CHAPTER III

CITIZENSHIP IN AMERICA--IN THE BEGINNING--AND THEN GOVERNANCE AS PRACTICED BY CITIZENS WITH THE ONSET OF THE EXPERT ELITES

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed;...."--*The Declaration of Independence*

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to give an historical perspective of the practice of citizenship in America. It will demonstrate that the original cultural ethos of America was basically self-government and that the transfer to a representative government was an epistemic shift that was not generally understood but passively accepted by the people. It will show that at the turn of the century, in the context of a groundswell of social reform, progressivism, and muckracking, the development of public administration emerged. This was a time for fundamental change that posed the options of either forming a pragmatic government that involved full citizenship or in forming a government of expert policy making. Government by expert policy makers was chosen in lieu of full citizenship--since this option served as a re-enforcement of the representative form of government set up in the Constitution. The attempts at strengthening representative government continues to go against the grain of the

cultural ethos of self government by citizens.

The American government belongs to the people. That is spelled out very clearly and plainly in The Declaration of Independence. The years prior to and immediately following the Revolution of 1776, the government as defined in the first constitution was highly democratic, with a great emphasis on popular sovereignty and decentralization of governmental authority.   A democratic form of government existed in colonial times. Let us take a moment to examine how the colonies were established and how they functioned in the colonial era.

Colonial Self-Government from Imperial Control.[1]

The three forms of government that were established in the colonies were either corporate, royal, or proprietary. For example, Massachusetts' charter established a corporate colony. The corporate colonies were usually formed as a joint-stock company. The incorporated company's charter served as a mini-constitution. But something happened in the forming of these colonies. The Massachusetts Bay Colony, for example, established a self-governing commonwealth even though the original charter was formed as a joint-stock company. With some changes made along the way, the charter became the framework for the constitution of Massachusetts, which became a model for other self-governing colonies. Even though the governor was to be appointed by the King, the Massachusetts colonists elected their own governor.

Virginia became a royal colony. Virginia's governor was appointed by the King. The governor had responsibility for carrying out orders from the King; he oversaw the military and advised the assemblymen.   The royal form of government became the form preferred by England in establishing future colonies as well as in re-establishing existing colonies.

Maryland, on the other hand, became a proprietary colony, the first of the continental colonies. A proprietary colony was one that was established in someone's name rather than in the name of a trading company or a church.

Maryland's appointed governor, Lord Baltimore, chose to remain in England. He then appointed a governor to oversee the Assembly of Freemen. The royal governor usually disagreed with the decisions of the assembly and hence overturned their decisions frequently.

With the absence of direct oversight of the colonies, the idea of citizenship in America had taken shape in the context of direct self-government. The early colonists practiced self government in various forms, even though the colonies were under the authority and rule of the King of England. The early colonies organized governance in ways similar to what was familiar to them in England. The head of the English government was, of course, the King. The King, at that time, claimed rule by divine right. The English Parliament was organized in two houses--the House of Lords and the House of Commons. Suffrage was confined to property owners.

Even though the original colonies were established as corporate, proprietary, or royal, the monarchy found that the royal colonies were the most loyal and easy to govern. Therefore, colonies that had been established originally as proprietary or corporate were changed by the monarchy into royal colonies. As the colonies moved from a system of administrative rule to self government, their experience with practicing democracy served as an epistemic shift in their cultural ethos. As the self-governing colonists experienced government with the controlling factor of the monarchy, revolution erupted and democracy took on a new form. Their experience led them to form a government whereby the monarchy could no longer deny them specific freedoms. They enjoyed freedoms of decision-making as to governmental power, sovereignty, taxation, and representation. Let us inquire into how self-government was practiced.

Early America As a Set of Peaceable Kingdoms.[2]

Self-government was the exclusive model for citizenship in colonial times.

Zuckerman captured the essence of this model of governance in his book, *Peaceable Kingdoms*. New England towns in the 1600's were primarily organized as church communities. Newcomers were allowed to enter a community on the condition of compatibility over a three-week period. After that time, if the community dwellers felt the newcomer could fit in peaceably, then the newcomer could stay; if not, they had to move on. This way of handling conflict kept the communities peaceable and like-minded. People took turns being responsible for seeing that the community's needs were met. Hence, the explanation for the title and theme of Zuckerman's book, *Peaceable Kingdoms,* is understood in describing the settlements in New England. The behavior of these "peaceable kingdoms" could function in this manner because the frontier existed. The wide-open spaces allowed for new communities to be started for those people who could not find their niche, so to speak. "Go West" had a profound meaning to those individuals who had a different way of thinking about life styles.

Town meetings were gatherings as a means of developing and maintaining consensus. Consensus was not maintained by simple oppression but through a process of continual discussion and socializing, and that the need for conformity was high because it was necessary to sustaining this kind of dialogue. In an indirect way, it was an educational process for active citizenship. As such, it was not so much conformity as we understand it today as it was conformity to a kind of relationship among citizens. To assure that the city fathers were doing a good job, all citizens attended these town meetings. One could vote if one were a property owner; otherwise, one just listened. One did not raise questions as to why something was done a certain way. One did not become a squeaky wheel for change. One was expected to go along with the group. One did not "rock the boat." Peace among the neighbors under all circumstances was the supreme word of the community. In this way, consensus did not mean oppression but a continuing of dialogue in the normal socialization of the citizens as a form of relationship-building or bonding among citizens. It

was a form of diplomacy working among neighbors and neighborhoods. Colonial self-government developed out of the way colonies were established from the very beginning.

What is very clear to understand is that from the outset, the sovereignty of the government belonged to the people as so stated in the Declaration of Independence. What happened in between the Revolution of 1776 and the Continental Congress in 1787 may have been that the federalists became unhappy with how self government was going. It was easy for them to turn to the British model of representative government--because they were familiar with it. This is a Deweyan thought: one's experience becomes one's practice. However, the practice for much of the populace was self-government. The colonists had started anew--new communities, new forms of government, and a new way of communicating with each other. This was a Gestalt shift from the very beginnings in the colonial era. The town meetings that required dialogue and a continuation of communication by frequent meetings of all the people in discussing mutual concerns of governance elevated the experience from monarchical control to an even playing field. Authoritative governance had been replaced by a true democratic form that focused on "ideal speech conditions."[3] Elias Canetti's model of health in social process describes this 'ideal speech condition.' He maintains that an individual must have space in order to have normal personal human interrelationships.[4] The new citizens found themselves in an environment that enhanced communication in the greater community. This may explain why the new Americans embraced "individualism" as part of their new-found psyche that had its roots in classical liberalism.

