

FOUNDATIONS OF A DISCIPLINE : THE STATE OF THE AMERICAN STUDY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION 1887 - 1926	العنوان:
مجلة الاقتصاد والإدارة	المصدر:
جامعة الملك عبدالعزيز - كلية الاقتصاد والإدارة - مركز البحوث والتنمية	الناشر:
Abd Alkawi, Khairy	المؤلف الرئيسي:
7ع	المجلد/العدد:
نعم	محكمة:
1978	التاريخ الميلادي:
يونيو	الشهر:
30 - 40	الصفحات:
655432	رقم MD:
بحوث ومقالات	نوع المحتوى:
EcoLink	قواعد المعلومات:
الإدارة العامة، الإنضباط، الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية	مواضيع:
http://search.mandumah.com/Record/655432	رابط:

FOUNDATIONS OF A DISCIPLINE: THE STATE OF THE AMERICAN STUDY OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, 1887-1926

By

DR. KHAIRY ABDEL KAWI*

Two important historical events make 1976 a very special year for the United States of America. Needless to say, 1976 marks the bicentennial anniversary of the birth of this great nation. It is also the 50th anniversary of the birth of the American discipline of Public Administration. The former event is symbolized by the Declaration of Independence. The latter, by the publication of the first textbook in the field, Leonard D. White's *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*,¹ (hereafter referred to as the *Introduction*.)

Celebrations are already underway for the nation's 200th birthday. Celebrations, however, are obviously more than festivities, important as these may be. They are, more importantly, time for reflection on the past, assessment of the present, and determination for the future.

In addition to participating in the national celebrations, American students of Public Administration are bound to also celebrate the birth of their discipline. They will undoubtedly be discussing the past, present, and future of Public Administration. 1976 will be an opportunity for re-visiting the works of the field's founding fathers, reviewing progress made over the years, and hopefully charting the course for the field's future direction.

This article is intended as a modest contribution to this process. It is a revised version of what can be described as the first chapter in the history of the American Study of Public Administration.

In 1887, Woodrow Wilson's article, "The Study of Administration",² appeared in the *Political Science Quarterly*. Students of Public Administration generally consider this to mark the beginning of the academic study of public administration in the United States. Without implying a cause and effect relationship, scholarly interest in the subject in the United States coincided with the appearance of Wilson's essay.³

* Special Assistant to the President for International Programs State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y., U.S.A.

In 1926, White's *Introduction* was published. The appearance of this first textbook in the field symbolized the birth of the discipline of Public Administration. White gave Public Administration its first comprehensive expression, defined its fundamental assumptions and its foundations upon which Public Administration developed to its present state.

The period from 1887 to 1926 was naturally an important and a necessary prelude to the work of Leonard White. Stimulated by major social, economic, and political developments in the United States, scholars produced a sizeable volume of literature dealing with various aspects of administration in numerous governmental agencies. This literature, some of which will be discussed later, served to provide insight into these particular agencies. More importantly, however, it served to highlight the nature and problems of public administration, and thus, provided a valuable source of information from which the discipline was synthesized.

Students of American public administration during the period under consideration were influenced by a number of currents most important among which were the following.⁴ First, the movement for governmental reform with its long historical roots dating back to the Civil War. Its objectives included the purification of government and society, and substituting merit for patronage.

Second, the scientific management movement. Building on Frederick Taylor's ideas and philosophy, the movement sought to discover, by scientific techniques, the one best way to perform routine tasks, as well as to organize and administer a factory, an industry, a society, and even the international community. Although the movement emerged in industry, its ideas rapidly spread to government with promises of more efficient and economical performance of public business.

Third, and closely related to the above, was political scientists's desire to transform the study of politics into a science. It was generally believed that by applying scientific methods of research to political activity, a science of politics was bound to merge — one which would enable both the prediction and control of political behavior. Thus, political scientists were anxious to apply rigorous techniques like those used in the natural sciences to study politics and government, believing that natural laws of politics and administration will thus be discovered.⁵

A review of the literature published between 1887 and 1926 reveals that certain general characteristics in approach, objectives, and understanding were common to public administration students of that period. The purpose of this article is to identify and describe some of these characteristics. This is important, I think, because it (1) enables us to take a new, and maybe a different look at some of the intellectual concerns of that period; and, (2) provides an added historical perspective and a background for better understanding the first textbook in Public Administration.

