



HAL
open science

Ulysses of Chicago: American Foundations and Public Administration 1900-1960

Pierre-Yves Saunier

► **To cite this version:**

Pierre-Yves Saunier. Ulysses of Chicago: American Foundations and Public Administration 1900-1960. American Foundations in Europe. Grant-giving policies, cultural diplomacy and trans atlantic relations 1920-1980, Peter Lang, p.115-128, 2001. halshs-00002838

HAL Id: halshs-00002838

<https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00002838>

Submitted on 15 Sep 2004

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

US domestic and transatlantic systems in Public Administration 1900-1960

Public Administration as a discipline and a field emerged in the USA in the inter war period with a strong support from the Rockefeller organizations, the Spelman Fund of New York being the main granting agency in the field. This emergence was closely connected to the European experience. This essay attempts to reconstruct the domestic and international settings in which this interchange took place, to pay attention to all those who played a large role in foundation work without being foundation officers, to trace the shifting roles of the European reference in the field of US public administration and to assess the impact of the European work in the field of government. Accordingly, Europe appears to be first a source rather than a target, and then a channel to the wider world rather than a scene of operation.

Pierre-Yves Saunier is a researcher at the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Lyon (France). He has published different studies of municipal employees and services, city planning and urban history. His current research deals with transnational circulations of 'urban issues' during the 19th and 20th centuries. His latest publication in this area is 'Sketches from the Urban Internationale. Voluntary societies, international organisations and US Foundations at the city's bedside 1900-1960', *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research*, vol.25 (2), June 2001.

PIERRE-YVES SAUNIER, 24 RUE SAINT PHILIPPE, 69 003 LYON FRANCE,

FAX 33 4 72 72 21 85

pierre-yves.saunier@wanadoo.fr

'ULYSSES OF CHICAGO'.

On February 2 1936 when mailing his diary to the trustees of his organization, the Public Administration Clearing House (PACH), Louis Brownlow enclosed a copy of a chart made up by his assistant Charles S. Ascher. This chart showed how he had allocated his time since starting this

diary in November 1933. '*I never realized how much of a traveling salesman I have become*' concluded Brownlow ¹. This chart, entitled 'Peregrinations of Ulysses' established that Brownlow had spent more time out of than in Chicago, where PACH headquarters were located. Out of the 531 days spent out of Chicago, 131 were in Europe. To be complete, it must be added that Brownlow also spent three months in Europe in the summer of 1930, two months in 1936 and that he was back again in 1936 and 1937. These European trips were familiar to many actors in the public administration scene in the USA. From 1900 to 1960, there was a constant flow of 'Atlantic crossings'² in this field. Journalists, administrators (local, state, federal), voluntary societies' officers and academics were constantly sailing or flying between Europe and the United States. Indeed, the very birth of the concept of public administration in the USA at the end of the 19th century was connected to European references. Frank J. Goodnow or Woodrow Wilson, even if they advocated an Americanization of European approaches to administration, built their conceptualization on German, French and British models. Wilson's thesis about 'taking administration out of politics' ³ exemplifies the use of European references to think about new ways to imagine public administration as a sphere of government and as a discipline on the domestic scene. This contribution will not attempt to follow the full story of US public administration in its intellectual connections with Europe. Rather, it will focus on the vital role of some philanthropic foundations (mainly the Rockefeller organizations and the Ford Foundation) in structuring those connections ⁴, in close cooperation with academic, political and professional partners.

The decades under scrutiny here have much to offer for anyone interested in how circulations, transfers, influences are made possible at the supranational scale. Surveying the field

¹ Louis Brownlow Diaries, vol. VI, University of Chicago, Joseph Regenstein Library Special Collections (hereafter JRL),.

² On transatlantic circulations, RODGERS, Daniel T., *Atlantic crossings. Social politics in a progressive age*, Cambridge: Belknap/Harvard University Press, 1998.

