IDEALS OF ORDER: ACTIVISTS, ACADEMICS, ADMINISTRATORS AND THE IDEAL OF GOOD GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES, 1870-1969

Aaron Horvath,
Department of Sociology
Stanford University

May 10, 2018
Draft[1]

ABSTRACT

Ideals of public administration and good government in the United States are examined from the late-19th to mid-20th centuries in order to understand the processes by which such ideals emerge and evolve. In brief, calls for moral, incorruptible administrators in the late 1800s, developed into calls for measurably effective and efficient administration during the early decades of the 1900s, and eventually gave way to an elaborated regime of comparisons, alternatives and tradeoffs (typified in practices such as Planning, Programming, and Budgeting, and cost-benefit analysis) in the wake of World War II. To explain this evolution, I draw on concepts from organizational sociology, considering the transposition and repurposing of materials across fields and time. Specifically, I argue that ideals take shape through encounters between adjacent social realms, becoming codified in organizations, persons, practices, and ideas. As ideals are rendered incarnate, they also give rise to new grievances, challengers, and alternative orders. But these new orders are not invented whole cloth. Rather they are constituted by the materials available within, and shifting relations between, adjacent arenas. By developing a sociological account of the evolution of ideals, this article contributes to ongoing theoretical discussions of institutional emergence and change.

Keywords: ideals; public administration; American state building; organizations; institutional change

INTRODUCTION

"A generation ago a municipal government was considered commendable if it was honest. Today we demand a great deal more of our public service. It must be not only honest but efficient as well. A number of techniques had been devised to insure honesty – the audit, legal checks, decentralization of authority – but with the shift of emphasis these techniques were found to be inadequate guides to administration" (Clarence Ridley and Herbert Simon, 1937)

Far from being a static, timeless concept, the ideal of rational government administration is a moving target, its history both variable and fraught with contingencies. Before 1870, there were only faint notions that U.S. government and policymaking could be the province of routinely applied expertise, rationality, and reason. Over the next century, what began as calls for moral rectitude and bureaucratic integrity gave way to calls for effectiveness and efficiency, which eventually led to a regime of comparisons, alternatives, and trade-offs. By the mid-20th century, what had originated at the overlap of municipal reformers and the burgeoning social science professions became firmly rooted in the offices and repertoires of federal government. As the United States entered the 1960s, the social problems of the era, according to President Kennedy, had become "technical problems," requiring "sophisticated judgments which do not lend themselves to the 'passionate movements'" of politics.[2]

Despite perennial efforts to subordinate politics to rationality, political passions have remained indomitable and the yardsticks of rational administration have continued to change. Put simply, the ideal government of the late-19th century is markedly different from that of the mid-20th. Using archival, historical, and secondary data sources, this article examines the evolving ideal of good government. I aim to narrate the history and evolution of rationalist government ideals from 1870 to 1969. I roughly periodize this evolution over three successive generations – moral, efficient, and optimal – and follow the shifting ideational, organizational, and professional contexts that propel and inhibit the transformation of ideals. The task of this paper is to explore the social and historical conditions through which ideals of good government crystallize, explaining the

processes that bring this development to life.

Such an explanation will shed light more generally on how ideals – the objects toward which people and organizations orient rational action – emerge and undergo change. In the social sciences, ideals have long been understood as preconditions for rational action. Classically, Weber observed that rational action, "cannot tell anyone what he should do – but rather what he can do" (1944: 54). The problem of "should" was left to the "ultimate values," "ultimate ends" or "points of view" – that is, relatively entrenched evaluative stances – upon which some field of rationalized knowledge is built (Weber 1930: xxxviii-xxxix). Rather than view these collective orientations as givens or as mere epiphenomena of material developments, this paper takes the perspective that ideals are both the product of their social and historical context and constitutive of it. They become instantiated in the values, practices, and habits of the people and the organizations they inhabit (Bendix 1956; Dobbin 1994; Fourcade 2011). What is ideal at one point in history may seem inadequate or irrational from the standpoint of another.

The evolution of these ideals is neither inevitable nor the spontaneous response of government administrations confronted with novel and unexpected challenges. Drawing on insights from organizational sociology, I explain the evolution of administrative ideals as the product of a shifting constellation of overlapping social domains, across which ideas, orientations, and capabilities flow, both routinizing and destabilizing institutional orders (Sewell 1992; Padgett and Powell 2012; Soule 2012; Mora 2014). I argue that ideals take shape *at* the interstices of these domains and *with* the materials that prior orders have left behind. The legacies of prior orders — the organizations, people, and practices developed in their image — become the grounds on which new orders materialize. Adjacent realms of social action, each with their own rhythms of change, become the source of new elements that complement or contest elements of the old. As new ideals take shape, they trigger a cascade of changes, bringing new organizations, people, and practices into being. Over

time, the relationship is reciprocal: even as the development of new ideals is grounded in people, the development of new people is grounded in ideals.

I illustrate this argument by narrating a history of the evolving ideals of good government. Ideals of good government are the predominant or ascendant idea of what government should be doing and how it ought to be doing it. This narrative takes place at the overlaps of three social fields – activist, academic, and administrative – the internal characters and interrelations of which develop through swings of ideological consensus, political shifts, economic crises, and wars. An emergent ideal of good government developed at the intersection of concurrent and interlocked reform efforts in the late 19th-century, which, by advancing collective visions through civic associations and vigilance leagues, crystalized a concept of the morally upright administrator as the essence of good government. As the movement gained momentum, its supporters found their way into government at both the local and national stage, carrying with them ideas and practices that bumped into obstacles and opportunities in their new contexts. Over time, what was once ad hoc became routinized in a new academic field, professional practice, independent research organizations, and government agencies, growing increasingly abstract and technical in the process. The moral administrator increasingly found himself accompanied — at times replaced — by the man of technical expertise. As the technical and efficient field of public administration became manifest, it created new challenges, grievances, and problems that other fields were poised to challenge. Challenges, however, did not emerge as whole-cloth rejections of what came before, but as derivations of it, materializing in the social context prior ideals set into motion. The once novel organizations, persons, and practices, associated with older ideals became endowed with new purposes and orientations.

AMERICAN POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE IDEALS

The subject of American political development and bureaucratic expansion has received attention from a number of scholars working at the intersections of political science, history, and sociology. Prevailing accounts hold that bureaucratic reform was a response to a set of social challenges and anxieties experienced toward the end of the 19th century. A government of "courts and parties," as Skowronek (1982) dubbed it, was ill-suited for the social and economic turmoil that characterized the era. Indeed, this turmoil posed challenges to extant political institutions and, following a dramatic electoral realignment in 1896, afforded opportunities for reform and bureaucratic innovation. American state building at the turn of the century was the product of government officials jockeying to gain or maintain influence at a time when long-standing arrangements faced novel strains.

This account, as well as a broader set of state-centric accounts of political and bureaucratic development (Evans, Rueschemeyer, and Skocpol 1985), broadly rejects views that the state is a passive arena for interest group contestation, an instrument of class rule, or a guarantor of economic activity. Posing an alternative, statist scholars tended to focus on the autonomy and actorhood of states – their ability to independently formulate and pursue goals – with special attention to how past actions circumscribe future possibilities. The image of administrative innovation on offer is one of new structures proceeding, somewhat imperfectly, along the divergent tracks laid by prior orders. Government structures develop when pivotal junctures are navigated by administrators drawing on well-worn patterns of what government can and ought to do (Skocpol and Finegold 1982; Weir and Skocpol 1985). New knowledge is absorbed into states when emergent policy paradigms complement existing institutions, a process determined by the organization knowledge regimes (Hall 1993; Campbell and Pedersen 2014).

In providing powerful explanations for continuity, these approaches struggle to explain

administrative transformation without resorting to critical events or incrementalism (Schneiberg 2007; see also Mahoney and Thelen 2010). If not altogether staid (Pierson 2000), the imagery of change is often abrupt, made up of critical junctures that create forks along one-way roads (Katznelson 1997). As Thelen (1999: 399) quips, for those studying political change, "happiness is a crisis that hits a lot of countries." Crises are important drivers of change, but alone they tell us little about the sorts of change that will result.

In granting considerable durability to political institutions, state-centered scholars tend to hold them separate from the persons, organizations, and collective orientations that inhabit and reproduce them. Collective interests and understandings are neither spontaneous nor inevitable, but products of social action. To be sure, the core concern of state-centric explanations is not the processes by which shared understandings of social order take shape. Yet, by treating the interests and aspirations of bureaucrats and government reformers as given, statist approaches resign themselves to an orthogenic understanding of administrative evolution. Though institutional reproduction is empirically common, it is not automatic. Because the collective conceptions of reality that animate social institutions are in regular flux, an account of institutional change that explores the tacit dimension of collective understandings of the present and visions of the future will complement our understandings of institutional change. Building flexibility into the tracks will cast light on moments where institutional trajectories are derailed, forked roads reconverge, and crises have unexpected effects. Thus, this paper seeks to imbue the realist entities that inhabit, constitute, and reform administration with socio-cultural imaginations and ideals that inspire and guide social action.

Ideals and Rational Action

For understanding the concept of ideals, Weber's "ultimate values" provides a useful starting

point. Rational action, he argues, proceeds from presuppositions of value derived from the "product of certain cultures" which dominate particular eras. But cultures, and their concomitant notions of rational action, vary across time and place, and what is rational from one perspective is irrational from another. In a Durkheimian sense, ideals are similar to religious worldviews in that they are models or ends that enliven social action with meaning, purpose, and direction. Socially rooted, they reflect both the state of society and normative aspirations of how it should be. They are, as Durkhiem wrote (1953: 93), simultaneously "derived from reality and transcending it." Thus, as used in this paper, ideals are secularized religious visions that give rise to an imagined future independent of the world that produces them. They are comprised of those shared values or characters of thought among groups that shape understandings of what is and is not possible, thinkable, and doable. Like other social structures, ideals are dual. They both constrain and enable thought, impede and facilitate action, and reproduce and transform intergenerationally (see Giddens 1976; Sewell 1992). As eloquently characterized by Kenneth Burke (1935: 70), "A way of seeing is also a way of not seeing."

Nevertheless, vision blurs and focus shifts. Ideals are less monolithic, bounded entities than they are shifting constellations of beliefs, rife with contradictions and discontinuities. As I will show, close inspection of historical eras or social groups reveals considerable heterogeneity and contestation, while a more expansive view reveals broad coherence. It is helpful to keep this dual lens in mind: the patterned changes we observe macroscopically are rooted in variations observed on a more mesoscopic level.

As social entities, ideals vary considerably with their social and historical contexts. Espeland's (1998) study of the planned construction of a dam in Central Arizona illustrates the point nicely. Three disparate groups converged on the project: young bureaucrats at the Bureau of Reclamation, engineers within the same bureau, and the Yavapai Indians upon whose land the dam would be

built. In determining the dam's value, each considered what effect the project would have. But there was no one effect because there was no one set of values. The dam would provide water to arid land, but it would do so at the cost of destroying cultural heritage, local ecologies, and tourism. The project was ultimately defeated revealing the challenge of converting dissonant orientations into binary decisions.

In a similar vein, sociologists have amply demonstrated the variability of knowledge and rationality across place, showing how rationality maps onto the distinctive cultural characteristics of social contexts. Such distinctiveness appears to hold at both the micro (Knorr-Cetina 1999) and macro (Fourcade 2011) levels. Comparing ostensibly similar fields of action across nations, scholars have found nationally unique approaches to policy and economics (Dobbin 1994; Fourcade 2009). Indeed, some of those clear-cut boundaries may blur as the ideas characteristic to one nation spread to others through organizations, education, and professional communities (Haas 1992; Meyer et al. 1997).

Despite their apparent coherence, ideals evolve. What is widely viewed as transgressive at one point may in time be viewed as normal in another (e.g. Zelizer 1978). This may be especially evident among professions where change may be due to shifting contextual influences, convergence around a lingua franca, attainment of cultural authority, new institutional imperatives, and turf wars (Starr 1982; Abbott 1988; Shenhav 1995; Khurana 2007). Fligstein (1990), for example, demonstrates how conceptions of managerial control – "totalizing world views" – are shaped by exogenous shocks and shifting environmental demands that urge managers to innovate or adopt new strategies for organizational survival. From a different perspective, Kuhn (1962), suggests that scientific paradigms – "entire constellation[s] of beliefs, values, techniques, and so on, shared by members of a given community" – change as routine science encounters irreconcilable anomalies. Perspectives like Kuhn's however, belie a lack of epistemic harmony in professional disciplines,

8

scientific or otherwise (see Collins 1994; Galison 1997). Thus, rather than view ideals as intrinsic to social groups or as spontaneous responses to macro-level change, this paper takes a more meso-level stance, understanding evolution as a dynamic process that unfolds between these two extremes.

Ideational and Material Change

Developing a meso-level perspective on the evolution of ideals, I draw from imageries of organizational sociology that lend insight on institutional durability and change. Specifically, I take the perspective that institutional change is the product of (1) transpositions of materials (i.e. persons, organizations, ideas, and practices) across adjacent realms of social activity, and (2) the longitudinally constitutive nature of institutions (i.e. their ability reproduce by bringing persons, organizations, ideas, and practices into being).

As used in organizational sociology, transposition is the movement of material and resources across realms of social action (Sewell 1992; Schneiberg 2007). Because the variegated nature of social structures offers diverse materials, well-worn practices in one realm may find their way into other realms as people move between activities, organizations, or locales. Such movement might be particularly likely during unsettled times. Social movements, for example, have been shown to facilitate contact between disparate organizations whose repertoires and interests transpose (Clemens 1997; Soule 2012; Wang and Soule 2012). Such transposition might be particularly visible when new fields develop in social interstices putting them "at the mercy of changes" in more established fields (Abbott 1995: 559).

The flow of materials across fields is rarely straightforward, however. Ideas and practices flowing across realms undergo change, are repurposed, bump into obstacles, enroll adherents, and find opportunities in new contexts (Padgett and McLean 2006; Padgett and Powell 2012). Reflective of Espeland's (1998) aforementioned account, many of these materials may clash with those in new

settings. But such dissonance, rather than necessarily producing impasse, may foster novelty (Stark 2009). For instance, the previously transgressive transpositions between university science and commercial enterprise led to the now-celebrated field of biotechnology (Powell and Sandholtz 2012). Furthermore, the simultaneous and mutually-influential developments in different fields can help to codify new categories, thereby shaping collective understandings of social identity. Such processes, facilitated by the presence of boundary spanning networks that lash together sites of action, help to legitimate, reinforce, and institutionalize new ideas (Mora 2014).

