



History of US public administration in the Progressive era

Efficient government by and for whom?

Mordecai Lee

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

Abstract

Purpose – Histories of American public administration during the Progressive era (1890-1920) tend to highlight the positive contributions of its major founders, skimming lightly over nativist, anti-democratic and racial writings. The purpose of this paper is to broaden the given narrative by setting the record straight regarding the latter writings of three major figures: Frederick Cleveland, Frank Goodnow and W.F. Willoughby. Not intended as an exercise in presentism, the goal is a more nuanced understanding of public administration history. This research approach can be used internationally by other management historians to examine cultural biases by other management theorists.

Design/methodology/approach – Mainstream qualitative research techniques in management history and a close literary examination of lesser known and out-of-print writings.

Findings – The three major public administration figures on President Taft's Commission on Economy and Efficiency (1910-1913) expressed nativist, racial and anti-democratic views in their published writings, before and after serving on the commission. These views are little known and need to be added to the given historical narrative. The three deemed that only limited populations were qualified to govern a democracy and provide efficient public administration to the masses.

Research limitations/implications – Internationally, scholars can apply this approach to the forgotten or largely hidden publications of other key management theorists.

Originality/value – Management histories of early American public administration have passed lightly over the works of its founders with nativist, racial and anti-democratic views. This has had the effect of sanitizing the historical record by ignoring publications that provide a fuller contextual understanding of the worldviews of these major figures.

Keywords Historical research, Government, Public administration, United States of America, Black people, Management history

Paper type Research paper

Management historians of the US public sector have sought not to romanticize the roots of American public administration in the Progressive era. Still, they tend to highlight the positive and important intellectual contributions of its major founders, skimming lightly over other publications. This historical examination seeks to broaden the given narrative by providing a more nuanced view of American public administration history by examining in more detail some of the largely forgotten works of three of its major figures.

There is a broad acknowledgement in the literature that a perception of a unified reform orientation of the good government movement during the Progressive era provides an “image [that] obscures as much as it reveals” (Adams, 1992, p. 364). That image has been shown to be “part memory and part myth” (Dudley, 2004, p. 335).



The literature has already explored some of the contradictions and conflicts that were part of the founding of modern US public administration. For example, Rubin (1994) differentiated between the good government activists who were Progressive reformers and Taft conservatives. Stever (1990) identified the tensions in that era between organic idealism and pragmatism. Hamilton (2007, pp. 5-6) divided the reforms of the Progressive era between the early push for “Government by the Good” versus the later focus on “Government by the Efficient”, somewhat parallel to Williams’ (2002, pp. 459-60) distinction between the Mugwumps and the Progressives. Lee (1995, p. 541) noted the differences between the civil service reformers on the federal level and the municipal reformers at the local level.

This growing historical literature of public management has also highlighted the anti-democratic strain embedded in some of the ideas that were generated by reformers in the Progressive era. Concepts such as efficiency and civil service were largely antipodal to modern mass democracy. For example, Karl (1987, p. 28) noted that the underlying premise of the short ballot movement was “a way of limiting voter input in the administrative process”. Luton (2003, p. 172) wrote that one of the themes of the era was “insulating the business of government from the politics of governance”. In her summary of the literature, Lee (1995, p. 541) concluded that these subdivisions of the Progressive reform movement held “biases against mass democracy and sought the reversion of power to the hands of elites, professionals, and scientists”.

However, the management history literature so far has not examined in detail the somewhat forgotten or omitted values and views of leading public management writers in the USA at the beginning of the twentieth century. The purpose of this inquiry is to add to the comprehensiveness and texture of management history of that era.

Management historiography: Wrege, Greenwood and Hata’s category III

Wrege, Greenwood and Hata’s typology of management historiography included what they termed category III topics. This related to any subject that for a variety of reasons “has become virtually unknown” (Wrege *et al.*, 1999, p. 415). For this genre of management research, they noted that routinely used historical sources and digitized databases are usually not helpful. They instead recommended focusing on obscure publications that “might not contain the term ‘management’ in their title, and might not seem to be sources of management information,” but which nonetheless are relevant to management history (p. 418).

Raadschelders (2010) recently noted the continued phenomenon of American public administration being largely detached from its historical context. Separately, and using slightly different nomenclature from Wrege, Greenwood and Hata, he identified one of the contemporary research approaches that sought to correct this omission by re-contextualizing the history of American governmental management. He called it a “setting-the-record-straight route of reinterpreting the past” (Raadschelders, 2000, p. 517).