³ 'The study of Public Administration', *Political sciences quarterly*, n.2, June 1887, p.197-222

⁴ Regarding Foundations in the sphere of public administration, Alasdair Roberts pointed their importance in establishing the discipline ("Demonstrating neutrality : the Rockefeller Philanthropies and the evolution of public administration", *Public administration review*, 54, May-June 1994, 221-228)

of public administration, then, is a lesson in network building and influence making, as it allows us to understand how foundations and their partners could work abroad with efficiency. The experience of PACH, the organization led by Louis Brownlow from 1931, is central in this picture. But it has to be placed in a wider chronological context to be understood as an aspect of the use of European references in the field of public administration. Accordingly, I will divide the picture into four frames that describe briefly the state of the Public Administration field in the USA in relation to philanthropy, and chart as well changes in relationships to the European model. I hope to be able to demonstrate the complexity of the intellectual and practical exchanges that was organized between Europe and the USA and to illustrate the coordination between the academy, the world of philanthropy and the public administrators in this transatlantic trade. This will offer a contribution toward the understanding of how foundations and their partners participated in an ongoing debate on the definition of universal administrative rules and practices for governments all over the globe, acting as one amongst other 'universal factories' which led the debate on the creation of global standards and rules in many spheres of human activity.

Individual philanthropic support (1900s-1910s)

This first stage of public administration in the United States is marked by the action of individual philanthropists. Charles Eastman, Julius Rosenwald, Robert Brookings, R. Fulton-Cutting, John D. Rockefeller Sr and Jr, Andrew Carnegie, made substantial gifts to local and national reform organizations dedicated to the 'improvement of government' through research, training or publication programs aimed at administrators or at the citizenry itself, especially in the municipal sphere. The achievements of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research and the Institute for Government Research and their achievements in budget reform are now a well known example of the support given by individual philanthropists to initiatives in the field of public administration ⁵. The Rockefellers were especially prominent on this front. The secretary of the Rockefeller Foundation, Jerome Greene, together with John D. Rockefeller Jr's adviser, Raymond Fosdick, were very active in the formation of the Institute for Government Research and the New York Bureau of Municipal Research ⁶. Fosdick is especially relevant, for he is interested in the 'European dimension' of American actors with a foundation connection in the field of Public Administration ⁷. Fosdick is kind of an embodiment of the US 'progressive tradition'. This Colgate and Princeton man, trained as a lawyer with a smattering of settlement work, was employed by the City of New York in various administrative positions. He was in charge of the war training camps during WW 1, until Woodrow Wilson nominated him to one of the under-secretaries of the League of Nations in May 1919. This was the beginning of his long personal militancy for the League and public dedication to the cause of internationalism that ceased only when Fosdick became president of the Rockefeller Foundation in 1935. He held this post until 1948, the culmination of a long-time association with John D Rockefeller Jr.

⁵ KAHN Jonathan, *Budgeting democracy. State building and citizenship in America 1890-1928*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997.

⁶ see Kahn, *Budgeting...* p.134-136 on Greene's role in the ousting of William Allen from the Bureau, and p.166-168 for Fosdick and Greene participation to Committee which set up the Institute.

⁷ On Fosdick, cf. his own *Chronicle of a generation. An autobiography*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958.

The first major act of this association is especially important. Fosdick was commissioned in 1913 by John D. Rockefeller Jr and the Bureau of Social Hygiene to study police organization in Europe, following Flexner's study of prostitution control in Europe. Fosdick published *European police systems* in 1914, which with the companion inquiry led by Fosdick on US cities, forms a characteristic 'progressive era couple' where the european examples are used to stigmatize American backwardness and to fuel action ⁸. Fosdick was also briefly the editor of the *American journal of crime and criminology* where he contributed to the introduction of European criminology studies that he perceived, together with civil service regulations, as one of the sources of a 'scientific police' divorced from politics. Fosdick's work in the field of public administration in the early 1910s, as an intermediary between Rockefeller and the organizations in the field, a trustee of the said organizations, an expert and a grantee, illustrate the piecemeal nature of the relationship established at the time between philanthropic organizations and the field : support was given to local organizations, to individuals, and focused on specific questions such as the police or the budget. This lack of organization was bound to change shortly.

⁸ On this classical process, see Rodgers' *Atlantic crossings...*, op.cit, especially chapter 4 on municipal government.

