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Ancestral Roots

In the spring of 1915, Luther Halsey Gulick III was completing work for a master’s degree in the Oberlin (Ohio) Theological Seminary. Having graduated from Oberlin College the previous year, he was preparing to emulate several generations of notable ancestors and become a Christian missionary. But during the year, he and his fiancée Helen Swift, a fellow Oberlin graduate, gave much thought to this prospect, and to alternatives.

"The more [we] thought about the needs of mankind, the more we were both convinced that my best contribution would be through social work and government, not through foreign missions and religion.

"The decision to devote my life .... to public law and administration came about not as a rejection of fundamental religion, but as an alternative, and what seemed to me to be for my generation a more productive and revolutionary way to achieve the goals of human welfare and dignity in the progressive unfolding of the universe.

"I came to recognize that values, codes of social behavior and responsibility, concepts of right and wrong, and the vitality of spiritual life are more the natural essence and dynamic of human life in our Universe than they are the fruits of the various religions."^1

The decision made, Luther pursued this cause with the same zeal and energy that his great-grandfather had given to bringing Christianity to the Hawaiian natives three generations earlier. By midlife Luther was one of the most prominent and prolific figures in American public administration, and for the last half century, one of the most frequently cited.

The transition of missionary fervor from the cause of saving souls to that of reforming government reflected the evolution of moral perspectives in the course of the nineteenth century. In 1827 Luther’s great-grandfather Peter Johnson Gulick, on being ordained as a Presbyterian minister had joined the mission service and been assigned to Hawaii, where he spent his entire career. Peter had

1 Unpublished autobiographical notes on his early life, dictated in 1977.
been moved to apply by an exhortation to the Princeton seminarians from a missionary on home leave, to become missionaries because "unless the poor heathen have an opportunity to hear the Christian message they will have to burn forever in hell." Skeptical seminarians asked why they should go to primitive foreign lands when there were so many heathen at home who needed saving. "The reason," they were told, "is that the heathen here at home at least have the opportunity of hearing the gospel, but the primitive heathen have no such opportunity and will have to burn through no fault of their own." unless, the missionary argued in a way that persuaded Peter, Christian missionaries gave them that opportunity.

In Hawaii, Peter fathered eight children, of whom seven survived and themselves became missionaries. The eldest, who became our Luther's grandfather, was named Luther Halsey, he studied both medicine and theology with the intention of becoming a medical missionary, but his talents for writing, speaking and administration led him to change the emphasis of his missionary career. He had five children of whom one, Sidney, became our Luther's father. Sidney also studied for the ministry and eventually joined the mission service, going to Japan in 1892. Luther Halsey III was born in Osaka, in 1892.

Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, radical changes

---

2 "Luther Halsey was a Princeton professor who befriended Peter Gulick when the latter was a student.
3 The first Luther Halsey bestowed the name on another son, our Luther's uncle, who became a noted specialist in physical education and recreation.
4 Luther Halsey III was the second of five children, who included his older sister Sue and three younger siblings--Sidney, Leeds and Ethel. His father and family were actually stationed in the provincial town of Kumamoto at the time, but for Luther's birth his mother went to Osaka, where western-trained doctors were available.
were emerging in the doctrinal views of many Protestant groups, respecting morality, personal ethics, and social responsibility, as expressed in the teachings of Jesus. Peter's descendants subscribed to and helped promote, the new thinking. His son John (our Luther's great uncle) was a prime example—he studied biology along with theology, wrote scholarly monographs on the evolution of shellfish in Hawaii, corresponded with Charles Darwin, and published a book on evolution in which he dismissed out of hand the fundamentalist objection to the concept of evolution.

Father Sidney Gulick stressed the social consciousness of Christianity, and contended that preaching Christ's social message was as important as saving souls. He broke with traditional doctrines in rejecting the notion of damnation and hellfire "God, being a loving father, can do nothing unjust." And he gave up trying to reconcile the behavior of nominally Christian nations with religion, and concluded that governments of Christendom were not in fact Christian, that they were instead "armed camps with machinery in preparation for mutual slaughter."5

Working with the Japanese, Sidney acquired an increasing respect for the people and their culture. In 1903 he published a book, *The Evolution of the Japanese*, in which he maintained that while their biological and cultural traits were distinctive, Japanese basic capacities at least equalled those of other races.

In the Gulick household the religious rituals were simple, with a minimum of formality—Sunday school and church services on the Sabbath, prayer meeting and other gatherings during the week, grace at table—with a minimum of panoply and sensory appeal. Emphasis was on the understanding, in intellectual terms, of the relation between man and God. Such a philosophy differs from the run-of-

the-mill missionary approach in the belief that true principles must be discovered—that they are not handed down on tablets of stone but rather must be pursued and captured, by all the resources of the intellect. Moreover, they are not unchanging, rather they are vectors of the evolving social and technological environment, and so themselves evolve.

His home life imprinted permanently on young Luther the values of morality, ethical behavior, and social consciousness, along with the conviction that mankind can improve itself by rightly directed effort. In his frame of reference, this means intellectual effort—discovering, defining and elucidating the principles of human conduct that, if applied, will promote the general welfare. And once discovered, such principles can be passed on to all who are willing to recognize the truth once it is convincingly shown to them.

Education

Luther got his early education in Japan, where he was privately tutored. School work and reading went badly until the discovery, when he was eight, of deficient eyesight. He was sent to Tokyo for glasses; thereafter he spent several months with his father's uncle John, the scientist missionary, who taught him to read. However—

......the late start and the verbal method of instruction left me a very slow reader all my life. Reading was always an uncomfortable necessity, never a pleasant escape or pleasure......I very seldom read a book or an article just for the fun of it until decades later, chiefly after I retired.

Despite this disclaimer, he managed to cover a formidable amount of printed material in the course of his career, and to keep in touch with major developments in the social and natural sciences.

Further elementary schooling was in Oakland California public schools, and one year in the Marburg Germany Oberschule. Secondary school was in the
Hotchkiss, Connecticut, private academy where his tuition was covered by a scholarship; he concentrated on Greek and mathematics, while his main extracurricular activities were public speaking and debate, and the school literary society. He was first in his class for three years; however some outspoken opposition to hazing, and his zeal in his junior year in organizing his team and winning the school debate (the question concerned whether Taft or Roosevelt should get the 1912 Presidential nomination) provoked resentment in conservative circles that led to withdrawal of his scholarship. Thereupon he applied to Oberlin College (where his sister Sue was already enrolled) and was admitted to the class of 1914.

Finances were the most difficult problem at the beginning. He made out by doing odd jobs, and gradually built up a yard maintenance business, with three employees and his own equipment, and did a variety of summer jobs. Academic work went well, despite poor eyesight, and in his first term he made the Dean's list. He majored in political science, and took courses in chemistry, psychology, mathematics, English, and art. His most important extracurricular activities were oratory and debate, and he polished the skills in communication which were the foundation of much of his later fame. And he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

Luther's work in political science had reinforced the ethical bent of his early immersion in ethical concepts toward a conviction that it is the responsibility of society, working through government as well as other institutions, to enable all its members to secure their basic needs, and to share fairly in the fruits of social and economic progress.

Moreover, the decision in his first graduate year to switch careers was taken in an age of reform. Widespread indignation and growing protests were being stimulated by withering documentation, by the great muckrakers of the early twentieth century, of corruption and incompetence in both government
and business, this at a time when rapid industrialization and urbanization were requiring an increasing volume and variety of government services. Responding to public pressure, federal and state legislatures were producing a flood of innovational legislation, much of which involved the use of government to check private sector abuses.\footnote{See David Mark Chalmers, *The Social and Political Ideas of the The Muckrakers*, Arno Press, 1964; and Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, Knopf, 1977.}

Two other movements of the age bore on Luther’s career choice. One was the scientific management movement initiated by Frederick W. Taylor, who was primarily interested in the techniques of performing given functions, beginning with such simple tasks as shoveling ore, so as to minimize the required inputs of both energy and materials. While the root of scientific management is the time and motion study, the concept has wider implications—it connotes not only the use of physical resources but the whole range of factors that affect the potential for efficiency and economy of "scientific" work methods and organizational forms.

The other conceptual innovation concerned efficient administration of organizations, both public and private. While in the United States interest in techniques of effective public administration, beginning with adequate records and accounts, dates back at least to Alexander Hamilton when he was Secretary of the Treasury in Washington’s Administration,\footnote{Including, at the federal level, the Interstate Commerce Act of 1887, the Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890, the Pure Food and Drug Act of 1906, the Clayton Antitrust Act of 1914, and the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914.} a more prevalent attitude had been that of Andrew Jackson, who justified the spoils system on the grounds that any citizen should be able to perform any governmental function. This view more or less prevailed until the 1880’s, when the first civil service system had\footnote{See Paul Van Riper, “The American Administrative State: Wilson and the Founders—An Unorthodox View,” *Public Administration Review*, 43/6, Nov.-Dec. 1983, pp. 477-490.}
been installed in the federal government. Woodrow Wilson, in the celebrated article published shortly thereafter (in the *Political Science Quarterly* of June 1887), introduced the modern concept of *public administration*, distinguishing "policy"—deciding what to do—a political matter, from "administration"—efficiently implementing the policy decisions—a technological matter.

As frequently happens, the private sector, where efficiency could pay off in greater profits, began to absorb the new concepts of administration before the public sector, where advocates, at least the more honest ones, could promise only better and possibly cheaper public services. It was not until 1907 that the first institution to be organized for the purpose of promoting better government began operating in the United States. This was the New York City Bureau of Municipal Research. Since it was in the BMR that Luther Gulick got most of his training in the theory and arts of administration, any account of his life and work must mention this remarkable and historic institution.

The Bureau was organized by three men—William H. Allen, Henry Bruere and Fred A. Cleveland (the ABC's—all of whom became famous in the field of government reform and public management innovation), and backed by financial assistance from a coterie of public spirited businessmen, mostly financiers, on the theory that what was good for business should also be good for government.

The Bureau's basic technique was survey research—gathering data, analyzing existing conditions, and proposing constructive improvements, based on the growing body of public administration concepts and management tools, many of which were developed by the Bureau staff. Concepts included centralization of planning and administrative control, consolidation of administrative agencies; functional organization of activities, placing ultimate administrative responsibility on the chief executive, the necessity of counterbalancing responsibility with the
gradualist evolutionary approach, in contrast to many reform movements which would be satisfied with nothing less than radical changes in the whole social and economic structure.

The Bureau's first study, *How Manhattan Is Governed*, provoked a libel suit for $100,000 brought by Manhattan Borough President Thomas Ahearn. The suit got nowhere. Mayor George McClellan interceded on behalf of the BMR, and eventually Ahearn was removed from office for incompetence by State Governor Charles Evans Hughes. The study was the first step in the BMR's meteoric success, not only in bringing about improvements in New York City government but in doing contract work elsewhere, and stimulating the creation of similar institutions in other municipal and state governments. It quickly drew national recognition—in 1911, Bureau co-director Frederick Cleveland was appointed director of President Taft's newly formed federal Committee on Efficiency and Economy, and several of his associates were appointed to the Committee.

Also in 1911, the BMR sponsored the first graduate-level training program in government management. The Training School, initially financed by a grant from Mrs. E. G. Harriman (mother of Averell), attracted young idealists interested in the public service, and soon there were hundreds of applicants for the handful of places. Robert Moses was one successful applicant, Luther Gulick was another. Robert A. Caro, in his biography of Moses, described the program and the prevailing spirit.

The Training School was unique in its down-to-earth practicality. Pupils not only were put through intensive reading courses on the theory of budget making, accountancy, scientific management, chart making and the use of forms, but also spent long days sitting in city offices authority to carry out responsibility, departmental reorganization and charter revision. Examples of management tools were accounting and budgeting (this being an era where systematic budgeting as an instrument of planning and control was still little known or appreciated), organization and methods, and personnel management.
trying to figure out ways to eliminate unnecessary personnel and analyzing projects the city was undertaking....they did the legwork for the Bureau members who were heading up the investigations.

The students believed in the importance of what they were doing; half a century later, rheumy eyes would light up and smiles would curl corners of wrinkled lips as they talked about it....in terms old soldiers reserve for old battles. "How would I sum up what we were doing?" one would say. We were fighting to make democracy work, that's what we were doing."10

In reading for his undergraduate major in political science, two of the authors that most impressed Luther Gulick were Charles A. Beard and John Dewey of Columbia University. In his senior year Gulick served on a committee to select a commencement speaker, and was instrumental in the choice of Beard, whom he got to know when Beard came to Oberlin. These circumstances led him a year later to apply for a fellowship in the Columbia Graduate School of Political Science (one of his supporting documents was his Seminary M.A. thesis on The Political Economy of Jesus Christ). He was awarded the fellowship and entered Columbia in the fall of 1915.

Beard had been attracted to the BMR Training School when he served on a Committee for Practical Training for Public Service appointed by the American Political Science Association and American Economic Association; his report to the Committee concluded that "the Training School serves every requirement of a university." The Training School never awarded diplomas or degrees, but following Beard's report, Columbia University, the University of Pennsylvania, New York University, and later, the University of Michigan began granting graduate school credit for Training School courses and field work. Beard became actively involved in TS work in 1915, when he was named supervisor of

programs, and in the fall began lecturing in public administration. Luther, who had just matriculated in the Columbia Graduate School of Political Science, attended the lectures and sat in on open sessions of City legislative bodies. As time went on, he was increasingly absorbed in PS activities, specializing in budgeting and finance.

