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Visions of Good Governance: Through Artists’ Eyes

Carol W. Lewis

Introduction

Culture is an important vehicle for transmitting ethics and values and communicating an understanding of the link between ethical behavior and political power. Defined broadly, culture is “the entire interactive symbolic environment in which humans live and communicate” (Donald, 2000, 23). Cultural expression assumes many forms, ranging from oral traditions and monumental architecture to popular music and podcasts.

The Greek word ethos (meaning character or habit), ethics means “guidelines for action that draw on what is right and important; principles of action that implement or promote moral values” (Lewis and Gilman, 2012, p. 287). The term morals (from the Latin mores or customs) “refers to standards of right conduct” (p. 239). For our purposes, the two terms may be used interchangeably and both include rational and intuitive elements.

Cautionary tales about right and wrong behavior weave throughout much of classical and popular culture. Like the vernacular morality plays in fifteenth-sixteenth century Europe, much of today’s popular culture frames ethics as a battle between good and evil. The books and films about the good Harry Potter, with Lord Voldemort portraying the evil wizard, are modern versions of the classic dichotomy. The “Star Wars” films, the science fiction/fantasy film, “Avatar,” and even Disney’s “Sleeping Beauty” broadly tell the same tale, although in different settings and with different characters. In Spike Lee’s 1989 film, “Do the Right Thing,” Radio Raheem recounts his version as a conflict between the right and left hand. The story, parable, allegory, fable, or myth often plays out in terms of a clash between virtues and vices (psychomachia). Remember the superheroes such as Spiderman and Batman facing off against super villains (see Figure 1)?
These stories are all stylized, simplified, symbolic, and straightforward allegorical representations that transmit lessons about ethics and power. They teach us how and why to recognize and opt for good over evil. As such, they are cultural tools that communicate a vision of the ethical foundation of good governance.

Artists and writers often use widely shared symbols and romanticized experiences to communicate the ideal. They intentionally display powerful icons that convey an attitude and a viewpoint. As such, they are meant to push buttons and stir up responses that are strengthened by the power of emotion and engagement. The work of psychologist Paul Slovic (2007) and others informs us that abstractions are difficult to evaluate, difficult to remember, and do not elicit empathy. We need imagery and feelings to tap into our moral intuition and so to affect behavior. Art is an effective heuristic for ethics because, as the moral psychologist, Jonathan Haidt (2001, p. 818), notes, “Moral intuition is... akin to aesthetic judgment.”
Figure 2: Site of Elihu Vedder’s Murals in the Library of Congress, Washington D.C.

Saul Nesselroth, 2011. Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved.

Figure 3: Site of Caleb Ives Bach’s Murals in Seattle, Washington

Carol W. Lewis, 2011. Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved.
Public Art as Statement of Power and Purpose

Public art is knowingly created by the artist for long-term public display and exhibited in accessible public or official venues such as government buildings and public squares. Public art is aimed at a popular audience. For analytic purposes, the longevity and authorized display distinguish public art from knowingly temporary graffiti, sidewalk chalk drawings, thumb-tacked posters, and the like. (Some contemporary street artists reject a distinction between public art and street art; see Imam, 2012.)

Figure 4: Ambrogio Lorenzetti, Allegory of Bad Government, 1338 (detail)

Just as the site signifies official sanction, public art evokes the legitimacy of formal authority. Public art most often supports the ruling regime, if only because governments and the wealthy dominant classes are often the patrons. Because of the simplicity of the message and despite the
sophistication of the medium, public art takes on the tenor of propaganda. (Illustratively, a fifteenth-century sermon uses the Lorenzetti frescoes as “a tool of persuasion” on behalf of civic peace [Debby, 2001, 272].)

Intended to shape public opinion and reinforce regime values, public art aims at underwriting the rulers’ ideology and legitimacy. For example, writing about the iconography of Justice which can be traced to ancient Babylonian and Egyptian gods, Judith Resnik and Dennis Curtis (2007, p. 145) point out that “we know the image of Justice because it has been deployed, politically, by governments seeking to link their rules and judgments to her legitimacy. …She has had a remarkable run as political propaganda.”

**Figure 5: Ambrogio Lorenzetti, Allegory of Good Government, 1338 (detail)**

Public works of art invariably are statements about political power and often about the link between power and ethical behavior. The British political theorist David Miller (2003, pp. 2-3) writes, “There is no better way to understand what political philosophy is and why we need it than by looking at Lorenzetti’s magnificent mural.” Public art is also a demonstration of wealth. With decorative adornments including marbles, sculptures, and paintings, the United States Library of Congress is an intentional and, some might add, ostentatious display of a nation intent on glory and the pursuit of wealth (see figure 2). Similarly, the richly embellished town hall conveyed the prosperity of republican Siena in the fourteenth century.

The three sets of murals examined here meet the criteria of creative purpose, longevity, and public site. They depict good and bad governance. Their conceptual and symbolic ties, such as personified virtues and vices, span more than six centuries and testify to a durable understanding
of the impact of certain virtues and vices on governance and society. The murals are: the fourteenth-century frescoes of Ambrogio Lorenzetti painted for the Palazzo Pubblico (town hall) in Siena, Italy; Elihu Vedder’s late nineteenth-century murals created for the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.; and Caleb Ives Bach’s late twentieth-century murals displayed in a large federal courthouse in Seattle, Washington. Bach’s murals were commissioned by the Art in Architecture program of the U.S. General Services Administration [GSA]. The GSA uses official and expert participation in the selection of the artist and approval of the artwork.

Vedder’s and Bach’s public sites are shown in Figures 2 and 3; images of Lorenzetti’s site are widely available on the Internet, including Wikimedia Commons. The reproduction of artwork here meet two pragmatic criteria: the art itself is in the public domain or available by permission and high-resolution digital photographs are similarly available.

Figure 6: Ambrogio Lorenzetti, Allegory of Good Government in the City, 1338 (detail)

The Display of Virtue and Vice

The panoramic frescoes by Ambrogio Lorenzetti line three walls of an ornate room in Siena’s town hall. They depict the rulers’ virtues and vices and their consequences for the general population and the well-being of the community in urban and rural settings. A temptation arises from the frescoes’ allegorical richness and artistic and historical stature to explore their many details. Succumbing to this temptation risks a disproportionate emphasis on a single set of murals and threatens to change this article’s subject to art history or art criticism. Auxiliary resources are
readily accessible because Lorenzetti’s frescoes have generated a large literature by specialists in
medieval history, art historians, and political and theological commentators. (Selected English-
language examples include Debby, 2001; Polzer, 2001; Prazniak, 2010; and Southard, 1979.)

**Figure 7: Elihu Vedder, "Good Administration," c. 1898**

Painted on the damp wall and badly deteriorated, Lorenzetti’s fresco on the effects of bad
government is also referred to as War (Debby, 2001; Polzer, 2002). The effects are displayed as
crumbling buildings, a barren countryside, and war and violence. Above the demonic tyrant,
depicted in figure 4 with horns and fangs and, thus, surely a devil, are the three deathly-white
figures of vices, labeled Greed, Arrogance, and Pride. Surrounding Tyranny, from left to right,
are Cruelty, Treason, Fraud, Fury and, not shown, Divisiveness (cutting herself in half), and
War. Fear (not shown in figure 4) is personified as a woman holding a banner that articulates the
absence of the common good: “Because each seeks only his own good . . . Justice is subjected to
tyranny” (transl. Miller, 2003, p. 2). It is fitting that Justice lays seemingly forlorn and powerless
at Tyranny’s feet.

Lorenzetti’s *Allegory of Good Government* (also known as Peace) conceptualizes a contrasting
vision. The ruler is surrounded by female figures personifying the virtues of Peace, Fortitude,
Prudence, Magnanimity, Temperance and Justice (see figure 5). Above him hover the virtues of
faith, charity, and hope (spes). The rich dress of the ruler and general population, accompanied by the signs of productivity, associate good government with material well-being and civic order. The circle of dancers in figure 6 suggests festivity, leisure, and civic engagement; hands that embrace neighbors’ hands hold no weapons.

**Figure 8: Elihu Vedder, “Corrupt Legislation,” c. 1898**


Elihu Vedder’s murals use strictly human and secular images to communicate a comparable argument about ethics and political power and their effect on the populace and community. Figure 7 shows the balanced scales of justice, an educated male citizen carrying a book and casting a vote, and prosperity represented by a female figure filling a jar with grain. The inscription on the marble below the feet of Justice reads “good administration.” By contrast, the defective, one-sided scale of justice indicates partiality in figure 8. The citizen in *Corrupt Legislation* pays a bribe from overflowing coffers that rest at his feet. A barefoot young supplicant, apparently without work, stands in a scene of crumbling infrastructure, closed-down smokestacks, and falling leaves symbolizing waning prosperity.