Institutionalization need not indicate permanence. Once an organizational form, idea, norm, or practice becomes taken for granted as legitimate, it is often understood that the debate around it tends to wither. Indeed, this is woven into the methodological fabric of institutional theory, on the understanding that the power of institutions resides in their taken for granted status (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Schneiberg and Clemens 2006). In this way, institutions are constitutive. New materials are made manifest in professional and organizational practices, shaping commitments and patterns of action (Kelly and Dobbin 1998; Horvath, Brandtner, and Powell 2017). In this way, institutional change may give rise to new industries, forms of regulation, and modes of evaluation (Lounsbury, Ventresca, and Hirsch 2003; Bartley 2007; Espeland and Sauder 2016). But institutions can also create new grievances, problems and challengers. Clemens (1993; 1997), for example, demonstrates how marginalized movement groups can create alternative models for organization. Thus, even as persons, organizations, and practices are encoded in institutions, institutions, to borrow from Marx, create their own gravediggers.

Following from this body of scholarship, I argue that the evolution of ideals is the product of social action that cuts across social realms and time. In the short-run, ideals are constituted by social action unfolding at the overlap of interwoven social realms. In the long-run, ideals are constitutive, giving rise to new organizations, persons, practices, and concerns. As these

embodiments enumerate, some move into influential positions while others lay dormant, or develop in relative isolation. As questions surrounding these embodiments become more vexed – such as during times of crisis – constellations of fields shift. Adjacent fields grow apart, disunited fields resume contact, new fields emerge, and positions of influence change. The evolving ideal of good government takes shape in the encounter between old ideals rendered incarnate and the new challenges, grievances, and concerns to which these embodiments give rise. Social action oriented toward the future develops in the shadow of prior orders and with the materials and possibilities made available through the interrelations with adjacent realms. Such an argument requires us to view social arrangements as carriers of past actions, acting upon the world, but also as sites for current action, acted upon by the world.

Using data from both primary and secondary historical sources, the remainder of this paper draws from these organizational insights to understand how administrative ideals evolved from 1870 to 1969. Through texts, organization foundings and membership rolls, commissions, reports, and news coverage, I illustrate the passage of ideal administration from "moral" to "efficient" to "optimal." The narrative centers on these three periods and the constellation of social fields, organizations, persons, practices, and concerns that animated them (distinctive features of these periods are summarized in Table 1). This periodization is inherently rough. Though the predominant concern of early developments was insuring the moral uprightness of administrators, these ideas coexisted with the early stirrings of efficiency and techniques of social analysis. Likewise, when the predominant concern centers on varying notions of efficiency, we see the instruments of optimization begin to take shape. Some developments, though seemingly peripheral to the thrust of an era's administrative ethos, factor heavily in the social arrangements of later eras. Although the historical narrative is presented in a roughly chronological fashion — historical research is attentive to sequence and contingency, where future action draws on the outcomes of past action (Clemens

2007) — it should be emphasized that there are no hard and fast boundaries demarcating successive periods of administrative ideals.

The breadth of the historical narrative comes at the cost of depth. My intention, however, is not to document the infinitesimal details of this history – it is a rich and complex one – but to present a historically-grounded sociological account of the transformation of ideals around which those seeking to improve government oriented their action. As the narrative will show, neither government nor ideals are monolithic. Indeed, the messy diversity of it all is what enables its evolution. Because fragmentation would elide the interconnectedness of parts, my focus is on fluidity. Persons, organizations, ideas, and practices that appear in one place and time, regularly appear in others.[3] This involves flows between municipal and federal governments, as well as flows between organizations, professional associations, commissions, and publications. Membership rolls and publication records contain names we will have heard before and names we will hear again.

TABLE 1. CHANGES IN ADMINISTRATIVE IDEALS, MID-19TH-MID-20TH CENTURY, U.S.

	Moral	*Efficient*	*Optimal*
Locus of action	City politics; Social Gospel; New social sciences	Municipal government; State government; Social Sciences; Federal Bureaucracy	Military; Social science; Federal government
Concerns	Graft; sin; lack of respectability and purity	Loafing; soldiering; lack of information; lack of organization	Value; limits of knowledge; quality of data
Organizations	Fraternal organizations; political parties; churches; watchdog groups; charities	Efficiency Bureaus; Municipal Research Bureaus; Presidential Commissions; Federal Research Organizations; Foundations	Armed Forces; Executive branch offices; Think tanks; Foundations
Tools to enact the ideal	Political influence; journalism; organized vigilance	Organization; scientific management; accounting; auditing; reports; data collection	Operations research; Systems analysis; Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System; Makings of cost-benefit analysis
Persons	Journalists; Clergy; Reformers; Volunteers; new social scientists	Social scientists; engineers; administrators; politicians; management gurus	Administrators; Social scientists; politicians;
Material legacy	Laws (Civil Service); extra-governmental organizations	Government programs; administrative offices; administration schools; professional administrators; funders	methods/techniques; professional policy analysts; policy analysis schools
Ideational legacy	Immoral officials are to blame for an array of social ills; trained, morally upright administrators offer a remedy	Society is perfectible through science; administrative problems are empirical questions	Administrators must make complex tradeoffs; technical method offers neutral optimization

FROM MEN OF CORRUPTION TO EDUCATED MEN OF INTEGRITY

Walking home at midnight on February 12, 1870, an eminent New York attorney, Dorman Eaton, was viciously attacked by an unknown assailant. As covered by The New York Times several days later, Eaton "was struck by a blow intended to kill him; as it was, the force of it was broken by the rim of his hat and the collar of his overcoat. He was not robbed of a cent." Few doubted the heinous assault was provoked by Eaton's recent interference with Jay Gould and James Fisk's machinations to block Cornelius Vanderbilt's purchase of an ownership stake in the Erie Railroad. Gould and Fiske had flooded the market with 50,000 shares of Erie Stock – a violation of New York state law – and bribed William Tweed, the boss of the Tammany Hall political machine, to steer legislation and judicial opinions in their favor. Despite the army of attorneys at their disposal, Eaton had proven a formidable foe. His lawsuit on behalf of the company's stockholders dismantled the Tweed Ring, and for his efforts he nearly paid with his life. Though the *Times* published editorials calling for the capture of Eaton's assailant (the New York Bar Association posted a reward of $5,000), the *New York Sun* sought to discredit Eaton's claim altogether, alleging his symptoms were "those of a drunkard," his injuries "the consequence of a mere debauch."

The evils visited upon Eaton ran far deeper than the Tammany Machine and its many patrons. American cities were in a dismal condition. Streets were filthy, schools inadequate, police unresponsive (especially to charges of corruption), and diseases like typhus, cholera, and smallpox killed scores of residents dwelling in crowded tenements. Recovering from the ravages of civil war, the United States was in the throes of transition, transforming from a disconnected agrarian society to a highly interconnected and complex society built on new technologies of communication and transportation. Government at all levels was in the pocket of political machines. Boss Tweed had analogues in nearly every major city around the United States. Congressional debate over single regulations took up to a decade, and measures that did pass were vacuous, regarded as little more

than vague declarations and advisory statements. The very notion of "national policy" was an illusion with little sense of continuity, minimal resources to pursue it, and little ability to enforce it. The undeveloped and underfunded national government held little sway with city bosses (Weibe 1967: 31). The majority of Americans, reflective of the divergent reporting on Eaton's attack, did not see machine politics as fundamentally problematic, immoral, or un-democratic.[4] Wealthy industrialists purchased clout by the railcar and made little effort to conceal their dealings (Sproat 1968).

It was from this pitiful political climate that ideologies of reform – some of which verged on utopian fantasies – sprang forth.[5] Educated men of means, like Eaton, instigated a high-minded anti-patronage movement aimed at spoils and political machines. Protestant theologians called for the enactment of scripture on earth, urging their congregations to address the social ills visible in their neighborhoods. A burgeoning faith in science, especially the newly invigorated social sciences, fostered the practical and intellectual equipment through which the ends of reform – aristocratic and Christian alike – would be understood.

There were no hard and fast lines distinguishing these faces of the Progressive impulse. Indeed, the membership rolls of organizations aligned with each reveal considerable overlap. Theologians were active in early social science associations and became ingrained in the anti-patronage efforts, even founding their own organizations. Social scientists mingled commitments to measurement and morality in their work, and turned their lenses on the conditions undergirding urban ailments. Well-to-do reformers helped to direct reform energies toward administration, broadcast grievances through widely-read periodicals, and brought the new ideal of administration into the halls of government both locally and nationally.

It is important to recognize the chaotic character of the era. A litany of challenges – extreme inequality, whispers of socialist revolution, and financial panics – captured public attention. Graft

and scandal were routine. That administration should be identified as the root of public problems and that the end of patronage its solution was not at all obvious. Alternative solutions to the problems of the day abounded, each with a plurality of adherents. Henry George suggested a single tax system, Edward Bellamy led called for a bloodless revolution of state socialism that would eradicate money, unemployment, and social conflict, and William "Coin" Harvey argued that bimetallism — the use of both gold and silver — would increase the amount of money in circulation, make agriculture more profitable, and end economic depressions. The ideas of well-connected Northern Republicans, however, proved to have staying power. Many of these men who had taken up the antislavery cause in prior years had grown frustrated with the scandals of government that dissuaded "respectable" men from politics, and left openings for inferior men to permeate political circles. "The gutter," in the estimation of one observer, was "governing the sidewalk" (Sproat 1968: 48).

Anti-patronage perspectives smoldered among the pages of local papers. *The New York Times* of the 1870s and 1880s was dotted with accounts of municipal crookedness. One particularly damning bookkeeping leak to the *Times* revealed that Boss Tweed's courthouse project included a $361,000 payment to a single carpenter for seven days work. Is this not "the luckiest carpenter that ever lived?" the author mused.[6] Journals such as The *North American Review, The Nation, McClure's, Harper's Weekly* (and much later, *The New Republic*), began to carry the torch, dedicating themselves to uncovering government corruption in all its forms. Their founders and editorial staffs – Edwin L. Godkin (*Nation*) and George Curtis (*Harper's*) – were among the most vocal proponents of reform. "Political corruption," *The Nation* declared, "is the great question of our time. It is greater than the suffrage, greater than reconstruction."[7] Spoils imperiled the "purity, economy, and efficiency" of administration while also destroying confidence in government altogether.[8] The momentum created by these periodicals helped to spread reformist perspectives through a newly interconnected society,

stitching together previously local concerns as part of a national discourse, fostering a virtual intellectual elite organized around the issue, and enrolling supporters for the cause.

As genteel men increasingly found themselves isolated from government workings, "politics" became a dirty term, and questions of government leadership began to animate church and civic association meetings. From these meetings came organizations dedicated to civil service reform. The Civil Service Reform Association of New York was founded in 1877 to "remove evils of patronage, favoritism, and partisan coercion from the civil service."[9] The New York Reform Club, formed in 1882 – at a Brooklyn Young Republicans meeting held in Theodore Roosevelt's home – was to be a "permanent organization" to promote the "election of honest and capable men to Municipal offices" and "watch the action of aldermen and assemblymen."[10] Membership was by invitation only. Under the leadership of Curtis and Eaton, the National Civil Service Reform League was established in 1881 and began publishing its own periodical, fittingly titled, *Good Government*. By the time Curtis called to order its first annual meeting in Boston a year later, representatives from 27 cities – as far south as New Orleans, as far west as San Francisco – were in attendance.

If corruption was the ailment, the antidote lay in finding incorruptible men to execute the duties of office. Through their many essays, the common solution, "good government" by "good men," was left imprecise, belying a more self-serving idea. Henry Adams, a journalist and member of the Adams presidential bloodline, confided in his brother: good men are "like ourselves or better" (Sproat 1968: 7). A self-serving notion of "good men," however, was a poor substitute for the self-serving practices of the party bosses they sought to unseat. They began to construct a concept of "good men" built on the abstract properties of training, professionalism, and expertise that held them together. His world would be one of individuality, professional jurisdiction, and codes of ethical conduct. His position would be based on merit, and, through adherence to public-serving codes of professional conduct, his allegiances would be to the public, not to internal organizational

maneuvering. If the core obstacle to good government was patronage, the only appropriate organizational form was one that safeguarded professional independence and that divorced the administration of the public will from the intrigues of politics. A meritocratic order was a moral order because it meant people of their own ilk would hold office. As doctors, lawyers, and journalists, the theorized administrator cast a familiar silhouette.

It is important to note what was excluded from this vision of "good men." Charles Nordhoff, a journalist writing in the pages of the *North American Review*, attributed the mismanagement of government to the "traits" of Irishmen, a people endowed with an "extraordinary aptitude for misgoverning cities." Among these traits he includes an Irish desire for government employment (a trait "common with some other foreigners") and his willingness to take "charity" which was "almost always a curse."[11] Indeed, the Irish had done particularly well in city politics, and Republican Northerners came to see them as the fount of misgovernment and political disrepute. Even though these reformers tended to bear the anti-slavery cause in prior years, they increasingly viewed newly emancipated blacks with ambivalence, accepting a narrative that the Reconstruction and carpetbaggers had facilitated corruption and misrule in the South. Godkin believed that only education would instill "moral vigor" needed for freedmen to participate as citizens, and took a patient stance on suffrage, worrying that uneducated blacks would be easily exploited by deceptive politicians (Sproat 1968). *The Nation* counseled in 1871 that even though the "unrepentant rebels" expressed little regret over the war (they "invariably allude to 'the cause' as highly respectable"), it was these men "who must purify Southern politics, if they can be purified."[12] A renewed allegiance with southern white elites was kindled.

With the election of Rutherford B. Hayes, reformers forsook the emancipatory cause for more resolute efforts to rid the nation of political corruption and other debasements of politics. A few years prior, their "best men" model of administration gained an unexpected ally when President

Grant – his own administration wracked by corruption – thwarted criticism from reformists in his party by urging Congress to establish the Civil Service Reform Commission in 1871. Curtis was made commissioner. Eaton was added to its ranks to years later, before closing unceremoniously in 1875. Congress refused to re-establish the commission under Hayes, but Hayes, having emphasized his reformist leanings in a tightly contested race against Samuel Tilden soon carried through on his promises. As Redeemer Democrats were regaining control of state governments, Hayes sent Eaton to England to report on the more advanced British civil service.[13] Eaton's study, *Civil Service in Great Britain: A History of Abuses and Reforms and their Bearing upon American Politics* was published in 1880, articulating a vision in which patronage stood at odds with the laws of progress.

When President James Garfield was assassinated the following year – somewhat ironically by a deranged lawyer who believed he was owed a political appointment – efforts at civil service reform began to ramp. The Pendleton Civil Service Reform Act was enacted in 1883 under Arthur (an opponent of Hayes' and a one-time machine politician himself), delivered a formal blow to machine politics and spoils.[14] The bill's primary objective was to "remove from American politics the degrading influence of the patronage system"[15] by requiring examinations for employment. Yet, even by that standard, the Act was feeble. It preserved only a small fraction of civil service positions for those whose abilities (not connections) warranted them, and it allowed politicians to decide which positions fell under its auspices. *Good Government* began to advertise training and guides for potential test takers and lambasting men who attempted to skirt examinations through bribery. As markers of professionalism, education and testing were the signifiers of upright men.