Then, however, the tendency toward self-government stalled in the developmental process. With the establishment of a representative government upon the adoption of the United States Constitution in 1787, this reverting back to what had been similarly practiced in England was not a comfortable position for the American people. A change of heart or a change in mind may have been prompted by the fears of true democracy that is evident in The Federalist

Papers.[5]   Publius of <u>The Federalist Papers</u> and the writings by the Anti-Federalists set these fears within a framework that posed the pros and cons of a strong central government versus a small decentralized government. In other words, the fear of true democracy is what motivated the argument in favor of a representative government. Therefore, in order "to form a more perfect union," the delegates at the Continental Congress in 1787 decided to form a representative government, a republican form, rather than a democratic form of government.   Could this work, when a democratic form of government existed in colonial times?

In summary, history tells us that in actuality, even though self-government was practiced, the frame of reference for government stemmed from England. England had parliamentary rule by the people with the King as head of the government. In this setting, government began to take form in the colonies. So when the delegates from the thirteen states met in Philadelphia in 1787, "to form a more perfect union," a representative form of government appealed to the Federalist point of view, as it reflected the basic experience of England.

From whence the dialectical pull–A Representative Government vs. A True Democracy–The Role of Citizens

The Federalist Point of View.

In the *Federalist Papers*, the role of the citizen is given some scrutiny. "Citizen" is mentioned twenty-five times,[6] while the word, "citizens," is mentioned one-hundred fifty-four times.[7] Citizenship is mentioned in Federalist Paper No. 62, in determining the qualifications of a member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, and in Federalist Paper No. 42, in establishing a uniform rule of naturalization throughout the United States.[8] Madison pursued the argument that the republican form of government is recommended over the democratic form of government in Federalist Paper No. 14. He stated that "a democracy . . .

will be confined to a small spot. A republic may be extended over a large region."[9] In Federalist Paper No. 37, he argued that it would be combining stability and energy in government with liberty and a republican form of government. "The genius of republican liberty requires that all governmental power should be derived from the people and that those who are entrusted with power should be kept in a state of dependence on the people by a short duration of their appointment."[10] In Federalist Paper No. 51, he reiterated that the "fountain of all authority is the people." He continued in No. 57 that a "republican government provides the best framework for maintaining the liberty and happiness of the people."

Madison's strongest arguments are made in Federalist Paper No. 10, when he said that: "Democracies have been spectacles of turbulence and contention." Specifically, he argued that the two main differences between a Democracy and a Republic are the "delegation of the Government" and the "greater number of citizens, and greater sphere of country, over which the latter may be extended."[11]   These were in essence the main arguments for a representative government over a democracy as portrayed by the Federalists. Specific guidelines for the role of citizens are not mentioned.

The Anti-Federalist Views.

First of all, who were the Anti-Federalists? Were they really "disreputable characters and obstructionists, always ready to overthrow order and decency?"[12] Were they "men without principle, willing to use any argument to drag down the Constitution?"[13] Were they truly "narrow-minded local politicians, unwilling to face the utter inadequacy of the Articles of Confederation or incapable of seeing beyond the boundaries of their own states or localities?"[14] In actuality, the record demonstrates that the Anti-Federalists "were committed to both union and the states; to both the great American republic and the small, self-governing community; to both commerce and civic virtue; to both private gain and public

good."[15] Many of the Anti-Federalists were not part of the deliberations held in Philadelphia in 1787. They had to learn about the contents of the Constitution after its release to the public, and react immediately before ratification. Not having enough time for rebuttal, their focus of argumentation missed the mark for winning the debate because of a lack of a constitutional plan.

The anti-federalist author in *The Federal Farmer* was preoccupied with representation. In regards to the representative branch, he recommended: "an increase of the numbers of representatives," and, "That the elections of them ought to be better secured."[16] Agrippa, another anti-federalist, argued that a republican form of government would "degenerate to a despotism. . . ." He preferred a confederate form.[17] Brutus argued that "in a large republic, the public good is sacrificed to a thousand views"; . . .and that we have "no example of a free republic. . . ."[18] Brutus primarily based his arguments on the size of the country as too large in a democracy or in a republic, and that the people should know their "rulers."[19] The role of citizens is not made clear even though the sense of self government is recognized as a positive role.   The transition from self-government to representative government, from true democracy to a republican form of government, when the new Constitution was adopted was an abrupt change for the American citizens. It marked a definite break with tradition, in that the Anti-federalists really did represent the dominant revolutionary ethos better than the federalists. It will be demonstrated throughout this chapter that this abrupt change in the way the people practiced governance has left an ambivalence in the ethos of the American people. The gestalt shift that was to take place, to go back to the way things were practiced in England and thus the way the federalists established in the Constitution of 1787, has not taken strong roots even though many attempts to the contrary have been made.   Despite the fact that a representative government continues to enjoy success with the over two-hundred years old Constitution, the transition from self-government to representative government continues to evolve through a ying-yang effect. The revolutionary spirit against big centralized government,

against a national government telling the states what to do, and a demand for a public voice--the people's voice--continues to resonate in the halls of Congress. As a nation, we have been fixing and tampering with this transition ever since.

Republican Form of Government Begins to Show Distress.
    From Self-Government . . .

American citizens originally practiced their democracy in town meetings, school house meetings, and sometimes out on the streets. I believe that in the early years of this nation, the average person felt the need to become involved in governance of the community and of the nation. Today, citizenship as voting once every four years has become the norm for many citizens. Since voting is only one part of what should be the experience of citizenship, what is missing in our processes that makes the practicing of democracy one of diminishing returns for citizens, hence, de-motivating them?

    . . . To Cynicism and Apathy.

We, as a people, find ourselves in the midst of cynicism and apathy toward our American government. Even though extremism and radicalism have been with us from the very beginning, events like the recent bombing of a government facility in Oklahoma, and maiming and killing men, women, and children, are not the American way. Many people have begun to feel that government is not good. I believe that the frustration is from a lack of education and training in citizenship and the ability to practice and experience democracy. These are the root causes of this feeling of apathy by many people in the United States.

According to Louis C. Gawthrop, two other periods of our history were marked with low public confidence in government:

"In the 1880's, when the excesses of political cronyism had

functionally disenfranchised millions of American citizens and in the 1930's, when citizens became almost comatose as public policy stagnated, the public administrative efficiency machine broke down, and economic collapse resulted."[20]

He reported that,

"Faith in democratic government was restored in the first instance by the emergence of a professional career service and in the second by an inventive public administration that combined administrative efficiency with political effectiveness."[21]

"The Growing Chasm Between Citizens and Their Government."