Vedder departs from Lorenzetti’s representation in at least four ways. Vedder’s setting is a classical scene that reflects the prevailing taste of his time. Replacing bad with corrupt, he uses terminology more modern than Lorenzetti’s. Vedder presents a purely secular argument, whereas Lorenzetti’s has significant religious elements. Lastly, Vedder incorporates a democratic element, although before the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution that ended women’s disenfranchisement.
Figure 9: Caleb Ives Bach, “The Effects of Good Government,” 1985

Caleb Ives Bach’s 1985 murals of Good Government (Heaven on Earth) and Bad Government (Hell on Earth) are reminiscent of the primitive genre in American art. Yet, the vibrant colors, details of everyday life, overall arrangement, and themes reflect Lorenzetti’s influence. In figure 9, Good Government, the angels of Faith, Hope, and Charity float above the six virtues of Justice, Courage, Wisdom, Generosity, Moderation, and Harmony. The orchards and river teeming with fish associate productivity and prosperity with good governance. Reminiscent of the circle of dancers in Lorenzetti’s fresco, Bach’s musicians and dancers signal that the populace appreciates the good fortune that comes with virtue (figure 10).
Figure 10. Caleb Ives Bach, "The Effects of Good Government," 1985 (detail)

© 2011. Carol W. Lewis. Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved.

Figure 11. Caleb Ives Bach, “The Effects of Good Government,” 1985 (detail)

© 2011. Carol W. Lewis. Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved.
The tree of life dominates the scene in figure 11; a loving family appears healthy, prosperous, and industrious at the foot of the tree. The tree of life is a familiar pagan, theological, and mythological motif, a scientific metaphor for evolutionary relationships and/or interconnectedness, and a recurring theme in contemporary films and video games. The trees suggest economic consequences in Vedder’s murals, whereas Bach’s depict a broader significance related to prosperity, family, and human relationships.

**Figure 12: Caleb Ives Bach, “The Effects of Bad Government,” 1985**

Bach’s mural on the effects of bad government sharply contrasts with figure 9. Sporting the devil’s horns as in Lorenzetti’s image, Tyranny rules in figure 12. Tyranny is aided by War, Treason, Discord, Fury, Fraud, and Cruelty. Above these hover the devils of Greed, Vanity, and Pride. Again, the tree of life dominates but the tree in Figure 13 is leafless, lifeless; people’s feet are bare and eyes unseeing; ancestors are disrespected and their corpses abused; the family appears distant and uncaring; and bad habits, drunkenness, war, thievery, prostitution, and executions replace music and dance.

Figure 13: Caleb Ives Bach, “The Effects of Bad Government,” 1985 (detail)

© 2011. Carol W. Lewis. Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved.

Conclusion

The point that these murals make is that good and bad governance deeply shape the course and quality of our lives and that the general public, the bonum plebis, can know the difference. The argument is deceptively simple: the ethical exercise of political power is the bedrock foundation of good governance, political stability, and prosperity. This iconography’s intended audience is generally the public, but public officials and community leaders are also reminded of requisite virtues and the negative impact of vices. In this way, art and literature also serve as vehicles of political mobilization by exposing the disagreeable effects of a mismatch between the idealized vision and actual practice.

In The Hero with a Thousand Faces, his study of comparative mythology that dates to the late 1940s, Joseph Campbell argued that different cultures at different times draw on the power of symbolic representations in allegories or myths to teach similar lessons. The similarities among these three sets of murals do not constitute evidence for this argument because the later two
derive from the fourteenth-century model and all three are expressions of Western European culture deeply influenced by the teachings of the Catholic Church.

These three sets of murals portray virtue ethics, which is grounded in values, virtues, and moral character. Benjamin Franklin, in his 1760 “Letter to Lord Kames,” framed the acquisition of virtue itself as an art, much like painting or architecture:

Most People have naturally some Virtues, but none have naturally all the Virtues. To acquire those that are wanting, and secure what we acquire as well as those we have naturally, is the Subject of an Art. It is as properly an Art, as Painting, Navigation, or Architecture. If a Man would become a Painter, Navigator, or Architect [or citizen, I add] . . . regularly and gradually he arrives by Practice at some Perfection in the Art.

The murals examined in this article acknowledge that the virtues are instrumental to good governance, prosperity, and political stability, rather than valued for their own sake. In this sense, the murals impair the very virtue ethics which they celebrate.

The murals use a human face to induce emotion, elicit empathy, and tell a story that appeals to our moral intuition. Yet, the face portrayed is exclusively European. Must the face mirror one’s own in order for virtue ethics to hold sway?

A central character in all three sets of murals, Justice has a feminine face. The association of power and impartiality with women contradicts the traditional assignment of gender-based roles, attributes, and virtues in European and derivative cultures, including some now-classical feminist writings (Gilligan, 1982; Nodding, 1984). Psychologist Steven Pinker (2011) marshals empirical evidence to posit that women in decision-making roles reduce a society’s level of violence. Why has this artistic icon endured and what function does it serve (see Resnik and Curtis, 2011)? This question suggests the utility of using these murals to open up existing discourses that address our understandings of and assumptions about good governance.

Lastly, does good governance actually rest on the virtue ethics of our leaders, or do we need a new vision—a new understanding—of what constitutes good governance in the modern world? If one agrees with Franklin that moral character is an art and with the murals that good governance rests on virtue, then it follows that good governance itself is an art. Is this so, or is ethical decision making susceptible to empirical research, as many psychologists and decision-making theorists argue (Doris, 2002; Kagan, 1998; Kahneman, 2011; Kahneman and Tversky, 1979; Turiel, 2002)? Why do we continue to derive our vision of good governance from a more than six-hundred-year-old fresco plastered on the walls in an old town hall in Italy?
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Notes

1. For visual evidence supporting this argument, compare the impact of the murals shown in this article with a representation of the correlation between perceived corruption and human development in The Economist Online (2011).

5. An expanded discussion here of the imagery and meaning of Justice is not directly relevant to the necessarily limited focus of this article. The sources cited in this paragraph serve as useful starting points for interested readers.
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Introduction

As Raadschelders (2010) ably argues, the historical study of American public administration is egregiously neglected within the field. Raadschelders (2010, 237) points out that his work “develops a basis for the systematic exploration of historical knowledge to advance the understanding of government and (possibly?) helping toward the solution of contemporary challenges.” He spends a considerable effort highlighting the regression of historical study within public administration by noting that the rise of quantitative research and an academic culture that emphasized pragmatic empirical modeling over formal historical inquiry (2010, 238-244). Raadschelders (210, 246-254) argues effectively that administration scholars need to develop a research framework that systematically assesses time and change within American public administration especially by using its history as a source for lessons learned as well has for theoretical development. He asks the essential question to our scholars and then conceptualizes the need to reintegrate the study of history back into American public administration education and research:

How can we bring administrative history from the margins back into the mainstream of the study? First, at the conceptual and perceptual levels it is necessary to be aware of the fundamental linear and cyclical nature of time…Second, at a psychological level it is
important to recognize individual attitudes toward change and how these influence positions that citizens and practitioners hold with regard to policies. What propels some people into embracing change and others into resisting it could simply be explained by age (young vs. old, “eager or cautious”), or experience in a job (e.g., “it did not work then, why would it now?”), or a sense of security (i.e., “why fix what is not broken?”), or a (political, religious) belief in something, common sense, perhaps, but not systematically investigated in public administration. (Raadschelders 2010, 255)

Here, Raadschelders highlights the basic historical dimensions that public administration scholars oftentimes fail to consider within their empirical and theoretical research designs. By no means does Raadschelders believe that this task of reorienting public administration research toward effective historical scholarship is easily remedied, but he argues that is nonetheless essential for scholars and practitioners to fully inform the profession.

On a more practical level, our public managers across the various levels of the federal system encounter seemingly new phenomena and social movements that ostracize or inhibit the basic functions of our public service system. Little do they realize that similar situations and processes occurred in the past, often to a detrimental outcome for American public administration. This is not only because our public servants rarely look to history for guidance. It is more often the case that public administration scholars fail to properly document and analyze that history.

Answering Raadschelders challenge, this article chronicles how major institutions representing American public administration handled a frontal assault of McCarthyistic proponents during the late 1950’s. This particular knowledge of our field’s history would be especially helpful in this distinct time of political and ideological division in our nation’s history. During the time this study covers, Richard Hofstadter wrote several essays that were ultimately published in his *The Paranoid Style in American Politics*. In the introduction to this work, Hofstadter (1966, xi) stated that:

For many years I have been interested in the conspiratorial mind portrayed in the essay on the paranoid style. Today this mentality is of particular interest as it is manifest on the extreme right wing, among those I have called pseudo-conservatives, who believe that we have lived for a generation in the grip of a vast conspiracy. But this is not a style of mind confined to the right wing. With modulations and differences, it exists today, as it has in the past, on the left, and it has recurred at times in democratic movements from antimasonry to populism.