A more focused picture (the 1920s)

The 1920s marked the organization of the field of public administration in the USA, its relationship with philanthropy, and also its connection with Europe. A large part of this organization work has its origins or manifestations at the University of Chicago. Charles E. Merriam, a familiar figure in the history of reform, the history of the social sciences and the history of philanthropy,⁹ together with his younger colleague Leonard White, the first 'Professor of Public Administration' in a US university, is central to this process. There is a long, interesting and (yet) untold story about Merriam's unachieved project to create a 'school of politics' at the University of Chicago. Public administration and its development as a science with its own universal laws is high in the agenda of the different versions of the plan Merriam developed in the mid-1920s. But what is relevant for us here is that this project finds some shape in the 1920s, thanks to the privileged connections Charles Merriam and the University of Chicago entertain with the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial (LRSM). Led by a board of trustees where John D. Rockefeller Jr, Raymond Fosdick and Arthur Woods sit together, indicating the strong connection of the Memorial to family leadership¹⁰, the Memorial had a well-known record in the support of the social sciences in the USA, with the operation of the Social Science Research Council as a highlight¹¹. The Memorial's concern for the social sciences and for what was labeled 'social technology'¹² led to a certain number of grants in the field of public administration : grants to some 'classical' institutions in the field like the Brookings Institution (the product of the merger in 1927 of the Institute for Government Research with the

⁹ On Merriam KARL Barry, *Charles E. Merriam and the study of politics*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1974.

¹⁰ Woods and Fosdick are both working as personal advisers to John D. Rockefeller Jr. The Board also includes Winthrop Aldrich, brother in law of John D. Rockefeller Jr, and the secretary of the Memorial is William S. Richardson, who was in Brown University with the Rockefeller heir.

¹¹ For different but complementary insight on the role of the Rockefeller organizations in the history of the US social sciences, see FISHER Donald *Fundamental development of the social sciences. Rockefeller Philanthropy and the United States Social Science Research Council*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993 and BULMER Martin 'The early institutional establishment of social science research: the Local Community Research Committee at the University of Chicago, 1923-30', *Minerva*, 1980 (18) p.51-110.

¹² 'The term social technology used to include activities in the application of social science to social problems', Report of the executive committee and exexecutive director of the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial for 1925-26, University of Chicago, Joseph Regenstein Library Special collections - then JRL-, Charles Merriam Papers, box 158, folder 8.

Institute of Economics) or the National Institute of Public Administration (the heir of the New York Bureau of Municipal Research), where Raymond Fosdick was a director and a leader ¹³; grants to schools of social service; grants to ad hoc committees, such as the Uniform Crime Reports Committee; exploration of the possible cooperation with governmental agencies (especially in the field of welfare administration where support was effectively given) and with association of government officials; grants to Universities for research and faculty ¹⁴. In all those matters, as well as with the appropriations from the Memorial, the University of Chicago ranked first. Indeed, it was associated with the Memorial in its first ventures in public administration, from the endowment of its School of Social Service Administration, which received the biggest grant in the field of 'social and public administration' to the use of part of the Memorial gifts to pay for research or faculty in the field of Public Administration. With this money, Charles Merriam and Leonard White began to elaborate not only a program of teaching (with the multiplication of courses in various departments at the University), nor only a program of research in public administration, which expression can be found in White's vita ¹⁵, but also to create a more 'practical' intellectual relationship with Europe. Thanks to Memorial funds for European trips, White was able to begin his work on the European civil service, to discover and participate to european institutions in the field of Public administration (like the British Institute for Public Administration or the International Institute of Administrative Sciences), and to stay in constant touch with European developments. Merriam and himself were able to mobilize this first-hand knowledge of the European scene in their struggle both in the domestic academic and practical field of public administration.

One particular endeavour demonstrates the system they created. In the summer of 1927, White was in Europe on Local Community Research Committee money (that is, Memorial

¹³ See his correspondance with Charles Merriam in 1920-1921 (JRL, Charles Merriam papers, box 29, folder 21).

¹⁴ Confidential memorandum from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial, 'Appropriations for social sciences and social technology up to december 1st 1927' (JRL, Charles Merriam Papers, box 144, folder 5). Though the 1928 appropriations are missing, this cocument it gives a detailed list of grantees.

