

Louisiana Law Review

Volume 12 | Number 2

The Work of the Louisiana Supreme Court for the

1950-1951 Term

January 1952

GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION, by
James C. Charlesworth. Harper & Brothers, New
York, 1951. Pp. x, 713. \$6.00.

Edwin O. Stene

Repository Citation

Edwin O. Stene, *GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION*, by James C. Charlesworth. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951. Pp. x, 713. \$6.00., 12 La. L. Rev. (1952)

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/lalrev/vol12/iss2/22>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at LSU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Louisiana Law Review by an authorized editor of LSU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact kayla.reed@law.lsu.edu.

attention and that even mechanical devices, such as electric voting, can help.

Dr. Griffith says that "given things as they are—the nature of the electorate, the size of Congress, the complexity, number and magnitude of the issues—Congressional organization and procedure do not come off badly."

This attitude has contributed to the failure of Congress to get the full benefits of the 1946 Reorganization Act and it is not responsive to the present demands on our national legislature. I feel that with his rich experience, Dr. Griffith could have made a more positive contribution to the improvement of congressional efficiency in this instance, but over all I recommend this book as important reading for those interested in their Congress—and that should include all of us.

*Estes Kefauver**

GOVERNMENTAL ADMINISTRATION, by James C. Charlesworth. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1951. Pp. x, 713. \$6.00.

General studies in public administration are of relatively recent origin. The first text book on the subject was written by Leonard D. White in 1926, and in the following year W. F. Willoughby published his classic *Principles of Public Administration*. Since that time six other authors or groups of co-authors have published books on the subject, James C. Charlesworth being the most recent.

In the period between the two World Wars the works in this field reflected an effort to discover and enunciate "scientific principles" of administration. Explicitly or implicitly the writers accepted Willoughby's oft-quoted prefatory statement that "in administration there are certain fundamental principles analogous to those of any science." Many of the standards of organization and procedure that were recommended by administrative analysts and other authorities on the subject came to be regarded as fundamental principles that could be violated only at the cost of inadequate service or unnecessarily expensive operation. The several survey reports on state administrative reorganization, and the report of President Roosevelt's Committee on Administrative Management (1937) accepted almost in toto the basic precepts of organization that had been set forth by Willoughby

* United States Senator (D., Tenn.).

and by his forerunners of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research. The Hoover Commission Report (1949) built upon these same premises and differed very little from the earlier reports in its general conclusions.

Yet there were men in academic and political circles who questioned the "fundamental principles." These doubters gained support during the war years and the post war period, and by 1950 leading writers had virtually ceased to refer to "unity of command," the separation of staff and line functions and other precepts of organization as "scientific principles." The effect of this loss of a hard core of accepted doctrines was varied and interesting. Some writers expounded vague notions about politics and administration, with occasional brilliance of expression but relatively few contributions to an understanding of the field of study. Others fell back upon the dull monotony of writing descriptive government. Still others tended, like "enlightened preachers," to continue to expound the tenets of fundamental doctrine, yet warn repeatedly that those tenets are not fundamental. Charlesworth falls most nearly into the category last mentioned, but he has made many original and refreshing contributions that are not based upon the "outmoded principles."

This latest text on public administration reflects a trend away from an emphasis upon techniques of financial and personnel administration. In the case of finance, Charlesworth has condensed the historical material and otherwise reduced the amount of descriptive detail, but his classification of financial processes and his definitions of accounting terms make the section almost encyclopedic in character. On personnel he has likewise avoided the detailed description of forms and methods of classifying positions, testing applicants, rating employees and the like; but he has given a thorough coverage of basic characteristics of both merit and spoils systems. In comparison with other recent texts he has taken a middle road, neither resorting to extensive descriptive analysis nor treating the subjects as though they were unimportant to a general understanding of public administration.

On the other hand, Charlesworth places more emphasis upon quasi-judicial procedures in administration and upon judicial controls over administration than do any of the earlier text book writers in the field of general public administration. He is critical of the attitudes of lawyers in government, but his coverage of the legal aspects of administration should provide the student with a

well-packaged body of useful information regarding rules of procedure that must be the concern of every high level administrator.

Charlesworth states in the preface of his book that its purpose is "to tell, not about administration, but rather, how to administer." With that objective he gives freely of fatherly advice on what the administrator should or should not do, and on how he should try to operate. The rules of conduct should be valuable reading for public administrators, including legal officers in both administrative and judicial branches of government. They are not rules that the author would classify as principles of administration; rather they are practical ideas that have been found useful sufficiently so often that they are worth passing on to the young administrator who seeks to advance in the hierarchy and in usefulness to the public that he serves.

Like most writers on general administration Charlesworth devotes his attention primarily to large scale organizations, usually the federal government. In some sections of the book local governments are virtually ignored; in others they are given relatively scant attention. His emphasis upon the separation of management functions from staff functions and placement of the latter in closer proximity to line departments becomes somewhat academic when applied to city governments or even to the less populous states. Also, the student who will begin his governmental service near the lower rungs of the administrative hierarchy may find that he will have to remember Charlesworth's rules of conduct for many years before he has much opportunity to apply them. For the experienced administrator in a large organization, on the other hand, Charlesworth's book should be the most useful reading of any one-package discourse on public administration available thus far.

To members of the legal profession the book should be particularly enlightening and challenging. As stated above, Charlesworth is critical of lawyers in government. At one point he refers to the courts as "the Number 1 public administration problem in this country," and cites as the principal cause, "the heavy hand of tradition." (p. 214). On another occasion he refers to attitudes of "tradition-bound lawyers" regarding the requirements of notarization of civil service applications and other similar papers (p. 480). His reference to "the maze of procedural technicalities which the legal craft creates to render their services indispensable" (p. 162) is suggestive of the criticisms directed

against a number of craft unions for the practice known as featherbedding. But the most severe criticism is found in his statements (p. 151) that "unfortunately there are selfish and antisocial persons who use every available route to escape from their proper responsibilities in a civilized society and who espouse the essentially criminal doctrine of giving as little to and taking as much as possible from organized government," and that "unfortunately, too, many members of the legal profession sustain such guerrilla warfare—for a fee." There are other criticisms also. But the lawyer, especially if he is in government, will probably find this book to be profitable reading, possibly as an aid to improving his professional service but even more so in preparing himself for administrative responsibilities which so often are entrusted to members of the legal profession.

EDWIN O. STENE*

* Professor of Political Science, University of Kansas.