Elements from both the Tea Party and the Occupy movements exhibit elements of the paranoid style outlined by Hofstadter—allegations of broad conspiracy toward political opponents, innuendo of motive, and pretense of patriotism. Determining how public service professions, when necessary, can respond to such movements requires, in part, an understanding of similar instances in the past. This inquiry seeks to accomplish this task. It presents a cautionary tale of administrative inaction in the face of defamatory attacks on institutional credibility. Specifically, this study analyzes activities undertaken by the National Municipal League (NML) and the Public Administration Service (PAS) during the 1950’s and 1960’s to counter libelous and slanderous actions taken by grass roots activists in opposition to efforts to reform metropolitan
governance across the United States—in essence this is a public administration case study of Hofstadter’s “paranoid style.”

The NML, located in New York City, was a longstanding good government organization founded in the 1890’s to support local government reform largely through professionalization and de-politicization of the local government workforce across the United States (Willoughby 1969; Childs 1952; Mann 1950). Its most notable contribution to this cause was the development of the Model City Charter, first in 1899, which became vehicle for the mass adoption of the Council-Manager form of government in the United States during the first half of the 20th Century. The PAS found its roots in the NML’s Municipal Administration Service in the 1920’s, moved from New York City to Chicago in 1931, was re-chartered as PAS in 1933 in the state of Illinois, and was housed within the Public Administration Clearing House (PACH) at the University of Chicago until the late 1960’s (White, 1933; Stone, 1983; Hazelrigg, 1938). During most of its time in Chicago, the PACH and the PAS (along with many other public management organizations, including the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA)) were housed at the 1313 E. 60th Street address on the University of Chicago campus. The “1313” location would become notorious to subsequent extremist critics. I have primarily utilized records from the NML archives, located in the Auraria Library at the University of Colorado Denver, and give special attention to their “Smear File” to chronicle and analyze the key events and actors below.

I specifically focus on the ideas and actions of opponents of metropolitan governance/government reform, largely from the South and West in the United States, including Don Bell, Jo Hindman, and Dan Smoot. These individuals used right-wing idea distribution vehicles including magazines, small-town newspapers, subscription newsletters, and radio broadcasts to disseminate their arguments and rally support for their cause. Through an examination of personal correspondence and publications, I analyze the actions and interactions of the subjects of their campaign at the NML and PAS—namely those of Alfred Willoughby, Executive Director of the NML; Herman G. Pope, Executive Director of the PAS; Richard S. Childs, former President of the NML and a longtime resident scholar at the NML; and Karl Detzer, Roving Editor for Reader’s Digest and contributing writer for the National Municipal Review, the academic and professional journal of the NML. The interactions among these individuals culminated into a lukewarm response to the vociferous attack from their radical right critics. Willoughby’s firing of a NML employee accused of communist ties during the McCarthy Era of the mid-1950’s would seemingly complicate this response.

Importantly, this study adds qualitative dimensions to the empirical literature explaining the lack of metropolitan governmental frameworks at the local level in the United States, which has been built on the work of Charles Tiebout (1956; 1960); Vincent Ostrom (Ostrom, Tiebout, and Warren 1963); Elinor Ostrom (1972; 1973; 1976); Robert Bish (1971); and Ronald Oakerson, and Roger Parks (Parks and Oakerson, 1989; 1993) which is largely recognized as the public choice explanation. These and other authors have put forth an argument that local level, jurisdictional competitive and cooperative frameworks within a polycentric metropolitan geography—through such devices as ad hoc service districts (water, sewer, soil, etc...), regional councils of governments, and inter-jurisdictional agreements, for example—have largely negated the need for broader metropolitan level government reform that had been sought through more blunt measures like city-county consolidation. Although this analysis is idiographic and
historical in perspective, it does not attempt to challenge or replace the core empirical results of the nomothetic modeling of the public choice scholars. It does, however, offer a possible alternative explanation as to why the notion of metropolitan government, if not metropolitan governance, has not received mass acceptance in the United States, especially during the important era of the 1950’s and 1960’s—when efforts to achieve reform were at their highest levels.

McCarthyism and American Public Administration during the 1950’s

As I will demonstrate, the approach taken by the opponents of metropolitan government outlined in this study is one of abject McCarthyism, herein defined as the unattributed, unfounded association of civic action with established or perceived international communist influences for the purpose of furthering a theory of conspiracy. Similar to the actions of Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin (whose historic Wheeling, West Virginia speech of 1950—which implicated the State Department as coming under the communist umbrella through the actions of specific diplomats and 57 other unnamed employee operatives—started this historical process of guilt by unfounded accusation and association) many of these accusations constituted nothing less than the classic political smear. As such, in 1958, the NML created a “Smear File” to catalogue and document such accusations and associations attributed by others toward the NML and its affiliated organizations, one of which was the PAS.

The literature analyzing the impact of McCarthyism on American Public Administration is quite small. Focused research on this issue within the core public administration journals is found within only two articles published during the 1960’s. McCulloch (1965) begins with the viewpoints of Jo Hindman, but analyzes them within the broad context of federalism, not within specific aspects of local public administration. Boyvey (1964) examines conspiratorial critiques of the rise of mental health care in the United States during the 1950’s and 1960’s, but he does tangentially mention the work of Dan Smoot and Don Bell, two of the key critics of the idea of metropolitan government during this time. Peel (1963) best captures the broad tenor of McCarthyism within the United States during the time I study. Although published in a political science journal (Western Political Quarterly), Peel’s work positions political extremism (mostly in the form of anti-communism) at the local level as a grassroots movement and effectively illustrates the tools and techniques of the dissemination of these ideas—many of which were used by the antagonists discussed here.

The Movement for Metropolitan Government in the United States following World War II

In the mind of the American public management community (such as those housed at the PACH in Chicago), the postwar suburbanization in the United States would highlight the need for some form of metropolitan government solution to deal with its sprawling metropolitan areas. Indeed the advocacy for metropolitan government would reach its apex during these years. Figure 1 shows the yearly level of citations found in American public management oriented journals,
academic journals and monographs (such as the National Municipal Review, Public Management, American City and County, the City Management Yearbook, among others).

At the top of the graphic is the associated Google Ngram viewer count of the term “metropolitan government” for the same years. The two graphs at the top of the figure are on the same time scale. The Ngram figure provides some support for the accuracy or reliability of the overall trend encountered in the second graph. Both indicate the rising policy importance of metropolitan governance reform in the United States during the postwar years.

Although large scale suburbanization had been underway in the United States since the early part of the 20th Century, and indeed could be classified as mass suburbanization during the 1920’s, no government planners expected the scale of suburbanization that would take place during the two decades that followed World War Two. The mass suburbanization that would take place due to population pressures in the central city would excite development at the edges of central cities to a scale that had not been seen in U.S. history. Orderly, planned development would not be the rule of the era, and the attempts to implement various schemes of metropolitan government did abound. Indeed, the discussion and advocacy of metropolitan government in the United States reached its apex during this era, with the actual peak taking place in the late 1950’s. The advocacy for metropolitan government during this era would be dominated by the efficiency rhetoric trumpeted by the public management professionals at the Public Administration Clearing House, and by people who found their ideas provocative. To a large degree, this is what the extremists outlined below were reacting against. The extent and nature of discussions regarding metropolitan government during this era was no less than astounding. Table 1 itemizes the metropolitan areas where such initiatives took place. Contents within the NML Smear File indicate that these events, in part, elicited an unforeseen reaction. The remainder of this paper will document and analyze fallout from some of these relevant events.

The Key Players

The following section provides summary biographies of the key players from the NML and the PAS involved in the metropolitan government debate in the United States during the postwar years, as well as key antagonists:

Amos Landman: Landman was the publicity director for the NML during the first half of the 1950’s. In July of 1955, Landman exercised his constitutional Fifth Amendment rights before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee when asked if he was a communist. Upon return to his NML job in New York City, he was forced to resign (“Landman Says…”, 1955, 1-2).