1. The Politics — Administration Dichotomy:

It is well to remember that political scientists were motivated, during this period, by a strong desire to see social reform in general, and governmental reform in particular. They sought reform which would cleanse government from the corruption

of politics and politicians, and improve the efficiency of administration. Philosophically, they saw no conflict between Jackson's ideas on democracy, and Hamilton's ideals of efficiency in government. Accordingly, they advocated measures which would realize and preserve the democratic ideals of society, and also accomplish more efficient and economical administration of governmental operations.

To reconcile democracy and efficiency, political scientists envisaged the functions of government as divisible into two separate and distinct functions — politics and administration. The political function, assigned to the legislative branch, included all those activities having to do with constitutional questions, deciding of laws, and making public policy. The administrative, concerned with the implementation of legislative acts in the most efficient and economical manner, was clearly the responsibility of the executive branch.

This dichotomy was clearly reflected in the literature of that period. For some, Wilson's above mentioned essay popularized, if not introduced the concept. Wilson's above mentioned essay popularized, if not introduced the concept. Wilson wrote of administration, in the sense of public administration, as "the most obvious part of government; it is government in action; it is the executive; the operative, the most visible side of government.⁶ Administration, which he described as a field of business "removed from the hurry and strife of politics",

lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices.⁷

It is not clear whether Wilson meant to say that the separation between politics and administration was or could be made a practical reality, or that he only intended the separation idea merely as a method for academic research which serves the purpose of establishing a science of administration. Be that as it may, the fact remains that his statements gave credence to the more definite expressions of the dichotomy made by other scholars — important among whom was Frank J. Goodnow.

In his *politics and Administration*,⁸ Goodnow offered a blue-print for political reform based on the concept of separating politics and administration. Theoretically, separation of powers meant to Goodnow, that government performed two functions through two distinct organs. The political, consisted of operations necessary for the expression of the will of the people, was assigned to legislatures; and the administrative, which consisted of operations necessary for the execution of that will was the responsibility of the executive branch. Although administration is subject to political control, it should be left free from political partiality. Thus, administration would become an efficient technical process, and politics would become more effective.

Operationally, Goodnow argued "that 'popular government and efficient administration' might be furthered by the legal regulation of the political party and by the concentration of administrative authority in the hands of the State's executive."⁹ The illegal political authority of the local bosses would thus be transferred to legally authorized officials who could then be held responsible and accountable for their actions.

The same controversy with regards to the proper interpretation of Wilson's distinction between politics and administration arose with regards to Goodnow's book. Waldo stated that, "Goodnow did not, certainly, identify politics simply with the legislative organs or the law-making process, administration with the executive or the process of law enforcement in its entirety."¹⁰ Students misread or misunderstood Goodnow, as they did Wilson, and for a long time maintained that they meant that politics and administration were separate functions, performed by two distinct branches of government.

A more definite expression of the belief in the separation of politics and administration was made by W.F. Willoughby. Willoughby argued that the Constitution divided governmental powers among five, not three, branches: electoral, legislative, judicial, executive, and administrative. He considered the three-fold classification of governmental powers unsatisfactory because it "lead to confusion of thought" and "to serious difficulties in working out the practical problems of the distribution of governmental powers functionally." In addition, the threefold system confused the functions of "administration" and "execution", a confusion which was unfortunate since these were different functions that connote operations of distinct character. He defined the two functions as follows:

The executive function is the function of representing the government as a whole, and of seeing that all of its laws are complied with by its several parts. The administrative function is the function of actually administering the law as declared by the legislative and interpreted by the judicial branches of the government. This distinction is usually made by declaring the executive function to be essentially political in character; that is, one having to do with the determination of the general policies, and involving the exercise of judgment in its use; and the administrative function to be one concerned with the putting into effect of policies as determined by other organs.¹¹

Albert Lepawsky described Willoughby's understanding of administration as a fourth branch of government as "the most extreme, but probably the most logical, result of the strict separation of administration from politics initiated by Wilson." Despite the fact that "in the next generation, Willoughby's 'fourth branch' theory was rarely accepted", his views were, nevertheless, influential.¹²

Thus, early students of Public Administration assumed that politics and administration were constitutionally separate and distinct functions of government. In addition, they assumed:

(1) that the distinction forms the basis for treating administration as a problem in techniques or science from which politics or policy-making can be excluded, and (2) that the division between politics and administration is the meaningful dividing line between the legislative and the executive branch . . . In short, the student of Public Administration tended to identify his subject—and indeed himself—with executive institutions and processes, and to presume that his subject had qualities of "hardness" lacking in politics and policy-making, which made it possible to use science as the central method in study and to take efficiency as the central criterion of success in operation.¹³

2. Absence of Concern with a “Discipline” of Public Administration:

The literature of public administration, during the period 1887-1926, reveals an intellectual preoccupation with the process of public administration, not its discipline. With probably Wilson's article as the only notable exception, most of the literature dealt with the processes of conducting the business of government. This is understandable given the reform impulse prevalent at that time.