The Budding Professional

Late in 1916, the BMW assigned Gulick to work with a Committee on Budget Reform in the State of Massachusetts, where he was soon named secretary of the Commission and drafted its report.

His experience was the basis of his Columbia Ph.D. thesis, *Evolution of the Budget in Massachusetts*, published by MacMillan in 1920. As Barry Karl has pointed out, his discussion is remarkable in treating the budget as the evolution of an instrument of control, rather than as a bright new concept of the managerial age, whereas in 1915 Cleveland, still BMR director, was writing that the "budget idea" had no evolution in the United States.  

In a 1920 address to the New York State Conference of Mayors and other city officials, Gulick drew on his budget studies to summarize "the conditions....essential to make the budget an adequate means of planning and control." Contemporary budget theory, with all its technical and political ramifications, still rests heavily on Gulick's main points.

- There must be a single executive authority;
- The city administration must have freedom in planning;
- The budget must be a complete plan;
- There must be a modern system of accounting;

The financial calendar must meet the needs of the budget;

There must be legislative ratification of the budget as a unit;

The ratified budget must be a controlling instrument;

There must be an independent audit of the execution of the budget.

It was in the course of this assignment that Gulick developed the analytical techniques that served him throughout his career. His reading difficulty led him to devise his own approach to matters requiring analysis. Instead of first looking into what other writers had said about it, he would type out his own analysis, drawing on what he already knew. As we shall see, this was the technique used in composing the famous *Notes on the Theory of Organization*. Over his working life, he composed hundreds of such "think pieces": some were incorporated into lectures; some into published articles or books (though most publications originated as lectures); many were only to clarify his mind and remained unpublished; some were dropped unfinished. However well-deserved his reputation for originality, therefore, it stemmed partly from his inattention to trends and nuances in the writings of others.

**War and Postwar**

When the U.S. United States entered World War I in 1917, Gulick tried to enlist in the Air Corps but was turned down for poor eyesight. Then he went to Washington to work in the statistical branch of the Council for National Defense, whose most important responsibility was compilation of a weekly statistical report for the President and his top advisers. Next, in Luther’s words--

When the statistics became embarrassing to the military, the military decided to
admit no more statisticians to look at their records. When that happened and the weekly report...was suspended, President Wilson got hold of Newton Baker, who was Secretary of War, and said ‘What’s happened to that report?’ Leonard Ayres [head of the statistical unit] had to say ‘Well, we have been denied access to the statistics by the military.’ The next morning...we all discovered, from Leonard Ayres...down to Luther Gulick, who sat at the bottom, that we had all been sworn in and made commissioned officers.

[Thereafter, there was a weekly report on] manpower, shipping, economic production, national product, and fiscal responsibility...which went to the President and eight other top people.]

The position with the statistical branch was an extraordinary vantage point from which to view and reflect on the course of the defense-war program, but his responsibilities following the war, plus the task of completing work on the book on the Massachusetts budget, prevented his publishing anything on his wartime experiences.

Gulick returned to the BMR in January 1919 to find the organization in a state of transition. Beard had left Columbia University in 1917 because of a tiff with President Nicholas Murray Butler, and had accepted a position of director of the Training School; the following year he was appointed director of the BMR. After Gulick's return, Beard made him director of the Training School, at the age of 27.

NIPA Director

The year 1921 saw another radical transition in Luther Gulick's career, precipitated by a number of events.

One was the desire to widen the base of operations. The BMR's close

12 Cleveland had left in 1916 and B. F. Goodrich succeeded him until Beard took over in 1918.
relationship with New York city (helped by a succession of appreciative mayors and finance officers) went down the drain with the inauguration, in 1918, of Mayor John F. (Red Mike) Hylan, who besides being one of the most incompetent mayors in the City's history, had the typical machine politician's attitude—a mixture of fear and contempt—toward reformers. Second, the old basis of financial support from the New York banking and business community had dwindled. Third, Beard wanted to leave the BMR and return to research. The solution was to create a new organization—the National Institute of Public Administration, while keeping the corporate shell of the old BMR. As Gulick later described the process, the main credit for the reorganization belonged to Raymond Fosdick, head of the Rockefeller Foundation and long-time financial adviser to John D. Rockfeller Jr. As a condition of support, Fosdick insisted on the broader emphasis, with reorganization of the Board. This was agreed to and a list of national leaders was put on the new board, along with several from the old board. NIPA was incorporated in April, 1921, in New York State as a noncommercial organization. As for Luther Gulick's role—

I was secretary of the Board, and helped draw the documents and write the programs on the basis of which money was raised by Fosdick (and to a small degree by me). In the meantime I served as team leader for a keen group of young men. We did some good work in state and local surveys, and things went well. I don't think anyone, least of all myself, expected me to be director of this new enterprise—I more or less inherited the job. It was Fosdick who put me in, and alone had the position of power in the matter.....Beard had a lot of influence

---

13 In 1928, the organization reincorporated under the state education law, more appropriate for a research and educational organization. In 1930, it received a charter from the New York State Board of Regents, as the Institute of Public Administration, entitled to grant the degrees of Master and Doctor of Public Administration. IPA has operated under that charter ever since.
with Fosdick, of course, and certainly pushed for me."\(^\text{14}\)

So Gulick took over at the beginning of 1922, on the eve of his 30th birthday. He would finally retire as President of the Institute of Public Administration in 1961, after which he served as Board Chairman for another 21 years. Thereafter he continued as a Board member with the title of Chairman Emeritus. Gulick has written of the reasons why he never left the Institute except for short-term government assignments.

I always avoided any political role for two explicit reasons, one fortuitous and the other intrinsic to my professional philosophy. First, throughout most of my professional career the American society progressively acknowledged and thrust on its governments increasing responsibility for social amelioration. While lively controversy continued as to the extent of such responsibility and the role of government, the reach of agreed public policy clearly stretched to the limit and beyond of government capacity for effective and efficient execution. Thus building government competence and planning for implementation of new policies and programs were often the most critical need in making real social progress.

Second, I always strongly believed that effective government in a complex, high-tech society requires trained technical and managerial expertise and that to retain the confidence of the public and political leaders, professional experts must avoid any appearance of partisan political involvement.\(^\text{15}\)

THE 1920'S

In a 1928 report,\(^\text{16}\) Gulick stated that the new organization took over the

14 1962 letter to Barry Karl.
old one, with its work, staff and accumulated experience, library and equipment, and contacts and goodwill, and more significantly—

It symbolized the nationwide recognition of the program, not only in its title but also through the election to the Board of trustees of men nationally known as administrators.\(^{17}\)

The report noted also that the BMR-NIPA combination since 1909 had made 235 separate surveys and field surveys including, since 1914, a partial list of 50 cities, 27 counties, and 26 states—eight of the latter\(^{18}\) were surveys of state governmental organization. The bulk of the studies were done in the 1920’s, under Gulick's general direction.

In addition to surveys requested by state and local governments, NIPA staff members in the 1920's did substantial independent research, and published a number of studies and reports in such fields as city and county health administration, municipal finance, state expenditure trends, organization of New York State governments, administrative consolidation, and a bibliography of public administration. Three projects exemplify NIPA consulting work.

\(^{17}\) *Ibid.*, p. 70. The Board in 1928 comprised the following members.

- R. Fulton Cutting, Chairman
- Raymond B. Fosdick, Vice Chairman
- Richard S. Childs, Treasurer
- Newton D. Baker
- Robert S. Brookings
- Mrs. E. G. Harriman
- E. Roland Harriman

- Herbert Hoover
- Vernon Kellog
- Frank O. Lowden
- Charles E. Merriam
- Carl H. Pforzheimer
- E. R. A. Seigman
- Leonard D. White

\(^{18}\) Arizona, Colorado, Delaware, Nevada, New York, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Virginia.
One was a survey of finances and organization of the State of South Dakota, instigated by the State's Governor. Gulick personally handled the financial study, complicated by the chaotic condition of State financial records. Gulick tried to interview the State Treasurer who, pleading illness, put him off. He then asked to see the books, but no, they were in the possession of the Treasurer. One day Gulick went to the man's house, was admitted by his wife, and stated his business. When she went into her husband's bedroom to inform him of Gulick presence, he followed her in, introduced himself to the Treasurer, and asked the whereabouts of the financial records. After persistent questioning the Treasurer finally admitted that they were in his bed covered by blankets, his explanation being that he had been working on them at home.

Needless to say, a section of the NIPA report dealt with the reorganization of the State's financial management and accounting records, while other sections dealt with budgeting, organization, and personnel administration. Sixty-five years later Gulick, now 97 years old, would meet a retired University of South Dakota professor of political science and public administration at the annual meeting of the American Society for Public Administration, who told him that the 1924 NIPA report had served as the bible of public administration in South Dakota ever since.

A second important consultation was with the State of Virginia, whose Governor (later U.S. Senator) was Harry F. Byrd. The project, having to do with a plan of reorganization and consolidation of state and county governments, led to
a long-term relationship with Byrd.\textsuperscript{19}

A third project involved Gulick's appointment as research director of a large study for the New York State Commission on Old Age Security. It was this study, and the ensuing report, that first brought him into close contact with Franklin D. Roosevelt, then Governor.

Gulick himself became heavily engaged in New York State finances, serving as staff director of the Senate Committee on Taxation and retrenchment, where he worked closely with the committee chairman Senator Frederick Davenport (whose credentials included a Ph.D in Sociology). In addition to his other work, Gulick was making his name known through a stream of lectures to professional organizations and civic groups, and professional publications--his bibliography lists some twenty-five publications between 1920 and 1930.

**Founding of the Maxwell School**

When Gulick became NIPA director, he appointed William Mosher as Training School Director. Mosher originally had taught German at Oberlin College, but wartime anti-German sentiment had obliterated demand for that specialty, and he had turned to another of his interests, personnel administration, and had served BMR as a consultant.

But the postwar Training School faced growing needs for a broader array of disciplines and skills, a larger library, scholarships, and placement services—all of which were beyond the financial capacity of the School and its sponsoring

\textsuperscript{19} A later 1920's project was concerned with the Virginia State budget and accounting system.
institutions.

On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University, Gulick described how the problem was solved. George Maxwell, who had accumulated a fortune as a patent attorney, inventor, and business promoter, had offered $500,000 to Chancellor Flynt of the University to establish a School of American Citizenship, suggesting that the program be organized by Senator Davenport, whom Maxwell had come to know and admire. The Chancellor informed Davenport of the offer, and Davenport turned to Gulick for advice. This started a training of events which culminated with the transfer of the Training School to Syracuse University, where it became the nucleus of the Maxwell School.

Gulick's first suggestion was that the endowment initially proposed should be doubled, to produce an annual income of at least $50,000, the amount of the Training School budget. The amount was forthcoming, and Gulick helped bring together the elements of the 1924 move to the Syracuse campus of the Training School program, the then registered students, and the Director Mosher, who became first dean of the Maxwell School. Under the arrangement, NIPA would continue the relationship with the School by accepting students as trainees who would work with NIPA staff on NIPA-BMR projects.

Gulick's part in relocating the Training School exhibited one of his outstanding characteristics—a generosity of spirit. He has never been an
imperialist, and has been instrumental in the creation and development of a number of organizations—including the Governmental Research Association, the Brookings Institution, the Public Administration Service, the National Planning Association, and the National Academy of Public Administration—without concern over their possible impact on the Institute of Public Administration.

For some years after the transfer, NIPA continued an active program of training in the practical work of government—for engineers, lawyers, physicians, accountants and other professionals desiring training in public administration, government employees and advanced graduate students planning a
career in government (including city management) or teaching. In addition,

NIPA--

Cooperated with Columbia University in offering a year's graduate
course in municipal government and administration, in which Gulick was
involved;

Staged a nine-weeks spring series of intensive daily conferences,
lectures and field trips, primarily for outside graduate students;

Sponsored special conferences with public officials, including
governors, state officials, legislative committees, mayors and city
administrators, and professional specialists, in health, finance, etc.;

Encouraged staff members to participate in other professional
organizations, and to prepare textbooks and other training materials;

In retrospect it is fair to say that NIPA as an organization reached the apogee
of its prestige and influence in the decade of the 1920's. Thereafter its
educational functions were increasingly taken over by the universities, and,
though staff research and consulting continued during the 1930's, they continued
to concentrate primarily on state and local government. Meanwhile, economic
collapse and the advent of the Great Depression shifted the national focus to the
federal government and the New Deal, and it was at this level that Luther Gulick
increasingly played a leading role.

The 1930's
By the early 1930's the endowment drive, begun in the 1920's, had raised some $1.5 million. The new Institute of Public Administration, incorporated under the New York State education laws, arranged an alliance with Columbia University, whereby IPA would be a working laboratory and training center for students in political science and administration, with Gulick being appointed Eaton Professor of Municipal Science and Administration. Columbia's contribution would be the salary of the Eaton Professor, plus $3,000 a year for operating expenses, and providing space for the Institute in a downtown Columbia building. Columbia would name four trustees to the Institute Board. Under the arrangement, a number of Columbia graduate students had opportunities to participate in IPA and Gulick-directed projects, notably including the governmental personnel study, the New York State educational study, and the Presidents Committee on Administrative Management. (The arrangement continued until the early 1940's, when it was terminated because of a controversy precipitated by Columbia members of the IPA Board, who wanted to move IPA and its endowment to the Columbia campus and convert it into a conventional academic institution.)