But there were inklings, most notably in the early writings of Eaton, that administrative work required more than mere moral rectitude. Government was complex. To Eaton, the acquisitiveness of government employees was just as much a product of administrative complexities as it was of Jacksonian spoils. "The day is passed" an injured Eaton wrote in in 1872 in a speech delivered on his

behalf, "when our City Government can be made so simple" as to be understood "before breakfast" by men "who have not studied it."[16] Similar calls were forcefully extended by a young political science lecturer at Bryn Mawr Women's College, Woodrow Wilson. In an essay penned for *Political Science Quarterly* he challenged his nascent discipline: even if political science could somehow arrive at "steady, infallible, placidly wise maxims of government…would the country act on them?" The focus, he argued, ought to be on the production of "technically schooled" civil service to address the "infinitely complex questions" of administration. Importantly, Wilson's vision of administration not only transcended politics, it demanded scholarly attention and the development of specific administrative skills.[17] Or, as he wrote: "It is getting harder to run a constitution than to frame one." Though Wilson sought to expand beyond the merit system, he remained imprecise on how the complexities of administration could be resolved. It was Wilson's broader field, social science, that would begin to offer answers on how the idealized administrative man was to be equipped.

Before the Civil War, social science had been understood as having no bearing on the affairs of common men.[18] But the war and its aftermath were widely understood as disturbances in the natural order of things; uncovering the underlying principles of that order would afford an opportunity for their restoration. Still in their youth, the social science disciplines remained the undeveloped province of dilettantism. The American Social Science Association (ASSA), founded in 1865 by a former abolitionist, was the only organization of its kind. Its membership consisted almost entirely of Northeastern gentry. Seventy-three percent had been born in New England, one-third were businessmen, one-third were professionals.[19] Despite this patrician background and what is now connoted by the term "social science," the majority of the association's members were absorbed in a Christian brand of social reform. Indeed, many drew parallels between the scientific and religious search for order. One circular listed interests core to the organization's membership: "Sanitary Conditions of the People, the Relief, Employment, and Education of the Poor, the

Prevention of Crime, the Amelioration of the Insane, and those numerous matters of statistical and philanthropic interest which are included under the general head of 'Social Science'" (quoted in Furner 1975: 13). Science, in the estimation of its membership, was the application of Christian morality to social problems (Seidelman 1985). It is through this mélange of scientism and Protestant morality that the administrative ideal would become more than "not a politician."

Their intertwining is made explicit in Washington Gladden's *Applied Christianity: Moral Aspects of Social Questions* (1886). In it, Gladden, a member of ASSA and pastor in Columbus, Ohio, laid out a case for what would eventually become known as the Social Gospel, even dedicating a chapter to the union of social science and Christianity. Both, according to Gladden, concern "laws affecting the welfare of mankind," and recognize that "men are in a condition of disorder and distress." He admonishes churchgoers for knowing more about the poor in India than they knew of those in the slums nearby. These slums, like many around the country, were riddled with evils: gambling, booze, prostitution, and destitution. Even those engaged in helping the poor are not spared critique. Charity in the 1880s consisted of saving souls and uplifting the downtrodden because poverty was understood as self-inflicted (Lubove 1965: 12-17). Such efforts, according to Gladden, were "rather uncertainly done" because there had been little effort to "systematize the knowledge" such that "concerted action may be based upon it."[20] To Gladden, "furnishing work to idle hands" should be the object of charitable endeavors.[21]

Before long, Gladden's ideas became manifest in charity. Between 1889 and 1895, over 20 settlement houses were established around the country. These houses, brought to the U.S. by Jane Addams and Ellen Gates Starr in Chicago, and Stanton Coit in New York, were the organizational embodiment of Gladden's ideas.[22] In one sense, they maintained the spiritual uplift of the period's charity by facilitating contact between the educated, middle-class volunteers and neighboring slum dwellers through cultural events, public lectures, and the like. They also maintained the meritocratic

ethos of the era, holding that the deserving poor, provided the right conditions, would emerge from poverty on their own volition. But they also innovated by turning a lens on the conditions that promoted privation. Addams and Starr of the Hull House began to engage in social research seeking to identify and address the social roots of poverty.

The research orientation of settlement houses, and their ability to draw residents from local colleges, made them the anchor tenant of early social science. The Hull House, for example, brought together figures like Albion Small, John Dewey, William I. Thomas, and Charles Merriam. As charity reform work expanded the sympathies of its academic residents, it shaped the course of social science in the late-19th century (Ross 1991). When Small founded the country's first sociology department in 1892, he proposed that Addams make the Hull House a laboratory for social work experiments – an offer she duly rejected. But Addams was not shy to research. Indeed, she was one of the most technically sophisticated researchers of the time, conducting quantitative research decades before it would enter the sociological mainstream. In 1895, Addams published a volume containing chapters by nine Hull House residents, titled *Hull House Maps and Papers: A Presentation of the Nationalities and Wages in a Congested District of Chicago.* In it, the authors provided carefully detailed maps and rich descriptions of the city's hardships: child labor, sweatshops, ethnic ghettos, and the labor movement. Their data, collected through survey and observation informed not only the course of Chicago sociology, but reform efforts as well.

Even as the social sciences grew more sophisticated, they retained their reformist motivations. When the American Economic Association (AEA) was founded in 1885, it drew 50 members from the ASSA, more than 20 of whom had been or were involved in the ministry (Furner 1975: 75). Gladden, Adams, and several young economists, including a Christian-socialist Richard T. Ely,[23] Edwin Seligman, and Edmund James a led the organization. At the Association's first meeting in Saratoga, New York, they adopted a platform consisting of four points, each signaling the

association's meliorist orientation. The association was to improve the "conditions of human progress" through "historical and statistical study of actual conditions" with solutions to be found at the intersection of "church, state, and science."[24] Indeed, the aim of promoting an active state featured prominently in their early writings, a policy of laissez-faire was deemed unsafe both in politics and morals. Actively employing social science in governance would promote social progress. In its early incarnation, the AEA saw itself as administration's fact-checkers.

Not all in the academy saw reform as a worthy end, however. William Graham Sumner, an American exponent of Herbert Spencer, argued in *What the Social Classes Owe to Each Other* (1883) that class stratification was the inevitable product of evolution and that any effort to alleviate such conditions was both futile tampering and against the natural order of things.[25] Indeed, such a perspective was quickly becoming marginal among the intellectual elite of the era. The Progressive ethos was, in spite of its many variations, one of self-confident man shaping his social environs. The same year, another sociologist, Lester Frank Ward, offered a durable counterargument: the lack of legislative success in mitigating social ills was attributable to lack of sociological knowledge in legislative sessions. But this did not mean that legislatures were irredeemable. In 1893, Ward followed his argument with another book, drawing on Darwin, to advance a concept of "sociocracy" where "all important questions" would be resolved through knowledge of society's function, obviating the need for "partisan strain upon the public energies." In this view, one need not wait for the slow and wasteful processes of natural selection to run their course. Through considered action, man could hasten the perfection of society.

When these social reformers called upon the scientific principles with which to address practical problems, they did so at a time with few reliable methods, and even less empirical data. Moreover, there was mixed faith that that the general propositions that could be derived from such data would be beneficial in concrete situations.[26] Indeed, James, speaking at a Good Government

Convention in Minneapolis, offered that the ideal city charter was the one that was right for a particular city at a particular time. That is, the principles of good governance were understood as specific to cities, not as a set of practices generalizable to all cities. Even in the social sciences, there was substantial debate about the role of data in making sense of social problems. Methods like Addams were viewed by many as effeminate and would only slowly be adopted by men in the coming decades (Deegan 1990). When Simon Newcombe released a book on the principles of political economy, its application of mathematical principles to economic thought was met with scathing criticism by men like James and Ely (Moyer 1992: 199; Fourcade and Khurana 2013). Over time, attitudes began to change. Speaking at the AEA's fifth annual convention, William Folwell reasoned that, with projected advances in statistical methods, "It may someday become impossible for two distinguished Senators, discussing an economic question, to make distinctly opposite statements in regard to the same state of facts."[27] To them, it seemed plausible that, once provided with sufficient information, decision-makers could uncontroversially choose a best course of action.

Entering the 1890s, Good Government Clubs (detractors referred to their members as "goo-goos") were surfacing around the country. The National Municipal League was founded in 1894 at the National Conference on Good Government held in Philadelphia. Though membership was open to the public, the organization boasted an elite constituency. In attendance were Roosevelt, Ely, James, Godkin, Adams, Gladden, and Eaton, among hundreds of others who had traveled from cities nationwide. Gladden delivered a paper using Ward's sociology to argue that "good city government is the servant of God."[28] For God's work to be realized in government, it was incumbent on the "Christian citizen to take hold with resolute hands" of administrative offices. After all, he added, "Satan finds some mischief still for the hands of public officials."[29] When the National Municipal League charter was passed, it was premised on selecting administrators of "trained ability and proved integrity" who would conduct their work through "investigation and

discussion of conditions."

Though the design of investigation was left open-ended, one attendee, Reverend Charles H. Parkhurst, had already put it into practice. Two years before, he had founded the City Vigilance League in New York City, with offices in each of the city's 30 assembly districts. He reported the organization's purpose in the *North American Review*: "We have a considerable number of municipal servants in our employ, whose salaries are being paid out of our pockets; we suspect these servants...of not doing what they are paid for doing, and we are watching them to discover evidences of their infidelity." He went further in enumerating the practices of the organization:

> Our preliminary need is of 1,137 men, honest and durable, who will undertake to represent respectively each of the election districts ... The duty of each of those men will be to make himself thoroughly conversant with all that concerns the district under his charge ... [I]n order to insure thoroughness ... each supervisor should prepare a chart of his own district, with the name of residents...nationality, etc. Buildings used for other than purposes of residence should be considered in detail...This will include schools and saloons, a full account of which later will embrace such particulars as the brewer under whose auspices the saloon is run, the general tone of the place, the relations subsisting between it and the policeman on the beat ... whether it is kept open in unlawful hours ... its customers, whether it is licensed ... whether its existence is necessitated by the paucity of saloons in the neighborhood ... whether people living in its proximity are enduring its presence under protest. The survey and tabulation must of course include a statement as to all houses of prostitution, poolrooms, policy-shops and gambling houses in the district ... [W]herever the administrative blood beats in this city the finger of the League shall be upon it counting its pulsations.[30]

The many faces of the Progressive period are evident in Parkhurst's call. In motivation, it is concerned with eradicating unchristian vice. In form, it is concerned with disciplining unscrupulous administrators. In method, it is concerned with surveying, documenting, and collecting facts. Though the strands that made the Progressive impulse became deeply interwoven, it is important to

recognize the distinct roles they played shaping and promoting a new administrative ideal. The Social Gospel gave a heart and soul to the anti-patronage efforts by identifying the destitute who were harmed by the corrupt affairs of political machines. Likewise, the anti-patronage efforts helped to identify the culprit behind the social ills deserving of Christian attention. Social science, and its emergent professional identities found its purpose, in the settlement houses and pews of the Social Gospel, and lent its idiom – system, method, and measurement – and academic respectability to the idealized new administrator. Just as Gladden's church sat across the street from the Ohio State Capitol building in Columbus, the anti-patronage essays of the progressive journalists reached laity and legislator alike. The rich associational life of the cities created spaces for people to convene, but the overlap in membership of the associations, and the various angles and diagnoses they brought to the same sets of social problems, helped to crystallize an ideal of what administration ought to be.

The following year, a Philadelphia reformer, Herbert Welsh, spoke at the second conference of the National Municipal League. No longer would reform be promoted by "speakers, by pamphlets, through columns of the press, by personal conversation, by parlor meetings, by prayer meetings." It was to be promoted by the creation of an organization, a "perfectly detailed machine" "of the most efficient and permanent kind" that would run "systematically and continuously." Such a machine, operated by "good people" would run on "moral and religious" fuel to counter the "political machine that fosters and protects moral evil."[31] The only way to beat an immoral machine was with a moral one. Thus, the movement that grew out of an effort to place independent men in the offices of government – not beholden to organization but to the public – ended up reifying the organization.

In their efforts to produce an individually-focused, exclusive, notion of the "good man" administrator, they had inadvertently sown the seeds of bureaucratic organization where functionaries do their job *sin ira et studio*. In effect, they prefigured a Weberian ideal type by

combatting what they saw as the excesses of the political organization of the past. In a surprising turn of history, an effort to subordinate the excesses of organization to the wisdom of the independent professional, they all but ensured its further elaboration.

When Eaton died of "nervous prostration" in 1899, his funeral was widely attended. Among the organizations that sent notices of his passing to members were the National League for the Protection of American Institutions, City Club of New York, Union League Club, the American Unitarian Association, and the organization he helped found, the Civil Service Reform Association. In his will, he made two bequests of $100,000 each. The first went to Harvard College to endow a professorship of Science and Government. The second went to Columbia College to endow a Professorship of Municipal Science and Administration. These professorships, by training students in the practical wisdom of the day, would aid in "preventing corruption and partisan despotism...inducing and enabling the most worthy citizens" to attain public office.[32]

EFFICIENCY AND PROFESSIONALIZATION

As the moral imperative of good government became increasingly well established, explicit concern with the moral qualities of administrators began to fade from discourse. The Christian tinge began to dissipate. A San Francisco-based periodical, *Pulpit and Social Problems*, was retitled *Civic and Social Problems* in 1899, its editors noting that the prior title led to misapprehension as to the nature of the publication" and "*Civic* is tho't to be better."[33] Though Christian language was fading from administrative reform discourse, a new religious zeal persisted in its place. Indeed, the early 1900s came to be characterized by a religious-like obsession with efficiency and eliminating waste in all forms. As the works of scholars like Ward had intimated, society was perfectible. If natural selection steadily improved society by discarding those that were inefficient and unfit, man could take it upon himself to hasten this process. Characteristic of the era, Thorstein Veblen ranted at length about

waste in his *Theory of the Leisure Class* (1899), and envisioned a "soviet" of efficient engineers as the rightful rulers of industry and administration in *Engineers and the Price System* (1919). Mirroring Ward's "sociocracy," Herbert Croly – later a co-founder of *The New Republic* – wrote *The Promise of American Life* (1909) to outline a theory of "industrial democracy" that wedded scientific principles with the hierarchical concentration of control. Efficiency, once a proxy for morality (e.g. Gladden's "idle hands"),[34] became an end in its own right. The "perfectly detailed machine" Welsh had described moved from blueprint to reality.