Alfred Willoughby: Willoughby was the Executive Director of the NML from 1947 to 1968 and was Assistant Director beginning in 1937. Willoughby was the key decision maker in terms of the NML response to the opponents of metropolitan reform. He spent the good part of 1958 and 1959 attempting to convince Charles Edison that the opponents of metropolitan reform were fundamentally wrong.
Figure 1: Citation Levels Related to Metropolitan Government

Metropolitan Government Related Sources, by Year

Metropolitan Government Sources by Year, 1946-1970
Table 1: Areas Where Metropolitan Initiatives Took Place in the United States, 1946-1970

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Consolidation</th>
<th>Federation</th>
<th>Action?</th>
<th>Success?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>1950, 1958, 1959</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>1959, 1964</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baton Rouge</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>1946, 1947, 1948, 1956</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1947, 1954, 1958, 1968</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1947, 1968</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charleston</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chattanooga</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1963, 1966, 1965, 1970</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>1948, 1956, 1959, 1968</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>1965, 1966</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>1948, 1959, 1960</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flint</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>1947, 1954, 1958</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>1967, 1968</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>1948, 1965</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>1947, 1967, 1969</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonville</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>1965, 1966, 1967</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas City</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1948, 1955</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>1955, 1970</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memphis</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1960, 1962</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>1948, 1958, 1959, 61</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>1965, 1966, 1968</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>1952, 1955, 1956, 1960, 1962</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport News</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensacola</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>1965, 1970</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>1952, 1960</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>1948, 1952, 1955</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>1953, 1965, 1967</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>1960, 1961</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochester</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1955, 1956, 1957</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Lake City</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>1956, 1968</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>1964, 1965</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1948, 1959, 1960</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1951, 1954, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>1954, 1955, 1957, 1959, 1960, 1962</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa Bay</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>1966, 1970</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wichita</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Karl Detzer:** Detzer was a long-time Roving Editor for the *Reader’s Digest* from the 1930’s through the 1960’s. He started a friendship with Willoughby in the late 1930’s that lasted through the 1970’s. Detzer and Willoughby had a brief falling out over the Landman affair. He was a voting member of the NML Council during the 1950’s.

**Glen Peterson:** Peterson was a Senior Associate with the NML from 1957 to 1960. He advocated for and was able to establish the Smear File with the permission of Alfred Willoughby.

**Richard Spencer Childs:** Childs was one of the founders of the council-manager form of government and was the resident scholar for the NML through the 1960’s. He was President of the NML during the 1930’s, was an avowed capitalist, and provided counsel to Willoughby during his years at the NML.

**Herman G. Pope:** Pope was Executive Director of the PAS from 1943 to 1972. He maintained contact with Willoughby during the late 1950’s regarding the actions highlighted in the Smear File and would author one of the official responses to the critics of metropolitan reform.

**Jo Hindman:** Hindman was a grass-roots activist from Los Angeles who was also a self-trained journalist who published pieces critical of regionalism and the professionalization of local public administration. She was recognized as the West Coast editor of the *American Mercury* and also published several pieces in another national conservative publication, *Human Events*. Hindman operated out of Los Angeles, California.

**Dan Smoot:** Smoot was a prominent political activist based in Dallas, Texas. A former FBI agent, Smoot maintained a weekly newsletter from 1951 through 1971 that covered the broad interests of what he believed to be a communist conspiracy to overthrow the United States government. He had an intermittent interest in the rise of regionalism and the notion of metropolitan government during the 1950’s and 1960’s. He was also a prominent syndicated radio and television broadcaster throughout the Midwestern and Southwestern United States.

**Don Bell:** Bell was also a prominent political activist in the vein of Hindman and Smoot. He operated out of Palm Beach, Florida, had a weekly newsletter, and also focused on the broad issues of the communist conspiracy in America (he was most like Smoot in this regard). His newsletter was in circulation between 1954 and 1991.

**Charles Edison:** Edison was the former reform Governor of the State of New Jersey, son of Thomas Alva Edison, and a former President of the NML. During this time, he operated the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation. He was also partial to many of the arguments put forth by Hindman, Smoot, and Bell.

**The Presage of McCarthyism at the NML**

On July 1, 1955, Amos Landman, Publicity Director of the NML, was called to testify before the Senate Internal Security subcommittee and was asked if he was at any time a member of the
In a newspaper interview, Landman stated that he invoked his Fifth Amendment rights against self-incrimination so as to not be compelled to testify against others—despite being on record elsewhere that he was a member of the Communist Party in the late 1930’s only to quit his membership after the Russo-German Pact of 1939. Later in the same newspaper interview, Landman noted that “the youthful Communists I knew 15 years ago have long since quit the party, married, reared children, bought homes, and assumed responsible positions. They never engaged in subversion.” It was also reported that

The National Municipal League, an organization which aims at raising the standards of state and local government, had indicated before Landman testified that his job hinged on his answers and particularly on whether he pleaded the Fifth Amendment…his resignation was asked yesterday through Alan H. Seed Jr., assistant director of the league, Landman said, adding: “Later, I was told that Alfred Willoughby, executive director, would talk to me when he returns from his holiday weekend, July 7. Apparently, I am fired” (“Landman Says…” (1955, 1-2)).

No record of the immediate interaction between Willoughby and Landman, if there was one, exists in the NML archive. Roughly one month later, Landman’s termination was approved at the NML’s National Conference in Seattle by the Council of the NML. In a letter subsequent to this official termination, Landman wrote to Willoughby:

I have been informed of the decision of the Council of the League with respect to my dismissal. I cannot say that I am delighted by that decision nor can I admit to much surprise. It would have been too much to expect the council to overrule not only you but Dr. Gallup, Mr. Linen, Mr. Morgan, and any other officers you may have consulted. I do believe that if I had been present in Seattle to state my case personally, some members of the council might have supported me, though by no means a majority. And I rather regret that there was apparently little or no discussion of the manner in which I was discharged, which does not, in my opinion reflect great credit on the League (Landman, 1955, August 5).

Landman went on to request a “rave” letter of reference in light of his self-reported stellar service to the NML over the years. In his reply to Landman, Alfred Willoughby did not revel in the termination of Landman, but he was firm in defense. Willoughby (1955, August 11) responded that

As for the “rave notice” you request in the form of a letter of reference, I think it would be mutually advantageous for me to take this under consideration until recent events can be seen in better perspective. I will be glad to any time to testify concerning your experience, ability, diligence and the effectiveness of your relations with the press…Meanwhile, I want to you to know that I sent no communication to members of the Council prior to the Seattle meeting to counter those from you…My oral presentation to the Council was gentle and restrained, as was the entire discussion. Had you been present, you would have become aware of the unfairness of interpreting the attitude of either officers or staff as indicative of any sympathy with the witch hunters.7
Landman’s firing did not go over well with Karl Detzer. Detzer was a long-time friend of Alfred Willoughby, was a good friend of the NML, and was a friend to the cause of progressive local government reform in general. Beginning in the late 1930’s Detzer, in his role as a journalist and Roving Editor for Reader’s Digest, authored numerous articles that appeared in national publications (including Scribner’s, Barron’s, Survey, and the NML’s National Municipal Review). Some of these articles would end up in Reader’s Digest and Detzer made it his work to make sure that articles of the like—those that espoused progressive and professional local government reform—would also end up in Reader’s Digest. Detzer, a member of the NML Council at this time, wrote to Willoughby before the firing (indeed, he had no knowledge of Landman’s status at this time), before the Seattle meeting and subsequent to the meeting—and Willoughby replied to each. In a letter dated before Landman’s testimony and firing, a despondent Detzer (1955, June 27) expressed his views to Willoughby about the direction of the NML and his role therein:

I’ve done a lot of soul searching lately. And I have decided that when one man is out of step with the majority, the only thing he can do gracefully is get out of the parade…My social and political philosophies seem so far removed from those of the people who apparently are in the majority in the League that I am of no help to them and they are of no help to me…Take the matter of the nominating committee. The inclusion of that man Graham from Louisville, who boasts that although a Democrat he’s a great admirer of McCarthy, is the sort of thing to which I refer. If it were an isolated case, I would not think anything of it…But I have read many statements by Edison; I’ve watched Goldwater’s record closely; I sat in at Phoenix with Tibbetts and his Texas pals and listened. They are not my kind of people and I’m sure that if you search your own soul you’ll admit that they are not your kind, either…So I’m not going to Seattle. You really don’t need me. You’ll not miss me. 

A concerned and defensive Willoughby (1955, June 30) replied:

Some years ago Mr. Sims of Seattle or someone from out that way demanded that I send him a marked list of our lay leaders classifying them as radical, liberal, or conservative. I refused to do so…But partly to show you the error of your belief that you are “out of step with the majority” and partly because your standards of who is liberal and who isn’t come closer to mine than those of our Seattle man, I send you herewith a marked copy of our 1955 Report and Directory in which I have checked those who I believe properly could be identified as conservative…the most I can find is nine out of fifty…I am sure that you can talk with any of the other forty or more without shocking them one bit and I am confident you would like their attitudes as they would like yours.