As reformers, early public administration students were disturbed by the existing political corruption and administrative inefficiency. They believed that by analyzing the organizational arrangements and the procedures used to perform different governmental operations, a better organization and a faster or less complicated procedures would be found which will make possible a more efficient and economical performance of these operations. By describing how the administrative process was, and prescribing how it ought to be, they sought to “strengthen the paths of government, to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness.”¹⁴

While sharing the general concern with administration as a process, Wilson also advocated the academic study of the subject. His article, “The Study of Administration”, was written for the primary purpose of attracting academic attention to, and interest in, a “science of administration.”

Wilson observed that “no one wrote systematically of administration as a branch of the science of government until the present century.” Political writers he noted, had concentrated on the constitutional aspects of government, “who shall make law, and what shall that law be.” The question of how the law should be administered “was put aside as ‘practical detail’ which clerks could arrange after doctors had agreed upon principles.”¹⁵

This was possible, Wilson explained, when government was simple. But now “there is scarcely a single duty of government which was once simple which is not how complex.” In addition, governmental functions were “vastly multiplying in number.” Thus, he concluded that since “it is getting to be harder to run a constitution than to frame one”, “there should be a science of administration”, which would seek to discover “what government can properly and successfully do”, and how it can do it efficiently, economically, and responsibly.¹⁶

Wilson described this “science of administration” as “the latest fruit of that study of the science of politics.”¹⁷ It was “a field of business” established upon “principles” which tied administration with “the lasting maxims of political wisdom.”¹⁸ This science was to deal with matters of personnel, organization and methods of government offices, the relationship between administration and (1) politics and constitutional studies, and (2) public opinion. He advocated the study and the comparison of administrative systems of other countries, and saw no harm in adapting these systems to suit American needs.

It is doubtful that this article, which “proved a remarkably accurate prediction of the shape of things to come”,¹⁹ had much of an impact at the time of its publication.

It was not until several years later that it was rediscovered and accorded the recognition it deserved. Certainly it deserved, among other things, to be known as the first academic work in Public Administration.²⁰ It was also the exceptional case to the generalization made earlier, that students of this period were concerned with the process of public administration, rather than the discipline.²¹

3. The Stratified Classification of Administration:

One of the most important characteristics of the early writings on Public Administration, is that it adopted a stratified classification of administration according to: (a) levels of government, (municipal administration, state administration, and national administration); (b) functions performed by government, (education, health, agriculture, forestry, etc.); and (c) particular administrative problems, centralization and decentralization, accounting, personnel, etc.).

John A. Fairlie's monograph, "The Centralization of Administration in New York State",²² was published in 1898. This essay is a good illustration because it reflects a number of the general characteristics under discussion. Because it is not very popular, it may be well to briefly describe some of its contents.

Fairlie's objective were to: (1) analyze the general causes of the movement toward centralization; and (2) establish principles which should determine future administrative centralization and decentralization in the State of New York.²³ The scope of the study was limited to the areas of education, health, charities and correction, and taxation and local finances.

He described (1) the trend toward decentralizing the powers and prerogatives of New York's governor historically from the early days of settlements until it reached its maximum in the third decade of the nineteenth century; (2) the serious problems created by the decentralized administration; and (3) the return tide toward centralization reflected in the Constitution of 1821. By the 1890's a considerable degree of administrative centralization was achieved in New York State.

He concluded that several factors had contributed to the trend toward centralization: (1) the social ideas of democracy on local and national levels; (2) the increase in the population, urbanization, and wealth; and (3) the revolution in the means of transportation and communications. In addition, he found that centralization created two organizational problems for the government of that State. First was the question of the degree of centralization.