In US public management history, there are several recent prominent examples of historical literature that embodied Wrege, Greenwood and Hata’s category III research approach and Raadschelders’ setting-the-record-straight focus. They include Stivers’ (2000) recounting of the previously largely invisible role of women in the reform efforts of the Progressive era and Stillman’s (1998) identification of the common religious backgrounds and moral idealism of those founders. This inquiry is also an effort to set the record straight in American public administration history using a category III approach.

Rigorous history necessitates a “warts and all” examination of important figures. This can be accomplished without the sin of presentism. The goal is not to condemn past figures for values and behaviors that are objectionable in the present. Rather, the objective is to gain a more nuanced understanding of history. This approach has not always been of interest to the field. For example, President Woodrow Wilson re-segregated federal offices in Washington, DC. Even though his racism is well known in secular biographies, it is rarely discussed in depth in public administration history. Rather, discussions usually focus on his 1887 groundbreaking article and leave it at that. For example, a recent book length study of Wilson’s views on public management discussed his racism in a portion of one paragraph (Cook, 2007, p. 142). Karl (1987, p. 29) was one of the exceptions, when he noted, “Wilson looked on the disenfranchisement of Negro voters as a good thing, not simply as an expedient.”

In two previous historical inquiries, this author briefly noted some of the anti-immigrant, racist and anti-democratic views of leaders in US public management leaders in the early twentieth century (Lee, 2008, 2006, p. 17, pp. 457-8). This paper seeks to add to the historical literature by examining much more comprehensively the published views of three major figures in the founding of the field. Those views were part of the beliefs and interests that motivated the push for good government, including promoting a new profession of public administration experts. The goal here is to expand and add nuance to the historical record by providing a more comprehensive exploration of the cultural values of these early thinkers as expressed in their published works, to a more textured understanding of their perspectives and motivations. This reflects (and necessitates) the historiographic approach suggested by Grattan (2008), namely of “crafting” history, including the foci of context, collection, selection and judgment.

Why focus on the members of President Taft’s Commission on Economy and Efficiency (1911-1913)?

Efforts at a kind of academic version of de-bowdlerizing US public administration history needs to be based on a structure that does not merely cherry pick the most racist, anti-immigrant and anti-democratic statements in any publications that might have a remote relevance to the government reform literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Therefore, the selection of authors whose body of work is examined needs to be based on an external historical standard that is a justified and legitimate selection for historical research purposes.

President William Howard Taft’s Commission on Economy and Efficiency has been considered a major landmark in the development of American public administration. As early as 1919, its historic status was recognized. Weber (1919, p. 84), a good government activist and writer at that time, called it “the most comprehensive and systematic investigation that has ever been made” of government in the USA, national or otherwise. His early historical verdict has been reconfirmed by contemporary management historians. According to Stillman (1998, p. 116), it was “the first comprehensive national study of the executive branch”. Arnold (1998, p. 49) identified its historic role, in both the presidency and public administration, as forming “the template of modern comprehensive reorganization planning”. Bertelli and Lynn (2006, p. 24) viewed it as “the first coherent national-level reform initiative”. Finally, according to Kahn (1997, p. 204) “The Taft Commission set the agenda” of budget reform. It irrevocably “altered the battle of administrative reform from an analysis of business practices to a struggle

for ultimate authority over the executive branch of government” (1997, p. 163). Therefore, in the history of American public administration, the work of the Taft Commission was a pivotal development, especially in that it nationalized what had previously been largely a reform movement focusing mostly on municipal administration.

This inquiry focuses on the members of the commission who were major figures in the field before, during and after their service on the commission: Chairman Frederick Cleveland and members Frank Goodnow and W.F. Willoughby. Their appointment to serve on a presidential commission (and, for one of them, chair it) presents an independent confirmation of their central leadership role in public administration at that time. The commission had five members. The other initial members were W.W. Warwick from the Panama Canal Commission and Harvey S. Chase, a private accountant from Boston. Owing to illness, Chase was an active member only during the second half of 1911. The Commission’s Secretary, Merritt O. Chance, auditor of the Post Office Department, was promoted from Secretary of the Commission to a membership on the Commission itself, largely as his replacement (Ballard, 1954, p. 9). If only based on their post-commission continued involvement in good government reforms, the three leading members to be focused on here are Cleveland, Goodnow and Willoughby.

Given the parameters of the research inquiry, the specific focus here is on a literary examination of their lesser known publications that, generally, have been largely disregarded by historians up to now. To avoid the seductive trap of presentism, their published opinions on race, immigrants and democracy are presented here without commentary, leaving it to each reader to make individual judgments of their significance and meaning to public administration’s history.