With efficiency came an acutely technical administrative ideal. Just as the social ills of neighborhoods could be measured through surveys of their qualities, so too could the iniquities of the men who staffed municipal offices. Their fitness could be ascertained not only by passing civil service examinations – such as those promoted in the Pendleton Act – but also through efficiency in the performance of organizationally prescribed duties. The personal nature of good administrators grew increasingly impersonal and subject to the rules and discipline of efficient systems. We see in this period a sort of protest against religious notions of good government and, in an effort to operationalize it, the fracturing of general tasks into their infinitesimal sub-parts. Thus, as concerns around morality shifted to the cognitive background, efficiency, system, method, and standardization become the watchwords of good administration. The emphasis was no longer debriding society of its impurities, but actively seeking to perfect its function.

This shift is best understood through the growing routinization of public administration organizations both inside and outside government and the tethering of these organizations to academic thought. A new corps of administrative scholars was increasingly called upon by governments – both locally and nationally – to provide the facts upon which decisions could be made.

With social sciences now self-assuredly claiming a position of neutral objectivity, moralizing

became less tenable. Reflecting this attitude in a 1905 address to the Phi Beta Kappa society at Harvard, Charles Eliot insisted that professors avoid propounding solutions to philosophical questions. Such questions, he argued, could never be resolved scientifically. Social scientists began to embrace a more tempered, distant, and less activist orientation. By the turn of the century, the reformism that had animated the early years of social science professionalization became outmoded for a younger generation of scholars for whom disciplinary commitments and the sanctity of the scientific method had become most important. Ely, for instance, abandoned his outspoken stances on socialism and labor for studies on land economics and public utilities. Small fell out of favor (Furner 1975; Smith 1994). By 1919, Luther Bernard, writing in the *American Journal of Sociology*, would proclaim that sociologists were "so definitely launched upon this trend toward objectivism and definiteness of measurement…that it is needless to argue in its defense."[35]

In an era of growing academic confidence, a new academic field of public administration began to form, emerging first in departments of political science. Frank Goodnow – who in 1903 was appointed to the Dorman Eaton Professorship of Municipal Science and Administration at Columbia – sought to lay a foundation for the discipline. For him, the qualifications of the administrators demanded more than moral rectitude and good sense. They must be versed in the complexities of governance, budgeting, and auditing, and possess an ability to regard facts impartially.[36] In advancing this statement, Goodnow echoed Wilson's politics-administration dichotomy, now nearly two decades old. If the highest form of politics was to be the expression of the public will, then the highest form of administration was to be the execution of that will.

The contents of the new science began to accumulate. Taking their cue from models of administration in private business, scholars began looking to other fields for inspiration. One field was engineering, which, in its growing focus on standardization (Shenhav 1994), had developed the concept of scientific management. Most famously preached by Taylor, the gospel of efficiency

sought to identify and strip all extraneous effort and redundancy from repetitive tasks, reduce

soldiering, and increase outputs. Such efficiency, Taylor and his admirers argued, would align

manager and laborer interests and, in doing so, engender social harmony that would permeate

throughout society.[37] The idea became prominent in 1910, when the Eastern Railroad Company

applied to the Interstate Commerce Commission for a rate hike on freight. Louis Brandeis,

representing the public before the Commission, argued that the managerial shortcomings of Eastern

should not be the public's burden. As a witness, he called on Harrington Emerson, an industrial

engineer and management evangelist, who testified that the company, had they relied on the

precepts of scientific management, would have saved a million dollars a day.[38]

The idea quickly became popular. In November 1911, New York City's Commissioner of

Accounts, Raymond Fosdick made an audacious claim. If the city had only adopted "modern

efficiency methods" it stood to save $15 million per year – roughly 10 percent of the city's budget.

His concern was not graft. Indeed, graft was becoming "increasingly difficult and correspondingly

unpopular." Rather, his concern was city worker "incompetence" and "loafing." The "merit system"

according to Fosdick, was the "lesser of two evils." Though it protects from partisan distortions, it

"keeps in public office inefficient men."[39] Waste is as bad as graft. Morality, in the absence of skill

and efficiency, made for inadequate administrators.

By December, Fosdick found a solution. Hiring Benjamin Welton, an engineer previously

employed under Merriam on a Chicago budget commission,[40] the New York City Bureau of

Efficiency was formed at the end of the year. Its mandate was as follows:

> In the conduct of its executive departments the city is simply a business corporation. The
> bureau of efficiency has been organized to make a thorough study of the principles
> governing successful commercial organizations, and then to apply those principles to the
> conduct of municipal departments. It is believed that modern scientific management,
> thoughtfully applied and intelligently worked out, will produce such astonishing economical

results in municipal work as to more than justify this addition to the regular activities of the commission.[41]

Welton identified eight sources of administrative inefficiency. Among them were: lack of knowledge, improper organization, improper methods, lack of discipline, lack of standards, and lack of performance records. By the following year, the Bureau had retained the services of Harrington Emerson and Frederick Winslow Taylor as consultants. The cost of sewer cleaning in Manhattan dropped from $4 to 76 cents per cubic yard.

Efficiency bureaus began to appear around the country. Chicago, Des Moines, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Madison, Muskegon, Norfolk, Rochester, Sacramento, and San Francisco all developed bureaus, either as nonprofits or as part of city government. Even the socialist city council of Milwaukee created an efficiency bureau, appointing John R. Commons its director (Smith 1991). By 1915, 21 cities had developed a similar – though decidedly more academic – breed of organization, the municipal research bureau.[42]

The first of these, the New York Bureau of Municipal Research appeared in 1906, established by members of the recently founded "non-partisan" municipal political party, the Citizens Union, an outgrowth of prior efforts to drain the politics from administration. Among the Bureaus ranks was considerable academic pedigree. Seligman, who had recently chaired the AEA, was in charge. Contrasting itself to prior watchdog organizations such as the Vigilance League, the mission of the research bureau was less to "seek out misconduct" than it was to "study the conditions and methods that continually generate misconduct" and "securing new and scientific machinery to prevent it."[43] Though its methods were different, the orientation of the organization bore resemblance to its predecessor. Through careful observation and analysis, good government could be assured. Among the New York Bureau's organizational principles:

"Make no recommendations as to personnel further than to present facts throwing light on

the efficiency or inefficiency of employee or officer or to suggest necessary qualifications and where to find eligible candidates….Prepare formal report to department heads, city executive officers and general public….Follow up until something definite is done to improve methods and correct evils disclosed…. Supply freely verifiable data to agencies..."[44]

Unlike the efficiency bureaus, who broadly sought to apply management shibboleths to administrative duties, the research bureaus' methods centered on original research and publishing findings. The Bureau specialized in budgeting and accounting, but in the Taylorist spirit of the period, also hired men to stand curbside with stopwatches and clipboards as public works employees filled potholes. By the early 1930s, over 60 such organizations had been established in the U.S.[45] The quest for academic legitimacy began to bear its mark on the administrative activities of cities.

Such an academic imprint soon transferred to the states. What came to be known as The Wisconsin Idea – as it was labeled by political scientist and progressive reformer, Charles McCarthy – took root in the early 1900s. A mixture of "seminar and soil,"[46] the plan sought to strengthen the ties between scholarship and statute. When Charles Van Hise became president of the University of Wisconsin in 1905, he committed the school to serving state purposes. "These departments are in the service of the state," he declared in a speech attended by Governor LaFollette and other Wisconsin politicians. Just as the university is "devoted to the advancement and dissemination of knowledge," the state would be devoted to "putting into practice" such knowledge. Among the departments Van Hise volunteered into state service was the first-rate economics department, home to both Ely and Commons. The legislative process was soon fed by a steady stream of academic expertise with faculty serving on commissions and helping to draft laws. McCarthy established the first legislative reference library, through which state legislators could learn from the experiences of other governments that had enacted ideas similar to their own. The lessons of legislation were now understood as generalizable — the experiences of other municipalities and states were relevant to plans for other municipalities and states. The Wisconsin Idea quickly became popular around the

country. Administrative developments were yoked to academic ones.

What began in the cities and flourished in Wisconsin was soon replicated on the national level. In 1912, President Taft established the Commission of Economy and Efficiency, comprised of Goodnow, William Willoughby, Frederick Cleveland (then head of the New York City Bureau of Municipal Research) and other experts on administrative and budgetary reform, to study the executive branch budget and devise a more rational budgeting system to overcome the deficits faced by the government since the turn of the century.

If actions in the states helped to wed scholarship and administration, developments at the federal level served to bring them closer. According to Bernard Baruch, financier and head of the War Industries Board during the war, "the greatest deterrent to effective action was the lack of facts."[47] Accordingly, administrators under President Wilson saw a need for social scientists to plan a war economy. Some academics, looking to validate their claims to professionalism and expertise, saw an opportunity to prove their practical value. The American Psychological Association created 12 wartime committees, most of which worked with the armed forces to measure the training and aptitude of soldiers. Though the AEA refused to create any official committees relating to the war, it strongly encouraged its members to offer their expertise to the federal government. Historians and political scientists were impressed into the Committee on Public Information to help produce propaganda (Blakely 1970; Smith 1994).

One advisory group, the Committee on the Distribution of Income, established in 1917 included a statistician, N.I. Stone, and a Malcolm Rorty, a pioneer in probability theory and statistician at the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. The two imagined creating an organization devoted to "fact finding on controversial economic subjects of great public interest" and set about recruiting some of the era's foremost economists: Wesley Mitchell, Edwin Gay, and Commons.[48] The War put the plans on pause until early 1920, when, with support from the Carnegie

Corporation, the National Bureau of Economic Research was established and Mitchell appointed Director. In the ensuing years (between 1922 and 1943), the new Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund, under the tutelage of Beardsley Ruml, provided nearly $2 million – roughly half the Bureau's budget.[49]

Ruml was an influential –and at times polarizing – character in the nascent realm of social science philanthropy. As a young psychometrician, he was hired by Rockefeller and soon began to develop a funding strategy for the social sciences. Fosdick, who by now was on the board of both the Rockefeller Foundation and the Memorial Fund, became an influential confidant. In 1924, he wrote a memo to the Memorial Fund's board recommending that support only go toward social sciences that take a stance of impartiality and that have revealed a practical value. With congress scrutinizing any philanthropic efforts that could be deemed political, the board agreed that funding should go toward basic social science research and not toward philosophical, theoretical, or reform-oriented efforts. Concern with scrutiny even carried into the language of Memorial's grants in which recipients were advised: "The Memorial would appreciate it if no public announcement were made of the gift."[50] Over the following six years, the Memorial disbursed more than $40 million, $21 million of which supported social science.

One group that eventually received Memorial funding was the Institute for Government Research, an organization that emerged from members of the Taft Commission, with Willoughby and Goodnow at the helm. The organization was to be a "non-partisan, independent institution to consider the problems of public administration, and particularly those of the National Government...[that used] the most scientific practical principles and procedures."[51] Early efforts were focused on budgeting. Willoughby, a renowned expert on the subject, wrote extensively on the need for administrative reform. In his report, *Organized Efforts for the Improvement of Methods of Administration in the United States*, he wrote: "The problem of public administration is resolvable into

five fairly distinct parts: problems of organization; problems of personnel, problems of material, problems of business practice and procedure, and problems of finance." He proceeded to illustrate each problem and how it would be addressed. Problems of personnel could be solved by keeping efficiency records of all administrative employees. Problems of finance, he wrote, were those of "handling and disbursing funds, of accounting and reporting, of audit, and, most important of all, making provision for the revenue and expenditure needs of the several services and of the government as a whole." The adoption of proper principles of administrative organization and procedure means that methods will be employed "not merely because they have the sanction of long-continued use, but because they are actually efficient and are dictated by a scientific analysis of the nature of the work to be done."[52]

Thus, good government required efficiency of "handling and disbursing funds, of accounting and reporting, of audit, and, most important of all, making provision for the revenue and expenditure needs of the several services and of the government as a whole."[53] His recommendations, and those of his organization (which would soon come to be known as the Brookings Institution[54]) were incorporated into the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 which established the Budget Office (now the Office of Management and Budget) and the General Accounting Office (now the Government Accountability Office). With these federal expansions, the administrative functions in government grew to include non-partisan auditing, evaluating, and investigating the use of public funds.

The parochially economic interests of NBER and the Institute for Government Research mirrored the disciplinary silos developing in the academy. It was with this concern that the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), led by Merriam, was established in 1924 with support from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Memorial Fund. It differed from other research organizations in several ways. First, it was not a research organization itself, but a stimulator – through fellowships

and grants – of social research. Second, it took a more holistically social scientific approach to understanding social problems. Rather than see issues as strictly questions of economy or efficiency, the council was inclined to adopt a range of academic perspectives. In some ways, the personality of the organization was split between fostering long-term development in the social sciences and addressing practical problems in the present. For Merriam, however, the goals were interwoven: the gap between current social science capabilities and the urgent need for their application demanded immediate attention.

Located at 1126 East 59th Street on the University of Chicago's campus, the Council's offices embodied the organization's ethos. Floor space was designed to be modular and facilitate easy collaboration across projects and disciplines. Rooms housed instruments for the study of anthropometrics, linguistics, psychology, and statistics. With its predominant use being research, few rooms were available for lecture space. Books were housed offsite, owing to the Council's emphasis on collecting "fresh material from the field rather than the distillation of new conclusions from documentary sources."[55] Carved into the building's stone façade are Lord Kelvin's words: "If you cannot measure, your knowledge is meager and unsatisfactory."[56]

The spirit of service intellectuals caught the attention of the president. Hoover, an engineer, regularly sought expert wisdom through commissions. As Secretary of Commerce, he had seen what science could do for industrial efficiency. As president, he sought to apply a similar model, bringing the wealth of social science to bear on social policy which could be made more efficient through calculated adherence to facts. In 1929, Securing a $500,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation to survey social trends,[57] Hoover tapped Mitchell, Merriam, and a University of Chicago sociologist, William Ogburn to lead his Research Committee on Social Trends.[58] *Recent Social Trends*, the committee's weighty two volume, 29 chapter report was released in 1933 containing contributions from a wide range of scholars on an equally wide range of social topics – environmental,

demographic, economic, organizational, religious, etc. – all with an eye toward changes unfolding over the century's first three decades. In addition, the committee published 13 volumes of data and specific studies to support the report's results. Among the report's pages is an unmistakable optimism about the potential for empirically-grounded policy to address the issues it contained therein.[59] Society's component parts are deeply interrelated, the report argues in its opening pages, and thus necessitates government's active use of science to address them. The most recent phase of administrative development had been "the recognition of the necessity of fact finding agencies and their equipment," the authors observe in the introduction, the next must "find more emphasis upon interpretation and synthesis."[60] Leonard White, echoed this perspective in his chapter on the development of public administration: "In 1900, the only technique for the improvement of administration...was agitation for reform, sponsored by men and women who were primarily intent on preserving the integrity of Democratic institutions."[61] As the volume itself would attest, the array of methods at the disposal of administrators had been quantitatively expanded and technically refined.