The problem of organization in all spheres of activity is no longer whether there shall be a central authority to coordinate and unify the work to be done, but what shall be the nature of the powers of these central bodies, and how large a degree of autonomy may be left to the local institutions.²⁴

Secondly, centralization created a need for the coordination of the many scattered and heterogeneous central authorities. The desire for cooperation in action called for coordination of efforts.

Fairlie's research uncovered certain principles which he suggested should guide the solution of the administrative problems of centralization in New York State. Following are two examples of these principles. (1) For the purpose of determining the distribution of work between central and local authorities he suggested that:

those matters in which the interests of the whole country or state are vitally concerned, and those in which the advantages of system and uniformity are overwhelming should be managed by the central government through its officials.²⁵

(2) Because there were matters of larger interest which could be attended to more efficiently and economically by local authorities:

it is desirable that in all matters where local knowledge is important, where the cooperation of private and governmental agencies can be secured, or where the need of uniformity and rigid system is less pressing, the detailed administration should be conferred on a local body.²⁶

Such matters called for central control of local activities.

As mentioned earlier, this essay combines several of the general characteristics of the early writings on public administration. It is not concerned with the discipline, but with the processes of public administration. It does not deal with administration in its totality, but with one of its problems on one level of government, in one state. The article reads like a report prepared by a consultant, to provide guidelines for the solution of the distribution problems of power and functions between local and state authorities in New York. In addition, it identified some general "principles" of administration, an essential foundation for the development of the "science" of administration.

Further evidence of the stratification of administration is found in the works produced by organizations such as the New York Bureau of Municipal Research. The Bureau was established in 1906, and led by some of the then most distinguished students of American government, to: (1) promote an efficient and economical city government; (2) promote the adoption of scientific methods of accounting and of reporting the details of municipal business; and (3) collect, classify, analyze, correlate, interpret and publish facts to the administration of municipal government of New York.²⁷ The Bureau's focus was obviously on municipal administration.

The literature produced by the Bureau men assumed that administration differed according to the level of government, the functions performed, and the administrative processes used. Here are some of the Bureau's most important publications of the period under consideration:

In 1920's the Bureau men and many who were formerly on its staff, produced texts which became the accepted standards in technical and functional administration: A.E. Buck on budgeting, municipal finance and state reorganization; Russell Forbes on purchasing; Philip Gornick on special assessments; J.P. Harris on election administration; Dr. Carl McCombs on health administration; Lewis Meriam on retirement plans; William E. Mosher on personnel;

Bruce Smith on Police systems; Chester Rightor on long-term financial planning; Sarah Greer on the bibliography of public administration; and Lent Upson on municipal administration.²⁸

It was Leonard White, who, in the 1926 *Introduction*, integrated the study of administration for the first time. He made a major contribution to Public Administration when he declared that administration was "a single process, substantially uniform in its essential characteristics wherever observed, and therefore avoids, the study of municipal administration, state administration, or federal administration as such."²⁹

White also declared, for the first time, that administration was an integrated unified subject - the core and central problems of which were the same wherever observed, and thus could be subject of academic study in and by itself. This was the basic assumption of the 1926 *Introduction*. Charles A. Beard acknowledged this contribution and praised the book saying that it was:

the first academic treatise on public administration as a general science as distinguished from the description of specific branches of particular jurisdictions.³⁰

4. A Problem - Solving Orientation

Another characteristic of the early writing in Public Administration is that it was problem-solving in orientation. In their search for political and social reform on one hand, and administrative efficiency and economy on the other, political scientists not only separated politics from administration as governmental functions but also proceeded to use scientific methods of research to discover the best way to perform government administrative tasks.

Evidence of this orientation is found in Wilson's essay, in Fairlie's report on centralization in New York, as well as in the works on the New York Bureau of Municipal Research. An interesting example, however, is Lent Upson's *Practice of Municipal Administration*, the publication of which coincided with the appearance of White's *Introduction*. Upson's book "attempts to review present-day municipal procedure and to suggest such improvement as experience has proved feasible."³¹ It prescribes "the most effective practices" for performing almost all administrative functions in practically all aspects of city government. Upson was concerned with such matters as: what factors should decide the type of pavements to be used in city streets; the choice of materials for sewerage systems; how best to organize police patrol posts, etc. The book is divided into thirty-one chapters dealing with the following areas of city government: administrative organization, elections, civil service, budget, revenues, debt, treasury, accounting, purchasing, motor transportation, law, planning, safety, fire, health, education, recreation, charities, police, traffic, courts, correction, markets, engineering, pavements, wastes, water, lighting, control of utilities, and municipality ownership.