Chairman: Frederick A. Cleveland (1865-1946)

In 1907, along with William Allen and Henry Bruère, Frederick Cleveland founded the New York Bureau of Municipal Research, the fount of government reform in the Progressive era. His role in creating and directing the Bureau was a trailblazing contribution to the subsequent development of American public administration.

Thumbnail biographical sketch

Cleveland began a career as an attorney in the state of Washington and then earned a doctorate in economics from the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania (Kahn, 1997, p. 39). He “was soon recognized as a specialist in municipal financial accounting” (Stillman, 1998, p. 112). At the Bureau of Municipal Research, he was “a dispassionate investigator, addressing fellow experts and bringing the tools of scientific reasoning to bear on discrete problems of administration” (Kahn, 1997, p. 47). Cleveland’s work at the Bureau brought him to the attention of President Taft and led to his appointment as head of the commission.

After his service on the commission, he returned to the Bureau and had a showdown with Allen over the direction the organization would take. Disliking Allen’s publicity-oriented agitations, Cleveland preferred a quieter and detail focus. With the promise of ongoing funding from John D. Rockefeller if the Bureau would adopt a lower and less controversial profile, Cleveland won (Schachter, 1997, pp. 48-53). Then the tables turned on him. Cleveland expected to be the head of a new Institute for Government Research (which evolved into the Brookings Institution) in Washington, DC. Following the model of the New York Bureau, it was to continue pushing for reform at the federal

level similar to the Taft Commission, and specifically to push for a national budget system. However, he was viewed as “boring, opaque, and more than a bit aloof” (Kahn, 1997, p. 167). W.F. Willoughby got the job instead.

In 1919, Cleveland was appointed the first professor of the US citizenship at Boston University, under the George A. Maxwell endowment (Ogg, 1919, p. 486). He retired in 1939 and died in 1946 (New York Times, 1946). Today (2010), an elementary school in the public school district of Norwood (a suburb of Boston, where he lived and helped write the city’s new charter in 1923) is named after him.

Publications before the Taft Commission

In May 1906, Cleveland was invited to address the National Conference on Charities and Corrections. He included it as a chapter in his book on municipal administration and accounting. One of the sections of the speech (and a subchapter in the book) was titled “The race ideal of accountability and control.” In it, he stated that:

Our highest ideal of administrative account and personal responsibility is not the dream of a prudist, nor the dogma of the reformer; it is found in the moral and religious culture which dominates the race (1909, p. 343).

In no place in the chapter did he elaborate on the precise meaning of his usage of the word “race.” It is possible, of course, that he meant it as a synonym for “a people,” such as Churchill’s (1956, p. 316) use of the phrase “the English race”. (Another related and common race-related term at the time was “stock,” as in “German stock” (Karl, 1976, p. 492).) But Cleveland (1909, p. 343) repeated the phrase several times, such as “we have the best race concept of control that is possible for the human mind to grasp” and “Whatever may be our religious faith, this race concept has in it a very direct bearing on the social problem before us – the great problem of institutional administration” (1909, p. 344). Despite his opaqueness (which could have been deliberate or merely his writing style), the context, audience and subject strongly suggest that he was talking about the superiority of whites. As an indication of the path-breaking and historic role of this book, it was republished in 1980 as part of a series on the classics of *Dimensions of Accounting Theory and Practice* (Cleveland, 1980).

Publications after the commission

Cleveland (1913) wrote an introductory textbook on American politics, for a book series titled *American Citizen*. In his discussion of suffrage, he excused the Jim Crow regime that denied voting rights to African-Americans. In his view:

The improvidence of the negro and of some of the whites as well has been taken into account in the disfranchisement of the shiftless who have no adequate concern in citizen welfare. The property qualifications which have already been referred to above aim to exclude this questionable element from the suffrage (Cleveland, 1913, p. 174).

Cleveland’s views on specific racial groups (and low-class whites) cohered in that textbook into an explicitly anti-democratic view of government. Disparaging universal suffrage and democratic sovereignty, he wrote that an ideal governmental system would:

[. . .] have to do with ascertaining what is needful for formulating *proper* opinion, for *impressing* this on the electorate, [and] for *enforcing* it on the official class through processes provided for making the government responsive and responsible (1913, p. 442, emphasis added).

By 14 years later, in a legal text on citizenship, he maintained the same position:

It is assumed that certain persons are not fit for membership in our political society by reason of their race characteristics or of social and political traditions and institutional experiences. We take the position, therefore, that naturalization should not be made the equal right of all races (Cleveland, 1927, p. 75).

It is unclear from the context if “We” was an expression of the author’s opinion while avoiding the impermissible “I” or of the author making a generalization about American society at the time, but it more likely the former rather than the latter.