Clearly, Willoughby is trying to assure Detzer he is wrong about the NML. Nevertheless, after Landman’s forced separation from the League, Detzer was even more perplexed. He wrote:

It was not until today that I heard of the summary dismissal of Mr. Amos Landman by the National Municipal League. I feel that it is most regrettable…Although I am not familiar with the details of the matter, I can readily understand how any man of honor might be forced to invoke the Fifth Amendment in the circumstances. I read the newspaper reports
of the Senate committee’s sessions, and judging from them, Eastland’s questions were so loaded, so unfair, so hewn with the McCarthy line, that no witness could expect fair and decent treatment…Mr. Landman states that he refused to testify because only by so doing could he, under the Constitution, refrain from naming others who in the long ago were mistaken but honorable citizens. I admire his unwillingness to expose these others to the calumny and malicious innuendo of stupid or headline hunting public officials…As I have told you before, I believe that the National Municipal League has been severely harmed of late by the statements and associations of certain of its officials, who chose to align themselves with the disreputable cause of McCarthyism. Here was an opportunity to prove to liberty loving Americans that the League is not dominated by persons of this kind…You have permission to present this letter to the Council at the annual meeting.10

In a Western Union Telegram sent five days later to the meeting in Seattle, Detzer (1955, July 23) was even more resolute by stating “please read my letter on Landman into the minutes of the annual meeting. The longer I think of this the more un-American and reprehensible it seems. The League should either outlaw McCarthyism or disband. Decency and democracy outweigh moneybags and small groups of fascist minded contributors.” No immediate response from Willoughby was found in the archive, but Willoughby did send a response on August 16 regarding actions taken at the meeting. He wrote to Detzer:

I am disappointed that, after all of the years that you have known me, you would leap to strong conclusions on the basis of one side of a rather complicated and distressing situation…After a very thorough discussion, the council agreed on the following statement to be inserted in the minutes: “The request of Amos Landman, former public relations director, for reconsideration of his dismissal was taken up by council and thoroughly discussed. His case, including his letter to the council and supporting communications, were considered…the council unanimously sustained the action of the Executive Director in his dismissal”(Willoughby, 1955, August 16).11

Detzer’s next missive to Willoughby was an even harsher indictment of the NML and constituted his resignation from the NML Council. Detzer (1955, August 21) responded to Willoughby:

Your letter was here when I returned last night from a business trip. I am sorry to disappoint you. But I see no reason that my attitude should surprise you. You and I many times in the past several years have discussed the growing un-American, undemocratic attitude of too many members of the Council…As you know, I am no sympathizer with communism. Nor do I believe in fascism. I still stand four-square with the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. I believe that the kind of thinking exemplified by McCarthyites is every bit as dangerous to our freedom as that of the communists…The Landman incident merely was another of the things I do not like. Why honor aging men (with money) who espouse any cause as un-American as McCarthyism today, and fire a man who in his youth briefly espoused communism and then had the common sense and decency to break away from it? Why fire Landman and keep these others?.. I was in California at the time of the annual conference, searched diligently in the daily press for reports of the meeting, found none. But I did hear, indirectly, that my letter had been read and that the council voted unanimously against my point of view. I also heard that
following the reading of my letter, one council member said “Oh, Detzer was always a New Dealer,” and that this evoked no protest from anyone present. The fact that it did not, in my opinion, points out clearly the kind of thinking that dominates the unanimous council. Any organization in which having been a New Dealer, in having been part of the vast majority of Americans, makes one suspect, is no place for me.

A direct result of this disagreement between Willoughby and Detzer was an apparent falling out with regard to their friendship. Between this time and the middle of 1958, the extent and nature correspondence dwindled considerably and went from personal and substantive to merely perfunctory.12

I quote extensively from the correspondence between Detzer and Willoughby for three reasons. First, it provides important insight into the management of one of the major professional public administration organizations during a time of American intellectual crisis. The fact that the brutal cynicism of McCarthyism found its way into the workings of the NML should, in and of itself, encourage an avenue of further, broader inquiry. Second, and more related to the topic at hand, the personal falling out of these two men provides an interesting presage to the assault of right wing radicals on the NML and the PAS. By inference, it colors the reaction and action of both men when these right wing radicals decided to target the notion of metropolitan government, governance, and planning as an example a grand communist conspiracy to wrestle governmental control from citizens across the United States. Finally, Detzer depicts the NML as vulnerable to any attack from right wing radicals, given that part of its leadership was predisposed to accepting some of the broad precepts of McCarthyism—a situation that would also make it difficult for the organization to respond to such assaults. The following section describes such McCarthyistic assertions that were leveled against the NML and the PAS.

**Enter Bell, Hindman and Smoot**

The work of Don Bell, Jo Hindman, and Dan Smoot, discussed below, are examples of the use of innuendo, suspicion, and smear to call into question the civic activities of persons and organizations associated with the NML and the PAS. Their intent to denigrate and defame the movement within American public administration to devise mechanisms to arrive at a more efficient machinery for metropolitan governance would, to a degree, force both the PAS and the NML into action.14

**Don Bell**

On February 21, 1958, in the newsletter “Closer up: Don Bell Reports”, commentator Don Bell described the PACH under the title of that week’s subject “The Story of 1313.” The lead paragraph ominously stated “There is an invisible government which controls you at the grass roots level. It is destroying your local government and aims to destroy your state government; Welding all into a world government dictatorship. This is the story of that invisible government and its methods of operation.” Bell (1958, February 21a) went on to describe the setting at PACH:
On land provided by the University of Chicago, in a building specifically erected for the purpose, there exists a beehive of organizations which are working day and night, year after year, at the task of eliminating elected and representative government at the local and the state level; and merging all into regional governments (as in Soviet Russia); these, in turn, to be merged into a centralized government which will be the North American branch of a World Government. This World Government is to be operated by appointed social science “experts.” These social science experts are the trained (not educated) elite; civil service intelligentsia who are a “class apart from the common herd” who are to serve the invisible government masters as the herd managers…”1313” is a headquarters building for some 22 organizations, all of which are dedicated to the task of destroying local and State governments. Their darling project of the moment is the establishment of what they call “Metropolitan Government,” which they “sell” to the local citizenry under the false label of “Home Rule.”

In a newsletter of the same date, titled “The Menace of Metropolitan Government: A Case Study of how “1313” is establishing the local units of World Government in Communities through the United States,” Bell (1958, February 21b) went on to explain the technique employed by PACH organizations (including the PAS) as one of “proposing a cure for a disease which did not exist” akin, as Bell argued, to U.S. Federal Government initiatives related to mosquito abatement, fluoridation of water, and the eradication of Dutch Elm Disease. He then explained that a similar technique was employed to bring “Metro” to Miami and Dade County, Florida:

Leonard D. White, Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago (home of “1313”) in his book “The City Managers” wrote: “What the whole world is witnessing is the emergence of government by experts, by men and women who are trained technicians highly specialized to perform service by scientific methods…The “scientific experts” had been installed as City Managers in 13 of the 26 municipalities in Dade County. In the municipalities over 25,000 population, all but one (Hialeah) were operated under the City Manager form of government. The first step having been taken, it was time to go on to step number two: establishment of “Metro.”

Bell then provocatively explained that a local research foundation was created (on the model of the Ford Foundation) to collect information on how to set up a metropolitan level governance system in Miami—research that was completed by Don Larson, who was employed by the University of Chicago—which then would propose a form of government to be voted on by the people. Stating that Larson left his position under a cloud of suspicion, Bell noted that “but before Don Larson packed his bag and baggage, he had brought in social scientist Harry T. Toulmin to keep the “Metro” pot boiling.” Ominously, he explained that

There is evidence that Toulmin came in as an expert “trouble-shooter” for PAS. Work had been begun on the “Metro” charter in 1955 and “a working draft was prepared during that year with the consulting assistance of the Public Administration Service.” But the Dade County Research Foundation didn’t push the plan as PAS must have desired. Because, in his report of Sept. 25, 1956, Toulmin said “If ever an organization was dead, this one was dead on August 15, 1956…Toulmin reorganized, poured on fuel, fanned the
flame and on May 21, 1957, the voters of Dade County had been brainwashed into approving a county charter designed to “create a metropolitan government.”

The approach by Bell would be emulated by Hindman and Smoot—speculation, sensationalism, and innuendo—all without any type of sourcing of information. In any event, all of this would cause much consternation for the PAS and the NML. 15

**Jo Hindman**

Jo Hindman’s approach was just as aggressive. She would approach the issue of metropolitan government in the same vein as Bell, with the same lack of sourcing of her speculations and assertions. Her major organ of national significance was the *American Mercury* during the late 1950s into the 1960s. 16 In her second article for the *American Mercury*, simply titled “Terrible 1313,” Hindman (1959a, 6-7) lashed out at the PAS and “1313”:

Like political cancer, giant cell “1313” has been uncovered within the United States. Released into various levels of government, its political leukemia attacks and abolishes divisions of free government. This leads toward total amalgamation into one superstate…Swift moving teams of social engineers, self-described as “experts” in the field of public administration are the “1313” carriers. They operate through a radical political apparatus called “metro,” or metropolitan government, which they urge Americans to accept, and work at city, county, state, federal, and international levels, destroying features of the American constitutional Republic, and substituting despotic “metro.”