¹⁵ Some examples are his *Introduction to the study of Public Administration* (1926) and *The city*

money). His project concerned the European civil services, and this necessitated considerable time in libraries, but also frequent visits to academic conferences and colleagues. White was searching not only for information and contacts to create a network of informers for keeping in touch with developments of public administration in Europe. He was also looking for some European lecturers to add to the political science department staff with money from one of the Memorial grants. This is why he was in frequent correspondence with his boss Charles Merriam, who had just been in Europe during the summer of 1926. White has an even more specific mission, which is to find an Englishman to appoint for a series of lectures, consulting work and research on police administration. Police matters, in fact, are one of the points on which Merriam and White want to lead a scientific and reform campaign with national dimensions, the principles of which are enclosed both in their own participation in governmental reform organisations (in Chicago and at the national scale) and in their ambitions for the political science department. Their project, according to the lines of Merriam 'school of politics' plan is to create at the University of Chicago a research and training center where reform of the governmental sphere (at the local, state and federal level) would originate. The Englishman White finally finds [that] assistant secretary A.L Dixon from the Home Office is the perfect man in his eyes. Even considering the Irish strain of the US police forces, Dixon would be able to promote the cause of a national and technically advanced police, and the development of an effective rural police and to alter the US conception of the police as repressive. Moreover, 'he has the immense advantage of being familiar with a police system which is far in advance of ours, and which would constantly stand as an immediate and to him attainable object'¹⁶. The police, White observes is 'the outstanding opportunity of this generation'. Dixon's series of conferences in the Spring of 1928 will be, despite his refusal to stay at the University as a professor in police administration, one of the basis on which the public administration program

manager (1927).

¹⁶ JRL, Charles Merriam papers, box 42 folder 17, Leonard White to Charles Merriam 26 august 1927

at the University of Chicago will prosper in the following decade.

A system in Public Administration (1930s-1940s)

An even more important foundation was built in the 1920s, again putting together the Chicago people and the Memorial. In the intricate process of imagining and creating both the Social Science Research Council and the institutions able to develop research in the social sciences at the University of Chicago, including his ideas about a 'school of politics', Charles Merriam, together with White, was gradually developing the idea of the development of research, teaching and installation in public administration. Several exchanges and proposals on the subject with Raymond Fosdick and the Rockefeller Foundation, together with his fruitful collaboration with the Memorial in national and local social science institution building, lead him to discuss some elements of his project with Beardsley Ruml, the executive-director of the Memorial. From the end of 1925, Ruml and the Memorial staff and officers are kept aware of Merriam's projects in the field of public administration. The interest showed by Ruml (and the Rockefeller officers in general) for 'practical' applications of the social sciences, coupled with the impending reorganization of the Rockefeller philanthropies and Ruml's anticipations of it, seems to be the determining factors that lead Merriam and Ruml to explore the possibilities of Memorial work in Public Administration at the end of 1927. Merriam's 'Memorandum on facilities for research and experiment of government officials or groups of officials' is received in the Memorial offices in may 1928¹⁷. It will be the blueprint for the action of the Spelman Fund of New York, a new Rockefeller organization created at the end of 1928 that will very soon devote all its resources to the Public Administration program outlined by Merriam's memo, thus producing the first 'system of Public Administration' that will rule the field until the mid-1940s.

¹⁷ Rockefeller Archive Center, North Tarrytown, New York (hereafter designed RAC), Spelman Fund of New York Archives (hereafter SFNY) Series 5, box 3, folder 774, ,).

The Spelman Fund of New York, whose operations were directed from its executive committee¹⁸, was incorporated on December 27, 1928, with an original capital of 10 millions dollars, consisting of a final gift by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial. The Fund appropriated about 13 million before it was dissolved in 1948. With the continuing presence of Beardsley Ruml among its executive committee, the other important actors of the Fund were Guy Moffett, who was hired as executive secretary in may 1929 (and effectively replaces Ruml in the position in December 1930), and Charles Merriam, who was named president of the Executive Committee in 1936. The Spelman Fund is the first born out of the three organizations which formed the system of public administration until the late 1940s. It is also the financial supporter and tutelary advisor of the two others, the Public Administration Committee of the Social Science Research Council (also created in 1928 under White's chairmanship), and the PACH (together with the cluster of administrators societies it gathered on the University of Chicago campus)¹⁹. When one adds to the picture the Public Administration program generated by the Rockefeller Foundation itself after 1935, this core of organizations was at the forefront of almost all the initiatives, projects and events in the domestic field of Public Administration²⁰. Leonard White, Charles Merriam, Louis Brownlow, Beardsley Ruml and Guy Moffett were the initiative nucleus of this activity that developed at all levels of the American government (local, state and federal). During the two decades from 1928 to 1948, Europe played an important role in their work.

In short, Europe was at once a rhetorical tool, a source of inspiration, and a scene of action.