From the perspective of the report's contributors, sensible administration should be restricted to what can be known by the contours of objective data. Not everyone in the academy shared this perspective, however. Charles Beard, reviewing the report in *Social Forces*, considered it an error to assume that "conclusions flow from the facts" and recommended that any future endeavor should begin with a statement of values – the scientific method, after all, is "only a method."[62]

The collapse of American prosperity in the 1930s brought with it grave suspicions about Hoover's approach to engineering society, as well as doubts about the ambitious promotion of social science in which foundations had been engaged. The growing attitude was reflected in 1932 by Franklin Delano Roosevelt, then a presidential nominee: "The presidency is not merely an administrative office ... it is more than an engineering job ... It is preeminently a place of moral

leadership."[63] In his administration, social scientists took up roles as policy advisors and administrators. Scholars like Ogburn, once fixated on the new role for social science in government, grew frustrated by a lack of genuine research opportunities. *Social Trends* quickly seemed a path not taken and the starry-eyed union of social science and social policy seemed – at least for the moment – to have reached its denouement.

Under the New Deal, the expansion of administrative duties spurred increasing demand for trained administrators. The federal government underwent unparalleled expansion during this period. Whereas in 1900 the government employed 100,000 civilians, by 1945, it employed 3.5 million (Fabricant 1949). Though the US population had roughly doubled during this period, its federal civilian workforce had increased by a factor of 35. During the New Deal period, government reach grew considerably as well. It oversaw the beginning of Social Security, rural electrification, mortgage insurance, and public works programs of various sorts. The act of getting things done, and at such immense scale, was, as Wilson had asserted 50 years before, a tall order. In line with this expansion, the administrative ethos of the era was one of regulating, planning, vertically integrating, and managing. Regulatory agencies were focused on documenting procedures and rules – writing down the correct way of doing things – with a focus on safety, fairness, and averting corruption. In this mode, the Securities and Exchange Commission was founded in 1934 to protect investors and ensure orderly markets, the Federal Communications Commission was established 13 days later to regulate interstate communications, the National Labor Relations Board was established in 1935 to oversee union elections and ensure fair labor practices, and the Food and Drug Administration was granted expanded regulatory power in 1938.

At the time, public administration education had only been offered in a handful of schools. The New York Bureau of Municipal Research had established its Training School for Public Governance in 1911, Robert Brookings had established a school for economics and government in

DC in 1924, and the Planning Commission of Los Angeles taught classes on public administration at University of Southern California as early as 1921. In 1912, an American Political Science Association's Committee on Practical Training for Public Service encouraged universities to connect with governments of all levels and determine training needs, but it was not until 1924, when George Holmes Maxwell, a patent attorney and alumnus of Syracuse University, furnished his alma mater with $500,000 dollars to establish the first standalone "school of American citizenship."[64] Other programs soon followed, with the University of Southern California, Princeton, Columbia, Stanford, Texas A&M, and the University of Michigan forming administration programs during the course of the depression. The Rockefeller Foundation bolstered efforts in Syracuse, as well as nascent programs at Berkeley and Harvard. The Civil Service Commission sought training support from American University in DC. By 1936, dissertations on public administration began to be listed separately in the pages of the *American Political Science Review*, marking the growing sense that political science, as a discipline, no longer adequately fulfilled the needs of those interested in optimizing government performance. Three years later, in 1939, at the APSA annual meeting, 150 members – about 5% of APSA's membership – broke away to form the American Society for Public Administration.[65] William Mosher served as president, Brownlow and Gulick served on the council, White edited the organization's new journal, *The Public Administration Review*, and Clarence Ridley, director of the International City Management Association, served on the editorial board.[66]

As the Depression deepened and international concerns brewed in Europe, President Roosevelt reverted to a more administrative concept of efficiency. He nominated Luther Gulick, a political scientist at Columbia University, along with Louis Brownlow and Merriam, to his Committee on Administrative Management (the "Brownlow Committee"). Looking for a counter-weight to National Socialism, Roosevelt sent his committee of scholars to Rome to learn the latest in efficient administrative techniques from Benito Mussolini's Fascist government.[67] The aim of their

study was both to make government more efficient – a continuation on a now well-worn theme – and to secure more power in the office of the president. "The president needs help," the committee reported upon return in 1937, "agencies need to be strengthened and developed as managerial arms of the Chief Executive." The authors continued, "There is but one great purpose, namely, to make our Government an up-to-date, efficient, and effective instrument for carrying out the will of the Nation." A strong leader buttressed by an efficient administrative staff was the most direct route to this end. With the American flirtation with Fascism fleeting, the proposed Reorganization Act barely passed in 1939, embracing only two of the committee's 37 recommendations, but significantly expanding the powers of the executive by establishing the Executive Office of the President and bringing several agencies under its aegis, including the Bureau of the Budget.

At the same time as his service on the commission, Gulick along with Lyndall Urwick, published a compendium, *Papers on the Science of Administration*, in which they spelled out contemporary ideas of organizational science. Gulick famously propounded his ungainly POSDCORB acronym – Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting – a recipe, he asserted, for efficient administration.[68] With considerable moxie, Urwick proclaimed that organizations "can be studied as a technical question, irrespective of the purpose of the enterprise, the personnel composing it, or any constitutional, political or social theory underlying its creation" Though they maintained the idea that politics and administration were – and should be – anathema, the ideas of Gulick and Urwick signaled a return to the organizationally-focused view of administration that had been promoted at the turn of the century. The Brownlow Committee was premised on a dramatically different idea of efficiency. Theirs was not the efficiency of the stopwatch, but the efficiency of bureaucratic structure. According to Gulick (1937: 193), efficiency – by which he meant clear lines of authority and responsibility – was "the fundamental value" of administration, its "single ultimate test."[69]

Remarkably, despite his service as an administrative expert, Gulick expressed significant reservations about the proper role of expertise. In *Papers*, Gulick expressed that, although "society needs" experts, "history shows us that the common man is a better judge of his own needs in the long run than any cult of experts."[70] Indeed, the Brownlow Committee report was reflective of this stance. Because federal government had grown reliant on a "headless 'fourth branch' of the Government" these agencies, or analogues to them, should be subsumed under the executive office. The report signaled a departure from the data collection flurry of 1920s administrative efforts and signaled a turn toward a more organizational – in terms of hierarchical structures and concentrations of power – notion of administration.

Bills bore this new administrative ethos. The Housing Act of 1937, for example, planned to "clear the slums" and provide "sanitary housing" to slum dwellers. It was an issue reminiscent of the concerns of the late 19th century, yet it revealed a dramatically more enumerated set of bureaucratic tasks and responsibilities. Though the act painstakingly enumerates responsible agencies, criteria for funding, funding sources, and penalties for malfeasance, it says nothing of evaluating effectiveness or indicators of success (as would become routine 30 years later). Illustrative in another way, the Employment Act of 1946 was, in a sense, a plan to plan. (Indeed, the National Planning Board released the report, *A Plan for Planning* in 1934.) The act mandates the president to submit an annual economic report and establishes a council of economic advisers to help regulate inflation and unemployment. The practice of public administration was one of faithfully implementing the political will by applying regulations, planning projects, and writing checks.[71]

As the ideas of the earlier period were built into organizations, organizations themselves became the object of administrative concern. The ideal rational administration now was less about the moral administrator whose qualities, though testable, were personal attributes. Now the focus was on his functional role within the machine, how he went about his work, and the structural

context in which he operated. It concerned the organization of his bureau and the information he was provided. No longer were administrators merely faithful implementers of public will, it was imperative that they became efficient executors of the will – even as notions of efficiency took on various and contested forms. Schools provided not uniquely gifted individuals but functionaries to keep the machine running efficiently. As the nation entered World War II, an ideal administration was one of organizational efficiency, with clearly delineated rules and roles. Programs would be implemented in accordance with design, checks would be written for the correct amount, and trains would run on time.

THE END OF PROVERBS AND THE BIRTH OF THE 'WHIZ KIDS'

In 1961, Dwight D. Eisenhower was near the end of his two terms in office. Over the course of his presidency, the nation had prospered, even as Cold War hostilities continued. With three days left in office, he took to national television to give a farewell address. In it, he invoked the "military-industrial complex," warning Americans of the perils – both in expenditure and liberty – of overcommitting to a militaristic mode. Detailing its implications, the former general emphasized the influence on scholarship, lamenting that government contracts had become a "substitute for intellectual curiosity" and warning that "public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."[72]

The previous two decades, from the bombing of Pearl Harbor to Eisenhower's farewell, had indeed been a productive period for the sciences. Building on the precedent of the First World War, World War II created high demand for scholars in the war effort. Social scientists helped produce propaganda, designed psychological warfare campaigns, collected data on serviceman morale, and helped to plan military mobilizations. In effect, the war taught social scientists to see responsibility as government service, democracy as psychology, and planning as expertise (Herman 1995). The

wartime Office of Scientific Research and Development made grants to university-based scholars for research aiding the war effort. The Army Air Force developed a unit for military strategy and propaganda, drawing on both physicists and communications scholars. In the war's immediate aftermath, the unit was dubbed Project RAND, and under the direction of General Henry "Hap" Arnold, Edward Bowles of MIT, and owing to the involvement of Donald Douglas, brought under the auspices of Douglas Aircraft. Early forays into the design of spacecraft, gave way to concerted efforts to enlist social scientists. By 1948, RAND had a staff of 200 with backgrounds in economics, psychology, mathematics, engineering, physics, and chemistry. Embodied in the organization was a commitment to intellectual cross-fertilization – from "the laboratories of industry, the seminars of universities, and the offices of administration." When RAND became an independent nonprofit in 1948, it remained near the Douglas headquarters in Santa Monica. The distance from Washington was more than geographic. Despite the organization's many contributions to military operations in its early years, it failed to garner much interest in civilian bureaus (Rohde 2013).

The political distance of organizations like RAND was meaningful in another way. Anti-communist crusades of the 1950s saw the traditional funders of social science, philanthropic foundations, adopt a subdued role. A recent growth in the number of private foundations had sparked congressional inquiries. One, led by Tennessee Congressman Reese, and another, led by Georgia Congressman Cox, took the perspective that the countries intellectual elite had been buttressing socialist ideology and promoting moral relativism since the New Deal. Because foundations were footing the bill, they were complicit in "diabolical conspiracy" against democracy (Hall 2013). The inquiries wore on the foundations, pressuring them to carefully articulate their social science funding efforts as undeniably anti-communist. When the Cox committee resolved that foundations might play a role in funding Cold War efforts, foundations were quick to conform. Moreover, foundations became increasingly hesitant to support work that might be viewed as

morally relative. The Rockefeller Foundation ceased funding research on values, morals, and ethics (areas that had received funding under Fosdick's leadership). The Carnegie Corporation's social science portfolio, which occupied 75 percent of its funding in 1948, was cut to less than 30 percent in 1950 (Solovey 2013).

There were, nevertheless, many intellectual administrative developments during this time. After the war, two major works of public administration scholarship were published. Together, they revealed the field's growing self-awareness and scholarly identity. Compared, they revealed inimical conceptions of the administrative ideal and equally distinct routes forward. Dwight Waldo's *The Administrative State* (1948) argued that administration's infatuation with efficiency had clouded its commitments to democracy, pluralism, and voice. Expressing hesitation about the fawning embrace of science, Waldo criticized the field's scholarly luminaries. Gulick, in his haste to advance a hierarchical, executive-centric model of administration had been "seeking ardently to advance democracy by denying its relevance to the administrative process."[73] Clear lines between politics and administration, notably advanced by Wilson and Goodnow, were utter fiction. The value-free, just-the-facts assumptions of *Social Trends* or *Papers on the Science of Administration* were naïve.

In *Administrative Behavior* (1947), Simon laid out a research agenda for studying efficiency within organizations. Contra Waldo, efficiency was both an empirical question and the determining question of good administration. But Simon's was not the efficiency of Taylor or Gulick. There was no a priori reason to believe, for example, that hierarchical structures were more effective than limited hierarchies, or that specialization by location was more effective than specialization by function. Such views – described in Simon's oblique attack on Gulick – amounted to little more than untested proverbs. And, like proverbs, for each principle of administration, one could find an equally "plausible and acceptable contradictory principle" by which to guide his action. Clear concepts of administrative outputs were needed, alternative means of achieving those outputs must

be examined. As Simon put it, under his criterion of rational maximization, "administrative man" would take his place next to "economic man."[74]

The application to public administration was clear. No longer were structures of government administration to be the primary concern. How well – and how efficiently – they accomplished their goals was the new criterion. No longer would organizational structure or tallying costs be the arbiters of good government. Those dollars would be put in terms of their efficacy in achieving some end, and compared to alternative methods of achieving the same ends. By the time Simon made his paradigm-shifting contribution, he had already been active in putting these ideas into practice. Beginning in 1937, Ridley, and Simon, then a graduate student at the University of Chicago, began to publish a series of articles on measurement and efficiency standards in city administration. If administration were to be great, they argued, its measurement instruments required updating. Specifically, administrators were in need of practical tools for "choosing between alternate courses of action."[75] In the familiar mold of municipal research and efficiency bureaus, the advancements first developed and adopted in city administrations would soon take root in federal government.

Simon's thinking kept pace with, and often led, developments in behavioralism, empiricism, and logic. Computational modeling and decision analysis methods emerged from the fields of systems analysis and operations research with the claim to improve decision makers' capabilities while reducing unintended consequences. Advances in game-theory by Von Neumann and Morgenstern at RAND promised to improve decision making through rigorous logic. The Cowles Commission helped to marry economics and statistics to advance econometrics. Donald Campbell and Julian Stanley published *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research* which urged scholars to consider experimentation outside the lab and within the social policy realm. Operations Research, first developed to destroy German U-boats was developed to mathematically optimize economic decisions. Systems analysis offered similar tools for less clearly defined goals. Decision

makers would clarify objectives, choose courses of action, act, and evaluate choices.

Tools developed outside federal administration were absorbed within it, starting with the Kennedy administration and more stridently under Johnson. New practices and new ways of imagining and solving social problems began to occupy the executive offices created and left behind in a later era, transforming the nature of their administrative work. Hopes were high. At the White House Christmas tree lighting of 1964, President Lyndon B. Johnson boldly stated that:

> "These are the most hopeful times in all the years since Christ was born in Bethlehem...Today—as never before—man has in his possession the capacities to end war and preserve peace, to eradicate poverty and share abundance, to overcome the diseases that have afflicted the human race and permit all mankind to enjoy their promise in life on this earth."[76]

At the time, liberalism – rooted in a faith that the federal government could provide for its citizens – was at its peak. Johnson had defeated Goldwater with the largest ever popular majority, Democrats had taken both houses of Congress, and polls reflected that 77 percent of Americans trusted the government to do what was right all or most of the time.[77] Daniel P. Moynihan, then serving as the Assistant Secretary of Labor, wrote gushingly in the inaugural issue of *The Public Interest* on how "exponential knowledge," "econometric revolution," and the "professionalization of reform" would usher a post-political era that would put an end to "animal miseries and stupid controversies," obviate "mile-long petitions and mass rallies," thereby freeing professionals to "turn to issues more demanding of human ingenuity than that of how to put an end poverty".[78] All manner of public problems, argued Moynihan, would be addressed with rational, governmental solutions.