The fear of a "growing chasm between citizens and their government" reflects a previous time, one that resulted in the inauguration of President Jackson. Frederick Mosher[22] called Jackson's election "a turning point in the direction of American society and its government."[23] Seidman and Gilmore highlight the fact that Jackson believed that it was the president's duty "to protect the liberties and rights of the people and the integrity of the Constitution against the Senate, or the House of Representatives, or both together."[24]

Jackson's election promoted an egalitarian philosophy of society that allowed for elections for all the people, instead of the propertied men. The reforms that Jackson espoused were that he wanted to correct the abuses of the business of government by promising to "select men whose diligence and talents will insure in their respective stations able and faithful cooperation."[25] But what Jackson said and actually did were two very different things. In his inaugural address, Jackson commented on what has become, according to Mosher, the "doctrine of the simplicity of public work."[26] Jackson claimed that government work was felt to be very simple and did not require great expertise on the part of its employees. He exclaimed: "The duties of all public offices are . . . so plain and simple . . . ."[27] Jackson's administration expanded the idea that anyone could be a government employee. During Jackson's administration, the institution of the patronage system engulfed government employment. As the

spoils system[28] permeated government employment, graft, corruption, theft and incompetence became prevalent in the ensuing administrations.

Reform Is Needed As a Means to Fix Representative Government.

Calls for reform began in the 1850's but did not have any effect until Grant's Administration. Grant attempted to institute civil service reform but to no avail.[29] The backdrop of Grant's corrupt government cemented the groundwork for social reform. Mosher headlined the period between 1829 (the beginning of Jackson's administration) to 1883 (the passage of the Pendleton Act of 1883) as "Government by the Common Man."[30]

The Pendleton Act of 1883.

Widespread public demand for civil service reform may have been the underlying cause of the Pendleton Act. This demand was brought about by the mounting incompetence, graft, corruption, and theft in the federal departments and agencies. The immediate cause, however, was the assassination of President Garfield in 1881 by a disappointed prospective appointee. Civil service reform became a leading issue in the midterm elections of 1882.

In January, 1883, Congress passed a comprehensive civil service bill-- sponsored by Senator George H. Pendleton of Ohio--providing for the open selection of government employees.[31]   Only about ten (10) per cent of the positions in the federal government were covered by the new laws, but nearly every president after Chester A. Arthur, who signed the bill into law, broadened its scope. By 1980, more than ninety (90) percent of federal employees were protected by the act.[32]

Advocates demanding change for years finally made inroads when the Pendleton Act of 1883 was passed in Congress. The progressive era experienced a fervor for change--whether it was good, or better, or for the best

change possible. No matter how the change would effect the status quo, anything would be better than what was being experienced. However, egalitarianism continued to permeate the landscape of government. This philosophy found its way into The Pendleton Act, and provided the foundation of the merit system. Marc V. Levine et al called the Pendleton Act "a crucial historical landmark in the evolution of the modern United States state."[33]

The Pendleton Act had three main features:

1.   Establishment of competitive examinations for entrance into public service;

2.   Security of tenure for employees; and

3.   Regulations intended to insure neutrality of civil servants.[34]

It also provided :

1.   Ten percent of the positions in federal employment to be reserved for political appointments by the incoming administration--the victors; and

2.   Stabilization in the career service of public employees.

Even though the Pendleton Act's purpose was to instill stability, capability, and expertise, it also had a side effect that was not intended. Levine alludes to this when he refers to the academic hurrah over distinguishing between administration and politics. Its effect was to separate further the government from its citizens.[35]

Civil Service Reform and Woodrow Wilson.

It is not coincidental that Woodrow Wilson, who advocated civil service reform, became president of the National Civil Service Reform League. Four years after the passage of the Pendleton Act, Wilson's famous essay, "The Study of Administration," (1887) is presented as a treatise on the neutrality of administration. His words set the frame for the discussion of separating administration and politics. He based his arguments on the proposition that

administration is neutral. His theme of neutrality permeated his discussion: ". . . administration 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."[36]

> *"Public administration advocates from Woodrow Wilson on believed that it was possible to separate politics--and policy--from administration of government."*[87]

The Politics/Administration Dichotomy--Wilson and Goodnow.

 As debate concerning the distinction between politics and administration ensued, Woodrow Wilson and Frank Goodnow began to discuss in their respective scholarly papers what has become known as the classical politics/administration dichotomy. The discussions focused on determining the executive's role in the execution of policy by those who were elected or appointed versus those who had to administer those policies to execute those policies. Those who make policy are those on the political side of the argument; while those who execute the policy are those on the administration side of the dichotomy. The citizen remained in the background of this discourse, undiscussed.   Policy-making and executing policy were to be done for the citizens, paternalistically. Government employees could do a better job than citizens at policy-making decisions because the experts are more efficient and are trained in the scientific method--or so the argument went.

According to Marc V. Levine et al in The State and Democracy, separating politics from administration "fueled a growing chasm between citizens and their government . . . "[38] But I am jumping ahead of the story. Let us go back to the beginning of public administration, at the time of Wilson's famous essay, "The Study of Administration," in 1887.

The Founding of PA–Public Administration

Nicholas Henry stated that Public Administration began in 1887 with Woodrow Wilson's paper on the "Study of Administration." Even though this work was not widely known or circulated, it became known as the founding treatise for public administration, the work that marked its beginning.[39]

The Heart of My Argument.

The time of the founding of the field of public administration was a moment containing the possibility of fundamental change. One possibility was to adopt a pragmatic form of government, one that involved full citizenship. Another possibility was governance through expert policy making, and this, obviously, was the possibility that was realized. I want to show from an historical perspective how this occurred and why this pattern has persisted over time. The heart of my argument is that the changes recommended as reforms on behalf of the public interest by the generation of social scientists that founded the field of public administration were really more in service of the project of establishing a class of new experts than they were in a project of bringing citizens into the process of governance.

What started out as an adjustment here and an adjustment there eventually changed the direction of governance as what had been in practice the first century of this nation. One can describe it as Michel Foucault's theory of the history of consciousness. White and McSwain[40] explain Foucault's theory as a "movement of human consciousness through time proceeds discontinuously . . . marked by shifts in the episteme that frames consciousness at a given historical moment." What happened at the turn of the century as public administration emerged to become a field of study in academia and to become a force in public policy proved to be an epistemic shift.[41] The new episteme of the times was

grounded in a progressivism which stressed that one can change what one already has by improving upon it through rational action. In other words, in the attempt of making government work better, citizens were left out of taking an active role in governmental processes. The citizens were left out of taking an active role in the direction of government, policy-making, and in the form of operations in governmental processes.

Progressivism.