The play with European references in order to demonstrate the backwardness of the US

¹⁸ first formed by Arthur Woods, Raymond Fosdick and Beardsley Ruml, the Committee would later include Guy Moffett and Charles Merriam.

¹⁹ On the links between the three structures, see Pierre-Yves Saunier, -'Sketches from the Urban International. Voluntary societies, international organizations and US Foundations at the city's bedside 1900-1960', *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research*, June 2001 and '*Selling the idea of cooperation*. The US Foundations and the European components of the Urban Internationale (1920s-1960s), in Giuliana GEMEMELLI (ed.), *American Foundations and large scale research: construction and transfer of knowledge*, Bologna: Clueb, 2001

²⁰ For a preliminary account of those actions and their impact, Alasdair ROBERTS, art.cit.. Donald Fisher in *Fundamental development...* develops the work of the Public Administration Committee of the Social Science Research Council p.137-144.

administrative scene, as well as to demonstrate its progress under the leadership of the 'Spelman connection', was still essential. The speeches made by Brownlow and Merriam to the American Municipal Association in November 1930, are just one amongst 'classics'. Brownlow, after Merriam's presentation of the strength of the German Union of Cities (the *Deutsche Städtetag*), and his own picture of the British organizations of local government and employees, ends up with this call to action: *'The picture that was painted for us by Dr Merriam may be too big for the United States. But it is not too big for the AMA. It is something of that kind that you ought to look forward to. Think on a big scale, plan on a big scale, and then you will be ready when this demand comes upon you'*²¹. But close exposure to European organizations, especially in the field of municipal administration, had been a genuine shock for the leaders of the US Public Administration scene. Already aware of the life and work of the European Public Administration field before their trips, thanks to readings or correspondences with US visitors or European natives, their direct encounter was even more rewarding. As a result of several trips between 1923 and 1932 White, Brownlow, Merriam and Ruml, and Moffett were enthusiastic about what they saw in their private correspondence as well²², and the work of the British and German administrators' societies was a touchstone on which they were able to secure safe ground for their enterprise of building a series of administrators' societies such as the one finally gathered around PACH. Thus the European reference was not only a rhetorical trick to convince their American interlocutors (including their own troops), but also something that was vital in allowing them to imagine some of their endeavours, and to pursue them with a sense that they were attainable. But both these uses of Europe were already present in former periods, including even before philanthropic foundations were included. What was innovative in this new 'system of Public Administration' is that Europe was a scene of

²¹ JRL, Charles Merriam papers, box 38, folder 5, clippings from the publication of the New Jersey State League of Municipalities, p.8

²² Spelman Fund papers (RAC), Merriam Papers (JRL), Guy Moffett papers (University of Virginia), Louis Brownlow papers (John Fitzgerald Kennedy Library)

action, thanks precisely to what foundations put in the balance, money and prestige²³. Thus, the 'Spelman connection' developed a program of 'importation', in order to sustain the improvement of public administration on the domestic scene. European study tours by the executive directors of administrators societies, invitation to foreign experts to solve or to reflect on US problems, part time European faculty and tours of European lecturers, development or support of American-European networks to ensure the clearing of research and information, surveys of special subjects by individuals or commissions (with a special attention to wartime european administration after 1939) were the tools that were used. This was paralleled by a more intrusive program that led to the financial support of European research organizations (such as the British Institute of Public Administration²⁴ or Zoltan Magyary's research in Hungary²⁵) and of european based and dominated international organizations (such as the International Union of Local Authorities, the International Institute of Administrative Sciences and the International Federation of Housing and Town Planning). There was also a constant interest in Europe because the governmental and non governmental international organizations that were also included in the vast program for the 'advancement of government personnel and methods' sketched in the nutshell of Merriam's 1928 memo, and in the Spelman Fund program from its inception were based there²⁶. This last aspect would be finally developed in the following phase of public administration

²³ For a development of the following sketch of the 'import-export' in the field of Public Administration , see P-Y Saunier, '*Selling the idea ...*', art cit., p.227-234.

²⁴ It is also in Britain that took place the only european demonstration/installation project financed by the Fund, with the support to the Cambridgeshire project for the reorganization of public services in rural areas (which received a 225 000 \$ grant in 1929)

²⁵ On Magyary, see the contribution by Aleksandra Witczak Haugstad and Erik Ingebrigtsen in this volume.