Part of the IPA endowment plan called for a research agenda of some 21 topics dealing with state-local government organization and management. By 1940, most of the funds came from the Harriman, Rosenwald and Rockefeller Foundations. Representative topics included study of local government debt limits and defaults, with special reference to borrowers' economic situations; studies in standards of measurement for purposes of accounting and budgeting, and data recording; examination of local tax administration machinery; study of current thinking on principles of administration, with particular reference to the division of functions between state and local governments; and effect on local administration
Gulick was able to report substantial progress on 17 of the topics, with some work on three others. Though publication was not IPA's major objective, the work did produce some 20 volumes authored by staff members, plus another 20 to which members made important contributions.

With the advent of the New Deal and the vast expansion of the federal government, public administration became an increasingly important concern in the federal government, and a public administration establishment emerged; two of its most important figures were Louis Brownlow and Charles Merriam. By the mid-1930's, Gulick had also become a familiar establishment figure; the following are only a few of the activities which contributed to his growing reputation.

Research director for the Commission of Inquiry on Public Personnel, set up by the Social Science Research Council in 1933. The Committee's final report, prepared under Gulick's direction, was considered the most important contribution of the interwar period to the modernization of public personnel management doctrine and the sensitizing of the public to the issues involved.

Chairman, Public Administration Committee of the Social Science Research Council, 1930-33. The Committee, composed of scholars and other leaders in the field, had been established in 1928; Leonard White was the first chairman and Gulick was his successor. During Gulick's tenure, he participated in the organization of the Public Administration Clearing House in Chicago.

Member, research staff of the Rockefeller Liquor Study Commission, organized by the Rockefeller Foundation in anticipation of the repeal of various systems of state aid.
the Eighteenth (Prohibition) Amendment.

Organizer and director of a National Municipal League study of liquor legislation, which was the foundation of a model liquor control law widely used by state governments post-repeal period.

Contributor of numerous articles to professional journals, mostly deriving from his work as consultant.

His most interesting publication of the period was the prescient article "Politics, Administration and the New Deal", published in *The Annals* of 1933, at a time when the New Deal was barely underway.

The article's main points were suggested in part by Gulick's association in London the preceding summer with Sir Ernest Simon (later Lord Simon), who had been Mayor of Manchester. From Simon, Gulick picked up a working knowledge of British parliamentary government and the British party system, about which he previously had only a passing acquaintance.

A few passages from *The Annals* article suggest ideas which were later to influence the PCAM report, in particular Gulick's strong belief, at least in this stage of Federal Government evolution, on the necessity of strengthening the chief executive. They demonstrate also a penchant for observing current trends and trying to project their implications for administration and management.

The article also abandoned the "classic" distinction, stemming from Woodrow Wilson, between "politics" and "administration."

The New Deal is politics; it is policy. Its success rests upon administration [and in turn] there must be developed a new and revolutionary extension of the practice and the theory of administration.....this will require a new theory of the division of powers ... it is clear that such a theory will be concerned not with checks and balances or with the division of policy and administration, but with the division between policy veto on one side and policy planning and execution on the other."
In the world into which government is moving the executive will be called on to draft the master plan. Deliberative and advisory representative groups will be asked to consider and adopt the broad outlines of various parts of this plan.

The executive will then be given full power to work out the remainder and the interrelations of the program and to carry it into effect, not only through the established agencies of government but also through new agencies of a quasi-private character. The legislature of the future will have two primary powers: first, the veto over major policy, and second, the right to audit and investigate. Behind the entire process will be the controlling hand of the mass of the citizens in party and pressure groups. These are the bricks and straws from which the new theory of the division of powers must be constructed.

In simple terms, Gulick undertook to adapt leading features of the British system, where the chief executive (Prime Minister) is a dominant force, and the role of Parliament is chiefly that of approving or disapproving critic of administration plans and programs. The Presidential system that emerges somewhat resembles that of the Prime Minister and Ministries, while the role of the Congress is analogous to that of Parliament. In particular, planning and the initiation of policy proposals comes from the President; the Congress discusses, approves or disapproves, and monitors results. Once proposed policies are approved, the executive implements them, subject only to the limitations implicit in the legislature's "right to audit and investigate."

From today's perspective, this seems like a much over-simplified formulation, particularly in that (1) the institution of the Presidency, with its massive and specialized staff and communication techniques, is very different from what existed in the early days of the New Deal, and (2) the sharpening of the perennial conflict between the Congress and the President on vital issues has led the Congress to equip itself with staff and expertise for gathering and evaluating information, and formulating policy. The prescriptions are indeed more appropriate for a model of parliamentary government, though the Gulick...
model makes no mention of the all important role of parties in the British system, and draws a sharper line between executive and legislative functions than exists in the British government. And the erosion of U.S. political parties and the revolution in media and communications technology have drastically changed the nature of the "controlling hand of the electorate."

As we shall see, by a half century later Gulick had changed his mind about the model of hierarchical organization, which he had come to believe derives from military precedents, and was calling for more emphasis on decentralization and cooperation. Clearly, the changes in his thinking stemmed from fresh insights drawn from the other social sciences, along with psychology and biology, about the psychological makeup and motivations of the human animal, and the nature of the society with which the citizen-voter interacts.

President's Committee on Administrative Management

Gulick was a central part of this towering landmark in American public administrative history, as one of PCAM's three members—Brownlow, Gulick and Merriam. In a report to the IPA Institute Board, he saw the work of the PCAM and its report in historical perspective.

The program of the United States Government growing out of the President's Committee on Administrative Management proved of striking significance both in Washington and as an example to the rest of the country. The project involved bringing together the results of prior work, especially by the Bureau and the Institute since 1911... The whole reorganization study and program was completely nonpartisan and was so regarded by the nation. The report was received with enthusiasm and interest, and probably would have been adopted had it not been for the controversy over the Supreme Court which began in Congress and in the nation before the reorganization bill was finally considered.²²

²² Another Twelve Years of Governmental Research, 1940 Report of the Institute of Public Administration.
Genesis of the PCAM

As President Roosevelt's New Deal program to combat the Great Depression evolved, a number of new agencies were created to implement and administer the new policies, which Roosevelt feared would be slighted if assigned to the old-line cabinet agencies. An inevitable result of agency proliferation was overlapping responsibilities on one hand and responsibility gaps on the other.

Roosevelt eventually had to recognize that, even with his genius for improvisation, the situation was too complex to be handled by a chief executive with virtually no staff except a few secretaries and people borrowed pro tem from other agencies. The idea for a study of Presidential powers and responsibilities, and the means for exercising them effectively, developed from several sources, two of the most important being Charles E. Merriam and Louis Brownlow.

Merriam was primarily an academic, whose scholarly career was devoted mainly to the study of political theory and the development of a science of politics. In New Deal days, he was a leader in Washington public administration circles, and a strong advocate of federal government administrative reform. He was appointed to the National Resources Committee, established in 1933, which in 1939 it became the National Resources Planning Board, with Merriam still a member.

Brownlow, who had known and advised every U.S. President since Wilson, had begun his career as a journalist who got into public life by being appointed to the three-man Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia serving under President Woodrow Wilson. Thereafter he served as city manager of two cities, and in 1922 was elected president of the City Managers Association, the first specialist in administration to be elected (most city managers in those days were
engineers). He later involved himself in a variety of activities, including organizing and serving as first director of the Public Administration Clearing House in Chicago. Not an academic, he had an intensely pragmatic approach—concerned not so much with the ultimate aims of organizations, as with making them run efficiently and effectively.

In 1935, there evolved the concept of a two-fold study dealing with (1) overall top management of the executive branch, and (2) the reorganization of the individual federal departments, agencies and commissions. With the encouragement of Merriam and Brownlow, Roosevelt made the top organization study a high priority item, over the opposition of some of his advisers.23

Roosevelt remembered Gulick from the days when he was Governor of New York, and consulted him from time to time. Gulick was also close to both Brownlow and Merriam, who kept him advised on the embryonic management study.

The President wanted a committee that would be in general agreement with his ideas, and would consult with him in formulating final recommendations. Not satisfied with various proposals that were thrown up, he temporized for a time. Meanwhile, in March of 1936, Gulick was approached by Owen D. Young (then Board chairman of the General Electric Company and prominent in civic affairs) who had been named chairman of the previously mentioned Regents Study of Public Education in New York, planned as a multi-year project of unprecedented scope. Young asked Gulick to direct the study, which would offer opportunities

23 An arrangement was worked out whereby a President's committee would concentrate on the problems of top management, while a Senate Committee headed by Virginia Senator Harry Byrd would concentrate on the government departments and agencies, problems of consolidation, duplication and overlapping of functions, and so on. (The President also hoped to get the House of Representatives to establish a counterpart committee; but after considerable preliminary maneuvering the House failed to carry through.)
for other IPA staff, as well as Columbia graduate students. Given the uncertainties of the still-unorganized President's study, Gulick decided to accept Young's invitation, agreeing to concentrate on the New York project.

Shortly thereafter, the President called Gulick to notify him of appointment to the three-man President's Committee. Gulick protested that he could not accept the appointment because of his New York State commitment, to which Roosevelt replied, "Luther, you can't turn down the President of the United States," and that was that.

It was Saturday, March 21, 1936. The following day Gulick rushed to Washington to meet with Brownlow and discuss the work to be done by the President's Committee. Monday morning he was back in New York to meet Young in his office and explain how he had been drafted. There was no difficulty--Young congratulated Gulick on the honor and an arrangement was worked out whereby Gulick would spend Tuesday through Friday on the education study, and the rest of his time on PCAM business.

On April 5, the first meeting of the President's Committee on Administrative Management was held in Chicago. The two senior members had engagements in Europe which would take them to Europe during most of the summer, during which time only Gulick would be available to manage the project and consult with the staff. The Committee began a furious round of activity, laying out the research program and groundwork for the report, and recruiting staff, including a Chief of Staff, Dr. Joseph Harris.²⁴

Summer of 1936

Preliminary arrangements completed, Brownlow and Merriam departed for

²⁴ Harris previously had been director research for the Public Administration Committee of the Social Science Research Council.
Europe, where they spent much of their time studying forms of government of various European countries.  

Gulick was left to be overall supervisor and expediter of the PCAM study. One of his first moves was to initiate the collection of the famous Papers on the Science of Administration, to which he contributed the Notes on the Theory of Organization (discussed in the following section) which became one of the most widely-acclaimed, and most controversial, essays in the history of public administration.  

In general, Gulick left the direction of PCAM staff work in the hands of Staff Chief Joseph Harris. He handled PCAM business that needed top level attention and, as he recalls, had no trouble getting to the President when he needed to. On one occasion he needed to clear several points respecting content of staff papers, and prepared a careful agenda for an appointment. He got the appointment but found, as was not uncommon, that FDR had other things on his mind on which he wanted opinions. On this occasion, he wanted to discuss output estimates of German military planes.  

He rocked back his chair and pulled out a drawer on which there was a tabulation of the German manufacture of fighter planes, and said, 'Look at this, Luther. This is the State Department's estimates of planes manufactured in different parts of Germany. This is the military intelligence estimate (it was nearly twice as high). There were two other columns with different colored pencil figures. FDR said, 'This is my estimate, based on my own secret service.  

He pointed to the first column and said, "The reason this is wrong is that it is based on the

25 They also attended a meeting of the International Union of Local Authorities, where they combined with representatives of the western European democracies to fight off attempts by the fascist powers to introduce resolutions asserting the principle of totalitarian executive power.  

26 The Notes was the introductory essay of the collection; Gulick also contributed the closing essay, Science, Values and Public Administration.
number of employees entering the factory compared with [an earlier point in time]. What they don't know is that the Germans have gone from one shift to two shifts, and there is one factory that has gone to three shifts, and it looks as though they are planning still more shifts. That is how I got my figures. What do you think?"

I said, "Mr. President, I'm the wrong man to talk to about this. I don't know a thing about it." But then I said, "I think you're right. If they changed from one shift to two shifts, they ought to be able to produce more than twice as many." He said, "Just what I think."

I was trying to get his attention back on the agenda when the appointments secretary came in and said: "Mr. President, you have to do this and that," and I realized it was time to throw me out. He [FDR] took the agenda and said, "One, yes; two, yes; three, no."

The point is that when he talked to me, he just wanted to hear how sensible his explanations sounded. This was one of his techniques.27

Despite the pressure of the PCAM and education studies, plus keeping an eye on IPA, Gulick made time for numerous other activities, some of which were mentioned in a family letter.

On Thursday, my Institute-Columbia Board met to go over the 1936-37 budget of the Institute. It was a peaceful meeting, the Columbia folks behaving very well in the presence of Raymond Fosdick.

[This week] I have to go to Albany on the Education Inquiry. That keeps me pretty busy these days.

My other make-busy is the final touches of the Westchester County work. I have the draft of the final report in my bag, having worked most of Saturday.

Other activities included consulting with the New York City Charter Revision (Thatcher) Commission) produced a charter, approved by the electorate and installed in 1938, with the most basic changes since the 1902 revision.28

27 Interview, 1986.
Gulick's interest in disseminating ideas on information led IPA to join several institutions in establishing the Public Affairs Committee in 1936, with the mission of interpreting the results of relevant science and exploring their implications for current public issues in brief pamphlets designed for easy reading. Gulick chaired a similar venture in the motion picture field, the American Film Center (also supported by grants from several foundations), which backed a number of documentary films designed for education and general information.