Richard Hofstadter described it this way.   Progressivism was a "widespread and remarkably good-natured effort of the greater part of society to achieve some not very clearly specified self-reformation."[42] As Hofstadter noted, no clear direction or outline or theory appeared as specifically calling for change. People knew that something had to be done, but nothing specific.   The Populist presidential candidate, LaFollette, in his call for "readjustments of the political order of State and Nation"[43] served as an emblem of the vague impulse toward change that characterized these turbulent times.

In essence, what the social reformers of the times created when raising the rhetorical question of the role of citizens were so-called "adjustments." "Being informed" seemed to be a good role for citizens. The emergence of referendum, initiative, and recall at the state level seemed to be a functional way of implementing some form of direct involvement on behalf of the citizenry. Even the New York Bureau of Municipal Research was very much involved in "citizenship effectiveness."[44] The New York Bureau had a dual purpose: "training for citizenship and for professional public service."[45]   One of the first publications of the Bureau was entitled, Efficient Citizenship, (1907). The purpose of this publication and those to follow was to assert the premise that efficiency made for an "*efficient democratic society*"[46]--stating in essence that efficiency was not inconsistent with democracy.

Science of Administration--The Rage of the Age.

Social reformers seemed to be caught up in the science vogue that was having such an effect on the public. Science became a focus for emulation. Physical and medical sciences served as prototypes for the social sciences as they sought to achieve acceptance as a legitimate voice for change. Metaphors from the physical and medical sciences began to appear in social science literature. The word "adjustment" came out of the health sciences; whereas, the words "efficiency" and "effective" came out of the physical sciences like engineering and physics and especially economics--a social science.

Think Tanks Emerge.

The Russell Sage Foundation,[47] one of the oldest policy institutions in this country, was founded in 1907 under the surge of progressivism and social reform. Its purpose was to conduct research on public health and sanitation, conditions affecting children, working conditions for women, and other issues on the progressive era agenda. The Foundation also played an activist role in legislation. Other institutions began to appear in answer to this need to "fix" or "mend" or provide "preventive medicine" in order to make for an efficient and effective government. The Brookings Institution was founded in 1916, the Twentieth Century Fund, founded as the Cooperative League in 1911, and the National Bureau of Economic Research founded in 1920--all were founded on the scientific metaphor of efficiency.[48]

Other policy institutions began to appear that were dedicated to international issues such as world peace. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace was established in 1910 for the sole purpose of ending war and instituting peace as an end.[49] As the need for other lofty aims were identified, other foundations and institutions were established to provide a source for research findings and information. The scientist was supposed to be an impartial

participant, an unbiased resource, and a nonpartisan expert; hence, the words, "neutral competence" described the new expert elite.

The Convergence of the Expert Class with Principles of Business.

At the turn of the century, the expert class emerged full blown. Two very important concepts materialized at this time. The Pendleton Act of 1883 paved the way for *an expert class*, a very important symbol. On the business side, the Rockefeller Standard Oil Trust was dedicated to *efficient, centralized, and systemized* business practices. Around 1880, the idea of efficiency in business became something to look for and compare to in government. The two concepts converged--the expert class with efficiency, centralization and systems from business that could be a model for government.

The onset of heavy immigration would influence the people's thinking on the government's role, as a twenty (20) million person population increase posed huge problems in social development. This was the time that a model city charter was proposed in 1899 in New York City by Robert Moses. In 1900, Frank Goodnow promoted the idea of separating politics from the administration of government, an idea that became known as the "politics/administration dichotomy." Political reforms began with the "Muckrakers" going after corruption and calling for political reform. All this had a great effect on the course of events.

Social Reforms Affects Citizens Interaction with Government.

The social reform movement had to be one of the greatest underlying reasons that served to change the way citizens and government interacted. I have to repeat here that at the turn of the century, the founding of schools of public administration was a moment for the possibility of fundamental change. One of those possibilities was to form a pragmatic, collaborative government, one that involved full citizenship. The other possibility was to form a government of

expert policy making, and this is the change that was realized. According to Dwight Waldo, the efficient citizenship movement emerged during the Progressive era as the only time in American history that integrated both the "classical, activist type of citizenship and modern equalitarian democracy." Waldo evaluates the success of this movement as "modest, its scope as limited, and its time as brief."[50]

The Influence of the Principles of Scientific Management.

Also, during this time period, entering into the twentieth century, Frederick Taylor presented the *Principles of Scientific Management.* These principles effectively influenced the idea of bringing experts into the field of government. Where were the experts to come from? The universities proved to be resourceful in this respect.

Academia Responds to Fill the Need for Experts.

From the 1880's onward, we experienced the need for efficiency, the need for the education of experts and the need for governmental research. This had a great impact on what the country experienced. Hence, a groundswell of appreciation for expertise in government slowly became accepted by the public. This groundswell of appreciation appeared to get lost in the spirit of the times. Economy, efficiency, and effectiveness appealed to the public. These ideas, accepted by the public, became the tools by which the experts in government began to function. The democratic values of representativeness, responsibility, and responsiveness remained background considerations in designing the new public service.

At the turn of the century, reform-minded citizens set out to make it easier to get through the red-tape of government that swelled with political corruption, graft, and the ill effects of the spoils' system.   These reformers sought the help of business in organizing bureaus of municipal research to make for a more efficient

government. Forty to fifty bureaus were formed in the larger cities across the nation. The most prominent of these was the New York Bureau of Municipal Research which was incorporated in 1907. The New York Bureau instituted the Training School for Public Service in 1911. Early on, the Training School became associated with the Institute of Public Administration and eventually became part of the IPA. The IPA became affiliated with Columbia University.[51] The Training School became the forerunner to the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs.   By 1928, the IPA became the National Institute of Public Administration (NIPA). As these were in their developing stages, Smith tells us that "a fundamental change in the notion of citizenship" occurred.[52] As the cry for a more efficient government grew louder, the need for scientific expertise expanded. While the New York Bureau was distributing pamphlets and reports under the title of Efficient Citizenship, one of its leaders, Henry Breure was quoted as saying that "the need for professional service in behalf of citizen interests" had become necessary.[53] The die was cast. The need for trained public servants became paramount in meeting the challenges of social reform to combat political corruption, graft, and the ill effects of the spoils' system.