²⁶ RAC, SFNY, series 2, box 2, folder 'policy'

The international stance 1950s-1960s

Truly, the system of Public Administration in the 1950s and 1960s in the US is much more diverse than in its former shape ²⁷. The dissolution of the Spelman Fund in 1948, and the growth of the organisations and institutions created in the 1930s have produced a less homogenous landscape. Institutions have developed which don't rely mainly on Rockefeller moneys, such as the Littauer School of Government in Harvard. The organizations once gathered around the PACH have grown up and taken more an[d] more autonomy. The discipline of political science, and especially the sub-field of Public Administration, was less homogenous and competing approaches developed, such as the ones promulgated by Herbert Simon or by Dwight Waldo in *The Administrative State* (1947). And, last but not least, the University of Chicago was no more the dominating center of the field.

But neither this new domestic configuration, nor the attenuation in the growth of the federal government in the US after the Democrat administrations of Roosevelt and Truman is enough to account for the international turn taken by the system created in the 1930s and 1940s with Rockefeller support. In fact, the concerns for international or regional administration were a concern of the Spelman Fund since its origins, as much as the international scale was for all the Rockefeller organizations which demonstrated support and concern for the work of the League of Nations and the International Labor Office. Concern for the world order, especially during WW 2, was significant one for many members or ex-members of the PACH compound, and many of them participated to the making and operation of UNRRA, UNESCO, UNO and other international organizations ²⁸, as did many people with a University of Chicago background. In those circumstances, the coordinated work of PACH associates like Louis Brownlow, Donald Stone, Charles Ascher, Herbert Emmerich or Rowland Egger had several connected dimensions: they were contributing to the design of the administrative devices that were to

²⁷ For a first hand account, see MOSHER Frederick C. (ed.), *American public administration : past, present future*, University of Alabama Press, 1975

operate the new world order, they were trying to develop research and training in Public Administration through the new bodies, but they also had an idea of how their previous experiences could connect to this. This was especially true as far as the international voluntary associations supported by the Spelman Fund were concerned. As soon as contact was reestablished with and among IULA, IIAS and IFHTP, the Chicago men thought of connecting them with the work of the International Governmental organizations in the making. Their efforts consisted in making them internationalize their membership, and developing their headquarters as service centers that could provide expertise and act as intermediaries to members and to IGOs. Two grants by the Ford Foundation in 1950 and 1952 were the opportunity for PACH to develop a vast international program that was directed to the 'improvement' of Public Administration in foreign countries and in international organizations ²⁹. Even after PACH closed shop in 1957, a system of information and cooperation in the field of Public Administration was in operation until the end of the 1960s putting the American milieu of Public Administration, the Ford Foundation and other philanthropic organizations into contact with the Intergovernmental organizations on one hand, and with the international voluntary associations on the other, ex-PACH leaders like Charles Ascher and Herbert Emmerich being instrumental in operating this system. While it was directed rather towards the 3rd world after 1950, in connection with Federal programs like the Point IV program and in the context of the Cold War ³⁰, Europe was never far away from the limelight.

The role of Europe in this last phase was rather different than before. There was much less talk about 'learning the best from the old world' in order to improve Public Administration in the USA,

²⁸ See PY SAUNIER, 'Sketches of the Urban Internationale...', art.cit..

²⁹ It is important to underline here that there were strong continuities between what had been PACH program and the program of the Ford Foundation in Public Administration. The continuity was not that much a 'natural' expression of a consensus, but an echo of the participation to the making and operations of the Ford of several people connected with PACH, beginning with Paul Hoffman and Robert Hutchins (both former trustees of PACH while Hutchins was President of the University of Chicago) to Don Price and Bernard Gladieux, including many consultants in Public Administration.

³⁰ For a first approach, see BERMAN Edward H..., *The influence of the Carnegie, Ford and*