Gulick later observed that the summer and fall of 1936 were the busiest six months he had ever spent.

"Day after day I had only four or five hours of sleep, and almost always was at work writing by four or five o'clock in the morning."

Papers on the Science of Administration

In early discussions with PCAM staff members, Gulick found that they lacked a common fund of information about many current topics in public administration, in particular, the dimensions of human psychology and motivations suggested by the Hawthorne studies, and the ideas of Mary Parker Follett, and of Henri Fayol and other Europeans. Gulick thereupon organized a project to review contemporary literature and select a number of representative articles for distribution to committee and staff members. The articles were published in 1937, under the nominal editorship of Luther H. Gulick and Leonard

28 Changes included the creation of a City Planning Commission headed by a Chairman appointed by the Mayor. Rexford Guy Tugwell, one of the original New Dealers, was the first Chairman.
29 Supported mainly by grants from the Falk and Sloan Foundations, the Committee in its first three years produced and distributed some 1.4 million copies of the pamphlet, Public Affairs, which covered a variety of current issues, particularly issues pertaining to public administration and government.
Gulick's main contribution was the *Notes on the Theory of Organization*.\(^{31}\)

Though intended primarily for as a framework for the guidance of the PCAM staff, it turned out to be Gulick's most important and most frequently cited contribution to basic public administration literature, which over the years has generated much controversy, that still goes on. Gulick later claimed to have pounded out the essay on his typewriter on Sunday afternoons, sitting with his shirt off under a tree in the backyard of his home in Bronxville. When the writer asked Gulick about basic materials that he consulted in composing the *Notes*, he replied, in effect,

> I didn't have time to consult any materials; I simply drew out of my subconscious the things I had absorbed while a staff member of the BMR.

Considering its brevity, the essay covers much ground; basic principles are advanced, hedged with qualifications. Here we can notice only the highlights.

1. The theory of organization has to do with the structure of coordination of different specialized work units required for large-scale or complicated enterprises.

2. Organization requires systems of authority—hierarchy, a principle that must take into account the facts that spans of control must be limited, and that each subordinate should report only to one superior.

3. The essential functions of the executive are summarized under the famous acronym

\(^{30}\) There has been a question as to why Urwick, an Englishman, was listed with Gulick as co-editor, in view of the fact that his contribution was no more substantial than several others, and that Gulick did not know him personally—they did not meet until some years later. The reason was that Urwick at the time controlled the paper written by Follett, which Gulick particularly wanted for the collection. Urwick's permission to print had to be obtained, not only for his own paper but also that of Follett, and the concession respecting recognition was a way of resolving the difficulty.

\(^{31}\) Gulick also contributed a five-page closing essay, *Science, Values and Public Administration*. 

---

32
POSDCORB, a typical Gulick device for focussing attention on essentials.\textsuperscript{32}

4. Work units can be organized according to several different bases (principles), by (a) purpose, (b) process, (c) clientele or objective, (d) place where service is performed. However, these "principles" are not mutually exclusive. Decisions must recognize that all four are present—each workman "is working for some major purpose, uses some process, deals with some persons, and works at some place."

5. "Organization is necessary.....but it does not take the place of a dominant central idea as the foundation of action and self-coordination in the daily operation.....of the enterprise. , that is, the development of the desire and will to work together for a purpose....."

6. "Human beings are compounded of cogitation and emotion and do not function well when treated as though they were merely cogs in motion.....The task of the administrator must be accomplished less and less by coercion and discipline and more and more by persuasion".

7. "In time of change, government must strengthen those agencies which deal with administrative management [including] coordination, planning, personnel, fiscal control, and research."

There has been endless discussion of the \textit{Notes} and their implications. Within a decade, Herbert Simon was challenging "principles" as being only "proverbs" lacking scientific content and incapable of precise definition in any case,\textsuperscript{33} and in successive editions of his book \textit{Administrative Behavior} he advanced quite different conceptual models of administrative organization. Simon's different approach influenced much subsequent thinking, and many public administration students came to think that the classical approach epitomized by Gulick was little more than a historical curiosity. Other writers, however, have found much of value in the \textit{Notes}, and Thomas Hammond asserts in a recent article that

\textsuperscript{32} POSDCORB stands for planning, organization, staffing, directing, coordination, budgeting. In a 1985 interview Gulick said, re POSDCORB: "What I was trying to do at the time was to state in a simple and easy-to-remember from the approach of the Institute of Public Administration, resting on the heritage of the Bureau of Municipal Research."

Simon's criticisms overlooked much of the subtlety of what Gulick had to say, and that "Gulick's essay has far greater relevance to current studies of hierarchy than has generally been recognized.\

Gulick never engaged himself in the "Gulick-Simon" debate nor published anything further on the theory of organization. But, as we shall see, he dramatically revised his position in a 1983 article.

Frederick C. (Fritz) Mosher contributed another kind of evaluation of the Notes in a 1987 conversation, saying—

"I don't know when I first read the PCAM report and the Papers, but I remember thinking that Gulick's piece was a great contribution to orderly understanding of practical administration—it was a way of ordering things. Gulick was able to bring some logical sense to an awful lot of stuff that had been written and that he had experienced. He was able to organize his experience into something that was understandable by other people..

His approach was normative but was, I thought, an attempt to create models that could be used for rationalizing organizations that was, so far as I knew, completely original.

Report of the PCAM

When Brownlow and Merriam returned from Europe in August 1936, intensive Committee work began. As described by Brownlow--

The full committee...met usually every alternative week for three or four days, having sessions morning, noon, and night, at which were reviewed in detail with each staff member his or her work.

In addition to these sessions, Merriam, Gulick and I had many long talks with all but one [the President] of the principal men in the federal government.\

In November 14 the President approved a skeleton framework of the final

34 Thomas Hammond, "In Defense of Luther Gulick's 'Notes on the Theory of Organization'". Public Administration, Spring 1990, p. 146; and references there cited.

35 A Passion for Anonimity, 1958, p. 371.
report, making the following significant remark:

We have to get over the notion that the purpose of the reorganization is economy. I had that out with Al Smith in New York. I pleaded with him not to go before the people with the pledge of economy. But he did, and his first budget after reorganization was way up over the previous budget, though there was some saving in administrative salaries.\(^\text{36}\)

A meeting with the President on the final report was scheduled for January 3, 1937. The report's most important elements are summarized in the following excerpts from the President's Message to Congress accompanying to implement the report.

To.....bring our administrative management up to date, the [President's Committee on Administrative Management] presents an integrated five-point program, which ...includes these recommendations.

1. Expand the White House staff so that the President may have a sufficient group of able assistants in his own office to keep him in closer and easier touch with the widespread affairs of administration, and to make for speedier the clearance of the knowledge needed for Executive decisions.

2. Strengthen and develop the management agencies of the Government, particularly those dealing with the budget, personnel and planning, as management arms of the Chief Executive.

3. Extend the merit system upward, outward, and downward to cover practically all non-policy-determining posts.....

4. Overhaul the 100 independent agencies, administrations, authorities, boards, and commissions.....place them by Executive order within one of 12 major executive departments [listed]; and place upon the Executive continuing responsibility for the maintenance of effective organization.

5. Establish accountability of the Executive to the Congress by providing a genuine independent postaudit of all fiscal transactions by an auditor general, and restore to the Executive complete responsibility for accounts and current transactions.

\(^{36}\) Gulick memorandum of the meeting on November 14.
On Sunday, January 3, in a session lasting more than three hours, the Committee delivered the printed report to the President, who quickly mastered the material and, demonstrating his prodigious memory, was able to "quote whole sentences and sometimes three or four sentences together, verbatim." On the following Friday Roosevelt presented it to the Cabinet, and on Sunday January 10, to the Congressional leaders.

In preparation for transmitting the report to Congress, the President directed that legislation be prepared to implement the recommendations, and requested that Brownlow draft the President's accompanying message to Congress. Brownlow delegated the assignment to Gulick—

I told him, and Merriam backed me up, that he had been in Albany often during Roosevelt's service in the State Legislature and as Governor, and that he himself was a priceless imitator..... Luther didn't seem to think that was a compliment.

Nevertheless, one morning after a sleepless night, he got up at four o'clock and in pen and ink.....wrote a message from the President of the United States to the Congress.....

When the President read the draft, he made no comment. I could not detect from his poker face whether he was pleased or displeased. The next time I saw it, it was in print from the Government Printing Office. The President had changed only one word, and Luther Gulick never again objected when I called him a priceless imitator. 37

Gulick later recalled what happened next.

The week after our report had gone in and had gotten a very good press, and our bill had been introduced, the Court packing bill went in and suddenly the President's good relations and standing with the Congress and the country went into the trash can. The development was the more peculiar because the President was ordinarily so sensitive in judging public reaction.

In the summer of 1937, Brownlow and Merriam were again in Europe and

Gulick, with the assistance of Harris, represented the PCAM. He conferred frequently with the President on the reorganization report, and on the search for greater efficiency and economy in national administration. One matter concerned the millions of personal accounts involved in the social security system.

The technical experts concluded that individual accounts were unnecessary and a great administrative waste.....I presented the idea to the President [but] something apparently troubled him about the suggestion and he said to come back.

Several days later.....he asked me to restate the proposition, and then said: 'I don't see any hole in the argument, but the conclusion is dead wrong. The purpose of the accounts for Tom, Dick, and Harry is not to figure what we collect or pay. It is to make it impossible when I am gone for the ..........Republicans to abolish the system. They would never dare wipe out the personal savings accounts of the millions.' I immediately knew he was right......The error the .....experts fell into was the inadequate definition of the system .....we missed two dimensions.....the political and the psychological.  

When Congressional hearings began, Gulick was in great demand as the principal expert on the reorganization plan.. A letter of August 10, 1937, gives the flavor.

The disturbing element has been the reorganization program in Washington. Just as I thought I was all through and that they would do nothing, I had a hurry- up call from Washington and went down much against my better judgment. I found that the Senate Committee had decided they could not let the House Committee overshadow them and that they would...bring out their omnibus bill and must have a report.....

[so] I spent all last week in Washington, just as I was expecting to get some vacation! I spent two days on the stand testifying in the face of some rather vicious cross-questioning by my friend Harry Byrd. He is trying to kill any move for reorganization by delay and delay and delay.

In the middle he broke off to go to Vermont for three days.

---

38 This anecdote is recounted in Luther Gulick, "The Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the American Society for Public Administration," Public Administration Review, 25/1, March 1965.
"On coming back...I went straight to Washington and put in 12 to 15 hours a day going over drafts of bills, writing reports, conferences with Senators and Congressmen. Sunday night I worked until 1 AM and caught the 2 AM train for New York as I had conferences with my educational staff scheduled for all day Monday.

I am satisfied that the members of Congress themselves have no interest in reorganization, economy and civil service reform. At the same time they do not wish to be caught in opposition to these measures. I do not expect that any reorganization legislation will be passed at this session as the desire to go home is unanimous, as is also the desire not to be asked to vote on reorganization.

Gulick was right about the reorganization bill's not passing in 1937. Though the House of Representatives passed one version and the Senate another, the two were not reconciled. In 1939, a less comprehensive reorganization bill was passed. However it was rated a drastic measure, effecting the greatest changes in the top organization of the Executive Branch since the adoption of the Constitution.

The 1939 Act gave the President the power to reorganize by submitting to Congress reorganization plans, which Congress could then overturn. Under its provisions were created the Executive Office of the President, with the Bureau of the Budget, the National Resources Planning Commission, and the Central Statistical Office. The President was authorized to hire six administrative assistants and given limited powers of reorganization (under which he created the Federal Security Agency and the Public Works Agency). Thus it gave the President immediate access to the three most important administrative functions. Students of administration have generally agreed that the establishment of the Executive Office, by making possible the effective

39 The powers expired in 1941 but were continued in the War Powers Acts and again by the Reorganization Act of 1945.
coordination of the widespread federal machinery, was essential for victory in World War II and for meeting the subsequent problems facing the Nation.

Report of the New York Regents Education Study

With the slackening of PCAM work in early 1937, Gulick in 1937 again could concentrate on the education study. Gulick edited twelve volumes of studies; drafted the final report, *Education for American Life*, directed and participated in preparation of *The New York Primer*, a pamphlet of charts summarizing the findings and recommendations of the report; and presented the findings to many organizations and groups, both in and outside the State. It was considered the most important education study to appear in a generation. In recognition, Columbia in 1939 awarded Gulick the Nicholas Murray Butler medal as the University alumnus who had demonstrated "the most competence in philosophy or educational theory, practice or administration" during the year. President Butler made a luncheon date with Gulick to discuss the Columbia University presidency (the conversation never came to anything). He received at least two other offers of at least two University presidencies. All these he declined, preferring to stay with the Institute.

In a letter dated December 17, 1939, Gulick stopped to take stock and resolved to slow down.

My days rush on in their madness. I keep getting into too many things for one reason or another, each of which is imperative, but all of which put together make no sense at all....I [should] just study and stop talking for a while.

Events of the 1940's, however, would push him in precisely opposite directions.