The influence of academia became great. The growth of programs in academia to provide the needed supply of experts created a new dimension in the university's mission.   Dual goals of educating people for good citizenship and training people for governmental service converged two different concepts. Citizenship evolved into a new meaning--citizenship became synonymous with training for governmental service. Good citizenship and liberal education became the training ground for governmental service. As citizenship remained a high goal, the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Service at Syracuse University was established as it took over the responsibility of training public personnel from the Institute of Public Administration.   The Training School for Public Service which began in 1911 was under the aegis of the Institute.[54] It sounded too good to be true. Reinforcing a good regime value--citizenship--with public service. The meaning of citizenship as a civic virtue whereby citizens were actively involved in

the governance processes was lost to a new meaning--citizens as public servants not as private individuals**.**

The Influence of Science--Neutral Competence.

Science became the motivation for the dual goals of educating people for good citizenship while still training "the best and the brightest" for government service. Scientific research reinforced the need for reform but added another burden to colleges and universities--to train people in the scientific method, including the social sciences.   Science came to be viewed as the key to all progress. Science could legitimize the importance of university education because *science* gave credence to social reforms. With emphasis on science and scientific training, educating for expertise in the social sciences became the engine for social reform. It became important to incorporate studies such as sociology, anthropology, and psychology into the *social sciences*. The scientific method became the basis and foundation in developing these fields of study.

All of this emphasis on the scientific method placed an added burden on universities to train people in the sciences. The schools of public administration began to emerge out of the political science field of study.   As an emerging expert class developed, the influence of academic credentials sustained the perceived need for an expert class. Institutions fulfilled the needs of government in providing research and technical expertise. The development of policy-making processes surfaced as a key element in the study of public administration.

As we approached the 1920's, three main concepts began to form a construct:

1.	Much stronger emphasis on governmental reform;

2.	Scientific management, as espoused by Frederick Taylor, became a new emphasis within public administration; and

3.	Application of science in business and government.

63

Presidential Commissions Attempt To Reform Government.

The idea of reform was given a big boost with the Taft Commission on Economy and Efficiency in 1913. The staff experts and the leadership on that commission made recommendations on how to make government more efficient, more economical, and more effective.[55] The two Hoover Commissions of 1945 and 1955, respectively, served to bring expertise into public service as more and more people were applying with academic credentials.

Expert policy making and expertise tended to drive citizens away from deliberating on public policy. The means for the citizens to be involved in the policy making processes was not readily available because the experts began doing the job for the people. It sounded and appeared to be for the good of the people and for the public interest. However, on the way to reform, the self interest of public administration materialized and took over.

The Civil Service reforms that had begun with the Pendleton Act of 1883 re-surfaced. These reforms protected public servants from politics, established criteria for qualifications for government work, incorporated a career service corps of dedicated public servants, and provided an opportunity for the government workforce to represent the country geographically from the general population. The Classification Act of 1923 and other mechanisms were instituted as a way of creating a better bureaucracy.

Public Administration As A Field of Study.

Leonard White authored the first text for the study of public administration, The Introduction to the Study of Public Administration in 1926. The study of public administration as a separate field of study is considered seriously but the turf war between public administrationists and political scientists continued. Wilson and Goodnow's "politics/administration dichotomy" placed the emphasis on the separation of the two entities. "Goodnow and his fellow public

administrationists believed that "public administration should center in the government's bureaucracy."[56] Political Science departments in universities claimed ownership of public administration study and sought to keep it from being separated. However, public administration as a separate field of study has developed and flourished. The turf war between political science and public administration departments continues to the present day. What we are concerned with in this paper is that the model of citizenship that emerged during this time period placed the expert elite *in loco parentis.*

Political Science Is a Politics for Science.

Charles Merriam, a prominent student of American Democracy, believed that the study of politics of science should remain the politics for science.[57] This meant that the study of politics should be taught as a form of science using scientific methods. The tension mounted between democratic ideals and the findings of empirical research. Merriam encouraged two of his students, Harold Gosnell and Harold Lasswell, to study the psychological aspects of political behavior. Lasswell[58] became the resident expert on the psychopathology of politics. He believed that the role of the public in decision making should be limited and that the decision making should be left to those few persons who were capable of making rational decisions because they required intelligence.

Scientific Research Used To Convey Public Incompetence in Public Policy Decision Making.

Gosnell proposed that special tests should be given to the public to weed out "undesirables" from voting. He belonged to the chorus of social scientists who were calling for "an aristocracy of intellect and character."[59] During the meeting of the American Political Science Association (APSA) in 1934, the presidential candidate of the APSA, Walter Shepard, called upon his fellow

academics: "men of brains," to "seize the torch."[60]   David Ricci took the political scientists to task in <u>Tragedy of Political Science</u>, in that they were producing studies "to undermine the very object which the discipline was professionally committed to support, namely, the democratic polity."[61]

Democratic Realists vs. Democratic Idealists.

The adequacy of ordinary citizens to handle governmental work became a platform on behalf of the emerging expert class. Robert B. Westbrook explored this part of history examining the work done by Lewis M. Terman, Edwin G. Boring, and William S. McDougall, prominent psychologists of the early part of the twentieth century. To prove their contention that average citizens were not capable of practicing hands-on democracy and to decry participatory democracy, they pointed to the intelligence tests that were administered to 1.7 million soldiers during World War I. The results demonstrated that between "60 and 70 percent of the soldiers tested were mentally deficient."[62]

Proving a Point with Scientific Research.

Terman, Boring, and McDougall defended the reliability and validity of the tests. To emphasize his beliefs, McDougall wrote a book, entitled, <u>Is America Safe for Democracy?</u>   McDougall strained the argument to the extreme when he suggested that making democracy egalitarian would be dangerous for a stable government. He used the tests to "support a racialist theory of the politics of cultural degeneration . . . "[63]   Edward A. Purcell's book, <u>Crisis of Democratic Theory</u>, is critical of the democratic realists who were biased against participatory democracy. The realists identified the idealists as proponents of a theory of radical democracy, a kind of democracy that was dangerous. The democratic realists took the opportunity to demonstrate to the public through the proofs of scientific research and study. They jumped on the bandwagon of psychological

testing to prove government work was too difficult for the average American and that government work required trained and educated personnel.

Psychological and Educational Testing.

Three main streams of thought were converging that eventually brought the interest of psychological and educational testing to fruition.[64] First of all, as modern science began to take hold in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the scientific method became a source of interest in the biological sciences. Scientific experiments were being conducted in physiology in Europe, especially in Germany. As the research began to spread to cover all parts of the human anatomy, interest in psychology became a subject for scientific experiments. The second main stream of thought was brought in by Darwin's Origin of Species in 1859. England's Sir Francis Galton, sparked by Darwinian biology, took an interest in differences in humans. In Germany, psychological studies were focused on the general traits of humans.[65] The third stream of thought involved an interest in deviant behavior. These three main streams of thought converged in what has become one of the most influential and widely utilized scientific tools of social research to date.