While this problem-solving emphasis may have been useful in helping resolve the administrative problems of the time, it may or a discipline of administration. Concentrating on the details of the day-to-day problems, did not allow for conceptualizing on administration in the abstract.

This is not intended, however, to minimize the importance of these works, or their contribution to the discipline as it emerged in the 1920's. The early writings, practical in orientation as they were, provided a basic source of information and knowledge used by White to prepare the first textbook in Public Administration.

5. The Belief in a "Science" of Administration:

One of the fundamental assumptions of the early writings on Public Administration was that administration, like politics, was a science, or could develop into a science based upon principles of universal applicability. By applying scientific methods of research, these principles would be discovered, their validity as laws of general applicability established, and the science would consequently emerge. As Waldo pointed out, one of the basic tenets of the study of Public Administration during that period was "that administration is or can be made a 'science', or at least lends itself to study and improvement by established methods of scientific inquiry."³²

The New York Bureau of Municipal Research adopted a scientific approach to the study of city administration. The Bureau men sought the facts in every situation they studied. Observation and the practical, matter-of-fact way of handling the problems of municipal administration were at the bottom of their research method. From their observation they began to regard certain techniques of administration as principles.

Probably the strongest statement in support of a "science" and "principles" of administration was made by Willoughby in the *Principles of Public Administration*, when he said that:

Administration constitutes a science in the sense that it needs to be inquired into in a scientific spirit, and that it comprehends fundamental principles that can only be established when studied in their scientific manner.³³

To Willoughby, a science of administration was comparable to the natural sciences in accuracy, and that the principles of administration and organization were comparable to the laws of physical sciences. Accordingly, the success of administration in achieving its objectives depended upon the discovery of the principles of administration and their strict application.

The position is here taken that, in administration, there are certain fundamental principles of general application analogous to those characterizing any science, which must be observed if the end of administration, efficiency in operation, is to be secured, and that these principles are to be determined and their significance made known only by the rigid application of scientific method to their investigation.³⁴

6. A Legalistic Descriptive Approach to Administration:

In 1887, Wilson advised political scientists to turn their attention away from the constitutional aspects of governments, “who shall make law, and what shall that law be”, in favor of a managerial approach dealing with how the law should be administered. This recommendation notwithstanding, political scientists continued to be preoccupied with constitutional and legal questions. In their consideration of the administrative problems of the time, they focused on the legal relations of administrative units.

The works of Frank Goodnow are a good example of the general thinking of that period. Goodnow's most important writings were: “*Comparative Administrative Law* (1893), *Municipal Home Rule* (1895), *City Government in the United States* (1904 and 1908), *Principles of Administrative Law of the United States* (1905), *Selected Cases on the Law of Officers* (1906), *Municipal Government* (1909), and in collaboration with Frank G. Bates, *Municipal Government* (1919).”³⁵

One of Goodnow's students who made significant contributions to the study of administration, was John Fairlie. Reflecting the then general legalistic, descriptive orientation of political scientists, Fairlie wrote a general survey containing a description of the administrative organization of the United States government.³⁶ It describes the legal basis for the administrative powers of the President, Congress, each one of the departments then in existence, and the so-called “detached bureaus”, namely, the Inter-State Commerce Commission, the Civil Service, the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and the Smithsonian Institute.

Not until the second decade of the twentieth century did studies in Public Administration begin to reflect managerial thinking and to be expressed in managerial terms. Influenced by the Scientific Management movement, concepts such as line and staff, functional organization, coordination, etc., emerged in the literature of the Bureau of Municipal Research. It was White, however, who, declared, in 1926, that governmental administration was a managerial process, and defined Public Administration in managerial terms.

Conclusion

The American literature of Public Administration during the period from 1887 until 1926 indicates the presence of certain common characteristics of thought. These include the separation of politics and administration; the concern with the processes, not the discipline, of public administration; the stratified classification of administration; the study of administration for the purpose of solving its practical problems; the belief in a science and principles of administration; and the adoption of a legalistic descriptive approach, rather than a managerial one, to the study of public administration.

