics.

A second slightly longer chapter advises on “Friction in War.” This is really a detailed discussion of the problems of implementation that Pressman and Wildavsky and Bardach among others would confront. Clausewitz provides the modern student enduring questions that go to the heart of how organizations set objectives and execute actions to accomplish them. He constantly warns of the need for a certain amount of humility—and that generals, policymakers, and doers need to be wary of the dangers of overconfidence.

## CIVIL SERVICE REFORM AND MERIT IN U.S. GOVERNMENT

---

American public administration did not invent the concept of creating a public service that would be based on merit. Would-be reformers of American government in the late nineteenth century not only borrowed from the European experience but also were fond of noting that possessing such systems was an essential step in “enlightenment” for the United States if it were to develop as a civilized nation. The first real steps toward creating a modern state of public administration in the United States were taken following the Civil War. At the heart of the matter was the struggle to limit the spoils system of rewarding political party members with government job appointments, as opposed to establishing a civil service system where appointments and tenure were based on merit.<sup>11</sup>

While federal civil service reform is generally dated from the post–Civil War period, the political roots of the reform effort go back much earlier—to the beginning of the republic. Thomas Jefferson was the first president to face the problem of a philosophically hostile bureaucracy. While sorely pressed by his supporters to remove Federalist officeholders and replace them with Republican partisans, Jefferson was determined not to remove officials for political reasons alone. He maintained in a letter in 1801 to William Findley that, “Malconduct is a just ground of removal; mere difference of political opinion is not.” With occasional defections from this principle, even by Jefferson himself, this policy was the norm rather than the exception down through the administration of Andrew Jackson. President Jackson’s rhetoric on the nature of public service was far more influential than his administrative example. In claiming that all men, especially the newly enfranchised who did so much to elect him, should have an equal opportunity for public office, Jackson played to his plebeian constituency and put the patrician civil service on notice that they had no natural monopoly on public office. The spoils system, used only modestly by Jackson, flourished under his successors. The doctrine of rotation of office progressively prevailed over the earlier notion of stability in office.

Depending on one’s point of view, the advent of modern merit systems<sup>12</sup> is either an economic, political, or moral development. Economic historians would maintain that the demands of industrial expansion—a dependable postal service, a viable transportation network, and so on—necessitated a government service based on merit. Political analysts could argue rather persuasively that it was the demands of an expanded suffrage and democratic rhetoric that sought to replace favoritism with merit. Economic and political considerations are so intertwined that it is impossible to say which factor is the true origin of the merit system. The moral impetus behind reform is even more difficult to define. As moral impulses tend to hide economic and political motives, the weight of moral concern undiluted by other considerations is impossible to measure. Nevertheless, the cosmetic effect of moral overtones was of significant aid to the civil service reform movement, because it accentuated the social legitimacy of the reform proposals.

With the ever-present impetus of achieving maximum public services for minimum tax dollars, business interests were quite comfortable in supporting civil service reform, one of a variety of strategies they used to have power pass from the politicians to themselves. The political parties of the time were almost totally dependent for financing on assessments made on the wages of their members in public office. With the decline of patronage, the parties had to seek new funding sources, and American business was more than willing to assume this new financial burden—and its concomitant influence.

Civil service reform was both an ideal—an integral symbol of a larger national effort to establish a new form of more responsive government; and an institutional effort—a series of internal reforms intent on creating new bureaucratic authority structures. Historians have sought to capture how the “Progressive Era” reflected the interplay between reform movements at the federal level and state and local governments in the context of political and social changes occurring after the Civil War.<sup>13</sup> Civil service reform was integral to that vision for change and viewed as embracing, in the words of one of the early reform champions, Dorman Eaton, “certain great principles which embody a theory of political morality, of official obligation, of equal rights, and common justice in government.”<sup>14</sup>

Dorman B. Eaton had been appointed chair of the first Civil Service Commission established by President Grant in 1871. When the commission concluded unsuccessfully in 1875, Eaton went to England at the request of President Rutherford B. Hayes to undertake a study of the British civil service system. His report—published as a book in 1880 with the title *Civil Service in Great Britain: A History of Abuses and Reforms and their Bearing upon American Politics*—obviously advocated the adoption of the merit system in America. His book enumerated the principles the civil service system would entail, as the listing of brief excerpts illustrates:

1. “Public office creates a relation of trust and duty of a kind which requires all authority and influence pertaining to it to be exercised with the same absolute conformity to moral standards, to the spirit of the constitution and the laws, and to the common interest of the people...”
2. In filling offices, it is the right of the people to have the worthiest citizens in the public service for the general welfare...
3. The personal merits of the candidate—are in themselves the highest claim upon an office...
4. Party government and the salutary activity of parties are not superseded, but they are made purer and more efficient, by the merit system of office which brings larger capacity and higher character to their support...”<sup>15</sup>