It became the fashion for American students to study abroad, especially in Germany. James McKeen Cattell did his graduate studies in Germany and became exposed to Galton's work. When Cattell returned to the United States, he continued in this type of psychological study, using the techniques of statistical analysis that he had learned in Germany. One of Cattell's students, E. L. Thorndike, took a great interest in psychological testing and is known for influencing the spread of standardized educational testing.[66] R. L. Thorndike and E. Hagen gave this historical insight in their book, Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education, that through the translations of Alfred Binet's work[67], Lewis Terman produced the intelligence tests used in this country. Binet's work in France focused on the maladjusted individual. Binet and his colleagues

developed measures for intelligence. Based on Binet's work, Terman presented the most influential psychological tests to date, the *Stanford-Binet.* America was fertile ground for this new scientific tool. From the years 1900 to 1915, mental tests in America were known as the pioneer years; the years from 1915 to 1930 were known as the "boom" period.[68]   This is the backdrop upon which the expert elites began to weave their argument that public policy decision making required expertise.

Governmental Reforms--The Models for the Role of Citizens Emerge.

All the presidential commissions, starting with the Taft Commission, give resounding lip service to the purpose of making government work better--in the sense of being more of responsive to the citizenry.   The Brownlow Commission Reforms of 1937 and the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 (APA) were mechanisms designed to improve governments' response to the public. The APA produced the famous "Sunshine Laws," which held that citizens could have access to public documents. Participation by citizens meant access to public hearings and access to the Federal Register. Social reform may have just been lip service to the public in stating that government reform meant more accessibility of government to the citizens.   In reality, reform proved to be ways to "fix" government.   Because the experts were managing government, the citizens could only observe, read, and/or listen.

Why have these efforts to involve citizens failed at giving citizens the experience of authentic dialogue with their government? Although we are primarily focusing on the federal level of government, state government is also included in this indictment. At the local level, much depends on the state and on how each community has been able to develop a tradition of citizen involvement. If that tradition has been established early on, it is easy to continue.

The Development of Federal Standards for Citizen Participation.

Cahn and Passett commented on the development of Federal standards for citizen participation during the sixties. They concluded that one must begin with the "New England town meetings, Madison's analysis in The Federalist and Jefferson's philosophy."[69] Cahn and Passett have chosen the beginning of the twentieth century, when citizens and public officials began to interrelate. They cite the creation of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in 1912, whose initial purpose was to "give business and industry a formal advisory role in public decisions."[70] It is interesting to note that giving business and industry an advisory role in public decisions was equated with giving citizens a public role. An advisory role for citizens also occurred in the Farm Bureaus, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), and the Resettlement and Farm Security Administration.

As one reviews the New Deal programs of the 1930's, one can find examples of citizen participation in the management of government agencies. The role of citizens participating in government agencies varied from program to program. For example, in the 1930's, the Farm Services Administration called for citizen participation to "build a political power base."[71] The Department of Agriculture developed a model program that provided both the theory and practice of citizen participation.[72] Despite the Department of Agriculture's efforts to develop a model for citizen participation, it was not until the passage of the APA that minimum standards of assurance were instituted that gave the public the opportunity to contribute to the administrative decision-making process.

However, the APA did not define how to involve citizens in this administrative process. Citizens were left to their own ingenuity and determination on how to become involved. The concept of involving citizens in the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) was called "voluntary association," but in reality, this was a method of cooptating citizens into an administrative apparatus that was viewed as democratizing society.[73] "TVA--the Grass Roots Democracy" did not adapt so much to the people as to the "existing institutions and centers of power."[74]

According to Cahn and Passett, the phrase "citizen participation" was

introduced in 1954 by the Urban Renewal Administration. "Meaningful participation" was rarely seen in the urban renewal programs of the fifties and sixties.[75] This laid the groundwork for the development of Federal standards for citizen participation that were implemented in the 1960's. When the seventies arrived, many attempts to involve citizens in the management processes of governance occurred in budgeting, personnel, planning, purchasing and in public hearings.

The greatest gain for citizen involvement occurred in 1979. Funds were made available for citizens to be a part of the decision-making processes. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) made the following recommendations regarding citizen participation:

1.   Citizen participation must be at each level of government.

2.   Citizen participation is required in federal aid programs to assure positive and consistent federal policy.[76]

The ACIR evaluations of the federal programs revealed that public administrators were frustrated by the recommendations to involve citizens in the government processes. They did not know how to involve citizens. The guidelines were said to be unclear and the goals not specific.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare found:

> "Attempts to conduct a study in a participatory spirit confirmed . . . many citizens were unhappy about the way in which Government operates. It further revealed that citizens were reluctant to do business with government officials. They were suspicious of the rhetoric of 'openness' and often believed that citizen participation was a ruse for cooptation or propagandizing."[77]

The distrust of government officials by citizens fascinated Toner and Toner. In their perspective, "Citizen participation is an interactive process, involving an exchange of important information between public officials and citizens for use in planning and decision making."[78] With all the attempts made in the name of increasing citizen participation in the last half of the twentieth century, very few have come close to resembling what Dewey exclaimed in his belief of experiencing

democracy. Two divergent views continue to surface on the landscape of governance--limited participation and maximum participation.

Forester and Benveniste discussed the citizen's role in the policy process. Forester advocated the inclusion of citizens along with business and government officials in working together throughout the entire policy making process. Benveniste, on the other hand, believed that it is quite adequate to include only the power brokers in the policy making process. In other words, Benveniste closed the door to citizen participation. He included only those persons necessary to get a policy enacted and implemented. Benveniste admitted that open participation is time consuming. He preferred "a form of selective participation."[79] Forester, on the other hand, believed that the open forum provided "a dialogue among planners, clients, developers, citizen groups, and other stakeholders. . . ."[80] Forester and Benveniste captured the essence of our dilemma in practicing participatory democracy.

One way of renewing citizens' faith in government is to revitalize the conceptual crown jewel of public administration--the "public interest." Charles Goodsell[81] revived the "Public Interest" Model as presented in 1936 by E. Pendleton Herring. Goodsell argued the "public interest" from the point of view of Legality-Morality, Political Responsiveness, Political Consensus, Concern for Logic, Concern for Effects, and Agenda Awareness.[82] He reviewed the old arguments that put a death knell on "public interest." Goodsell's arguments for the importance of the "public interest" as serving as the purpose for civil servants challenges the nay-sayers.   For example, Charles Lindblom publicly stated that the concept "public interest" was not more than what the individual public administrator wanted it to be from his personal perspective.[83] In essence, Lindblom argued that the "public interest" was a nice concept but in reality, there was no "public interest" so to speak.