The period from 1887 until the first textbook of Public Administration appeared in the United States in 1926 represented a seed-time for the discipline. Great as the awareness of the importance of administration in the field of governmental affairs had become, little effort was made during that period to study

administration as such. Willoughby described the state of the field prior to 1926 by saying that:

though, therefore, there has been no general work aiming to cover the whole field of the principles of public administration, there are now available certain works dealing with particular branches of public administration and a large volume of literature concerning itself with the problem of the administrative organization and procedure of particular governments.³⁷

The importance of this period's literature to the development of the discipline could hardly be over-emphasized. Both White, author of the first textbook in the field, and Willoughby, author of the second textbook, relied heavily on that literature which they recognized as the original or source material for the study of problems of public administration in the United States.³⁸

Footnotes

1. Leonard D. White, **Introduction to the Study of Public Administration**. (New York: MacMillan, 1926). White maintained a policy of producing a new edition of this book almost every decade. A revised edition appeared in 1939, the third version in 1948, and the fourth in 1955.
2. Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration", **Political Science Quarterly**, II (1887), pp. 197-222.
3. Leonard D. White pointed out that "systematic university attention to public administration developed at Columbia about 1890, and resulted in a series of monographs on the general problem of centralization within the states." White, **Trends in Public Administration** (New York: MacMillan, 1933), p.325.
4. Dwight Waldo **The Administrative State** (New York: Ronald Press, 1948), p. 3-61.
5. **Ibid.**, p.23.
6. Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration", **Processes of Organization and Management**, (ed.) Catheryn Seckler-Hudson (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1948), P. 8.
7. **Ibid.**, p. 17.
8. Frank J. Goodnow, **Politics and Administration** (New York: MacMillan, 1900).
9. Sterling D. Spero, "Public Administration", **Encyclopedia of Management**, (ed.) Carl Heyel, (1963), P. 771.
10. Dwight Waldo, "Public Administration" (paper prepared for the new **International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences**, (February 1964), p. 11.
11. W.F. Willoughby, **An Introduction to the Study of Government of Modern States** (New York: Century, 1924), p. 232.
12. Albert Lepawsky, **Administration. The Arts and Science of Organization and Management** (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1949, reprint 1960), pp. 47-48.
13. Dwight Wald, "Public Administration", p. 11.
14. Wilson, "The Study of Administration", **Processes of Organizations and Management**, p. 10.
15. **Ibid.**, pp. 8-9.
16. **Ibid.**, pp. 8-10
17. **Ibid.**
18. **Ibid.**, p. 17.
19. Dwight Waldo, **Ideas and Issues in Public Administration** (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953), p. 64.
20. Dwight Waldo, **Political Science in the United States. A Trend Report** (Paris: Published by the United Nations, 1956), p. 67.
21. More supporting evidence of this generalization is included throughout this article.
22. John A. Fairlie, "The Centralization of Administration in New York State.", **Series in History, Economics, and Public Law**, edited by the faculty of Political Science of Columbia University (New York: Columbia University, 1898).

23. **Ibid.**, p.21.
24. **Ibid.**, p. 197.
25. **Ibid.**, p. 198.
26. **Ibid.**, p. 199.
27. Jane S. Dahlberg, "The Contributions of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research to the Development of Public Administration", (Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Graduate School of Public Administration, New York University, June, 1964), p. 24.
28. **Ibid.**, pp. 142-43.
29. White, **Introduction** (1926), p. vii.
30. Charles A. Beard, "Government Research - Past, Present and Future", **Proceedings of the Governmental Research Conference (November 22-23, 1926)** Rochester (New York: Governmental Research Conference, 1926), p. 76.
31. Lent D. Upson, **Practice of Municipal Administration** (New York: Century, 1926), p. vii.
32. Dwight Waldo, **Political Science in the United States - A Trend Report**, p. 68.
33. W.F. Willoughby, "The Science of Public Administration", **Essays in Political Science**, (eds.) James M. Matthews and John Hart (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1937), p. 57.
34. W.F. Willoughby, **Principles of Public Administration** (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1927), p. ix.
35. Charles C. Harris and Marshall E. Dimock (eds.), **Essays on the Law and Practice of Government Administration. A Volume in Honor of Frank Johnson Goodnow** (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1935), pp. x-xi. All titles underlined are in italics in the original.
36. John A. Fairlie, **The National Administration of the United States** (New York: MacMillan, 1922).
37. Willoughby, **Principles of Public Administration** (1927), p. x.
38. White, **Introduction** (1926), pp. 479-83, and Willoughby, **Principles of Public Administration** (1927) p. x.