Following in the mold of New Deal expansions and keeping with the optimism of the moment, Johnson announced his plan for a Great Society where solutions to matters of poverty, education, and environment would be reached by "assembling the best thought and the broadest

knowledge," establishing "working groups" and conducting studies.[79] The announcement preceded a flurry of social policy expansion. Between 1964 and 1965, Johnson and Congress passed the Civil Rights Act, Economic Opportunity Act, and Voting Rights Act. Medicare and Medicaid were established and a federal food stamp program was given permanent legislative authority. The Immigration and Nationality Act, which abolished national-origins quotas, easily passed the House and Senate. Emphasizing equal access in education, Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into law. Head Start and the Job Corps were created. The Department of Housing and Urban Development was founded in August, 1965 and the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities were founded a month later. A slew of environmental protection acts were passed. When historian William Leuchtenberg interviewed Johnson in September 1965, he began by remarking, "Mr. President, this has been a remarkable Congress. It is even arguable whether this isn't the most significant Congress ever." To this, Johnson angrily quipped, "No it isn't. It's not arguable."[80]

Though the social programs of Johnson's administration capture the bulk of historical attention, one of the most notable actions came in the form of a memo to the members of the presidential cabinet and federal agency heads on August 25, 1965. In it he announced a new Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS) that would be adopted throughout government. The objective of this program, he wrote, was to "insure sounder judgement through more accurate information; to pinpoint those things we ought to do more, and spotlight those things we ought to do less; to make our decision-making process as up-to-date as our space-exploring equipment."[81] Administrators were now expected to regularly identify precise national goals and select the most urgent among them, search for alternative means of attaining those goals at the least cost, and measure the performance of programs to "insure a dollar's worth of service for each dollar spent." "Our judgment" he added at the end, "is no better than our information." The executive

offices added to the federal bureaucracy under the advice of the Brownlow Committee soon found themselves dramatically repurposed.

PPBS was not new in design, but it was new in application. The Department of Defense, at the urging of its new director, Robert McNamara, had adopted the system in 1961. McNamara – a graduate of Harvard Business School, and former President of Ford Motor Company – had great confidence in the ability for data and analysis to guide decisions. When McNamara left Ford for the DoD, he brought with him the belief that matters of national defense could be understood from the perspective of industrial production organized for optimal efficiency. In the same year McNamara joined the Kennedy administration, two economists at RAND, Charles Hitch and Roland McKean wrote *The Economics of the Nuclear Age* which provided, in effect, academic backing for McNamara's belief. McNamara picked Hitch to head the Systems Analysis Unit where he oversaw development and implementation of the PPB system – the contours of which were inspired by earlier reports from another RAND economist, David Novick. To staff the new unit, McNamara hired a young team of scholars, many of whom had been working at RAND and were fresh off their PhDs. These "whiz kids" (as they were known, copying the moniker from a similar group in which McNamara participated at Ford) were largely unfamiliar with the substantive details of the policy assignments they were given. Their expertise was in methods of analysis and econometric methods – not the subjects of analysis.

With the new PPBS, budget items that were previously considered in line-item form – maintenance, equipment, supplies, personnel – were wrapped into the military programs and weapons systems, the ends of which they served. The move was straight out of the Novick playbook. In *Efficiency and Economy in Government Through New Budgeting Procedures* (1954), he advocated for a system of "program budgeting" which meant expenditures would be aligned by the ultimate goal of many interdependent activities. Expanded by Hitch and McKean, the goal of retaliatory

striking power, for example, was the product of "missiles, manpower, food, paper clips, and transportation," the value of which could be determined by their measurable contribution to the goal.

Before long, the whiz kids caught the attention of President Johnson. PPBS analyses required analysts to determine the objectives of the agency, aggregate line-item expenditures with their associated objective, and assess the contribution of these items to the stated objective. These evaluations – and their link to the Defense budget – rendered what might have otherwise been an academic exercise into a matter of national consequence. And their method was portable as well. Novick, in a later work titled *Program Budgeting – Program Analysis and the Federal Budget* (1965), argued that administrators ought to "introduce into the nondefense areas of the federal government the kind of program analysis that has been installed in the Department of Defense." Shortly thereafter, Johnson released his memo.

In 1969, four years after Johnson's memo, the Joint Economic Committee released a report evaluating the effectiveness of PPBS. The forewords to the report were written by the populist Texan Congressman, Wright Patman, and Chairman of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government, Senator William Proxmire. Proxmire spoke glowingly of bipartisan endorsement of PPBS and insisted that government administration, if it were to make effective and rational decisions, must rely on program evaluation. According to Proxmire:

> Any decisionmaker, whether he be the head of a household or the head of a business firm, must rely on the comparison of the gains and costs of his decisions if he is to be successful at achieving his objectives. To ignore the careful consideration of gains and losses is equivalent to saying that he has no objective at all; no goal which he is attempting to achieve. While the objectives of the Federal Government are less tangible and more complex than those of a household or a business firm, they do exist, and analysis should be carried out to

determine which of our alternatives will allow us to satisfy these objectives at least cost.[82]

Proxmire's optimism reflected that of Willoughby a quarter century prior. Yet, the view of the budget and the task of budgetary analysis had become more complicated than writing checks for the policy imperatives handed down from on high. The budget was now the locus of formulating those imperatives and weighing alternatives. It was at the center of decision-making itself.

Despite the enthusiasm surrounding new methods, the 607-page program budgeting assessment compiled 26 papers elaborating on the difficulty of such analysis. One section is titled, "Limits on the consideration of expenditure alternatives" and another is titled, "Lack of knowledge and data as a constraint on effective policy analysis." The list of authors reads as a who's who of mid- and late-20th century social science: Kenneth Arrow, William Baumol, Mancur Olsen, Nelson Polsby, Alice Rivlin, and Burton Weisbrod. Their reports were dotted with technical considerations of correctly assessing costs and benefits, measuring opportunity costs, accurately considering the externalities of policy decisions, and determining discounting rates for the present value of government investment decisions. Though their methods varied and were sometimes at odds, they collectively reach a similar conclusion, expressed in a paper by economists Otto Davis and Morton Kamien of Carnegie-Mellon University:

> The tools of cost-benefit analysis appear to provide the proper perspective. In a given situation, the policymaker should consider the problem and imagine the application of each of the alternative approaches to it. The principle of selection is simple. Each measure of policy (including that of doing nothing) will have costs and benefits associated with it. The policymaker should select that measure for implementation which produces the greatest net benefits.[83]

The same year saw the publication of another document, released on the last day of the

Johnson administration and one-sixth the length of the PPB evaluation, titled *Toward a Social Report*. This report, prepared at the request of Johnson, was to outline a set social indicators that could be measured repeatedly over time. Much like GDP, unemployment, and inflation, these indicators would mark progress or deterioration in the social life of Americans. Indicators included measures of health, mobility, environment, income and poverty, crime, education, science, art, and levels of participation in democratic institutions. "Toward" in the title is key. The report merely assesses what data could be used to mark social change but does not measure social change itself. Amongst the report's contributors were prominent scholars including Daniel Bell (the chairman of the report), Alice Rivlin, William Gorham, James Coleman, Otis Dudley Duncan, and Neil Smelser. Bell, reflecting on the report in an essay published later that year, located the intellectual origins in the pioneering work of *Social Trends*. With waning faith in the Great Society that was prevalent in 1969, he wondered who would put the indicators into practice: the Nixon administration? Foundations? University groups? Though many questions remained open, to Bell it was obvious: "the 'idea' of a social report is one whose time has come."[84]

With the increased demand for evaluation of government policies and interventions, came a demand for highly specialized personnel with analytical skills and technical expertise. The late 1960s saw emergence of a new form of administrative education focused on the methods of policy analysis and distinguished from the public administration programs of the past. From their formation, policy schools were an interdisciplinary cobbling, "designed to do for the public sector what business schools had done for the private sector: produce students to colonize the bureaucracies, to criticize what those bureaucracies were doing, and, in a modest way, to set things right" (Wildavsky 1993 [1979]: xxv). Graduate programs – both masters and doctoral – were established at Michigan (Institute of Public Policy Studies), Harvard (Kennedy School), UC Berkeley (Graduate School of Public Policy, eventually the Goldman School), Carnegie Mellon (School of Urban and Public

Affairs), the RAND Corporation (RAND Graduate School), University of Pennsylvania (Department of Public Policy and Management), Minnesota (School of Public Affairs), Texas (LBJ School of Public Affairs), Duke (Institute for Policy Science and Public Affairs), and Yale (the Institution for Social and Policy Studies).

Their students began to staff a growing list of think tanks that came to populate D.C. The Johnson administration, highly aware of the capabilities of RAND, also felt it necessary to establish another organization that was less identified with a specific branch of government (Dickson 1971) and encouraged the founding of The Urban Institute in 1968, and picked Gorham to fund it. As the administration saw it, the institute would be funded by a balanced mix of federal agencies (though initial funding came primarily from Housing and Urban Development) and private foundation funding would be encouraged where possible.

Though at first this new breed of think tank sought to distinguish themselves topically from organizations like RAND, they were similar in design. Full-time employees would do contract research for government agencies and report findings through their publications and testimonies before congress. Soon, organizations previously focused on international and military matters began to incorporate domestic polices into their analyses. Understanding the methods at their disposal as universal, many think tanks to emerge during this time embraced their broad charters and offered general policy advice. Across the board, these organizations characterized themselves through phrases like "objective analysis" and "expertise."

But the optimism associated with these ideas would be quickly dashed. Politics only intensified and, despite the growing scientization of politics – the idea that matters of value could be wrangled by the universal authority of the scientific method – rifts between right and left reached new extremes. The political challenges of the time would evade easy resolution. Despite economic prosperity, the U.S was still enmeshed in a Cold War, and involvement in Vietnam escalated with the

introduction of ground troops to fight the Viet Cong. By many accounts, reliance on indicators and an overwhelming amount of misleading data would lead to grave miscalculations during the war, driving a wedge between decision-making analyses and battlefield realities. In March 1965, police violently beat civil rights marchers as they crossed the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Alabama in what later became known as Bloody Sunday. Students for a Democratic Society organized one of the first major anti-Vietnam War marches in April, attracting 25,000 student activists to Washington, D.C. Attendance at anti-war protests swelled throughout the year and some protestors burned their draft cards in defiance. Riots broke out in the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles for a week in August highlighting the abuse African Americans had long-suffered at the hands of police. By the end of the year, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Council considered expelling whites from the leadership of their organization, which they eventually did. Color lines were still boldly visible, the women's movement was still a faint whisper, war was at hand, and the nation sat on the precipice of accelerating deindustrialization.

There was also cultural recalcitrance around the economization of society. RAND, for example, was sharply lampooned in Stanley Kubrick's 1964 film, *Dr. Strangelove*, where Peter Sellers' character – an icy technocrat and former Nazi sexually aroused by the thought of nuclear war – was said to be employed by the "BLAND Corporation." Kubrick's jibe was a thinly-veiled reference to Herman Kahn, RAND Corporation employee, and author of the military strategy treatise, *On Thermonuclear War* (in which he coined the idea of a doomsday machine). That same year, marchers in the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley equated growing reliance on computers with dehumanization, gray flannel suits, and the rationalization of social life. Using Hollerith cards as symbols, they vocalized fears of being treated as mere data points in political and military machinations.

Scholars also foresaw problems with the influx of economizing methods in policy analysis.

Aaron Wildavsky, striking a tone reminiscent of Waldo's, wrote critically of contemporaries that saw these methods as "neutral tools" with "no politics," argued that this could only be true insofar as they omitted the plurality of perspectives on any given policy matter.[85] In other words, decisions could not be made in an analytical vacuum; political objectives have political roots. Early promoters of systems analysis in government were aware of the challenge. In a piece titled, *On the choice of objectives in systems studies*, Hitch wrote, "no national objective...can be taken as given...Ours is a democratic and plural society...there is no single authority...that can say 'These are our national objectives'... when objectives conflict, they will assign different weights to their alternatives, and sometimes different signs to their values." Later in the essay, his tune changes: "Nothing but rigorous, quantitative analysis can tell us whether some objective makes sense or not."[86]

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Writing in 1922, Walter Lippmann argued that "every complicated community has sought the assistance of special men, of augurs, priests, elders. Our own democracy, based though it was on a theory of universal competence ... recognized that the specially trained man was in some dim way oriented to a wider system of truth." But neither the presence of such augurs and priests, nor the forms and applications of their expertise are the inevitable products of history. The period between 1870 and 1969 witnessed a dramatic transformation in the ideals of public administration and notions of good government in the United States. What began as scattered calls for municipal reform and moral rectitude in boss-run cities, eventually blossomed into a small industry of policy experts and think tanks seeking to measure and compare alternative courses of action in exacting detail. As the ideal of the moral administrator faded into the cognitive background as an objectified feature of good administration, a new ideal – that of an efficient bureaucrat centered on notions of continuity, regularity, technical skill, and productivity – arose to take his place. But even as

technically competent functionaries spread throughout administrative offices, a new ideal of administration gave rise to a new type of worker versed in the methods of analysis and comparison rather than substantive knowledge and the act of implementation. In their time, each new role was the embodiment of an administrative ideal hashed out in the interstices of reformist interests, academic imaginaries, and the varied opportunities and constraints afforded by organizations. From the vantage point of later generations, however, embodiments of the past were found wanting and insufficient. As if the collective appetite for rational government had only been whetted, each successive development inspired new possibilities.

The evolution of administrative ideals, far from adhering to some predetermined grand plan, was goaded along by the sporadic and contingent confluence and concatenation of new visions made possible by the organizations, persons, and practices that old visions left behind. This process is one of contemporaneous transposition – ideas and practices moving across adjacent social realms – and sequential repurposing – the material embodiments of past ideals being pressed into service toward new ends. This pattern is evident in a review of the connections within and across the periods outlined above.

Moral ideals of administration, as we have seen, developed from an elite distaste for the state of politics as well as mounting status insecurity, coupled with the worldly concerns of the Social Gospel born at the interstices of faith and social science. In challenging the political status quo, they provided an alternative that would see men like themselves replace those they deemed inferior. Blatant self-promotion, however, was out of step with high-minded claims and these reformers found resonance in the moral-scientific agendas of others responding to the social upheaval of the period. Through periodicals, these reformers enrolled large swaths of the public in their cause. Through their contacts, clout, and biographical trajectories, they promoted legislation and administrative practices friendly to their cause. Through their civic associations, they set up

watchdog agencies to police the actions of administrators whose allegiance prized party over people.