Camilla Stivers developed a model of citizenship in her dissertation, Active Citizenship. She made the argument that before public administration could achieve legitimacy in governance, the people must be included in the process of

dialogue. She identified this process of dialogue as active citizenship. Stivers'
chapter entitled, "Active Citizenship and Public Administration" in <u>Refounding</u>
<u>Public Administration</u>, described the added dimension that supported White's
"Authority/Participation debate," Wamsley's "Agential Leadership," and the
centerpiece of public administration, Goodsell's "Public Interest Model."[84]

  In the beginning, expert elites were considered "guardians and philosopher
kings."[85] However, Bruce MacLaury is a little more cautionary in his assertion of
what is expected of expert elites. He stated: "From the 19th century battles
between social Darwinists and social reformers to today's contentions between
libertarians and pragmatists, the role of expert knowledge in service to political
power has been in dispute."[86]   As we consider the role of citizens and the role of
expert elites in governance, it must be taken in context with politics. Attempting to
distinguish the difference between politics and administration has been the subject
for theoretical discussions over the years since Wilson introduced the idea in 1887
and Goodnow promoted it in 1900. It is Dwight Waldo who seemed to have the
last word on attempting to distinguish the difference when he stated that "public
administration is properly served by multiple theories, perspectives, strategies, and
roles, and by a situational, pragmatic adaptation of means to ends."[87]

Conclusion

  As this review shows, efforts have been made to involve citizens in
governance since the founding of public administration. Despite these many
attempts to recognize citizen involvement as a viable force in the government
processes, citizens feel that the forces have missed their mark. Public
Administration literature has been deluged with insightful writings regarding ways
to make government more accessible to citizens. However, few theorists have
provided adequate building blocks upon which to forge a foundation for a
pragmatic role model for citizens. Those theorists who have provided the building
blocks will be illustrated in the discussion of John Dewey's developing theory of

American Democracy.

The American founding placed the sovereignty of the government in the hands of the people--as so stated in the Declaration of Independence. Self-government proved to be the exclusive model for citizenship in colonial times. In the typical early communities of the 1600's, peace for the sake of peace appeared to be the rule of thumb. However, the form of government that was adopted seemed to replicate what was experienced in England.

As the country prepared itself for the twentieth century, social reform became a calling. Governmental reforms stressed efficiency, economy, and effectiveness. The drive for reform overshadowed the role of citizens. For decades, the spoils system and the abuse by employees under the patronage system caused dismay in the public. In response to this abuse of public power, of public monies, and of the public trust, social reformers of the progressive movement sought ways to reform government. In 1883, the Pendleton Act was passed, thus instituting the merit system. Just as with anything new to a system, the institutionalization of the merit system and the implementation of the Pendleton Act took time. In the meantime, the social reformers were hard at work taking their new role seriously. Just as engineers and scientists were designing the workplace for more effectiveness and efficiency, so then, it was thought, one could compare industry or business with government.

The social reformers suggested that an informed public seemed to be the answer for an effective government. Citizenship became a catchword for institutions of higher learning. The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University took over the work started by the Training School for Public Service which had begun with the New York Bureau of Municipal Research.

Early governmental reforms tended to submerge authentic participatory roles for citizens in the policy-making processes. However, some public administrators did actively seek to include citizens in governance. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations developed efforts in demonstrating to citizens that government was accessible and working for the people.

In all the models of citizenship in governance that have been either proposed by public administration theorists or by government sponsorship, citizens have been given a token role in governance. Until the environment is created whereby citizens are able to practice democracy on a regular basis through the communication vehicle of authentic dialogue, citizens will continue to feel alienated from their government.   Educating citizens for active involvement in governance is the cornerstone of citizenship in a democracy.

Endnotes

1.   John D. Hicks, <u>The Federal Union: A History of the United States to 1877</u>. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, The Riverside Press, 1957, pp. 52-92.

2.   Michael Zuckerman, <u>Peaceable Kingdoms</u>. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1970.

3.   Orion F. White, "Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate,'" <u>Refounding Public Administration</u> by Gary L. Wamsley et al, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1990, p. 208.

4.   Ibid., pp. 198-200.   For further information on Canetti's ideas on social pathology, read Orion White's chapter on "Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate." Canetti's book <u>Crowds and Power</u> is an in-depth description of his thinking.

5.   Refer to FP#10 in <u>The Federalist</u>. Edited by Jacob E. Cooke, Middletown, Connecticut: Wesleyan University Press, Third Printing, 1989, pp. 61-64.

6.   Federalist Papers #'s 2, 8, 10, 21, 35, 38, 40, 44, 45, 48, 52, 54, 55, 57, 59, 62, 65, 70, 75, and 78.

7.   Federalist Papers #'s 2, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 72, 78, 80, 81, 83, 84, and 85.

8.   Alexander Hamilton, John Jay and James Madison. <u>The Federalist</u>. Ed. Michael Loyd Chadwick, Springfield, Virginia: Global Affairs Publishing Company, 1987, p. 334 and p. 229 respectively.

9.   Ibid., p. 69

10.   Ibid., p. 190.

11.   Ibid., p. 62.

12.   Hicks, p. 212.

13.   Murray Dry, "Preface," <u>The Anti-Federalist</u>, Ed. By Herbert J. Storing, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985, p. 1.

14.   Ibid., p. 1.

15.   Ibid., p. 4.

16.   "The Federal Farmer" Letter #VII, December 31, 1787, <u>The Anti-Federalist</u>, Ed. By Herbert J. Storing, Preface by Murray Dry, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985, p. 74.

17.   "Agrippa" Letter #VI, December 3, 1787, <u>The Anti-Federalist</u>, p. 235.

18.   "Brutus" Letter #1, October 18, 1787, p. 113.

19.   Ibid., pp. 114-116.

20.   Louis C. Gawthrop, "Toward an Ethical Convergence of Democratic Theory and Administrative Politics," in <u>A Centennial History of the American Administrative State</u>. Edited and Introduction by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1987, pp. 189-190.

21.   Ibid., p. 190.

22.   Frederick C. Mosher, <u>Democracy and the Public Service</u>, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., Second Edition, 1982, p. 56-82.

23.   Ibid., p. 64.

24.   Harold Seidman and Robert Gilmour. <u>Politics, Position, and Power</u>. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., Fourth Edition, 1986, p. 67.

25.   Ibid., p. 65. Quoted from James D. Richardson, Ed. <u>Messages and Papers of the Presidents</u>, Vol. II (Bureau of National Literature and Art, 1903), p. 438.