Unlike Bell, she also tied the mission of the PAS with that of its historical founder, the NML. She observed that

In the United States, “1313” controls power through the secretariats of two of its main subcells: The Council of State Governments (CSG) and the Public Administration Service (PAS). Through a web of interlocking memberships, these two manipulate 20 allied “1313” organizations. In turn, both the CSG and PAS reflect the parentage of the National Municipal League (NML) whose headquarters are in New York and not at the “1313” Chicago Address…the NML was founded in 1894 upon apparently sound principles of municipal reform to wipe out corruption, bossism, and graft at the municipal level, but radical mutations of policy made under appearances in the NML almost from the start. Executive control of government through appointed managerships became a NML plank around the year 1915. In 1931, NML prime functions were defined as research and militant reform (Hindman, 1959a, 9).

Hindman (1959a, 9-10) then proceeded to explain the formation of “1313” in a diabolical manner, noting that “the plasm of “1313” swarms with an executive elite, including the NML, who sit on each others’ boards, commissions, committees, and secretariats. Subordinate carriers, whom “1313’s” employment service places into key positions in government, carry “1313” policy into every nook and cranny of American life and local government affairs.” Figure 2 illustrates Hindman’s argument that the NML and the PACH comprised a scheme for
communist control and one world government. The connections highlighted within her arguments and statements here are partially illustrated in the chart.

**Figure 2: Jo Hindman’s Framework Detailing the Communist Conspiracy Surrounding the Public Administration Clearing House**

[Diagram image]

In her next article for the *American Mercury*, Hindman (1960a, 33) made further assertions about the workings of “1313” within the context of the Metro chart: “A political law factory in Chicago is drafting legislation engineered to rob millions of Americans of their freedoms, such as the right to vote and the right to own property.” She dubbed this approach, “mail-order law.” Hindman (1960a, 37) goes on to criticize the actions of the Council of State Governments (CSG). She states that the CSG “is as formidable as it is ruinous to grass-roots home rule. In given time, the uniform mail-order law movement could bind all states of the republic under disastrous collectivistic Metro government.” She went further:

Today, the collectivism of “1313” penetrates practically every level of government. The crazy hawking of “1313” legislation throughout the states may carry graver undertones,
due to a fact recently uncovered: CSG is part of a linkage that leads into Red Russia, as follows: CSG interlocks with Committee on International Municipal Cooperation which transmits funds raised in the United States to International Union of Local Authorities, the organization that co-mingles with Communist Yugoslavia and Communist East Germany, the latter through the International Federation for Documentation, an international information pool. Records further reveal that IFD collaborates with the USSR through the International Committee Social Sciences documentation in sharing legal information, including an annotated up-to-date bibliography on law in the United States of America (Hindman, 1960a, 39).

Again, see Figure 2. What is one to make of this? Clearly, according to Hindman, the movement for metropolitan government in the United States was associated with international communism and had to be stopped. The problem for the PAS and the NML was that it was becoming a problem with some of its officials. The work of Dan Smoot illustrates this.

**Dan Smoot**

Dan Smoot was one of the most influential right-wing radicals of the 1950’s and 1960’s. In her work, *What’s Fair on the Air: Cold-War Right Wing Broadcasting and the Public Interest*, Heather Hendershot notes that Smoot’s radio audience in the early 1960’s was probably in the millions, and at its height, his newsletter, *The Dan Smoot Report*, had upwards of 40,000 paid subscribers (Hendershott, 2011, 70-75). It is less clear what Smoot’s television audience numbered, but it was also substantial. It is clear that the NML and the PAS had something to be concerned about here.\(^{18}\)

Smoot’s first foray into the metropolitan government debate was an attack on the New York Metropolitan Regional Council, an organization that he associated with the desired implementation of metropolitan government in Greater New York.\(^{19}\) In the April 13, 1959 edition of *The Dan Smoot Report*, Smoot’s target was Dr. Wallace Sayre, a professor of Public Administration at Columbia University and the chairman of the council. Smoot (1959, April 13, 115) weighed in on the assertions and motivations of Sayre and the council:

> Dr. Wallace Stanley Sayre and his council found that the New York area, without an “authoritative regional leadership institution” achieved “first-rank position in the nation and the world.” Now, however, the region will go into decline, if it does not, forthwith, set up a permanent organization of experts “with the capacity to foresee” the region’s difficulties, and with the power to reach across municipal boundaries and state lines to do the planning and “inspiring” for 16 million people who—although they managed somehow to build their region into the “nation’s premier metropolitan area”—are now unaccountably incapable of maintaining what they built.”

Like Hindman and Bell before him, Smoot inveighed against experts associated with any proposed regional governance strategy. In fact, the language Smoot used is very similar to the language used previously by Hindman. Smoot (1959a, April 13, 116) wrote:
“Metropolitan Government” has become part of a pincers movement which can destroy the whole fabric of government and social organization in the United States—eliminate the sovereign states as meaningful political entities, and divide the nation into metropolitan regions (or soviets) managed by appointed experts who will be answerable to the supreme soviet in Washington, which will provide most of the tax money...The only function that citizens will have in “governing themselves” will be periodically to vote for the commissioners or councilmen who appoint the experts. These elected officials will become the victims rather than the supervisors of the experts they appoint. When the condition fully develops, elections in the United States will have precisely the same meaning that elections now have in peoples’ democracies behind the iron curtain...At the top of this pincers movement is the drive for world government...At the bottom of the pincers movement is “Metropolitan Government.”

In his very next newsletter dated April 20, 1959, Smoot continued his assault on the notion of metropolitan government. After giving a critique of the Miami approach to metropolitan government that mirrored that of Hindman’s, Smoot (1959b, 126) finished his argument by giving his reader “some grim truth about metropolitan government.” Smoot wrote:

Metropolitan government is part of a movement to establish in America a soviet style arrangement which can destroy the whole fabric of government and social organization in the United States...The “Metro” idea is being vigorously pushed all over the nation, by people who envision a new kind of America: an America in which the old federation of sovereign states, held together in union by a central government of carefully limited powers, will be changed for a nation divided into metropolitan regions which sprawl across forgotten and meaningless municipal, county and state boundary lines...The states thus being eliminated as meaningful political entities, each metropolitan area will be managed by an appointed expert, under no direct control (and little indirect control) from the people on whom he imposes laws and taxes.

Collectively, the three antagonists—Bell, Hindman, and Smoot—presented a troubling yet consistent picture of how the radical right of this time viewed the possibility of adopting metropolitan government or governance schemes in American metropolitan areas. Through the use of unsubstantiated statements—the authors made a habit of not properly sourcing (documents, interviews, legislation, etc...) their scurrilous charges—various innuendo, and guilt by association (smear), Bell, Hindman, and Smoot engaged in a frontal assault on two of the most engaged public management organizations in the United States at the time, the NML and the PAS. Based on the reactions of these two organizations, Bell, Hindman and Smoot were indeed causing a problem.

**The Reaction and Response at the NML and the PAS**

*Glen Peterson*

The reaction at the NML began in the fall of 1958. The reaction at the PAS appears to have begun sooner. The work of Glen Peterson at the NML was important regarding its initial
reaction. Peterson came to the NML after serving as the Research Director of the Dade County Research Foundation in 1957. This gave Peterson some direct experience in encountering the charges of extremists. Peterson is important in this story because it is he who established the NML Smear File and lobbied Alfred Willoughby to take a more active role in countering the libelous charges from the likes of Bell, Hindman, and Smoot.

On October 30, 1958, Peterson sent a letter to Edwin H. Crawford of the Manatee, Florida Civic Association. After providing an historically accurate version of the establishment of the PAS and the PACH (“1313”) and defending the establishment of the Council-Manager form of government—both of which Crawford apparently equated with a communist conspiracy—Peterson (1958a, October 30) came to the defense of the PAS and its work:

PAS was the consulting organization which made the original study for the establishment of Metro government in Dade County. It recommended the abolition of the old five member county commission and the substitution of the county-manager plan which incidentally was vindicated with a resounding vote in an amendment election on September 30th. When the Metro Charter was first proposed in Dade County, charges similar to those being made in your community were aired in Dade County and directed at the PAS. This is nothing new, either on a national scale or in Florida…To reinforce my statement that these unfounded and malicious lies are not confined to Florida, I cite you a report in the Anaheim Register (California) of October 15 which states that an organization known as the Liberty League Inc. has branded the city manager there a possible dictator and a member of 1313 which the Liberty League handbills state “are destroying federal, state and local governments” and further that “this be part of Stalin’s plan to take over the United States without firing a shot.”...The ridiculousness of these charges can further be disproved by asking how would it be possible for city and county managers to turn over their communities to the Communist Party when a simple majority vote of any city council is all that is necessary to fire the city manager. Such a gigantic conspiracy would require the active collaboration of a majority of each city council in more than 1,600 American communities which operate under the plan. Such a charge is pure garbage.