As the orientation moved from punitive to improvement, the organizations followed suit and the methods of insuring against avaricious men became the methods of ensuring improved public services for citizens. Research and efficiency bureaus had roots in the civic associations and vigilance groups that preceded them. As the social sciences matured, a new academic field of public administration found legitimacy in the tools and idioms of industrial engineering, appropriating its means for the service of public ends. City and state efforts to meld academic knowledge with administration were paralleled federally through a new crop of think tanks focused on collecting and assessing information relevant to national policymaking. Various, at times incommensurate, theories of government efficiency resulted in the enumeration of executive offices and the vast expansion of federal activities and capacities.

Following World War II, the strands rooted in prior decades – legislative reference libraries, and social trends – were carried forward and put toward new ends. Traces of the legislative library idea can be found in the comparisons made between alternative policies and interventions during the 1960s. New methods used to understand the consequences of policy alternatives were built on techniques developed within the budding social sciences, pressed into service for the military, and harnessed by whiz kids, many of whom trained in the administrative schools founded to produce proficient administrators. RAND took the familiar organizational form of the research bureau while importing new methods of analysis. The executive offices developed under along with the Brownlow Committee's recommendations became the home of PPBS and budget- and evidence-driven administrative rationality.

Each step in the evolution was premised on a combination of what came before it and what developed alongside it. Materials made available in adjacent realms are brought into contact and put to new ends. In some instances, the pattern resembles Tilly's (1985) claim that wars make states even

as states make wars. Indeed, we see the military apparatus of WWI, WWII, and the Cold War carry an array of academic skillsets into public service where they remained even as military efforts receded, often bringing skills and ideas to a new set of issues. Parallel processes occur in the absence of wars as well. Political realignments – pushed, as we have seen, by developing ideals of what government ought to look like – motivated the construction of new offices to be staffed by new persons. Long-term development, furthermore, did not unfold in a single, pre-determined direction.

Some ideas persisted over time. Each generation saw a depoliticized future on the horizon that would be made possible through only modest moral, intellectual, and analytic capabilities. But we must also realize that this horizon remained perpetually in the distance. As society became an object of study and collective knowledge about it grew, the solutions to its problems appeared more, not less, opaque. The more that became known about the complex inter-relations of social phenomena, the less clear it was which actions would ameliorate the many problems now legible to policymakers and administrators.

It is also important to note what did not happen. Considering the transition between the first and second periods, for example, we did not see further development of a Christian morality in public administration. Instead, we saw efficiency transcend its vague role as a morality's proxy when it became tethered to the scientific perfectibility of society. We did not see the dominance of the stopwatch or organizational conceptions of efficiency carry into the 1960s, but a permutation of both.

None of these developments wholly displaced what came before. Even as new organizations, persons, and practices sought to surpass what were seen as the limitations of prior establishments, they did so with the materials left behind by those establishments. This suggests that, in the short-run, administrative ideals are both products of their socio-historical context, and in the long-run, ideals are constitutive of it. This paper has taken the perspective that innovation comes

from the recombination of existing elements, facilitated by linkages holding social realms together (Padgett and Powell 2012). Ideals of good government take shape when partially autonomous realms of social life – each with its own rhythms of change and modes of thinking – come into contact and become mutually influential (Galison 1997). Elements associated with these realms become assets in adjacent realms of social activity, and through contact, are given new meanings, new purposes, and are concretized into enduring patterns (Schneiberg 2007; Mora 2014).

The collective pursuit of new ideals brought into being new persons, organizations and modes of thinking. Because they are molded in the image of their context, organizations, professions, and practices are ideationally imprinted, acting as vessels that connect social action across time (Stinchcombe 1965; Johnson 2008). The concretization of ideals in patterns of professional and organizational action helps to make them durable and influences the future identification of problems and potential solutions (see Levy 2014). Similarly, this process fosters new challenges and alternatives – they too being permutations of prior orders (Stark 1996; Padgett and McLean 2006). For example, the Brownlow Committee broke with the growing trend of quantified abstraction in favor of an older notion of efficiency-via-centralization (á la Croly). But they did so using the scientific authority of a new field of administrative scholarship and by drawing on resources made available through research organizations.

This argument offers implications for institutional research. A long-standing challenge for social scientists studying political institutions has been to provide explanations that capture both the durability of social structures and the sources and possibilities for change. Prior analyses of American political development have tended to see the administrative state as tethered to the past in ways that heavily circumscribe the future. The observation that structures are routinely reproduced, however, does not mean that such reproduction is either necessary or automatic.

To account for change, many scholars turn to disruptive historical junctures, entrepreneurial

efforts to establish new orders, or the confluence of the two during moments of political opportunity (see Tarrow 1994). Less dramatically, some have argued that gradual institutional change occurs when problems of rule interpretation and enforcement create space for people to implement existing rules in new ways (Mahoney and Thelen 2010). As a result, scholars have struggled to explain unexpected directions in the course of administrative evolution.

The alternative approach presented in this paper attends to the socially constructed nature of collective understandings, locating both the reproduction and possible alteration of institutions in the cultural assumptions of those persons and organizations that animate society. Social structure has both semiotic and material qualities, the interplay of which is critical for understanding change.

REFERENCES

Aaron, H.J. (1978). *Politics and the Professors: The Great Society in Perspective*. Washington, DC: Brookings Studies in Social Economics.

Bartley, T. (2007). "Institutional Emergence in an Era of Globalization: The Rise of Transnational Private Regulation of Labor and Environmental Conditions." *American Journal of Sociology*, *113*(2), 297–351.

Berger, P.L and Luckmann, T. (1966). *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York: Penguin Books.

Bernstein, M.A. (2001). *A Perilous Progress: Economists and Public Purpose in Twentieth-Century America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Burke, K. (1935). *Permanence and Change*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Campbell, J., & Pedersen, O. (2014). *The National Origins of Policy Ideas Knowledge Regimes in the United States, France, Germany, and Denmark*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Clemens, E.S. (1993). "Organizational Repertoires and Institutional Change: Women's Groups and the Transformation of U.S. Politics, 1890-1920." *American Journal of Sociology*, *98*(4), 755.

Clemens, E.S. (1997). *The people's lobby: Organizational innovation and the rise of interest group politics in the United States, 1890-1925*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Clemens, E.S. (2007). "Toward a Historicized Sociology: Theorizing Events, Processes, and Emergence." *Annual Review of Sociology,* 33: 527-49.

Collins, R. (1994). "Why the Social Sciences Won't Become High-Consensus, Rapid-Discovery Science." *Sociological Forum*, *9*(2), 155–177.

Dawley, A. (1993). *Struggles for justice: Social responsibility and the liberal state.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

De Witt, B.P. (1915). *The Progressive Movement: A Non-partisan, Comprehensive Discussion of Current Tendencies in American Politics.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Dickson, P. (1971). *Think Tanks.* New York, NY: Ballantine Books.

Dobbin, F. (1994). *Forging Industrial Policy: The United States, Britain, and France in the Railway Age.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Durkheim, E. (1953). *Sociology and Philosophy.* New York: Routledge.

Espeland, W.N. (1998). *The Struggle for Water: Politics, Rationality, and Identity in the American Southwest.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Espeland, W.N., & Sauder, M. (2016). *Engines of Anxiety: Academic Rankings, Reputation, and Accountability.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Evans, P.B., D. Rueschmeyer, and T. Skocpol (1985). *Bringing the State Back In.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Fligstein, N. (1990). *The Transformation of Corporate Control.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fourcade, M. (2009). *Economists and Societies: Discipline and Profession in the United States, Britain, and France, 1890s to 1990s.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fourcade, M. (2011). "Cents and Sensibility: Economic Valuation and the Nature of Nature" *American Journal of Sociology*, *116*(6), 1721–1777.

Fourcade, M., & Khurana, R. (2013). "From social control to financial economics: The linked ecologies of economics and business in twentieth century America." *Theory and Society*, *42*(2), 121–159.

Furner, M.O. (1975). *Advocacy and Objectivity: A Crisis in the Professionalization of American Social Science, 1865-1905.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Galison, P. (1997). *Image and Logic: A Material Culture of Microphysics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Giddens, A. (1976). *New Rules of the Sociological Method: A Positive Critique of Interpretive Sociologies.*

Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Gulick, L. (1937). "Science, Values and Public Administration." In Gulick and Urwick (Eds.) *Papers on the Science of Administration.* Concord: The Rumford Press.

Gulick, L. and L. Urwick. (1937). *Papers on the Science of Administration.* Concord: The Rumford Press.

Haas, P.M. (1992). Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization*, *46*(1), 1–35.

Hall, P. A. (1993). "Policy Paradigms , Social Learning , and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain." *Comparative Politics*, 25(3), 275–296.

Hall, P.D. (2013). "Philanthropy, the Nonprofit Sector & the Democratic Dilemma." *Daedalus*, 142(2): 1-20.

Herman, E. (1995). *The Romance of American Psychology: Political Culture in the Age of Experts.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hofstadter, R. (1955). *The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R.* New York: Knopf.

Johnson, V. (2008). *Backstage at the Revolution: How the Royal Paris Opera Survived the End of the Old Regime.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Katznelson, I. (1997). "Structure and configuration in comparative politics." *Comparative politics: Rationality, culture, and structure,* 81-112.

Karl, B. (1974). *Charles E. Merriam and the Study of Politics.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kuhn, T.S. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lee, M. (2008). *Bureaus of Efficiency: Reforming Local Government in the Progressive Era.* Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.

Levy, J. (2014). *Freaks of Fortune: The Emerging World of Capitalism and Risk in America.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public Opinion.* New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.

Lounsbury, M., Ventresca, M., & Hirsch, P.M. (2003). "Social movements, field frames and industry emergence: a cultural-political perspective on US recycling." *Socio-Economic Review*, *1*(1), 71–104.

Mahoney, J. and K. Thelen. (2010). *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mora, G.C. (2014). "Cross-Field Effects and Ethnic Classification The Institutionalization of Hispanic Panethnicity, 1965 to 1990." *American Sociological Review*, *79*(2): 183-210.

Meyer, J.W., Boli, J., Thomas, G.M., & Ramirez, F.O. (1997). "World society and the nation-state." *American Journal of Sociology*, *103*(1), 144–181.

Moynihan, D.P., 1965. "The professionalization of reform." *The Public Interest*, (1), p.6.

Nelson, W.E. (1982). *The Roots of American Bureaucracy, 1830-1900*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Padgett, J.F., & McLean, P.D. (2006). "Organizational Invention and Elite Transformation: The Birth of Partnership Systems in Renaissance Florence." *American Journal of Sociology*, *111*(5), 1463–1568.

Padgett, J.F., & Powell, W.W. (2012). "The Problem of Emergence." In J. Padgett & W. W. Powell (Eds.), *The Emergence of Organizations and Markets* (pp. 1–29). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Pierson, P. (2000). "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics." *The American Political Science Review,* 94(2): 251-267.

Powell, W.W., & Sandholtz, K. (2012). "Chance, Necessite, et Naivete: Ingredients to Create a New Organizational Form." In J. F. Padgett & W. W. Powell (Eds.), *The Emergence of Organizations and Markets* (pp. 379–433). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ridley, C. and Simon, H.A., (1937). "Development of measurement standards." *Public Manager*, 19(3), pp. 84-88.

Rodgers, D. (1998). *Atlantic Crossings: Social Politics in a Progressive Age*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rohde, J. (2013). *Armed with Expertise: The Militarization of American Social Research During the Cold War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ross, D. (1991). *The Origins of American Social Science*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sewell Jr., W. (1992). "A Theory of Structure: Duality, Agency, and Transformation." *American Journal of Sociology*, *98*(1), 1–29.

Schneiberg, M. (2007). "What's on the path? Path dependence, organizational diversity and the problem of institutional change in the US economy, 1900-1950." *Socio-Economic Review*, *5*(1), 47–80.

Schneiberg, M., & Clemens, E.S. (2006). "The typical tools for the job: Research strategies in institutional analysis." *Sociological Theory*, *24*(3), 195–227.

Shenhav, Y. (1995). "From chaos to systems: The engineering foundations of organization theory, 1879-1932." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *40*(4), 557–585.

Silberman, B.S. (1993). *Cages of Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simon, H.A. (1946). "The proverbs of administration." *Public Administration Review*, 6(1), pp.53-67.

Simon, H.A. (1947). *Administrative Behavior: A study of the decision making processes in administrative organisation*. New York: Macmillan Company.

Skocpol, T. (1985). "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research." In Evans, P.B., D. Rueschmeyer, and T. Skocpol (Eds.) *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Skocpol, T. and Finegold, K. (1982). "State Capacity and Economic Intervention in the Early New Deal." *Political Science Quarterly*, 97(2), 255-278.

Skowronek, S. (1982). *Building a New American State: The Expansion of National Administrative Capacities, 1877-1920*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, M.C. (1994). *Social Science in the Crucible: The American Debate Over Objectivity and Purpose, 1918-1941*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Solovey, M. (2013). *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Soule, S. A. (2012). "Social Movements and Markets, Industries, and Firms." *Organization Studies*, *33*(12), 1715–1733.

Sproat, J. (1968). *"The Best Men": Liberal Reformers in the Gilded Age*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stark, D. (1996). Recombinant Property in East European Capitalism. American Journal of Sociology, 101(4), 993–1027.

Stark, D. (2009). *The Sense of Dissonance: Accounts of Worth in Economic Life. Accounts of Worth in Economic*

Life. Princeton and Oxford. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Stinchcombe, A. L. (1965). Social structure and organizations. In J. G. March (Ed.), Handbook of
   Organizations (pp. 142–193). Chicago: Rand McNally and Company.

Tarrow, S. (1994). *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics.* Cambridge, UK:
   Cambridge University Press.

Thelen, K. (1999). "Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political
   Science,* 2: 369-404.

Waldo, D., (1948). *The administrative state: A study of the political theory of public administration.* New York:
   Ronald.

Waldo, D., (1952). "Development of theory of democratic administration." *American Political Science
   Review,* 46(01), pp.81-103.

Wang, D. J., & Soule, S.A. (2012). Social Movement Organizational Collaboration: Networks of
   Learning and the Diffusion of Protest Tactics. *American Journal of Sociology,* *117*(6), 1674–1722.

Weir, M. and Skocpol T. (1985). "State structures and social Keynesianism: responses to the Great
   Depression in Sweden and the United States." In Evans, P.B., D. Rueschmeyer, and T. Skocpol
   (Eds.) *Bringing the State Back In.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Wiebe, R.H. (1967). *The search for order, 1877-1920.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Wildavsky, A., 1993. *Speaking Truth to Power: The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis.* New Brunswick, NJ:
   Transaction Publishers.

Zelizer, V. A. (1978). Human values and the market: the case of life insurance and death in 19th-
   century America. *American Journal of Sociology,* *84*(3), 591–610.