The Defense-War Era

*40* He was also given an honorary doctorate by his alma mater, Oberlin College.
With Europe on the verge of war and the U.S. Government increasingly concerned with defense matters, the Carnegie Foundation persuaded Gulick to begin spending much of his time in Washington, with the general assignment of being useful in the task of improving federal government policy and administration, with the Foundation financing whatever part of his Institute salary that was not covered by consulting fees from government agencies. In Gulick's absence, Bruce Smith would take over day-to-day Institute management. The only available record of Gulick's activities in this period is his own pithy account in the preface to *Administrative Reflections from World War II*.

[At the outset] "my opportunities for participation in and intimate observation of war emergency administration arose chiefly—

In connection with assignments on organization and programming problems in the National Resources Planning Board, where I was asked to serve as the coordinator of post-war programs;

In the Treasury, where I directed a study of federal-state-local fiscal relations which covered certain aspects of war finance as well [the other members were Professors Mabel Newcomer of Vasser College and Harold Groves of the University of Wisconsin];

In the War Department where I participated in setting up the Control Division and in developing the reorganization plans of February, 1942;

In the War Production Board, where I helped in developing the organizational structure of the Board and served as the Head of the Office of Organizational Planning for some eight months in 1942, and as a consultant again in 1945;

In the office of the Coordinator for InterAmerican Affairs, where I was the organizer and chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education;

In the Foreign Economic Administration and in the Department of State, where I was a member of the staff of the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation Operations;

In the Department of Commerce, where I have been a member of the Census Advisory Committee;
In the Smaller War Plants Corporation, where I was in charge of the technical aspects of the reorganization of 1944;

In the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, where I was the acting chief of the Secretariat at the time of its organization;

In the Bureau of the Budget, where I served in various capacities, particularly in connection with the administrative history of the war and the stimulation of war histories through the war agencies; and finally

In the White House staff, where I was asked on a number of occasions to aid with administrative matters, and where I served for over a year, with assignments on reparations which carried me through Europe and the Pacific as far as Russia, Japan and the Philippines, involving attendance at the Potsdam Conference in 1945 and the meeting of the Foreign Ministers in Paris in 1946.

Gulick's experiences with nearly a dozen administrative agencies, spanning the defense, war and reconstruction periods, and both the national and international theaters, are the stuff of fiction. There must be few instances where a person of his professional training and experience, complemented by a capacity for observation and reflection, had such an opportunity to view the grand problems of administration from the top level, where administration and policy merge.

The experiences would certainly have provided a wealth of anecdotal history. Unfortunately Gulick, not given to reminiscence, never had the inclination or time to recapture them. And he never kept a journal; only in letters to family members do we get scattered accounts of his on-the-spot observations and experiences.

Gulick began working with, and helping organize, the newly created National Resources Planning Board (NRPB). In 1944, he was requested by the U.S. Treasury to head a committee to do a study and report on fiscal relations between
the federal, state and local governments.

A picture of his activities appears in May 1941 appears in two letters to his parents.

Flew back from two days in Washington, where I worked on NRPB matters. We were preparing some material for the President on post-defense Planning. I made a draft of a new Bill of Rights, i.e., major social and economic objectives for, not only for the period after war, but in reality the things we are planning to guarantee to ourselves and our children through the defeat of the dictator aggressors.

This week and last I had dinner or lunch with Maynard Keynes (the great English economist), Daniel Bell (Under Secretary of the Treasury), Adolph Berle (Asst. Secretary of State), John Winant (US Ambassador to London).

I have at last gotten my Treasury study underway. My two chief associates are Professor Groves of Wisconsin and Professor Heer of North Carolina. The New York Times said that we were hunting for "pleasant" taxes. We shall probably be known as the Green Pastures Tax Study!

The other study [for the NRPB] moves on. The last conference had to do with the kind of economy we would have if we have "full employment". It is quite intoxicating to see how easily we can eradicate poverty if we will work as intelligently for peace as we are now beginning to work for war.

In September of 1941 he flew to London, via Lisbon, for a conference on "Science and the Postwar world", where he gave a paper on the TVA, and met, among others, Russian Ambassador Maisky, H. G. Wells, the Chinese Ambassador Wellington Koo, and Anthony Eden.

Letter of November 3. The most important part of the mission to England turned out to be the work that [Alvin] Hansen and I did in starting some talks on Anglo-American cooperation to work for international trade to achieve full-employment within each country on the basis of a positive internal governmental policy.....these discussions have led Hansen and me to have conferences since we have returned with Secretary of State Hull, Laughlin
Curie, and Milo Perkins (assistants in the State Department), Vice President Wallace, Secretary Morgenthau, and some others.

November 26. I have gotten up an insurance scheme [to be used in conjunction with] payroll taxes as a means of sopping up buying power in the lower-income brackets, especially [as a means of] lessening the strain on the price system. You have no doubt seen Secretary Morgenthau's suggestions along this line recently....But the Congress lacks courage and will let prices climb another 10-15 percent before taking necessary action.

My work is as interesting as ever. I think the most worthwhile part is the small meetings with the various planning experts and economic advisors of the chief departments. We have a monthly meeting of about 30 men on general problems of inter-agency information and a Tuesday luncheon club of five to seven top strategists. This is the best fun—no program and no effort to make an effect or defend an interest. Thus far the planners are working together in fine spirits, even where the departments from which they come are at each other's throats.

I am also at work in the Treasury. That staff is now organized and working in good shape under Prof Harold Groves. My other jobs are more of a consulting nature--Census Advisory Committee, Education Committee of Inter-American Coordination Office, and Budget.

Letter of August 17, 1942, when he was head of Organization Planning in the War Production Board.

My work.....brings me into contact with most of the men who are managing the war on our side.....I am working against time to get the WPB organized and top personnel straightened out....

April 4, 1943--Gulick had become involved with the new Office of Foreign Rehabilitation Operations, headed by former New York Governor Herbert Lehman.

We finished our comprehensive program for the first year of European
Relief and Rehabilitation..... giving our estimates of proportions of liberated peoples needing feeding, clothing, medical care, etc., and emergency seeds and tools needed. The document also gives the diets planned for emergency rations and for supplementation of the regular supplies.

August 1, 1943. I am getting up a memo which I call "Logistics of European Relief and Rehabilitation." The document is everything the title implies.....also I have been working on the proposed organization of U.S. and British joint economic controls for Italy.

October 10, 1943. I had two meetings this week, one a dinner and discussion of the place of planning in the national government, arranged by the Social Science Research Council Committee on Administration.

"The other was a dinner I gave for Lord Maynard Keynes, Sir David Whaley, Lionel Robbins, Dennis Robertson, James Meade and Alvin Hansen. The distinguished group of Britishers is here for the US-UK discussions of the proposed world bank. (My secretary selected the menu and fed them beefsteak, the first several of them had had in a year or more, and the first I had had in weeks and weeks.)

Gulick's contribution to the cause of public administration improvement was formally recognized by the American Society for Public Administration, which elected him president for the years 1945 and 1946. He had been one of ASPA's leading promoters, and in 1939 had drafted the resolution calling for its establishment.

On April 12, 1945, the world was shocked by the death of President Roosevelt. Gulick attended the funeral services in the White House, which he described in a family letter.

In the White House were perhaps four hundred persons.....I was in the Blue Room [with] all the War Production tops, the heads of the District Government, Governor Lehman, Leon Henderson, James Farley, a lot of military and naval people, Tom Cochran, Ben Cohen, and many others...... I did not see Truman, but I did see the Roosevelt family. Mrs. R was tall and straight, dressed all in black, and very tired looking.
Walking out of the White House.... I could see the thousands of common folks standing in the parks and streets. It was they who loved him most, and in their instinctive and unreasoned way felt they had lost a great and devoted friend. There were more moist eyes there than in the gathering of the great.

No man in history has been mourned by more men in more lands than FDR. This is partly the result of radio of course, but it is also the result of his personality and things for which he found and the time in which he lived and died. His page in history will be a notable one, and I think a great one.

On May 23, 1945, Gulick was in London with members of the American delegation dealing with reparations; while there he heard prophetic speculation as to who might win the upcoming national elections.

The British situation is upset a good deal because the Conservatives have decided to have an election soon....I am told that the Conservatives may take a serious trimming....that the election will hang on future programs, with great fear of the Conservatives' plan to remove all controls immediately.

Following conversations with their British counterparts, the delegation went to Paris, from where Gulick wrote on May 24.

We have spent the last two days away from Paris with the various top military offices in charge of the administration of Germany, with special reference to property controls, restitution and reparations, and labor and production.

From France, Gulick went for the first time into Germany, where he began evaluating the impact of the war on the German economy, and on German capacity to pay reparations.

From Frankfurt, May 30. Frankfurt.....is a shambles. The entire center of town is blasted and burned. The buildings are standing, but only one in 20 to 40 is partly habitable. The small residence and apartment districts
are almost as bad, but some of the middle class houses are less wrecked. The RR station is roofless and burned but trains are running. The opera is roofless and burned, as are all churches and theatres.

From Leipzig, June 3. Our trip through Germany has been very interesting..... The country is beautiful as always, perhaps more so in contrast to the pitiful plight of the cities.

Transport is the great problem now, a difficulty that will be translated into food a little later. There is hardly a wheel turning in Germany except the military. There is a great deal of plain carrying, and ever so many bicycles used as beasts of burden, so loaded they cannot be ridden. The streams of displaced are pitiful, French and Belgians going west, Poles and Russians and Czechs going East.....Incidentally my German is pretty good. I have no trouble in talking with natives about their experiences in the war.

Next was a trip to Moscow, to help lay the groundwork for a meeting of the Allied Reparations Commission.

June 15. Wednesday I went to work revising my memo on the alternatives presented in the organization of the conference. Wednesday night Marshall Minister Maisky [Russian member of the Reparations Commission] threw us a Russian dinner of welcome. Seven members of the US delegation and five Russians sat down at about 7:30 PM in a private dining room of the Savoy Hotel..... The table was heaped with dishes of cold cuts, salads, cheeses, sardines, cookies, etc......each with appropriate wine, vodka, champagne, cognac and liqueurs]... The man at my end was the Vice-Commissar of the Gosplan, a young vigorous engineer. We had much in common as he had read the reports of the NRPB on which I worked.

Later there was a trip to Stalingrad....None of us will ever forget the sight of ..... the city.....where the Nazis were turned back.....

June 21. We had the first meeting of the Inter-Allied Reparations Commission today....Much the best opening statement was made by our Mr.Pauley. They have asked me to be the chief of the Secretariat on the U.S. side and I guess I am in for it.....This very minute I
am supposed to be working on the structure of the committees for the Commission.

June 30. Sunday we had box stand "seats" for the great Victory Review and Parade in Red Square..... some 40 to 50,000 troops..... paraded past for 3 to 4 hours...

This week we have been working very hard. Especially me, as I had two meetings, with the necessary documents and minutes. In addition I wrote two important documents.....and went to a dinner with Pauley, Parten and the British.....That day I worked from 5 AM to 1 AM the next morning!

On July 14, Gulick returned to Berlin, where he attended the Potsdam conference of Russian, British, and U.S. heads of state in July 1945.

July 15. We sat up till 2 am talking with Joe Davies, Will Clayton, David and Harriman.

July 20--fourth day of the meetings of the Big Three. An average day goes like this: I am up and around by 7:30 which gives me two hours of quiet for writing and reviewing before the rest arise..... I make the rounds..... of the State Dept., Chiefs of Staff, the White House ... etc., picking up documents, our part of the "pouch" and gossip. At breakfast the Ambassador puts out some action ideas and more or less agrees to the agenda for the day..... The cables are passed about and discussed and a flock of outgoing cables are suggested, and the drafting turned over to various members of the staff. Things we want done by the Big Three are put into letters or memos or agenda notes. This work is done by lunch time.

During the morning the Committee of Ministers (Byrnes, Eden and Molotov) meet and agree on the business to be taken up by the Big Three at 4 PM. Incidentally they have a bad time finding meeting times for the Big Three because Stalin likes to start at around 1 PM, right after breakfast; Churchill likes to nap from 3 to 5 PM, and Truman likes to work in the morning, in good American fashion! As you know, they surprised Harry by electing him chairman of the meeting at their first session. He

Shortly afterward occurred the British elections, in which the Labour Party defeated the Conservatives and Churchill was replaced by Clement Atlee.
promptly went to work with no opening ceremonial speeches by himself or anybody else, and announced that the Big Three would be meeting every day at 4 PM.

...my work comes chiefly in arguing about policies and then drafting up the documents Pauli puts in. I deal chiefly with question of administration and with the analysis of broad economic matters involved in reparations and the management of the German nation. When I get an idea, I write it up and throw it into our own staff for thinking about.....it generally becomes the basis of something that goes on to the Drafting Committee, the Committee of Ministers, and to the Big Three.....

At luncheon, which stretches from 1 to 3 PM, Ambassador Harriman, Murphy, [and] some of the Generals generally drop in. The talk covers some of the conference developments, though not very deeply. After lunch I generally get a nap, though I am generally routed out for this document or that cable which can't be found.....[after which] I go back to reading and writing and revising for the following day.

Around 8 PM the meetings are over and the fun begins. We eat dinner and hear all about what Stalin, Churchill and the President said and agreed to. That starts off another lot of discussions and document drafting.....and.....figuring how to get the horse back again which has been given away during the day!

All sorts of people drop in during the evening..... By 1 AM most of the outsiders have gone home and we decide what we will do. Some preliminary wordings are put down, but nothing finished except me, and I go to bed..... I expect that we will be through here in another week. I shall then go back to Moscow to see if we can't wind that thing up in another two to four weeks.