Peterson’s response to Edwin Crawford represents the initial response to slanderous charges that a communist ideology was guiding the actions of the NML and the PAS. Herman G. Pope of the PAS would be next.

Herman G. Pope

Pope and Peterson engaged in a short correspondence regarding the views of extremists regarding the actions of the NML and the PAS. Peterson shared his letter to Edwin Crawford in his first letter to Pope, queried whether the PAS had been encountering such material, and indicated that he had set up the Smear File in that same letter (Peterson, 1958, October 31). In his response to Peterson, Pope (1958, November 12) stated that “there is indeed a nationwide pattern to the type of activity mentioned by Mr. Crawford. This pattern developed (and specifically in relation to metropolitan government reform) after the issue of the “newsletters” mentioned in my enclosed statement.” In the referenced document, Pope was specifically
referring to the February 21, 1958 work of Don Bell. The document is addressed “To Whom it May Concern,” so it is not clear exactly to whom the document is addressed. Since it is on PAS letterhead, one could surmise that the PAS Governing Board as well as the other 1313 officials received the letter. In this letter, Pope states:

The Public Administration Service has, for some months, received inquiries from various sources throughout the country concerning DON BELL and his attack on the Public Administration Service and other organizations headquartered at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago. The initial decision was not to dignify DON BELL’s material with attention. However, as inquiries have persisted, it has become desirable, if only as a courtesy to inquirers, to prepare a statement in reply to the questions that have been addressed to me (1958, November 11, 1).

Pope then described a previous admonishment of Bell’s extremist approaches by the American Legion (in 1955) and a series of articles by Jack Steele of the New York World Telegram and Sun that surveyed the activities of extremist commentators, one of whom was Bell (also in 1955). In the last paragraph of his letter, Pope (1958, November 11, 1) concluded that “it is my view that the DON BELL attack constitutes one of the finest compliments that could possibly be paid to the PAS and the organizations with which it is associated, and represents one of the strongest possible testimonials to their efforts on behalf of the American system of government.” One could argue that this “badge of honor” approach inhibited the leadership of these two organizations from seeing the harm that can be done by failing to counter lies made in the public sphere. Glen Peterson of the NML was cognizant of this problem.

Back to Peterson

Pope’s dismissive attitude toward the impact of McCarthyistic screeds against the NML and the PAS appears to be the common early reaction from both organizations, at least from the top management. Glen Peterson, at the NML, had a somewhat different approach, however. Following up on a letter to Aileen Lotz from the Miami Beach Taxpayers Association, Peterson (1959, February 19) noted:

I forgot to mention in my letter the other day that we all read the American Mercury story about the National Municipal League and “Terrible 1313.” There were some folks who, in the beginning, tended to be a bit indignant, but after that wore over, we all had a very hearty laugh over the whole thing. It is really rather ridiculous. My inclination was to reprint the article in full in the National Municipal Review and let our members and readers know what kind of lunatics oppose this organization and the things it stands for. Regrettably, my suggestion was vetoed.

So, even though he had a laugh with his colleagues about Hindman’s attack on the PAS and the NML, Peterson’s inclination was to directly reply, but he was overruled, possibly by Alfred Willoughby himself. Later that year, Peterson would write a lengthy memorandum to Willoughby advocating an active, step by step, response to the likes of Bell, Hindman, and Smoot. In the closing part of the memorandum, Peterson (1959, June 17, 6-7) argued:
I strongly urge that these proposals be given serious consideration and that some action be taken in this direction. The time to plan the defeat of such insidious groups is when they are weak and disorganized, not when they are strong and united. If a little bit of time and money is spent now, gathering information and data, and thoughtfully exploring the best strategy to employ if action is ever required, responsible organizations will be in a far better position to act effectively if an when conditions demand, than if they do nothing and put their faith in a hope that the hate mongers will subside or wither away...these people, their organizations, and the lies and distortions they spread are a menace to the League and to the cause of better government. We would be remiss if we fail to recognize this menace and equip ourselves to confront it should it grow in strength. A little time, effort, and foresight may now prevent a great deal of damage in the foreseeable future. If the hate mongers should abandon their assaults on the League and its programs, and turn their wrath in other directions, thereby happily putting an end to the program I have proposed, we could look back and say that we merely bought some expensive insurance.

In a short note on the front page, initialed by Willoughby, read as follows: “Yes, eventually, no for now. We do not have manpower. The PAS is keeping a file, I am pretty sure. AW.” Like Pope’s initial approach, it appears that Willoughby was not as concerned as Peterson. But as I will show, this is not because the issue was not weighing heavy on Willoughby.

Willoughby and Detzer

Since their falling out nearly four years previous, the contact between Alfred Willoughby and Karl Detzer was sparse. In the several years previous to 1955, Willoughby and Detzer would exchange correspondence several times a year and would often meet personally outside of the bounds of professional responsibility. In 1956, 1957, and 1958, the two men exchanged a total of 4 messages. Their correspondence was reignited in the spring of 1959—the beginning of the busiest time for Willoughby in terms of dealing with the McCarthyites. Detzer, not so tongue in cheek, (1959, April 19) wrote:

It is fitting, I think, that I should write you on this historic date, with the echo of the shot heard round the world still ringing in our ears. I have just finished a delightful several hours perusing material for which I sent to Palm Beach, Fla., and Hollywood on Metro government...To my delight, I find that the NML is a handmaiden of the commies...I’ll never speak to you again! Welcome to the gutter with the rest of us unmentionables who don’t think that the Junior Chamber of Commerce sitteth on the right hand of God...I find by today’s reading that you, Metro, 1313, Roy Howard, the Rockefeller, Henry Ford II, Henry Luce, the Federal Council of Churches, Kuhn, Loeb&Co., Ike, the U.S. Public Health Service and the Supreme Court are all mixed up in the conspiracy to turn us over to Moscow.

In the letter, Detzer also asked Willoughby if he knew anything about Don Bell. In his response, Willoughby (1959, April 28) guardedly answered Detzer:
Responding to yours of April 19, no, I don’t know anything about Don Bell and never expect to learn anything about him that can be repeated in decent company…I enclose a copy of a memorandum by Herman G. Pope, Executive Director, Public Administration Service. Pope may have additional information for you…Large quantities of the “Terrible 1313” article from the American Mercury have been used in at least two unsuccessful attempts to improve metropolitan area situations. The same stuff was used recently in a campaign to force abandonment of the council-manager plan in Evanston, but apparently the citizens there are too intelligent to fall for this.

In a more serious tone, Detzer (1959, May 1) replied:

Thanks for your letter and for the report on Don Bell from PAS. Maybe I’ll dig deeply into this one. It’s a real stinker and should be opened…As to Dade County, I am more than ever convinced that the experiment has almost run its course. It will probably be continued in name, with a politically appointed manager as a front…Latest problem there: last week Hump Campbell made a new contract with an ambulance company that has a local monopoly, increasing the rate $2.00 a call. His county commission immediately cancelled it, and it will decide what the new rates will be. That sort of thing happens nearly every week. It can’t last.21

At this time, it was apparent that Willoughby started feeling some pressure regarding the position of the NML in the face of the unfounded criticism regarding their support for metropolitan reform. The next couple of months would be eventful for him.

Richard Spencer Childs

Richard Spencer Childs was considered to be the resident historian and scholar for the NML during the tenure of Alfred Willoughby as Executive Director. The initial propagator (some would say inventor) of the council-manager form of government during the early 1900’s, Childs was simply an important figure in American public administration and Willoughby understood this. At this time, he was Chairman of the Executive Committee of the NML. Childs was asked by someone at the national Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR) office in Washington, D.C. to investigate various assertions made by Bell, Hindman, and Smoot among others that found their way into DAR pamphlets. Childs (1959, June 8) shared his thoughts with Willoughby after his analysis of their materials:

There is no way of combating the hate mongers with reason and facts since they have no interest in anything of the sort, nor the Mercury magazine, whose rewrite of their material is in line with the present reckless policy of that once responsible journal, a policy of assailing all sorts of responsible organizations for the purpose of gaining circulation by selling copies to the victims. However, the DAR might be willing to take a second look…I suggest that you as a member of the PAS Board, might suggest to your Chicago associates the issuing of a good-tempered invitation to the DAR to send a committee or delegation to spend a day at 1313 to examine everything that they ought to see and are willing to be shown, bringing an attorney with them if they wish to make an expert public inquisition and promising them every courtesy.
Child’s suggestion was forwarded to Herman G. Pope, to which Pope (1959, June 24) replied:

> Your suggestion that the DAR be approached with a view of enlarging its understanding of certain subjects of its resolutions is, of course, a sensible one. However, I am not sanguine about the results that might be expected…A letter was written to the DAR taking exception to the report on metropolitan government, submitted to its convention by the so-called National Defense Committee, but so far we have nothing more than an interim acknowledgment. We will probably nudge them a bit later but realism discourages any high expectations.