When President Garfield was assassinated in 1881 by an insane and disappointed office-seeker, the movement for civil service reform would finally produce legislative results. Eaton would be prominent in providing the language for the Pendleton Act of 1883, which created a federal civil service system based on merit. Under the act, a civil service commission was established and a class of civil service was created where employees would be hired through open competitive examinations and promoted and retained based on merit. Thus, at the federal level, progress toward implementing reform was generally measured in terms of the percentage of government employees who were in the classified service. While the Pendleton Act did not make civil service mandatory for all federal agencies, coverage under civil service would grow from 10 percent in the 1880s to nearly 70 percent between the world wars.<sup>16</sup>

However, the relatively rapid categorization of federal positions under civil service was not all that it seemed to be. Frederick Mosher noted in his examination of the public service that the ranks of the civil service were largely concentrated in entry-level employees. Indeed, the requirement that entrance to federal service “be permitted only at the lowest grade” was specifically removed by the Congress, creating “an open civil service with no prohibition of what we now call lateral entry.”<sup>17</sup> Within two decades of its existence, the Civil Service Commission would be bemoaning the lack of upward mobility and promotions for the talented workers they felt had been selected for employment under civil service, a situation Mosher notes that would not be remedied until the 1940s. Thus it was relatively easy for a federal agency to accept civil service as the new norm because it applied to entry-level hires and did not preclude an agency from appointing—via lateral entry—higher-level employees of their own choosing.

Civil service reform was also an important issue for state and local governments. While only three states (Massachusetts in 1883, New York in 1884, and Ohio in 1902) passed legislation that required civil service for municipalities, adoption of civil service reform was widespread. But a distinction about the means of adoption should be made especially where it concerns the importance of requiring civil service procedures by law. Some assessments of the adoption of civil service reform during the first quarter of the twentieth century conclude that the Pendleton Act was a weak statute in that it did not require federal agencies to classify their positions under civil service and did not mention state and local governments. Another interpretation of the fact that only three states enacted statewide legislation on civil service reform would be that it reaffirms the “relative autonomy” that most cities enjoyed from higher governmental authority, be it federal or state.<sup>18</sup>

Still, over 200 cities adopted civil service reform by the 1930s, the majority from states that did not have a mandatory state statute. The National Civil Service Reform League, which regularly reported on which states and municipalities had adopted the “competitive system,” noted in their 1911 report

six variations for adoption of civil service from charter provisions to popular votes establishing local commissions.<sup>19</sup>

Thinking back on the premises of civil service reform and the promise of the merit system could not be more instructive, especially now, when some states and local governments have moved away from civil service. In 1996, the State of Georgia passed legislation terminating civil service coverage for new state employees. Other states, notably Florida, South Carolina, Arkansas, Missouri, and North Dakota, have followed suit.<sup>20</sup> In a 2006 survey of state reform efforts, 28 of the 50 states were identified as having expanded the numbers of “at-will employees” or public sector workers who are not under the protection of civil service guidelines.<sup>21</sup> Public administration has always been in a debate about how to make the public workforce more responsive and productive—only this time it is the bureaucracy and over-protectionism of the civil service that is the target of reform.

## CALLING FOR A NEW DISCIPLINE ON RUNNING A GOVERNMENT

---

While Alexander Hamilton,<sup>22</sup> Thomas Jefferson,<sup>23</sup> Andrew Jackson,<sup>24</sup> 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. This came from Woodrow Wilson’s famous 1887 essay, “The Study of Administration.” Although it attracted slight notice at the time, it has become customary to trace the origins of the academic discipline of public administration to that essay.

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.<sup>25</sup> 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, 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.”<sup>26</sup>

In “The Study of Administration,” Wilson attempted to refocus political science’s study of governments. 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 already 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.

By authoring this 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 his 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 the politics-administration dichotomy would be later discredited, his ideas are still highly influential and essential to an understanding of the evolution of public administration.<sup>27</sup>

## 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.<sup>28</sup> 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.”

Reprinted here is Goodnow’s original 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 articulation of the politics-administration dichotomy also reflected the next phase in the emergence of American public administration. Whereas the first phase before World War I focused primarily on the evils of the patronage and spoils systems and eliminating corruption in municipal government, the second phase would emphasize the growth of public spending and the ascendance of the “new management” in government. City managers, executive budget systems, and centralized and accountability-driven administrative systems were all key reform themes.<sup>29</sup>

## SELF-GOVERNMENT AND THE PROBLEM OF MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION

---

As public administration struggled to establish its identity, it was aided greatly by the progressive reform movement that sought to raise the standards of honesty in government and to enlarge the level of public services provided to citizens, especially in American cities. While the term has its origins in religious concepts that argued for the infinite improvability of the human condition, rather than ordained class distinctions, by the end of the nineteenth century it had come to mean a responsibility of classes for one another and a willingness to use all government and social institutions to give that responsibility legal effect.

To a large extent the movement was a reaction to Social Darwinism, Charles Darwin’s concept of biological evolution applied to the development of human social organization and economic policy. The major influence on American Social Darwinism was the Englishman, Herbert Spencer, who spent much of his career on the application of concepts such as “natural selection” and “survival of the fittest” to his ideas of social science. American Social Darwinists, generally speaking, occupied a wide