---

[1] Acknowledgements: Though an early draft, this paper has benefitted from conversations and comments with Woody Powell, Sarah Soule, John Meyer, Christof Brandtner, Claire Dunning, Paul Starr, Katey Webber, and Dave Schwartz. The Stanford Philanthropy and Civil Society workshop, Networks and Organizations workshop, and the Comparative Sociology workshop have provided invaluable feedback on earlier drafts. There are several readers for whom this is their *nth* time reading some version of this manuscript. I owe y'all a beer.

[2] Kennedy 1962

[3] The history is analogous to Chekov's gun: "One must never place a loaded rifle on the stage if it isn't going to go off."

[4] Indeed, political machines were often understood as representing the interests of the common man. Many represented themselves as pro-labor, provided direct aid to poor immigrant families, and offered employment for slum dwellers – all in exchange for votes.

[5] Whether attributed to the intellectual awakening of a new middle class (Weibe 1967), or the reactionary response of vulnerable white elites seeking to maintain social status and influence (Hofstadter 1955; Sproat 1968), or the channeling of radical socialist politics to more tempered bureaucratic functions (Dawley 1991), historians tend to agree that these responses, and thus the legacy of the Progressive Era, was forged in reaction to bleak social conditions. A more

international approach to explanation can be found in Rodgers' *Atlantic Crossings* (. Indeed, as will be discussed, many ideas for reform efforts and the improvement of administration were imported from Europe.

[6] *New York Times*, 1871, "The Secret Accounts"

[7] *The Nation*, 1867, "The Republican Troubles."

[8] GW Curtis, in the foreword to Eaton's *Civil Service in Great Britain: A History of Abuses and Reforms and their Bearing upon American Politics*, 1880, page v.

[9] Civil Service Reform Association of New York Constitution, 1877.

[10] *New York Times,* 13 Oct 1882, "The City Reform Club: Young Men Following the Lead of Brooklyn Young Republicans"; *New York Times*, 7 Dec 1882, "The City Reform Club"

[11] Charles Nordhoff (1871). "The Misgovernment of New York – A Remedy Suggested." *The North American Review*, 113(233). Nordhoff goes on to describe how these traits deserve the attention of some scientific investigator.

[12] *The Nation* (6 July 1871). "A Southern View of the Southern Problem" 13(314): 4-5.

[13] Because of congressional disinterest and Hayes's inability to secure an appropriation, the Department of State wrote Eaton a rather unfortunate note: "you will not be authorized to incur any expense for which the United States is to be held responsible." The letter is reprinted in the opening note to Eaton's eventual report on the British Civil Service.

[14] The bill, though bearing Senator Pendleton's name, was drafted by Eaton and based on his research on the British civil service conducted under Hayes.

[15] As stated in the 1889 Civil Service Report to Congress.

[16] Eaton, D. 1872, *City Government: Outline for a Plan for and Honest and Economical Administration.*

[17] Wilson, W. 1887: 209. This essay is commonly cited for the clear distinction Wilson makes between politics and administration. Yet, as we have seen, this distinction had already been made in numerous forms throughout the previous two decades. Instead, what is most notable about the essay is Wilson's insistence on the "wisdom, knowledge and experience" and "power of dominant minds."; Wilson, W. 1889, *The Atlantic*

[18] More broadly, professions during the Jackson administration' were viewed cynically as vestiges of patrician self-interest operating at the expense of the common man.

[19] Smith 1994

[20] Gladden, W. 1886. *Applied Christianity.* p. 223

[21] Quoted in *Civic and Social Problems*, 1899.

[22] Addams attributes the motivation for the Hull House to "the desire to interpret democracy in social terms," the urge to "aid in the race progress," and "the Christian movement toward humanitarianism." She also, attributes some of the Settlement movement to a "certain renaissance going forward in Christianity…share the lives of the poor...make social service…express the spirit of Christ." (See Addams, 1892, "The Subjective Necessity of Social Settlements")

[23] Ely was a founder of the Christian Social Union, a social gospel organization with a pro-labor, socialist orientation.

[24] Ely, R. (1886). Constitution By-Laws and Resolutions of the American Economic Association. *Publications of the American Economic Association*, 1(1), 35-46. Also, it is fun to note that annual membership was $3.

[25] Sumner was, nevertheless, ardently opposed to political spoils and supported clean government, largely on the grounds that these were not the natural order.

[26] Such is reflected in Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.'s ringing argument for common law. Law is the arena of experience, he maintained, not of "axioms and corollaries of a book of mathematics." (Holmes 1881). Senators, too, revealed a general ignorance about how data would be incorporated into decision making.

[27] Folwell, W. 1893. "The New Economic", *Publications of the American Economic Association,* 8(1): 19-40.

[28] Gladden, W. 1894. "Influence upon Officials in Office", *Proceedings of the National Conference for Good Government*, p. 165.

[29] Gladden, W. 1894. *Tools of the Man: Property and Industry under the Christian Law.* New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

[30] Parkhurst, Rev. C.H. 1983. "Our City Vigilance League." *The North American Review*, 156(434): 98-104. Excerpted from pages 103-104.

[31] *New York Times*, 9 Dec 1894, "Lessons in City Reform: The Second Conference of the National Municipal League"

[32] Anonymous. 1900. *Dorman B. Eaton: 1823-1899.* (Compendium made available by University of California Library)

[33] *Civic and Social Problems, 1899*

[34] Likewise, Woodrow Wilson, in *Congressional Government: A Study of American Politics* (1885: 255) saw efficiency as the "only just foundation for confidence in a public officer."

[35] Bernard, L.L. 1919. "The Objective Viewpoint in Sociology." *American Journal of Sociology,* 25(3): 298-325.

[36] Goodnow, F.J., 1900. *Politics and administration: A study in government.* Transaction Publishers.

[37] Of course, the coming years would see many critics of such efforts, especially from the labor movement. Henry Braverman, writing in 1974, describes Taylor as a "neurotic crank. These traits fitted him perfectly for his role as the prophet of modern capitalist management, since that which is neurotic in the individual is, in capitalism, normal and socially desirable for the functioning of society" (92). Nevertheless, Taylor's ideas were fundamental in a society hell bent on efficiency and he developed a cult following. He even enrolled the socialist government of Milwaukee in his beliefs –

they set of a Bureau of Efficiency in 1910.

[38] Representing the Railroad, William Ellis offered a snarky reply: "Much weary toil and wearing anxiety could have been saved had they known what an easy and offhand process it is to save a million a day – on the railways – from the law library in Boston" (*Evidence Taken by the Interstate Commerce Commissions in the Matter of Proposed Advances in Friend Rates by Carriers*, 1910).

[39] *New York Times*. 7 Jan 1912. "Does New York Get the Worth of its Money?" Some might question if the obsession with efficiency was the concern of those interested in reducing taxes. Indeed, it ends up playing a polysemous rhetorical role, but from the outset, it was melded with Progressive concerns about creating better government. To this end, Fosdick remarked, "there are hundreds of demands for expenditure in a great city like New York, which, under the present wasteful system, cannot be met without extravagantly high tax rates. They might be met if every cent was made to count."

[40] Welton, B.F. 1912. "The problem of securing efficiency in municipal labor." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 41(1): 103-114.

[41] Commissioners of Accounts, *Annual Report for the Year 1911*. Reported in Lee (2008).

[42] New York Bureau of Municipal Research. 1916. *Municipal Research to Promote the Application of Scientific Principles to Government*: Issues 69-80 (link)

[43] *New York Times*. 22 May 1906. "Municipal Research."

[44] New York City Bureau of Municipal Research. 1912. *Six Years of Municipal Research*. See also De Witt, B.P. 1915. *The Progressive Movement: A Non-partisan, Comprehensive Discussion of Current Tendencies in American Politics*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

[45] White, L. 1933. "Public Administration" in *Recent Social Trends*, Vol 2: p. 1421.

[46] McCarthy, quoted in Stark, J. 1995. *The Wisconsin Idea: The University's Service to the State*. In the 1995-1996 Wisconsin Blue Book.

[47] Quoted in Smith 1994: 24.

[48] Rorty, who was of the view that political stability could be brought about if one were "certain of the fundamental facts of industry and business" sought out Mitchell, who had previously and unsuccessfully tried to convince the Rockefeller Foundation of this perspective. The Rockefeller Foundation was, under the advice of Frederick Gates, was deeply involved in medical research but more hesitant about the promise of social science to "improve the wellbeing of humanity."

[49] The role of philanthropic foundations in funding of social sciences was relatively new. The Rockefeller Foundation, acting on the advice of Frederick Gates and following from its successes eradicating hookworm, was hesitant to support the social sciences. Prior to the formation of NBER, Mitchell, shrewdly aware of the foundation's disposition, argued that "Just as science affords the chief means of improving practice in medicine, social science affords the chief means of improving the practice of social regulation." With John D. Rockefeller Jr. advocating, and following the passing of Laura Spellman Rockefeller, the foundation eventually turned its attention to social scientific efforts. One reason that Carnegie was an earlier player in the field was the influence of Elihu Root – chair of its board of trustees – who, as a former Secretary of State and a Senator had come to believe that German military might was tied to the strength of Germany's well-funded educational and research apparatus. Lacking such infrastructure, Root argued, American's were at a disadvantage in war (Root, E. 1919. "The Need for Organization in Scientific Research," *Bulletin of the National Research Council*, 1)

[50] Quoted in Bulmer and Bulmer, 1981: 382.

[51] Institute for Government Research. 1922. *The Institute for Government Research, Its Organization, Work and Publications*.

[52] Willoughby, W. 1917. *Organized Efforts for the Improvement of Methods of Administration in the United States*, pages 7-8.

[53] Willoughby, W. 1917. *Organized Efforts for the Improvement of Methods of Administration in the United States*.

[54] When the organization faced funding shortcomings, one of its board members, Robert S. Brookings, a financier from St. Louis, stepped in to help. He had, in conjunction with the Carnegie Corporation in 1922, created an analogue to NBER, the Institute of Economics, as well as a Graduate School of Economics and Government in 1924. In 1927, the three institutes were combined, and the Brookings Institution was born.

[55] White, 1929. "The Local Community Research Committee and the Social Science Research Building" in T.V. Smith and L. White (eds.) *Chicago: An Experiment in Social Science Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[56] Frank Knight. 1940. Quoted in "Quantification: The Quest for Precision – Roundtable" in Louis Wirth (ed.) *Eleven Twenty-Six: A Decade of Social Science Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press (page 169).

[57] Foundation support at the time was viewed with considerable suspicion by congress. Yet, Hoover was not unique in quietly seeking foundation support for projects regarding improved governance. Roosevelt had done this previously. Hoover was of the belief that organized philanthropy, not government, should be the financial sponsors of such efforts.

[58] Notably, Mitchell and Merriam were both reluctant to join the committee. Mitchell had been jaded by his experiences working for government during WWI, and Merriam has nervous about the potential misuse of science by the presidency,

especially because he had reservations about Hoover (Karl 1974). Ogburn represented a different attitude and was easily sold on the idea. He had an abiding faith in the absolute objectivity of social science research. Because facts are simply objective statements, their use in politics was unproblematic.

[59] Hi reader! You still there? Stay strong. Email me at ahorvath@stanford.edu and I'll buy you a beer.

[60] Research Committee on Social Trends, 1933. *Recent Social Trends in the United States: Report of the President's Research Committee on Social Trends,* Vol. 1: lxxii

[61] White, L. 1933.

[62] Beard, C. 1933. "Limitations to the Application of Social Science Implied in Recent Social Trends." *Social Forces*, 11(4): 505-510.

[63] Quoted in Packer, G. 2010. *Interesting Times: Writings from a Turbulent Decade.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, p 394

[64] Characteristic of its time, its original mission was to "cull from every source those principles, facts, and elements which, combined, make up our rights and duties" as citizens.

[65] Guy 2003.

[66] Names and positions listed on the opening pages of the first issue of the *Public Administration Review.*1940. "Front Matter." *Public Administration Review*, 1(1).

[67] America's dalliance with Fascism was not spontaneous. The idea began to emerge in Progressive circles, notably under Herbert Croly, one of the founders (along with Walter Lippmann and Walter Weyl) of the *New Republic.* In his book, *The Promise of American Life* (1909), he envisioned leaders with special qualities and a strong federal state run by special elite pulled from the new professional classes. His ideas were particularly influential on Theodore Roosevelt whose campaign slogan, "New Nationalism," was inspired by the book (and a friendship with Croly).

[68] The idea suggests a return to the maxims of scientific management, the contents of POSDCORB cribbed almost entirely from a French mining engineer, Henri Fayol – a Taylor contemporary. Fayol developed what might be seen as the managerial counterpart to Taylor's task-focused approach. He enumerated 14 principles of management – of how organizations ought to be structured and how workers ought to be motivated – upon which he developed five elements of management still recognizable today: planning, organizing, command, coordination, and control.

[69] Gulick and Urwick 1937: 49; Gulick 1937: 193

[70] Gulick and Urwick 1937: 49; Gulick 1937: 3-13

[71] It is unclear whether the proponents of these ideas understood their work as scientific in the same sense as, for instance, Ogburn, or more as a set of guiding principles. According to Gulick: "Students of administration have long sought a single principle of effective departmentalization just as alchemists have sought the philosopher's stone. But they have sought in vain. There is apparently no one most effective system" (Gulick and Urwick, 1937: 31).

[72] Eisenhower, DD. 17 Jan 1961. "Farewell Radio and Television Address to the American People." *UCSB American Presidency Project.*

[73] Waldo 1952: 85

[74] Simon 1946: 64

[75] Ridley and Simon 1937

[76] Johnson, L.B. (1964). "Lyndon B. Johnson: Remarks at the Lighting of the Nation's Christmas Tree. - December 18, 1964." *The American Presidency Project.*

[77] National Election Study 1964

[78] Moynihan 1965

[79] Johnson, L.B. (1964b). "Lyndon B. Johnson: Remarks at the University of Michigan - May 22, 1964." *The American Presidency Project.*

[80] Leuchtenberg, W.E. (1990). "A Visit with LBJ." *American Heritage*, 41(4)

[81] Johnson, L.B. (1965). "Lyndon B. Johnson: Memorandum on the Operation of the Government-Wide Planning, Programing, and Budgeting Systems." *The American Presidency Project.*

[82] Proxmire, W. (1969). The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System of Papers, A Compendium Submitted to the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee. Page vi

[83] Davis, O and M. Kamien (1969). "Externalities, Information and Alternative Collective Action" in The Analysis and Evaluation of Public Expenditures: The PPB System of Papers, A Compendium Submitted to the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee, pages 67-86.

[84] Bell, D., (1969). "The idea of a social report." *The Public Interest*, 15: 72-105.

[85] Wildavsky, A., (1966). "The political economy of efficiency: cost-benefit analysis, systems analysis, and program budgeting." *Public Administration Review*, 26(4): 292-310.

[86] Hitch, C.J., (1960). "On the choice of objectives in systems studies." *RAND*, page 5 and 12