My work here in Potsdam has been very interesting, though with the most irregular hours I ever experienced. This is hard on me, as I find I am wide awake at 7:30 or 8 AM, even when we all work until 1 or 2 AM.

I have taken two long rides through the industrial districts of Berlin and through the freight marshalling hards to study the Russian policies of German deindustrialization. This is the only field work I have done. The rest of the time I spend analyzing documents and writing memoranda,
and conferring on committees.

July 29. Last night I worked all night right through, ate breakfast at 8:45 and went to bed and slept till around 3 PM. It was this way: [we were] working up toward the final discussions when we found that Ambassador Pauley was going to need some documents summarizing not only the economic statistics, but reviewing all our documents and negotiations to date. This developed at II PM. The material had to be ready for him to take to a conference at 9 AM today. We got through drafting and revision by 6:30, and the poor stenogs finished around 8:15.

The more I see, the more I am convinced that it is bad practice to lose a war, especially to the USSR. Their totalitarian approach to public affairs results in a most oriental approach to the management of a defeated economy. I only wish there were some way we could quietly slide out of all responsibility for what is going to happen over here.

The Conference of the Big Three is about over. Yesterday another meeting was held, and apparently the logjam was broken and the final decisions came through thick and fast. It is fascinating to see the ‘final decisions’ developing and to note the tactics of the various national interests at play. Human beings are extraordinary and interestingly complex things. The interrelationships of great forces and individual peculiarities is quite a study.

Yesterday... really started the day before, because after the late meetings of Monday, we went to work redrafting and recomputing some statistics. I got to bed around midnight, though my roommate, who is our Chief Counsel, was up until 2:30 AM working on the language. We got the material in shape for Mr. Pauley to get to a 10 AM meeting with Secretary Byrnes.

Around II or 12...... there came an assignment for defining the Ruhr, which is...the great industrial center of Western Germany..... Though everyone talks about the Ruhr, it has no fixed geographic or political boundaries..... The industrial experts, the economists and the geographers from our own staff and from the State Dept had more ideas about defining the boundaries of the Ruhr than you could shake an Atlas at...... after about an hour of debate Colonel Fogelson and I put an end to the talk, "fixed' the boundaries" for purposes of this agreement' and threw out the experts, except for the cartographer, who
went to work.

I am not one of those who think the work accomplished was very helpful. After the drift of the conference was clear, I would have adjourned....All the rest might better have been left to a Council of Ministers which should have been established, and to the Allied Control Council in Germany. In that way, all the other decisions could have been approached gradually as a matter of practical administration.....I never felt so constrained against my best judgment as in this situation.

Yesterday, I went to downtown [Berlin] and found [for the first time] the entrance to Hitler's private bomb-shelter. I judge very few have found it as most of the furniture is intact except in Hitler's own bedroom where a fire destroyed the furnishings. All the furniture is still in Eva Braun's room, a light birdseye maple sort. The private safe has been blown, but I think I shall go down and get the lock if I have time.

The shelter is about 40 to 45 feet underground and is very complete, with a dispensary, large telephone exchange, electric kitchen, several living rooms, servants' quarters, and the two master bedrooms each with a private bath.

The whole place is under Russian guard. I get in because my Conference pass is in Russian and has no expiration date, for some reason. I expect to have it taken up one of these days. If you never hear of me again, look for me in Siberia...

Gulick soon after returned to the U.S...... However, he was retained for work with the Allied Reparations Commission, and November found him going out to the Far East. By November 10, he was in Tokyo, staying in the old Imperial Hotel (designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. ) In addition to advising on technical work and writing memoranda concerning decisions respecting what equipment and other reparations might be transferred to China, the Philippines and other Pacific Allies, he managed to travel over and observe a good deal of Japan, including Matsuyama, where he had lived as a child, and which had been
"flattened" by the war. By mid December he was headed home again.

Back in Washington, Gulick began wrapping up his unfinished commitments and making plans to move back to New York. However, he was tapped for one more assignment—attending a conference in Europe of Allied Foreign Ministers on implementation of postwar reparation and rehabilitation policies.

Gulick recaptured what he thought had been learned about administration and management in the course of organizing and conducting the titanic war effort in a series of lectures later published in the book, Reflections on the Administrative Lessons of World War II.\footnote{University of Alabama Press, 1948. The lectures were delivered at the University in November 1946.} Paul Van Riper, compiler of an annotated bibliography of Gulick's writings, thinks that this is "Gulick's most complete and thorough intellectual writing..."a superb review of wartime administration and of requisites for...any future conflict." Of one thing Gulick was quite sure—the democracies, and notably the United States, had done much more in emergency planning and war management than had the militaristic dictatorships.

The comparative failure of Germany and Japan...arose from inadequate initial planning, inadequate integration of military production programs, the tardy development of controls over the industrial economy, the selfish behavior of entrenched cartels and favored politicians, the failure to recognize blunders and make adjustments.\footnote{Ibid., p. 145.}

To be sure the democracies also made many blunders; these are inevitable in the conduct of large new endeavors, especially under crisis conditions. But--

No American blunders of broad war planning were as disastrous as half a dozen major German errors...The greatest superiority of the free peoples...arose from two things: the superiority of their broad plans and their elasticity, their quickness to change in the face of
need....Broad plans are more valid when they have been subject to the kind of review and criticism which democracy alone affords. Plans hatched in secret by a small group of partially informed men and then enforced through dictatorial authority are likely to contain fatal weaknesses, undetected until too late.\footnote{44}

Writing in the Public Administration Review, Herbert Emmerich noted—

Not the least courageous assertion in the Reflections is that organizations and the men selected to direct them are expendable. Here is a writer who perceives that war organization must be a state of flux and that agencies and personnel must change under the pressure of changing situations....Instead of apologizing for flexibility of structure and personnel, Gulick asserts its virtues as a sine qua non of good war organizations.\footnote{45}

Among the observations that most impressed Gulick, and was the subject of his memorable luncheon address at the 1981 fall meeting of the National Academy of Public Administration, was the importance of time in the administrative process.

The element of time was found to be not just something on the clock or calendar, but it was the precise equivalent of steel and copper and aluminum; it was ships, aircraft, 100 octane gas and rubber....a million tons in one month was 500,000 tons in two months; it was time that made the difference."\footnote{46}

**New Directions**

Returning to the Institute of Public Administration after the War, Gulick began considering new directions for IPA. The old staff had been depleted--some members had gone elsewhere, some had retired or were on the verge of retirement. A proliferation of consulting firms was pursuing government consulting work.

\footnote{44}{Ibid., pp. 145-7.}
\footnote{45}{Public Administration Review, 8-3, Summer 1948, pp. 211-218.}
\footnote{46}{Time and Public Administration, published by NAPA in 1981.}
Inflation had depleted the purchasing power of the IPA endowment. If it were to continue as a significant force, IPA would either have to look for new endowment, use up its nest egg and retire gracefully into history, or rely more heavily on income-producing projects.

Unknown to Gulick and his colleagues, a giant project was coming down the road which would enable putting off for a decade decisions about IPA's future. Meanwhile, income-producing projects appealed as at least a partial solution—it was still an era when IPA's reputation would bring clients to its door. Here the difficulty was lack of staff—most of the old professionals had retired or had gone to other jobs.

The most ambitious project of the latter 1940's was an education program, modeled on the old Training School, designed primarily for veterans who might be considering careers in the public service. But lacking a diversified curriculum and ancillary support, the program, though by no means a failure and still esteemed by alumni, never attracted sufficient students to make it viable, and after a few years was abandoned.

Meanwhile, the IPA, prompted by Gulick's long-standing interest in nature and recreation, undertook a research project on administration of the U.S. Forest Service. The project was notable for producing two books, and for launching the career of a leading scholar of American public administration, Herbert Kaufman. One of the books, a broad survey of the Forest Service Administration, was written by Gulick himself, drawing on materials gathered by the IPA staff; The other, The Forest Ranger, was by Kaufman, then an IPA fellow.

In the post-World War II period, the federal government was attracting the lion's share of talented people going into public service. But the most urgent
domestic problems were down at the level of state and local governments—problems created by the great relocation of population and changes in economic structure precipitated by the defense-war experience, and the steadily rising incomes of the postwar generation.

Gulick, perceiving all this, started turning his attention to urban problems; the trend is evident in his speeches and writings of the period. But first he would find himself at the center of the largest government improvement study yet undertaken anywhere, the New York City's Mayor's Committee on Management Survey (MCMS)—the term came to be applied to the survey itself as well as the Committee that directed it).

The MCMS

The survey would be the most ambitious and complex Gulick had yet undertaken, and with the involvement in New York City government that grew out of the project, would take most of the following five years of his professional career.

When the project was launched in 1950, New York City could boast that it was the world's biggest and wealthiest metropolis, with the second largest government budget (after the U.S. federal government) in the Western Hemisphere. The city government had grown out of the first and still the greatest metropolitan consolidation, consummated in 1898.47

The city's complex government defies any short description, but it is worth identifying the major power centers as they existed in the early 1950s. They included:

47 The consolidation brought together two major cities (Brooklyn and New York, now Manhattan), five counties, and some sixty towns and villages, in an area of 320 square miles.
The Mayor, elected for a four-year term—one of the most powerful executives of any American city. Despite his enormous responsibilities, the mayor had only one official assistant, a deputy mayor, appointed and serving "at the pleasure of the Mayor."

The Budget Director, heading the Bureau of some 400 employees. Legally the appointee of the mayor, the budget director had an independent power base in that the Budget Bureau also provided staff assistance to the Board of Estimate.

The Board of Estimate, de facto the City's senior legislative body. It comprised the City's chief elected officials: three elected city-wide (mayor, comptroller, president of the City Council) and the five borough presidents, elected by each of the City's boroughs.48

The mayor who actually established the MCMS was William O'Dwyer, who in 1946 had succeeded the ebullient Fiorello LaGuardia.49 Though O'Dwyer himself had made a generally good impression during his first term, the City's chronic financial bind was even worse than usual, and there was growing discontent with the City's administrative structure and performance. Immediately after his reelection in 1949, Mayor O'Dwyer appointed the Mayor's Committee on Management Survey, with a broad mandate to look into the policies and management of all City government functions, excluding only the domains of the quasi-independent authorities.

The Committee was a variegated group of about thirty persons, including several top city officials; representatives of leading civic groups, labor organizations, and principal business and professional groups. The Chairman was

48 The Board operated under a system of weighted voting, with the city-wide elected officials having three votes each, and the borough presidents, two votes each.

49 O'Dwyer had served in Europe during the World War II, achieving the rank of Brigadier General, and had been assigned to Military Government, where he had acquired some insight into the problems of governing a civilian population.
City Comptroller Lazarus Joseph, who was selected because of his position rather than for any expertise in government management or finance.

An ad hoc search committee was set up to find an executive director, and after looking over many candidates lighted on the name of Luther Gulick. He was reluctant to take the assignment, but finding that most MCMS members supported his appointment, he consulted with the Mayor, seeking assurance that O'Dwyer was not merely making a token gesture to the reformers. The Mayor convinced him to take the job, under an arrangement whereby the City would contract with the Institute of Public Administration to provide services to the MCMS, including Gulick's service as executive director; he thereby avoided having to resign from the IPA.

The next large issue concerned the nature of the survey the MCMS would carry on. Over the objections of the city officials, other Committee members argued that there was little information on which to base recommendations, and that there should be in-depth surveys, drawing on outside as well as inside expertise. The broad view prevailed.

The survey office was organized in March 1950. Gulick and his staff laid out an ambitious program of surveys for the consideration of the Committee, which approved most of it.

Gulick managed the work of the Committee and steered its deliberations with outward aplomb. It was a difficult and nerve-wracking task, for there were many stresses and strains within the Committee itself. He recalls some of the problems.

The bureaucrats gave me more trouble than anyone else. They were always eager to prevent studies which would dig into the guts of city management, desiring to cover up bad administrative conditions, including graft.
In the fall of 1952, the Committee's final report was adopted and published in two volumes. The project was acclaimed an outstanding success by the press, the civic organizations, and the general public, though not, of course, by the unrepentant bureaucracy.

Of the top recommendations, the one most germane to this story was to "reorganize and equip the Office of the Mayor...." The Committee proposed a "Deputy to the Mayor with the title Director of Administration to assist the Mayor in the coordination of all departmental activities."

In the view of most advocates of administrative reform, it was a weak recommendation because it did not give the new functionary enough power to be effective. There were several reasons why Gulick went along with it. First, he was a staunch believer in the strong chief executive, responsible to the electorate; his instinct was to follow the first maxim of the PCAM—the President [chief executive] needs help, and the PCAM had recommended a system of administrative assistants completely controlled by the President. Second, this was only one of hundreds of issues to be resolved in drawing up a complex report;

50 The good government groups wanted a city administrative officer who would be more than an administrative assistant to the Mayor—more like a city manager. Such a post was recommended in 1953 by a New York State Commission on City government organization appointed by Governor Thomas Dewey, whose research director was the respected Columbia University Professor of Public Administration, Wallace Sayre. The State Commission called for a City Administrator "appointed by and subject to removal by the Mayor," who would serve as the Mayor's second-in-command over the City administrative agencies, with power to appoint and remove heads of agencies under his jurisdiction (subject to the Mayor's approval), exercise administrative control over agency managers, and supervise the preparation of the expense and capital budgets. Such recommendations went far beyond anything that the Mayor-elect and his advisers were willing to accept.
Gulick simply lacked time to reflect. Third, any attempt to invest real power in a director of administration would have met strong opposition from the City representatives in the Committee.