Finally, in an ambitious and wide-ranging treatise on scientific knowledge, he suggested that a slave willingly volunteered to be a slave:

A relationship has been entered into between master and slave which gives to the master the right to exercise complete domination over another individual who *consents* to an arrangement in which he is dominated; the slave *consents* to being a thing (Cleveland, 1929, p. 512, emphasis added).

Member: Frank J. Goodnow (1859-1939)

According to the Stones, Goodnow was “sometimes referred to as ‘Father of Public Administration’ because of his prolific writings and ardent teaching” (Stone and Stone, 1975, p. 27). More recently, he was described as “one of the nation’s most distinguished scholars of public administration” (Smith, 1991, p. 12) and, similar to the stones’ characterization, another scholar wrote that he was “considered the founder of the public administration field” (Patterson, 2001, p. 877). However, he is “little known by today’s students” (Lynn, 2009, p. 805).

Goodnow is most remembered today for his 1900 *Politics and Administration* (Goodnow, 1900), often depicted (inaccurately) as the founding document of the politics-administration dichotomy. The book is truly a public administration classic (albeit probably more often cited than actually read) and has been republished several times (Goodnow, 1914, 1967). Most recently, it was republished as part of the publishing house’s series on *Library of Liberal Thought* and with a new introduction by Rohr (Goodnow, 2003).

Thumbnail biographical sketch

After Frank J. Goodnow received a law degree from Columbia in 1882, he became a professor of administrative law there, staying on Columbia’s faculty until 1914. His contributions to the legal aspects of public and administrative law gradually helped create the field of public administration. In 1903, he was elected the first President of the American Political Science Association (APSA), serving two one-year terms, the only APSA president to do so.

In 1914, Goodnow was named President of Johns Hopkins University, serving until his retirement in 1929. He died in 1939 (*The New York Times*, 1939). In 1996, APSA (2010) created an annual award in his name:

[...] to honor service to the community of teachers, researchers, and public servants who daily toil in the many fields of politics. Frank J. Goodnow, the first president of the American Political Science Association, a pioneer in the development of judicial politics, and former president of Johns Hopkins University is an exemplar of the public service and volunteerism that this award represents.

Publications before the Taft Commission

In 1897, Goodnow referred to “The existence of a large ignorant negro population” in the South as an acceptable rationale for non-legal limits on universal suffrage in the Jim Crow era (1897, p. 147). In 1904, he stated unequivocally, “It has been shown that the social qualities that are developed by urban life are not the qualities that favor good government” (Goodnow, 1904, p. 110). Goodnow’s (1911, 1897) book was republished in 1911. His 1904 book also sold very well, with the publisher quickly reissuing it in 1908 and 1910 (Goodnow, 1908, 1910a). The lasting significance of the book was confirmed by its republication in 1974 (as part of a series titled “Metropolitan America”) and again in 1991 (Goodnow, 1974, 1991).

There were more of such comments in the rest of Goodnow’s oeuvre. In 1906, he condemned the results of universal male suffrage. (A reminder that women did not get the right to vote in federal elections until 1920.) Bemoaning the effects of mass democracy and the expansion in the number of elected municipal offices, he noted, “if we may judge of municipal conditions by contemporary criticism and literature, their last state was worse than their first,” suggesting things were better before mass urban democracy (Goodnow, 1906, p. 4). In particular, the expansion in the number of municipal elected offices, had the effect of being “monopolized by persons of inferior intelligence and character, incapable of rendering to the community service of the highest value” (1906, p. 7). The book was republished in 1997 (Goodnow, 1997).

Goodnow (1909) further discussed his opposition to universal suffrage for voters in municipal elections. He made a careful distinction between differences in eligibility for voting in federal, state and municipal elections. He felt broad suffrage was a simplistic application of the franchise to vote because it made “little or no allowance for the peculiar characteristics of urban populations” (Goodnow, 1909, p. 139). A few pages later, he elaborated. Some urban residents “may not have sufficient political capacity, because of lack of the power to read or because of previous associations, to cast a vote intelligently” (p. 146). When copies of the first run of the book were sold out, the publisher reissued it the next year (Goodnow, 1910b).

Publications after the commission

In 1919, a second edition of his 1909 book on municipal government (this time co-authored) repeated his statement of 22 years before, that the South had “a large ignorant negro population” (Goodnow and Bates, 1919, p. 160). In that 1919 textbook, he also repeated, unchanged, his 1909 statement regarding immigrants (1919, p. 158). The book was republished in 1925 (Goodnow and Bates, 1925).

