

## Key Terms

four tides of reform	mix of reforms	Reorganization Act of 1939
scientific management	rhetoric of reform	Hoover Commission Reports
war on waste	centralization vs.	(1949 and 1955)
watch-eye	decentralization	reinventing government
liberation management	President's Committee on	episodic changes
hyper-reform	Administrative Management	reorganization trade-offs

## Suggestions for Further Reading

Any serious study of this subject should start with the reading of the fundamental reorganization documents—commission reports, executive orders, and congressional acts such as the Taft Commission Report, the Brownlow Commission Report, Executive Order No. 8248, the Government Corporations Control Act of 1945, and the two postwar Hoover Commission Reports—all of which are found in two volumes: Frederick C. Mosher, ed., *Basic Documents of American Public Administration: 1776–1950* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1976), and Richard J. Stillman II, ed., *Basic Documents of American Public Administration Since 1950* (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1982). A recent retrospective, on the Brownlow Report, its historic importance and significance for today's government to mark its seventieth anniversary appeared in the *Public Administration Review*, "Brownlow Report Retrospective," edited by Stephanie Newbold and David Rosenbloom 67 (November/December 2007), pp. 765–1058.

For secondary sources, the most thoughtful works on this complex subject include Herbert Emmerich, *Federal Organization and Administrative Management* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1971); Frederick C. Mosher, ed., *Government Reorganizations: Cases and Commentary* (Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967)—read, in particular, Mosher's concluding commentary; Harold Seidman, *Politics, Position and Power*, 3rd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980); Harvey C. Mansfield, "Federal Executive Reorganization: Thirty Years of Experience," *Public Administration Review*, 40 (July/August 1969), pp. 332–45; and Martin Landau, "Redundancy, Rationality and the Problem of Duplication and Overlap," *Public Administration*

*Review*, 29 (July/August 1969), pp. 346–58; and for a useful collection of several insightful pieces on this topic, see Robert T. Golembiewski, ed., *Approaches to Organizing* (Washington, D.C.: American Society for Public Administration, 1982).

For some excellent studies of particular reorganization efforts, see Schuyler Wallace, *Federal Departmentalization: A Critique of Theories of Organization* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941); Herbert Simon, A. G. Kozmetsky, and G. Tyndall, *Centralization vs. Decentralization in Organizing the Controller's Department* (New York: Controllershship Foundation, 1954); Catherine Crane, *Mr. Carr of State—Forty-Seven Years in the Department of State* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1960); Daniel P. Moynihan, *Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding* (New York: Free Press, 1969); Richard Polenberg, *Reorganizing Roosevelt's Government* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966); and Joseph A. Califano, Jr., *Governing America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981).

Much can also be learned from the continuing arguments for decentralization found in the *new public administration* writings of H. George Frederickson, *New Public Administration* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1980) versus the writings of the *centralizers*, like Victor A. Thompson, *Without Sympathy or Enthusiasm: The Problem of Administrative Compassion* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1975). Perhaps for most practicing public "administratists," the *pragmatic perspective* is closest to their views on this topic, and this viewpoint is reflected in Harvey Sherman, *It All Depends: A Pragmatic Approach to Organization* (University: University of Alabama Press, 1966).