The MCMS had started a chain of events that would lead to two more years of intimate involvement with New York City affairs. Robert F. Wagner, Jr., son of the famous New Deal senator, who himself had glittering credentials, had decided to run for Mayor in 1953. One of his principal campaign pledges was to implement the recommendations of the MCMS, in particular to establish a post of City Administrator. He won election handily, and one of his first moves after election was to ask Gulick to accept the City Administrator’s post. Gulick again was reluctant, but was persuaded by the argument that no one else was as well qualified to assist in implementing the MCMS recommendations.

In negotiations over the bill to create the post of City Administrator, Gulick had been inclined to insist that the Budget Bureau should be subordinate to the City Administrator in the chain of command. But former governors Lehman and Harriman had advised Wagner against any arrangement that would impose an intervening level between the chief executive and his budget director. Gulick conceded the point, and agreed to take the newly created post, on Wagner’s assurance that Gulick would indeed be his senior adviser on administrative matters. As Gulick was later to discover, it was a game in which the Budget Director held most of the high cards.

Even before Gulick assumed office he was well started on his first task of selecting candidates for top posts in the Wagner Administration. With his wide contacts, personal reputation and powers of persuasion, he brought together an outstanding group of commissioners, including several with national reputations. But his most important recommendation was one which he later would have liked very much to recall—to retain the Budget Director who had caused so much
difficulty as a member of the MCMS, Abraham Beame.\textsuperscript{51}

With a large staff, authoritarian control exercised through a line-item budget and powerful budget examiners, the Budget Bureau's role as staff to the Board of Estimate, and Beame's and the Bureau's political network, the budget complex was a formidable power block. Whereas a knowledgeable reform-minded budget director could have joined forces with Gulick to promote constructive administrative reform, Beame from the beginning regarded the very existence of the City Administrator as a threat to his own barony.

While Gulick recognized the potential conflict situation, he did not consider it a serious threat at the time he was preparing to assume office. He had great confidence in his powers of persuasion and felt that he could win Beame over. And he had resources of his own, including assurances from the Mayor, the backing of the civic groups, and the support of most of the press, led by the potent \textit{New York Times}.\textsuperscript{52}

Gulick was sworn in on New Year's Day, 1954. Columbia University observed the event by awarding him an honorary Doctorate of laws. (Meanwhile, Beame had gone through the New York public school system and graduated from the City College of New York, where he majored in accounting. He had an marked talent for politics, and gained sufficient recognition in the Brooklyn Democratic organization to win an appointment as assistant budget director in 1946. He moved into the top job in 1951, when his predecessor budget director died. He would be elected Comptroller in 1961, and in 1973, Mayor.

\textsuperscript{52} Gulick also set about organizing his own office and staff. The Charter Amendment provided for a first deputy city administrator and two other deputies. For the first deputy's post he chose Charles Preusse, a politically well-connected lawyer with a wide knowledge of City affairs. One of the other deputy posts went to Gordon Clapp, widely respected for his work as Director of the Tennessee Valley Authority (the other initially was left vacant). For a core staff Gulick recruited consultant-specialists in various fields.
the American Political Science Association had already recognized his many contributions by electing him President for 1952.)

One of Gulick's first moves as city administrator was to persuade the Mayor to establish a cabinet which would meet weekly to discuss and decide on program priorities, and how they should be implemented. This was not the conventional cabinet of department administrators, but was composed instead of the Mayor's top assistants.\(^5^3\) In Gulick's words —

The Cabinet was fashioned as an instrument for bringing issues, sharply defined to the Mayor's attention, and getting decisions which would initiate the mobilization of the City's technical resources.

An early assignment from the Mayor was to assume responsibility for liaison with the established civic associations and citizens' groups. He proceeded by setting up a Citizens Committee, which divided itself into a number of subcommittees--including business and finance, city management and administration, health and hospitals. One subcommittee which got major attention was that on management, chaired by David Lilienthal, distinguished former chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The first governmental reorganization accomplished by the City Administrator was the creation of a new Department of Personnel, with a single head appointed by the Mayor. A departmental reporting system was established, with monthly reports on agency problems and progress.

The City Administrator frequently was requested by the operating agencies and their exasperated commissioners to intercede on their behalf in what they regarded as arbitrary decisions by the "abominable no-men" in the Budget

---

\(^{53}\) They included the City Administrator and Deputies, Budget Director, Corporation Counsel, Chairman of the City Planning Commission, Personnel Director, and Press Secretary.
Bureau. Frequently the issues concerned matters in which one or more civic groups were interested. With the limits of its resources, the Administrator's Office would investigate requests which appeared reasonable, and if they were found to have merit, the Administrator would take them up with the Mayor, often in Cabinet Meeting. In this way, the Administrator would serve a political purpose, despite his firm disavowal.

On public relations, Gulick's position was that he would not be responsible for presenting or defending political decisions.

The Administrator did not hesitate to make reports on subjects with important political overtones, but any such reports always stuck to the technical aspects of the problem involved.

A source of continuing controversy with the Budget Director concerned long-term fiscal planning, one of Gulick's favorite causes. The MCMS had recommended that—

The Budget Bureau should undertake to anticipate the City's revenue requirements, and to study the ultimate consequences for the City's finances of the adoption of proposed policies.

But long-term fiscal planning was opposed by the Budget Director, ostensibly because it would put the City into a financial strait-jacket, but more probably, proponents suspected, because it would restrict his ability to wheel and deal.

The above of course are only the high spots of the Gulick tenure. In the fall of 1955, he began planning to return to the Institute at the end of his second year as City Administrator. His public position was that the Office was now a viable and growing force in the City Government, and that with the start made under his leadership, would continue to grow in power and prestige. Privately, he was disenchanted with the Mayor's failure to carry through with needed reforms.

One of the unresolved issues had to do with the Bureau of the Budget—
the lack of agreement over the respective responsibilities of the two agencies, and the failure to establish a harmonious relationship. A second was the failure to move expeditiously in implementing MCMS recommendations in various agencies. A third was that the Administrator's Office was still not adequately equipped to deal with the range of activities necessary to exercise a full-blown management supervision and development function.

So Gulick returned to IPA, with the accolades of the civic groups, the press, and his City Government colleagues—many of whom regretted his departure while others, for their own reasons, were glad to see him go. He had left a mark on City Government that would not be quickly erased. The lost opportunity had been in the failure to give professional management a firm power base, along the lines advocated by the New York State Commission and Wallace Sayre in 1953. For a long time Gulick wondered if he might have won the battle if he had stood firm while the structure of the City Administrator's Office was being considered; in a later family letter he remarked—

Looking back at the whole operation, I wonder if I should have threatened resignation more often, and more noisily.

Back to the IPA

The first task was rebuilding the depleted staff; the last two old guard professionals, A. F. Buck and Philip Cornick, had retired. A number of senior and junior professionals were recruited, enabling IPA to take on several new consulting projects.54

Gulick was still convinced that urbanism would be the nation's leading

54 Major projects included overhauling the sales tax administration in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and a survey-and-evaluation for the Washington (DC) Mass Transit Commission of alternative possible revenue sources and organizational forms.
domestic concern for the foreseeable future. His main interest at the time was in the metropolitan area phenomenon—rapid city growth exacerbating the old problems that crossed city boundary lines, thus creating new problems. In an address to the Regional Plan Association in 1954 he had ticked off four such functions which could be adequately handled only by new forms of metropolitan-scale organization—water supply, air and water pollution control, intraregional transportation, and waste disposal.

With financing from the Stern Family Fund, he promoted studies by a number of leading scholars of metropolitan problems, including Robert Connery, Richard Leach, Arthur Bromage, and Ferrel Heady.

A commitment to deliver the William W. Cook lectures at the University of Michigan in March 1961 obliged him to pull together his own observations and conclusions respecting the metropolitan phenomenon. The lectures were published the following year in the volume Metropolitan Problems and American ideas.\footnote{Knopf, 1962.} The book on first review may seem a bit dated, the lectures having been composed before the social convulsions and responses of the 1960s, and the ensuing period of reaction beginning with the Nixon presidency and extending to the "New Federalism" of the 1980s. However, many of Gulick diagnoses of and prescriptions for urban ills are still lively topics of discussion.

In the lectures, Gulick first reviews the development of U.S. federal, state and local government institutions, and of corresponding public attitudes toward government. He evaluates gaps and weaknesses in the federal system, emphasizing the need for institutional changes to handle metropolitan scale public problems. Next, he discusses principles which might guide moves for improvement, and in the final lecture, entitled Action—emphasizes that the first requirement is a change of attitude, from the White House down through
federal agencies and state-local governments, from indifference to muscular interest and collaboration. State and local governments can initiate action programs following already established precedents--intergovernmental service contracts, legislation to adopt new types of federated or consolidated local governments designed for metropolitan areas, establishment of new state agencies to serve as the focal point of state action, action to move problem services (such as urban transportation, water supply and air pollution control, to wider jurisdictions.

He insists on the necessity for Presidential initiative--

The only leadership which can "really start the ball rolling" must be that provided by the U.S. President, "who owes his election to the urban voters". However--

Depending on the situation in each area, all levels of government must participate in dealing with urban metropolitan problems. Responsibility of each level for various major functions should be worked out and agreed on, and--

Since "the only place where the problems emerge into full view is at the grass roots and on the sidewalks of our urban areas...the ultimate coordination (among levels of government) must be effected at the point where the various programs reach the people and are there intertwined in their composite impact".

Other activities

New York State and New York City made frequent calls on Gulick. He served on a State Commission on Governmental Operations of the City of New York; a New York City Charter Revision Commission; a Mayor's Commission on Professional, Technical and Managerial Manpower; as Chairman of the Committee for Modern Zoning of the City of New York; New York State Temporary Commission on City Finances; a Mayor's Task Force on City Finances; a Mayor's Task Force on the
New York State Constitution; the New York World's Fair Corporation; a Commission of Inquiry, New York City Board of Education; and other Boards and Commissions. Private organizations also sought him out, and he continued long-term associations as Board member of the National Planning Association and the New York Regional Planning Association.

He also began taking overseas assignments. In 1957 he went to Teheran to work on a project with the Government Affairs Institute, which had a contract to provide technical assistance to the Iranian Government. But that experience was largely frustrating. He was first assigned to work with the Minister of Planning to establish a system of national development planning, but when that official was removed from office shortly afterward, Gulick was reassigned to work on plans for improving the personnel system.

In 1959, he went to the Calcutta Metropolitan Area in India with a World Bank team to study ways and means of providing a hygienic water supply system. Gulick's assignment concerned political and administrative problems of setting up an organization for the metropolitan area, which comprised some sixty municipalities, including the central city of Calcutta, along the polluted Hooghly River.

Retirement and After

Gulick was 69 in January 1961 and wanted to retire. He and the Trustees had selected the writer to succeed him as soon as I could gracefully exit from my post as New York City Administrator (in which I had succeeded Gulick's successor Charles Preusse when the latter resigned at the end of 1959). I returned to IPA on April 1, and on July 1 was installed as President, while Gulick became Chairman of the Board of Trustees.
He was invited to Egypt in the same year for a Ford Foundation-financed review of Egyptian government planning and organizational problems. During Gulick's visit, President Nasser was persuaded by his advisers to arrange an appointment to discuss a new constitution for the United Arab Republic that Nasser was readying to announce. Gulick looked it over, and discovered that it was almost entirely concerned with the top structure of government, with little attention to functions, organizational structure, and similar elements of administrative apparatus. He later recalled with some glee that his recommendations for changes made an impact in part because he flattered Nasser by comparing the project for a new constitution with that of the drafting of the Napoleonic Code.

While in college, Gulick had developed a great interest in Egyptian art, and he took special pleasure in becoming involved, through contacts with the Egyptian government and UNESCO in the project for preserving national monuments threatened by the Aswan Dam. He claims credit for having suggested that the Abu Simbel monument, with its giant statue of Rameses II, be cut into blocks and relocated out of the path of the advancing waters.

In 1962, again sponsored by the Ford Foundation, he returned to Egypt for a survey directed at strengthening planning and administration under the new Socialist regime. With Professor James Pollock of the University of Michigan, he spent several months in the country working with top government officials. The assignment had numerous delicate aspects--dealing with an authoritarian would-be socialist regime, operating in a framework of Islamic law and custom. Gulick and Pollock assembled an impressive amount of information, and analyzed and made recommendations covering the major problem areas of the Egyptian domestic government and economy. Of particular interest are the sections on organizing and controlling the public enterprises which would replace private
firms; if they were to succeed, Gulick warned, they must be grounded on market principles and not depend on state subsidies. In a move designed to enhance the report's creditability, and the attention it would receive, he persuaded a leading Islamic legal authority to certify that it complied with Islamic law.

In 1963 Gulick went to Peru on a mission for IPA, which had a USAID contract to work with the Government to help plan and organize a training institution for government employees, and to provide technical assistance to Peruvian Government agencies. He served on a United Nations Expert Committee for Planning and Development at the Stockholm Conference in 1971. The following year, his 80th, he was a participant and rapporteur for a Pan American Conference on Public Administration in Lebanon.

And he continued lecturing and writing.