The exact phrase that Goodnow had used twice “large ignorant negro population” (including not capitalizing “Negro”), was also used by Garner (1910, p. 493) in his 1910 introductory political science textbook. It is possible Garner, a Professor at University of Illinois, lifted it from Goodnow’s, 1897 book without a citation. It is also possible that this was a pat phrase widely used in elite white circles in the South and North as a supposedly self-explanatory and self-justifying phrase regarding their support for Jim Crow laws (Garner was President of APSA in 1923-1924).

Member: W.F. Willoughby (1867-1960)

William Franklin Willoughby is better known in public administration as W.F. Willoughby, the name he used in his professional work. Confusingly, his

twin brother, Westel Woodbury Willoughby (1867-1945), often wrote under the professional name W.W. Willoughby. Hence, when both only used their initials to identify themselves in their publications, their middle initials were the sole differentiation between them. Westel was a prominent professor of political science at Johns Hopkins, capping his career as APSA President in 1912-1913 (two decades before his brother's elevation to the same position).

Thumbnail biographical sketch

Willoughby graduated from Johns Hopkins in 1887 and obtained no further degrees beyond his BA. He worked as a statistician at the US Labor Department, was appointed to a federal post in Puerto Rico and then was Assistant Director of the Census Bureau (Kahn, 1997, pp. 168-9). He taught briefly at Princeton University as the McCormick Professor of Jurisprudence and Politics.

After his service on the Taft Commission, he remained in Washington to continue pushing for some of its reforms. In 1916, he edged out Cleveland to become the Director of the newly created Institute for Government Research (which became the Brookings Institution). Willoughby is generally credited as the main author of the 1921 Budget Act (Stillman, 1998, p. 119), which established a centralized presidential budgeting system for the federal government and created the Bureau of the Budget (in the Treasury Department). He was elected APSA President for 1931-1932. Willoughby was forced out of Brookings in 1932 (Critchlow, 1985, p. 111). He was then a consultant on government for the Library of Congress from 1940 until retiring in 1944. He died in 1960 (Olesky, 1960).

Publications before the Taft Commission

In 1891, Willoughby and his brother co-authored a textbook on American Government to be used in the Washington, DC public schools. It was published by Johns Hopkins University Press. In their recounting of antebellum US history, they wrote of the South's "warm climate being congenial to the negro, and the rude manual labor of the field suited to his meager capabilities." A few paragraphs later, they amplified that slavery in the South was "suited to the frames and abilities of the African" (Willoughby and Willoughby, 1891, p. 131). This book was reprinted in 1973 (Willoughby and Willoughby, 1973).

While he was serving in Puerto Rico, Willoughby authored an article in 1907 in the *American Political Science Review* that "displayed his elitism and disdain for popular democracy" (Kahn, 1997, p. 172, no. 19). He wrote that residents of the island lacked the ability for "the successful working of complete self-government" (Willoughby, 1907, p. 567).

Publications after the Commission

In 1919, Willoughby wrote a textbook about government. He discussed the need for determining an electorate that was less than universal in suffrage. Restrictions on qualifying to vote would not be necessary "Were a political community composed wholly of individuals capable of expressing an intelligent opinion regarding matters of general interest" (Willoughby, 1921, p. 273). The problem was that:

In all communities, however, a very considerable proportion of the persons composing them are of a character manifestly disqualifying them for the exercise of political authority.

Reference is made to persons of immature age, to those of unsound mind, and, in certain cases, to members of uncivilized or but partly civilized tribes who are included in political groups of people possessing a higher degree of intellectual development (1919, p. 273-4).

In 1936, he revised and enlarged that textbook. He repeated the same observations with minor re-wording, but with no substantive change (Willoughby, 1936, p. 271). The revised edition of the textbook was reissued after Second World War (Willoughby, 1947).

Analysis and conclusions

In his ground-laying 1887 essay, Wilson argued that bureaucracy, as a method for delivering government services, was not inherently anti-democratic, even though it was most well developed at that time in Germany and other non-democratic countries. The USA, he said, could adopt a bureaucracy for its own governmental system without degrading its republican and democratic bases. Wilson famously likened bureaucracy to the method a murderer used to sharpen a knife. Learning to sharpen a knife the same way as a murderer did not mean the knife could only be used for such nefarious purposes. Rather, it could be used for constructive goals just as easily (Wilson, 1941, p. 504). However, the publications of the three major figures in public administration after Wilson indicate the opposite. Cleveland, Goodnow and Willoughby were openly advocating the bureaucratization of American Government precisely because it was anti-democratic. Given their explicit and published views about African-Americans and immigrants, the professionalization of American public administration they were seeking would serve precisely the goal they wanted, to protect government from mass democracy. Still, that their positive contributions continue to be valued is a back-handed confirmation of Wilson's metaphor of the uses of a knife. The public administration that Cleveland, Goodnow and Willoughby helped create was, and still is, a valuable and worthwhile neutral tool (similar to the knife) even though their intention for its use was not only anti-democratic, but also nativist and racial.