though comparative government research was a running interest of PACH leaders. Europe was definitely a theatre of operations and a beachhead towards the wide world. With the remnants of the Spelman grants and the new Ford resources, PACH was able to sustain a wide range of initiatives, beginning with the reconstitution of the 'Brussels center' that had been dissolved by the war. American contributions flew in again, breathing new life into the organizations. The International Institute for Administrative Sciences, International Union for Local Authorities and the International Federation for Housing and Town Planning were re-connected, and the last two soon moved from Brussels to The Hague. The European program of PACH also included cooperation with the US High Commissioner in Germany, the provision of professors to teach the lessons of US federalism in the College of Europe in Bruges (Belgium) or the spreading of the 'case report' teaching method in Public Administration through the International Institute of Administrative Sciences. But Europe was more and more a means rather than an end. The role of the European-based INGOs, supported by PACH and foundation money since the early 1930s, is especially interesting as it shows that those organizations and their European dominated membership were used by PACH to spread the gospel of Public Administration towards the former European colonies and the developing world. Charles Ascher, chief of the PACH New York office, official representant of IULA, IFHTP and IIAS to UNESCO and the INGOs conference of the Economic and Social Council of the UN is the vital pivot of this together with Herbert Emmerich, director of PACH until its dissolution, senior consultant in public administration of the UN (1957-63) and subsequently president of the IIAS. The Atlantic was then definitely too small an ocean for those supranational go-betweens of public administration, who created a global system linking the US academy, the Ford Foundation, the IGOs and the old European INGOs to the developing world.

conclusion

Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign policy .The ideology of philanthropy, Albany: State University of New York press, 1983, chapter 3.

There is a striking continuity in this story, which threads might have collapsed in the early 1970s when the retirement of a generation of academic and organization leaders who had held the scene since the 1930s coincided with the rise of new paradigms in the field of Public Administration, such as management and cybernetics³¹. The belief in a neutral administrative apparatus, propelled by a highly competent manpower and based on techniques and devices inspired by the development of the social sciences, was at the core of the agreement between the US academics, administrators and philanthropic agencies that shaped the domestic field from the early 20th century onwards. Such a belief was institutionalized around 1930, through organizations like the Spelman Fund, the Public Administration Clearing House with its '1313' cluster of administrators associations and the Public Administration Committee of the Social Science Research Council. The tenets, *modi operandi* and people who were shaped during a decade of consulting, organizing and writing in the field of Public Administration were at a later stage breathed into the Public Affairs program of the Ford Foundation³² during the 50s and 60s. The Public Administration Clearing House and the 1313 cluster seem to be a particularly lively breeding ground where individuals, principles and angles were built, fortified and disseminated from.

The connection with Europe was one of the tenets and *modi operandi* which structured the field. The commitment to work across borders and across nations, on the tenet that governmental devices, despite radical controls, were transferable through importation and adaptation³³, was vital in the story of the Public Administration field. Europe was first a theatre from which exhortations could be drawn, know-how could be imported, advice could be solicited and information obtained.

31 The creation of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis in 1972 might be a hint in this direction. IIASA, which was supported by the Ford Foundation, included such themes as municipal administration, city planning, housing in its agenda. See Giuliana Gemelli 'Building bridges in science and societies during the cold war: the origins of the IIASA', In Gemelli, *American Foundations and large scale...*, op.cit.

32 On this continuity, see PY Saunier, "Improving municipal Government, planning and housing : The european action of the US Foundations on the urban scene 1920s-1960s", *Philanthropy and the city* , September 2000 conference (Rockefeller Archive Center/City University of New York).

The European program of the Spelman Fund, such as developed between 1929 and 1948, was built for the benefits of the US domestic scene. Using Ford Foundation resources to pursue their action, the leaders of the organizations created by the Spelman Fund turned Europe into a beachhead for reaching out the decolonized countries. On the whole, and despite some initial intentions, Europe was a marginal theater of operations in itself. Accordingly, it would probably be a misunderstanding to try to evaluate the role of US Foundations in European Public Administration on the same grounds as, say, their role in the social sciences. The impact of the Spelman Fund and the Ford Foundation programs in Europe is not in the development of research, in the implementation of institutions, in the support to individual, in the endowment of professorships or education outfits. And the sums of money which are involved are on the whole quite ridiculous, when you compare them with Foundations appropriations, even with Public Administration expanses for Africa or Asia in the 1960s ³⁴.