One of the advantages of Gulick's retirement status was that he could spend more time at his cherished summer home on Caspian Lake, in Greensboro, Vermont. Since youth he had been an enthusiastic sailor, and the local yacht club, with a miscellaneous assortment of sailboats that raced casually on weekends, provided an opportunity for excitement. He acquired a Flying Dutchman, an Olympic class 19-foot racing sloop. With that weapon, and with visiting grandsons for crew, he promptly began winning weekend races. Other aspiring competitors were forced to acquire their own Flying Dutchmans, and before long it was the dominant boat on the lake. Gulick's innovation was celebrated in the early 1970's, when the Club staged a Luther H. Gulick Flying Dutchman Regatta, attended by owners who trailed their Dutchmans from all over the Northeast to compete, with Himself serving as a judge.

He could also indulge his lifelong love of the arts, and take more time for concerts and exhibitions, and his favorite diversion, the ballet. In Vermont, he
became co-founder and board member of the Craftsbury Chamber Players, which ever since has provided pleasure to music lovers and has provided an outlet for talented young musicians of the area. Always a passionate outdoorsman, he served on the boards of the National Audubon Society, National Recreation Foundation, and Nature Centers for Young America. He was co-founder and into his nineties an active board member of the National Recreation Association.

He was one of the founders, in 1967, of the National Academy of Public Administration, which in 1980 received a Congressional Charter to serve as official adviser to the Federal Government on matters of govern- organization and administration. The only other organization to receive a Congressional charter is the National Academy of Science, established to serve a similar function relating to matters of scientific policy.

Tragedy struck the Gulick family in 1969 when Helen died, after 52 years of a model marriage. With a deep sense bereavement that is registered in his contemporary letters, Gulick started putting his life together again.

It was his great good fortune, in 1970, to marry Carol Moffet, widow of Guy Moffet. Carol herself had had a lively professional career as a journalist and author. This second model marriage continued until Carol's death in January 1989.

And so life continued, with participation on several boards, including the Regional Plan Association, the National Recreation and Park Association, and of course the IPA, where he continued as chairman until 1982 when he became emeritus, though continuing to serve on the Executive and Finance Committees of the Board. In later years, public appearances have been mainly limited to

56 Guy was a former Director of the Spellman Foundation, and in his time one of the great figures of public administration; the Gulicks and Moffets had long been close friends.
occasional lectures, in which he divulged the evolution of his thinking on the philosophy of government in general—major themes of which are discussed in a following section. In 1986 he was the subject of a panel on the program of the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association; the following January he was the central figure in a meeting at the University of Virginia, convened to mark the 50th Anniversary of the presentation of the report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management. In April 1989 he attended the 50th Anniversary meeting of the American Society for Public Administration, where he was acclaimed as one of the principal founders.

At this writing he is in his hundredth year, still alert and especially interested in federal government policy directions.

Themes of Gulick's Thinking

The "themes" here listed are main conclusions of a lifetime of informed observation and contemplation. The first two themes, having to do with planning and goals, have been basic from the beginning of his career. The third, concerning the unfortunate consequences of the modern fragmentation of knowledge into many disciplines, emerged in his search for reasons why public administration failed to fulfill the original bright hopes of its pioneers. The fourth, respecting ethics has been basic from the beginning, whereas a principal derivative—the necessity of reinterpreting concepts of authority and hierarchy, evolved only after his retirement, when he had time to think things over.

Theme 1--The Importance of Planning. The position of the "P" in POSDCORB signifies that planning is the first of the top administrator's seven main functions. Gulick has no patience with "muddling through", regarding it as the
antithesis of good administration, and little more patience with "disjointed incrementalism", which has been inelegantly described as putting on your pants one leg at a time without bothering overmuch as to whether they match the suit. His most explicit involvement with planning theory came when he collaborated with Gerhart Colm in co-authoring a 1968 report by the National Planning Association, *Program Planning for National Goals*, which stressed more systematic application of knowledge to policy decision-making, saying that--

The lack of needed information, and of adequately informed judgments based on it, often betrays intelligent and sincere public leaders into making reckless and inconsistent promises to the public. Much of the 'credibility gap arises from this failure of government to produce needed current facts and information.

**Theme 2--The Necessity of Goals.** Planning logically begins with goals, so two themes are closely related. Any of Gulick's pronouncements on administrative or other improvements invariably sets forth a list of goals to be achieved. This is a standard ploy with public leaders, of course, but Gulick, unlike so many others, takes his goals seriously. Rightly conceived, worded and timed, he feels, they can be powerful tools for inspiring and energizing the populace. In particular, he remembers the impact of President Roosevelt's Four Freedoms, Freedom from Fear, Freedom from Want, Freedom of Religion and Freedom of Speech.57

The goals listed in his 1983 article are significant not only because of their symbolic importance but also because of what they say about Gulick.

---

57 First enunciated in the State of the Union Message of 1941 and later incorporated in the Atlantic Charter signed by the President and Prime Minister Winston Churchill at their high seas meeting in 1941.
It is not enough for a nation to reach for military prowess, economic prosperity, and a flamboyant standard of living for its upper crust. These are transitory, selfish, and ignoble goals. What we now require is a realizable dream. This cannot be put into words by any one man, but already we can see that it will have to include the following goals.

First, the development of the next generations, so that they may be better informed, more skillful, and superior to us who go before them;

Second, the greater equalization of the use of global resources to promote the welfare and alleviate the suffering of mankind;

Third, the progressive democratization of our national and local governments, and of our economic and social systems; and

Fourth, the progressive adoption of international policies of peaceful coexistence.

Theme 3. The necessity of coordinating knowledge. In his later years Gulick's views on public administration were broadened by his wider reading and appreciation of important trends of thinking in the natural and social sciences. While recognizing the necessity of specialization, he came to deplore its adverse effects upon policy-making and administration, saying that—

Specialization cannot be achieved...without the exclusion of a great deal of information and experience....The most significant mistakes of bad logic and exclusion have surfaced in recent history when too many historians excluded economics and psychoanalysis, biologists excluded physics, economists excluded politics, and the public interest, and political science excluded economics, psychology, and biology.

His pet peeves were the separatist tendencies in political science and economics.

There can be no adequate and fundamental political science without embracing most of
economics, and no meaningful economics.....without fully recognizing the the political state and power. By the same token neither political science nor economics can go far without history, philosophy, sociology, psychology, biology, ethics, aesthetics, and the underlying natural sciences....

One of the most dramatic blunders of blind specialization is the failure of economics to realize that its advice to politicians is flawed today because their block of knowledge and praxis ..... has failed to incorporate in its ambit environmental impacts, the public interest, and ..... the sheer power which in fact often nullifies the wholesome influence of Adam Smith's "invisible hand".....

The most dramatic failure of public administration has been its failure to base its analysis and therefore its programs, on the solid foundation of the knowledge of human beings as living animals, surviving together in the milieu of the modern world. Thus the new public administration, as a field of knowledge and operation, now requires specific attention not only to economics and psychology, but also to the relevant aspects of human biology. [Emphasis added.]

Theme 4—Ethics is the foundation of everything else. Gulick's basic philosophy has always rested on a strong normative base, stemming from concepts of ethics and ethical behavior in which he was so thoroughly grounded by his missionary family. It was this background that led to the original decision to concentrate on reforming the administration of government institutions. There were several critical underlying assumptions--

1. Administration—"getting things done" is a continuum of policy-making—"deciding what to do".

2. Good administration", emphasizing efficiency and economy, is tantamount to

58 All the above quotations are from Gulick's Introduction to a book of essays designed to "illuminat[e] public administration with the relevant perceptions and revelations of modern human biology.”
"honest (i.e., ethical) administration.

3. The electorate places a high priority on honest administration. (On this assumption, the Bureau of Municipal Research insisted on publishing their surveys—to inform the public of evidence of poor administration, along with recommendations for improvement.)

In his earlier years, when he wrote the 1932 Annual article and served on the PCAM, Gulick's advocacy of strengthening the Presidency, had been based on these assumptions. Herbert Kaufman has suggested that—

----- the root idea [that] integrates and animates Luther's lifelong work [is his ] consistent hope and admiration for the independent popularly elected chief executive as an instrument of governmental unification, energy and creativity....Luther and Wally Sayre both saw this institution..... as the driving force of our system.59

But Gulick's early enthusiasm reflected his admiration for Franklin D. Roosevelt and the tone of his Administration. After retirement, when he had time to think things over, he obviously changed his mind, as the executive office of the President grew to monstrous proportions while the Congress appeared less and less able to cope with national needs. He saw, particularly at the federal level, a waning concern with the quality of administration, and a series of egregious blunders and moral breakdowns in the Administrations of a succession of Presidents whom he regarded as mediocre or worse. In 1975 he said,

We in public administration have always been quick to point out that the lack of 'good management' lies at the bottom of most ......disappointments and failures.....We must now admit that there is now a deeper failure, a fundamental political and moral failure. The American people, with their rich heritage and devotion to democracy and freedom....have not been able to decide where they as a people want to go, and have not selected leaders of character and ability to guide them in dealing with the growing problems of the present and the future.

If this aimless political incompetence and dishonesty continue over the next decade, it may well be said that the American Dream has failed.60

59 1980 letter to Paul Van Riper.
Similar sentiments are expressed in excerpts from a rare sally in verse.

Those who drink deeply of supreme authority
Become prematurely hard of hearing.
They fill the tank with heavily leaded super-power,
Gun the engine, and squeal the brakes,
Mistaking the road of their own exhaust
For the plaudits of the populace......
And poor old Congress
With its fractured crew and antique structure,
In the U-Haul out behind,
Learns that talk alone is useless......
Ah me, is it "power that corrupts,"
Or haste, secrecy, insecurity, one-upsanship?
And lonely irresponsibility?®

Theme 5. Deemphasis of authority and hierarchy. In the early 1980's Gulick broke sharply with his early notions of beneficent government and organization based on hierarchy. In an April 1981 letter to John Miller he said--

We are now in a dangerous and uncertain era—the end of the movement started by the New Deal. The situation is doubly dangerous because the Administration is moving to turn all power back to the hands of special interests and private centers of control.

The modern state has four functions:

60 Democracy and Administration Face the Future, a lecture delivered at Indiana University, April 1, 1976.
1. Be a war machine;
2. Maintain law and order, and perform various agreed-upon public services;
3. Prevent any major change in the distribution of wealth and power;
4. Manage adaptation of social, economic and political system to meet major changes
changes in the total environment.

The forces behind Reagan-Meese are embracing the first function, and turning power back
to businessmen and entrenched new power groups, particularly in the Southwest. This
colossal move is disguised as elimination of governmental interference.

A follow-up letter of February 1982 was even sharper.

I have come to feel that our management theory in the West is fundamentally based on
(1) military administration and (2) the steam engine with its eighteenth century factory
system. This gives high centralization, hierarchy, more and more specialization, the least-
common denominator vulgarization for the mass market, and the limitation of options. This
approach may be highly useful [for a state] designed primarily for war; it may not be for a
state that has other important functions as (1) increase of productivity and quality, (2)
distribution of GNP, (3) education of electorate, (4) peaceful international relations, and (4) the identification and approach toward the adaptations of the
human species for survival in an ever-changing environment.

In 1983, Gulick published the ringing declaration that seemed to repudiate
publicly his early notions of organization based on hierarchy.62 Three
statements make the point.

The structure of the modern state is specifically designed for war. (Here, it should be
noted, he has reached a conclusion closely resembling that which his father had stated nearly
a century earlier.)

We need more decentralization and the abandonment of the present hierarchical, military-
styled structure of governments.

62 "The Dynamics of Public Administration today as Guidelines for the Future, Public
Administration Review, 43/3, May-June 1983."
We need to introduce in all nonmilitary civil agencies a truly democratic and participatory system.

Nothing has happened since to change his glum conclusion.

Then what remains of the notion of hierarchy and of POSDCORB? Probably more than the language, taken literally, would imply.

To begin with, Gulick's blistering indictment of the national state as a "war machine, pure and simple," is prompted by the madness, which affects nearly all national states, of sacrificing some 15 percent or more of the world's resources to purposes of destruction, and specifically to United States policies that outrage his deeply ingrained sense of morality.

In calling for "more decentralization and the abandonment of the present hierarchical and dictatorial military structure of governments...and the introduction of more truly democratic and participatory systems," Gulick is not implying that government agencies can dispense with all the apparatus of hierarchy and specialization, and with manuals of administrative methods and procedures. What he is saying rather is that communication in government, as well as other organizations, must be a two-way street—that personnel up and down the line must have a voice in defining organizational goals and objectives, and that their knowhow and suggestions must be taken into account in the defining the methods and procedures under which they will operate. He is calling also for more flexible organization, which makes greater use of devices such as task forces and ad hoc groups in which members themselves can decide how projects and assignments should be carried out.
This summary account closes with a typical Gulick windup, to his 1980 speech before the National Academy of Administration, *Time and Public Administration*.

We in public administration do not present a Utopia furnished with solved problems; we offer mankind instead a better future in a changing world.

Past, present and future cover the time span of public administration. The past cannot be changed; it is gone, gradually carrying its storehouse of wisdom to oblivion... The present, which after all is not a tangible thing but a mental construct without dimensions, is passed before it can be altered. But it is in that precious interval between past and future that conclusions are reached and decisions are made. Thus, the future is all we have to work on...... And this, my friends, is what public administration is all about.