In Egnal's recent revisiting of the economic aspects of the Civil War and its aftermath, he suggested, in passing, a revised interpretation of the motivations of the post-bellum good government reformers. In the decades after emancipation, the Republican Party increasingly developed a relatively narrow pro-business agenda. What happened to the anti-slavery activists? Egnal suggested that some stayed with the party to pursue a logical extension of their pre-war views. They supported enforcing equality and voting rights for the freedmen in the post-bellum south. As to the North, they "came to value Northern black voters, who had been enfranchised by the Fifteen Amendment and could make the difference in close elections" (Egnal, 2009, p. 341). But, a different cluster of the pre-war anti-slavery activists were not interested in furthering civic equality of blacks, especially not the right to vote. Instead, for these other reformers, "the issues they pursued involved 'clean' government, not African American rights" (p. 337). This suggests the possibility of a revisionist generalization about the roots of American public administration. The good government reformers who held racist views had broken off from the pragmatic Republican partisans who valued black votes in the North. Egnal's perspective contributes a single consistent prism by which one could interpret and understand the nativist, racist and anti-democratic publications of the three major public administration figures on the Taft Commission. Perhaps, they gave voice to a group of anti-slavery activists who did not like what was happening to partisan politics (corrupt politicians promoting the

interests of big business), but equally did not like furthering the rights of former slaves. To do that, they developed a reform platform that was anti-party, anti-democracy and anti-black. Further research to examine the accuracy of Egnal's observation would be valuable and worthwhile follow-up to this inquiry.

The purpose of this category III management inquiry was solely to set the historical record straight by presenting the opinions of these founders of public administration in their own words and without facile commentary. Their views can speak for themselves. They were men of their times. Each reader can make a personal judgment whether these published statements on race, immigrants and democracy are excusable as reflecting the times or inexcusable as outside the underlying democratic values of American public administration.

The powerful and constructive legacy of these three major figures of early American public administration is not necessarily diminished by setting the record straight of their racial and nativist prejudices. Nor should they be condemned based on presentism. Few of the academic elite had Progressive views about African-Americans and immigrants at that time. Instead, the purpose of this inquiry is a documentation that the three were men of their times, not saints. For example, reminders of President Lincoln's racial views do not necessarily dim our respect for him, and those views should not be hidden. They provide a more complete view of an historical figure.

Similarly, for Cleveland, Goodnow and Willoughby, their contributions should not be sanitized or bowdlerized. Hagiography has no place in historiography. Contemporary histories of public administration need to set the record straight by presenting the entire picture of the founders' views, not just inoffensive material or antiseptic summaries. Academic history should not be packaged as a fairy tale. That these men had views on race, immigrants and democracy that would be unacceptable in contemporary times does not have to detract from their separate positive and substantive contributions to the discipline and profession they helped create. Future research should be encouraged on an international basis to expand this kind of inquiry to other key figures, eras, nations and related subjects.

Waldo's (2007) *Administrative State* was a breakthrough because he demonstrated that American public administration was more than a value-free theory. Rather, it was also a value-laden political philosophy deeply rooted in American and Western culture. Therefore, perhaps the lesson of this inquiry for management historians internationally is the imperative to peel back and identify cultural values embedded in any historical management event. Values are usually hidden deeply in the sub-structure of management ideas. Based on this exploration, the international imperative includes asking if an important development in management theory or history was value free or not. If not, what national, ethnic and cultural values underlay it? Can a management theory be truly generic in international applicability without the need for localized modifications?

Hindsight improves with age. The greater the distance of the event, the easier it is to "see" embedded values, as detailed here. It is harder to conduct similar examinations of more recent management events. The closer one is to current times, the more difficult it is to step outside of one's cultural "box," view developments from a disinterested and dispassionate perspective, and then locate underlying values influencing and controlling a particular management event. This author suggests that one should presume there are always some there.