Nevertheless, the continuing interchange that took place between the early 20th century and the 1960s was based on networks that were used for some very practical European achievements. The reeducation of German local government by the military government, the 'management' part of the Marshall Plan, the dissemination of some US budgeting and national accountancy devices in France ³⁵, the creation of some training programs in public administration in Europe³⁶ were set up thanks to networks that had been built by Foundation work in the 1920s and 1930s. But this is not part of any program in itself, rather off-spins of it that were able to blossom, possibly briefly, on the

33 This statement of principles is made by Louis Brownlow in *The autobiography of Louis Brownlow, the second half. A passion for anonymity*, Chicago: University of Chicago press, 1958, p.302

34 In the 1960s, the Ford Foundation gave several grants to African universities for research, clearing and training programs in government. The National School of Law and Administration in Congo received 3 million \$ between 1961 and 1970 (BERMAN, *The influence...*, op.cit., chap. 3)

35 On the French reappropriation of national accounting in the 1940s/50s, and of social accounting and of the Program Planning Budgeting System (PPBS) in the 1960s, see FOURQUET François, *Les comptes de la puissance*, Paris: Encres, 1981 and SPENLEHAUER Vincent 'Intelligence gouvernementale et sciences sociales', *Politix*, 48, 1999.

36 Samuel May, who was associated with Merriam and Brownlow in Public administration endeavors since the 1920s, member of the Public Administration Committee, of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences, etc, was on his way to Bologna to establish a training program in Public administration there when he died in 1955.

possibilities the Fund action in Europe had created, in synergy with other Rockefeller or Ford Foundation programs. The main impact of the Spelman Fund program and its aftermaths probably lies in the cultural changes that affected the old European based INGOs like IULA, IFHP or IIAS, because of the initiatives launched by the Fund in the 1930s and that its beneficiaries maintained until the 1960s. Those organizations were transformed from rather formal gatherings of 'men of good will' to professional organizations who could provide expertise, relay or leadership for international programs that IGOs or the US Department of State were engineering. Herbert Emmerich, at a moment when he sought support from the Rockefeller Foundation in order to fund his presidency of the IIAS wrote *'It is no exaggeration to say that American influence has transformed the Institute from its pre war posture of a small Western European elite group of intellectuals, preoccupied with problems of administrative law, to a world wide organization, with nations new and old, and embracing all phases of government administration and administrative law in its sphere'*³⁷.

Nevertheless, one can wonder whether European Individuals who participated to those organizations, were influenced by what Public Administration was in the USA through the development of contacts, the obtaining of grants and fellowships. Some indeed even tried to transfer the discipline in their mother country . Though their success or failure would remain to be precisely evaluated, the French case is a fine example to suggest the limits of their attempts. In front of the domination of approaches to government in terms of administrative law, Georges Langrod, a Rockefeller Foundation fellow, published *la science et l'enseignement de l'administration publique aux Etats-Unis* in 1954, where he tried to promote the idea that the approaches of public administration should be developed as a core item in the agenda of political science³⁸. But the teaching of the 'science administrative' in France does not seem to have left the atmosphere of the law schools not to have emancipated itself from the juridical approach, and no real support seems

37 memo by Herbert Emmerich, 1962, box 14, Herbert Emmerich Papers, RG 21/38.711, University of Virginia

to have come from Foundations to promote such change. In fact, and since their first explorations of Europe, the Spelman Fund go-betweens had been irritated by the discovery of this primacy of administrative law on the Continent. They saw the situation as reproducing what they had contributed to shake down in the US university, but never made its change a priority. Their choice and the choice of the Spelman Fund European program was to work through international societies such as IIAS to bend them towards interests, researches and activities that could be useful for the US public administration scene in the 1930s 1940s, or for the public administration scene in the developing world in the 1950s 1960s. Even such (rare) moves such as support by the Spelman Fund to Zoltan Magyary's Hungarian institute of Public Administration, to Public Administration teaching at the London School of Economics ³⁹ or to research at the British Institute of Public Administration were not coordinated attempts to put a new discipline on the European academic map. They participated to the same concern than the rest of the Spelman Fund European program: to build connections and networks who could be used as resources to improve government in the USA. In this sense, the case of Public Administration exemplifies a case and a moment in which cross fertilization, under the guidance of Foundations, worked in the direction of the USA rather than in the direction of Europe. Foundation work in the field contributed to change the US dynamics by the use of European references, probably much more than the other way round.

38 Paris: Armand Colin, 1954 (Cahiers de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques N.59)

39 Herman Finer, who was teaching Public Administration there has a long record of consulting and teaching in the USA (mainly through the channels of the University of Chicago and the Public

Pierre-Yves Saunier

CNRS, UMR 5600 Environnement Ville Société

Administration committee of the Social Science Research Council). Thus, he kinds of personifies this use of European development in Public Administration for the US domestic scene.