26.   Mosher, p. 65.

27.   Ibid., p. 65.

28.   The term "spoils system" refers to Senator William L. Marcy of New York in 1832: "They see nothing wrong in the rule, that to the victor belong the spoils of the enemy." (As quoted in Leonard D. White, <u>The Jacksonians</u>, New York, Macmillan, 1954, p. 320).

29.   Mosher, pp. 66-69.

30.   Ibid., p. 64.

31.   To be administered by a Civil Service Commission and guaranteeing the right of citizens to compete for federal appointment without regard to politics, religion, race or national origin.

32.   Encyclopedia Britannica, Chicago, Illinois: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Vol. 9, 1993 edition, pp. 207-209.

33.   Marc V. Levine, Carol MacLennan, John J. Kushma, Charles Noble, with Jeff Faux, and Marcus G. Raskin. The State and Democracy: Revitalizing America's Government. New York: Routledge, 1988, p. 55.

34.   Ibid., p. 55.

35.   Ibid., p. 55.

36.   Woodrow Wilson, "The Study of Administration," (1887), in Classics of Public Administration. Edited by Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde. 36. Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987, p.20.

37.   Levine, p. 54.

38.   Ibid, p. 56.

39.   Nicholas Henry, "The Emergence of Public Administration as a Field of Study," A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1987, p. 39. Note: Countering this proclamation is Paul P. Van Riper who states that it is Alexander Hamilton who is the father of the administrative state not Woodrow Wilson nor the reference Wilson cited in the person of Dorman B. Eaton.

40.   Orion F. White, Jr., and Cynthia J. McSwain. "The Phoenix Project: Raising A New Image of Public Administration From the Ashes of the Past.", in Henry D. Kass and Bayard L. Catron (eds.) Images and Identities in Public Administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publishing Co., 1990, pp. 23-59.

41.   I agree with White and McSwain in explaining the difference between Foucault's "episteme," and Kuhn's "paradigm." A paradigm shift is incommensurable; whereas, an epistemic shift is an historic movement of human consciousness.

42.   Richard Hofstadter,   Age of Reform: From Bryan to FDR. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1955, p. 5.

43.   Ibid., p. 89.

44.   Chester A. Newland, Public Administration and Community: Realism in the Practice of Ideals. Public Administration Service, November, 1984, p. 12.

45.   Ibid., p. 10.

46.   James A. Smith,   The Idea Brokers: Think Tanks and The Rise of the New Policy Elite. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1991, pp. 50-51.

47.   Ibid., p. 290.

48.   Ibid., p. 17.

49.   Ibid., p. 297.

50.   Dwight Waldo, "Politics and Administration: On Thinking about a Complex Relationship," A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York: Macmillan, Inc., 1987, p. 111.

51.   Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor A. Thompson. Public Administration. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., Sixteenth printing, October, 1974, p. 18.

52.   Smith, p. 50.

53.   Ibid., p. 51.

54.   Paul P. Van Riper, "The American Administrative State: Wilson and the Founders," in A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited and Introduction by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, a Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1987, p. 20.

55.   Presidential commissions that seek some kind of reform always tend to emphasize the principles of economy and efficiency.

56.   Nicholas Henry, "The Emergence of Public Administration as a Field of Study," in A Centennial History of the American Administrative State. Edited and Introduction by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York, N.Y.: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc., 1987, p. 40.

57.   Robert B. Westbrook. John Dewey and American Democracy. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1991, p. 280.

58.   Ibid, pp. 282-285.

59.   Ibid., p. 285.

60.   Ibid., p. 285. See Walter Shepard, "Democracy in Transition," American Political Science Review 29, (1935): 18-19, 20.

61.   Ibid., p. 281.

62.   Ibid., p. 282.   It should be noted that many foreigners served in World War I to gain citizenship.

63.   Ibid., p. 282.

64.   Robert L. Thorndike and Elizabeth Hagen, <u>Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Second Edition, Seventh Printing, March, 1967, pp. 3-6.

65.   Ibid., p. 4.

66.   Ibid., p. 5.

67.   Ibid., p. 4.

68.   Ibid., pp. 5-6.

69.   Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett, Editors., <u>Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change</u>. Published in cooperation with the New Jersey Community Action Training Institute, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971, p. 130.

70.   Ibid., p. 130.

71.   <u>Citizen Participation</u>. Community Services Administration, Washington, D. C., 1978, p. 13.

72.   Vincent Mathews, <u>Citizen Participation: an analytical study of the Literature Prepared for the Community Relations Service</u>. Washington, D.C. Catholic University of America, June, 1968, p. 38.

73.   Philip Selznick,   "The Cooptative Mechanism," in <u>Classics</u> of Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, Eds. Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1987, p. 197.

74.   Mathews, p. 41.

75.   Cahn and Passett, p. 45.

76.   <u>In Brief.   Citizen Participation in the American Federal System</u>. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D. C. August, 1979, pp. 34-35.

77.   New Carroll Toner and Walter B. Toner, Jr. <u>Citizen Participation: Building a Constituency for Public Power</u>. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1978, p. iii.

78.   Ibid., p. 1.

79.   Jay D. White, "From Modernity to Postmodernity: Two Views of Planning and Public Administration," <u>Book Reviews I</u> in <u>Public Administration Review</u>. November/December, 1991, Vol. 51, No. 6, p. 565.

80.   Ibid., p. 565.

81.   Charles T. Goodsell, "Public Administration and the Public Interest," in <u>Refounding Public Administration</u>, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1990, pp. 96-113.

82.   Ibid., p. 112.

83.   Charles Lindblom served as the Guest Speaker for Hightable at Virginia Tech's Center for Public Administration in Blacksburg, March, 1992.

84.   Orion F. White, "Reframing the Authority/Participation Debate," pp. 238-241; Gary L. Wamsley, "The Agency Perspective," pp. 148-155; Charles T. Goodsell, "Public Administration and the Public Interest," pp. 96-113; Camila M. Stivers, "Active Citizenship and Public Administration, pp. 246-273, in <u>Refounding Public Administration</u>.   Further discussion in Ch. 5.

85.   Donald N. McClosky is John F. Murray Professor of Economics and Professor of History, University of Iowa, from his book, <u>Crisis of Late Modernism</u>, quoted in <u>The Idea Brokers</u>, cover.

86.   Bruce MacLaury is President of Brookings Institution, quoted in <u>The Idea Brokers</u>, cover.

87.   Dwight Waldo, "Politics and Administration: On Thinking about a Complex Relationship," <u>A Centennial History of the American Administrative State</u>. Edited by Ralph Clark Chandler, New York: MacMillan, Inc., 1987, p. 108.