References

- Adams, G.B. (1992), "Enthralled with modernity: the historical context of knowledge and theory development in public administration", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 52 No. 4, pp. 363-73.
- American Political Science Association (2010), "Frank J. Goodnow Award", available at: www.apsanet.org/section_311.cfm (accessed 9 May 2010).
- Arnold, P.E. (1998), *Making the Managerial Presidency: Comprehensive Reorganization Planning, 1905-1996*, 2nd ed., University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.
- Ballard, R.N. (1954), "The administrative theory of William Howard Taft", *Western Political Quarterly*, Vol. 7 No. 1, pp. 65-74.
- Bertelli, A.M. and Lynn, L.E. Jr (2006), *Madison's Managers: Public Administration and the Constitution*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Churchill, W.S. (1956), *The New World, A History of the English-speaking Peoples*, Vol. 2, Dodd Mead, New York, NY.
- Cleveland, F.A. (1909), *Chapters on Municipal Administration and Accounting*, Longmans Green, New York, NY.
- Cleveland, F.A. (1913), *Organized Democracy: An Introduction to the Study of American Politics*, Longmans Green, New York, NY.
- Cleveland, F.A. (1927), *American Citizenship: As Distinguished from Alien Status*, Ronald, New York, NY.
- Cleveland, F.A. (1929), *Modern Scientific Knowledge of Nature, Man, and Society*, Ronald, New York, NY.
- Cleveland, F.A. (1980), *Chapters on Municipal Administration and Accounting*, Arno, New York, NY (1909).
- Cook, B.J. (2007), *Democracy and Administration: Woodrow Wilson's Ideas and the Challenges of Public Management*, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Critchlow, D.T. (1985), *The Brookings Institution, 1916-1952: Expertise and the Public Interest in a Democratic Society*, Northern Illinois University Press, DeKalb, IL.
- Dudley, L.S. (2004), "Enduring narratives from progressivism", *International Journal of Organization Theory and Behavior*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 315-40.
- Egnal, M. (2009), *Clash of Extremes: The Economic Origins of the Civil War*, Hill and Wang, New York, NY.
- Garner, J.W. (1910), *Introduction to Political Science: A Treatise on the Origin, Nature, Functions, and Organization of the State*, American Book, New York, NY.
- Goodnow, F.J. (1897), *Municipal Problems*, Macmillan for Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- Goodnow, F.J. (1900), *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*, Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Goodnow, F.J. (1904), *City Government in the United States*, Century, New York, NY.
- Goodnow, F.J. (1906), *Municipal Home Rule: A Study in Administration*, Macmillan for Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- Goodnow, F.J. (1908), *City Government in the United States*, Century, New York, NY (1904).
- Goodnow, F.J. (1909), *Municipal Government*, Century, New York, NY.
- Goodnow, F.J. (1910a), *City Government in the United States*, Century, New York, NY (1904).
- Goodnow, F.J. (1910b), *Municipal Government*, Century, New York, NY (1909).

- Goodnow, F.J. (1911), *Municipal Problems*, Columbia University Press, New York, NY (1897).
- Goodnow, F.J. (1914), *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*, Macmillan, New York, NY (1900).
- Goodnow, F.J. (1967), *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*, Russell & Russell, New York, NY (1900).
- Goodnow, F.J. (1974), *City Government in the United States*, Arno, New York, NY (1904).
- Goodnow, F.J. (1991), *City Government in the United States*, Wm. W. Gaunt & Sons, Holmes Beach, FL (1904).
- Goodnow, F.J. (1997), *Municipal Home Rule: A Study in Administration*, William S. Hein & Co., Buffalo, NY (1906).
- Goodnow, F.J. (2003), *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*, Transaction, New Brunswick, NJ (1900).
- Goodnow, F.J. and Bates, F.G. (1919), *Municipal Government*, 2nd ed., Century, New York, NY (1919).
- Goodnow, F.J. and Bates, F.G. (1925), *Municipal Government*, 2nd ed., Century, New York, NY.
- Grattan, R. (2008), "Crafting management history", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 174-83.
- Hamilton, M.R. (2007), "Democracy and public service", in Box, R.C. (Ed.), *Democracy and Public Administration*, M.E. Sharpe, Armonk, NY, pp. 3-20.
- Kahn, J. (1997), *Budgeting Democracy: State Building and Citizenship in America, 1890-1928*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.
- Karl, B.D. (1976), "Public administration and American history: a century of professionalism", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 36 No. 5, pp. 489-503.
- Karl, B.D. (1987), "The American bureaucrat: a history of a sheep in wolves' clothing", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 47 No. 1, pp. 26-34.
- Lee, E.W. (1995), "Political science, public administration, and the rise of the American administrative state", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 55 No. 6, pp. 538-46.
- Lee, M. (2006), "The history of municipal public reporting", *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 29 Nos 4/6, pp. 453-76.
- Lee, M. (2008), *Bureaus of Efficiency: Reforming Local Government in the Progressive Era*, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee, WI.
- Luton, L.S. (2003), "Administrative state and society: a case study of the United States of America", in Peters, B.G. and Pierre, J. (Eds), *Handbook of Public Administration*, Sage, London, pp. 169-76.
- Lynn, L.E. Jr (2009), "Restoring the rule of law to public administration: what Frank Goodnow got right and Leonard White didn't", *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 69 No. 5, pp. 803-13.
- (The) *New York Times* (1939), "Dr. F.J. Goodnow, noted educator", *New York Times*, 16 November, p. 23 (obituary).
- (The) *New York Times* (1946), "Dr. F.A. Cleveland, noted economist", *New York Times*, 28 January, p. 19 (obituary).
- Ogg, F.A. (1919), "Personal and miscellaneous", *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 484-90.
- Olesky, J. (1960), "William Willoughby dead at 92; economist and US consultant", *Washington Post*, 7 May, p. D2.

- Patterson, S.C. (2001), "Remembering Frank J. Goodnow", *PS: Political Science & Politics*, Vol. 34 No. 4, pp. 875-81.
- Raadschelders, J.C.N. (2000), "Administrative history of the United States: development and state of the art", *Administration & Society*, Vol. 32 No. 5, pp. 499-528.
- Raadschelders, J.C.N. (2010), "Is American public administration detached from historical context?. On the nature of time and the need to understand it in government and its study", *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 40 No. 3, pp. 235-60.
- Rubin, I.S. (1994), "Early budget reformers: democracy, efficiency, and budget reforms", *American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 229-51.
- Schachter, H.L. (1997), *Reinventing Government or Reinventing Ourselves: The Role of Citizen Owners in Making a Better Government*, State University of New York Press, Albany, NY.
- Smith, J.A. (1991), *Brookings at Seventy-five*, Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Stever, J.A. (1990), "The dual image of the administrator in progressive administrative theory", *Administration & Society*, Vol. 22 No. 1, pp. 39-57.
- Stillman, R.J. II (1998), *Creating the American State: The Moral Reformers and the Modern Administrative World They Made*, University of Alabama Press, Tuscaloosa, AL.
- Stivers, C. (2000), *Bureau Men, Settlement Women: Constructing Public Administration in the Progressive Era*, University Press of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.
- Stone, A.B. and Stone, D.C. (1975), "Early development of education in public administration", in Mosher, F.C. (Ed.), *American Public Administration: Past, Present, Future*, University of Alabama Press, University, Tuscaloosa, AL, pp. 11-48.
- Waldo, D. (2007), *The Administrative State: A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*, Transaction, New Brunswick, NJ (1948).
- Weber, G.A. (1919), *Organized Efforts for the Improvement of Methods of Administration in the United States*, D. Appleton, New York, NY.
- Williams, D.W. (2002), "Before performance measurement", *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 457-86.
- Willoughby, W.F. (1907), "The executive council of porto [sic] Rico", *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 1 No. 4, pp. 561-82.
- Willoughby, W.F. (1921), *An Introduction to the Study of the Government of Modern States*, Century, New York, NY (1919).
- Willoughby, W.F. (1936), *The Government of Modern States*, revised and enlarged ed., D. Appleton-Century, New York, NY.
- Willoughby, W.F. (1947), *The Government of Modern States*, revised and enlarged ed., Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York, NY (1936).
- Willoughby, W.W. and Willoughby, W.F. (1891), *Government and Administration of the United States*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, MD.
- Willoughby, W.W. and Willoughby, W.F. (1973), *Government and Administration of the United States*, Johnson Reprint Corporation, New York, NY (1891).
- Wilson, W. (1941), "The study of administration", *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 56 No. 4, pp. 481-506 (1887).
- Wrege, C.D., Greenwood, R.A. and Hata, S. (1999), "What we do not know about management history: some categories of research and methods to uncover management history mysteries", *Journal of Management History*, Vol. 5 No. 7, pp. 414-24.

About the author

Mordecai Lee is Professor of Governmental Affairs at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, where he teaches public administration and NGO management. His books include *Nixon's Super-secretaries: The Last Grand Presidential Reorganization Effort* (2010), *Bureaus of Efficiency: Reforming Local Government in the Progressive Era* (2008) and *Institutionalizing Congress and the Presidency: The US Bureau of Efficiency, 1916-1933* (2006). He has also published numerous articles on governmental and NGO history, public relations and images in pop culture. Before joining the professoriate, he had been elected to five terms in the Wisconsin State Legislature and was executive director of a faith-based advocacy NGO. Mordecai Lee can be contacted at: mordecai@uwm.edu

To purchase reprints of this article please e-mail: reprints@emeraldinsight.com
Or visit our web site for further details: www.emeraldinsight.com/reprints

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.