Obviously, Pope was dubious about confronting the problem head on. He would find, however, that it would not simply go away. Nothing in the NML archives suggest that Willoughby, Childs or any other official at the NML extended a similar invitation to the DAR.

**Alfred Willoughby and Charles Edison**

The month following the last Pope-Childs exchange, Alfred Willoughby wrote a letter to Herman G. Pope requesting help with a letter he was writing to Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey, former President of the NML, and the son of Thomas Edison. With the NML being a nonprofit, it was apparent that Edison was an important official in a number of ways, not the least of which was his inherited wealth and his ability to garner financial support within the broader corporate community nationwide. Willoughby (1959, July 24) explained his situation to Pope:

> One of the League’s former presidents, who also is a former governor of a state, seems to have become favorably impressed with the “Dan Smoot Report.” At a recent session I had with him, I made some intemperate remarks about this sort of report and he challenged me to make a factual analysis of two issues of the report…Can I impose upon you to look over the enclosed rough draft of a letter I am preparing to send him?...I will appreciate anything you can do in this connection. It may be possible to save this man from the error of his ways.

One week later, Pope (1959, July 31) replied:

> I have now had an opportunity to read your draft of a letter to one of your former presidents regarding Dan Smoot. I think that the letter is an excellent one. It is correct in its statement of those things of which I have personal knowledge, and since I couldn’t have written it as well myself, I have no improvements to suggest…I am returning your draft herewith but I would appreciate your giving me a copy if you can do so without impropriety. I would be glad to keep it in confidence if you choose but it would be helpful to me in the preparation of some of the correspondence I, too, am saddled with.

To which Alfred Willoughby closed this chapter of his interaction with Pope:
Here is a copy of the letter about which we have had correspondence. It is sent to you in confidence. It is my thought that it should not be quoted directly, at least until I learn the reaction of the recipient…My suspicion is that the recipient is going to send or show this letter to the writer of the reports under discussion inasmuch as he objected to my characterization of this writer as a demagogue and challenged me to answer the reports with facts rather than name calling.

This exchange is interesting in that it illustrates important points. First, both the NML and the PAS were facing a significant problem regarding extremist assertions about their role in American public administration and they were sharing possible responses. Second, both Willoughby and Pope took a “close to the vest approach” to this matter, clearly not wanting the matter of the NML’s and PAS’s alleged communist motivations to be given a full public airing. Even though the claims were baseless, they were wary to confront them.

Willoughby’s rebuttal of Smoot, per Edison’s request, was ten pages long, factual in nature, and spirited in defense of American public administration. After a point-by-point rebuttal of Smoot’s characterization of Wallace Sayre and the New York Regional Plan association’s activities, Willoughby (1959, August 12, 3) came to a final defense of Sayre:

The report of the committee chaired by Dr. Sayre is in no sense an “example of propaganda for metropolitan government.” There is no suggestion of a super metropolitan governmental unit in this report. Quite the contrary, this report places reliance upon the responsible conduct of government by elected local officials and proposes strengthening a mechanism for their working together to solve problems of mutual concern…Such a vicious, sneering attack on an individual is especially fantastic in view of the fact that Dr. Sayre is a leading exponent of the strong mayor form of government as opposed to the council-manager form…The Regional Plan Association, by the way, is an outstandingly constructive organization led by prominent business and professional men and supported by business.

After a specific defense of the NML, its establishment, and its activities (with which Edison, as a past president, should have been very familiar with), Willoughby (1959, August 12, 5) moved on to the topic of metropolitan government. Willoughby proceeded right to the point of contention:

The careless libeling of many thoughtful people who have been studying the problems of metropolitan areas unselfishly with a statement such as the one on page 121 that metropolitan government “is part of a movement to establish in America a Soviet-style arrangement” is regrettable and scarcely responsible.

Willoughby spent the next few pages of his rebuttal correcting many factual inaccuracies of Smoot’s regarding the nature and operation of Miami’s Metro federation. Toward the end of the letter, Willoughby (1959, August 12, 9) came to the guard of those who are “experts” in the various fields of public administration:

If people who spend their lives studying and trying to master the problems of government are automatically to be smeared as Egg Heads and the operators of a plot to destroy the
democratic process, then our schools have failed. The obvious remedy is to abolish all political science and public administration departments of universities and to revise constitutions and laws to provide that anyone who knows something about government shall be forbidden to participate in it.

In closing, Willoughby (1959, August 12, 9-10) went on to appeal personally to Edison:

As I said in our conversation, this kind of irresponsible, ignorant agitation is doing serious injury to ideas close to your heart. Adequately informed conservatives cannot help but be repelled…I have taken the time, as promised, to make a point by point analysis of the cynical drivel masquerading as vigorous Americanism not because I think it is worth this much attention but because of my personal regard and admiration for you. I realize how deeply you feel about basic trends and dangers to our way of life and I think it would be a major tragedy for a man of your stature and influence to be taken in by such false, irresponsible stuff…As I told you at the luncheon, I’m ready to stack up my record as a conservative against yours or anyone else’s. I never did vote for “that man,” as almost everyone else did, whom only the grim reaper could remove from the White House.

The importance of this rebuttal can be evaluated in a couple of ways. First, it kept with the behind the scenes approach that Willoughby and Pope cultivated in responding to the attacks from political extremists. Also, Willoughby’s letter did provide a quality factual rebuttal to audacious assertions forwarded by Smoot, among others. And, it is apparent that Willoughby had a pretty close relationship with Edison, given the tone of the letter, and that Willoughby thought Edison to be an important figure to the NML and within American public administration. It is also evident that he did not vote for Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR). This last point is important in that Edison supported most facets of FDR’s New Deal and served as Secretary of the Navy under FDR. Also, FDR supported Edison in his successful bid, as a Democrat, to become New Jersey’s Governor in 1940 (Venable, 1978, 102-169). This was Willoughby’s way of brandishing his conservative credentials to predate Edison’s own. In any case, it is not clear that his letter had much of an impact on Edison. In many later communications to others he would reference this letter, but he did not indicate that Edison responded in any way. Nothing in the NML archives leads me to believe that a response from Edison resulted. No communications from Edison were found in the archive that were dated past 1961, so his involvement in the NML may have come to an end shortly after this letter from Willoughby.25

**Pope’s Follow-up to His November, 1958 Memorandum**

Pope continued to have the problem of the extremists on his agenda. He sent a memorandum, accompanied by an extensive rework of the original “To whom it may concern” letter of November 1958, to PAS Trustees, of whom Willoughby was one. The subject line contained “Terrible 1313, etc., etc., etc…” Pope (1959, December 11) stated:

PAS Trustees and many other persons have expressed concern over certain attacks originated by Don Bell early in 1958. In keeping up with numerous requests for additional information on this subject, I have prepared the attached manuscript which,
you will note, is marked Preliminary and Confidential because it requires further editing and perhaps major re-writing, depending on how it is used…I would welcome reactions and suggestions concerning the manuscript, both as to its content and possible use. Among the more readily evident probabilities are (1) reproduction by mimeograph, multilith, or another inexpensive process; (2) publication (with reprints) in a journal of an organization represented on the PAS board; (3) re-writing by a professional free-lance writer with a view to publication (with reprints) in a respectable popular magazine. The last named possibility holds little appeal for me since it would spread the Bell brigade lies in millions of copies and, to that extent, serve a destructive purpose as well as a constructive one.

In this rework of his original memo, he still focused on the Don Bell statements of 1958, only in a greatly expanded exposition. Similar to Willoughby’s approach to Smoot, Pope’s work was a step-by-step rebuttal of the many misstatements and allegations put forth by Bell, especially those related to Miami’s metropolitan form of governance. Willoughby (1959, December 22) responded to Pope’s memo thusly:

It is difficult for me, as I know it must be for you, to be sufficiently objective about this slimy situation to figure out how and where to catch hold of it. There is really no head to bash and no neck to throttle…carefully reasoned though it is, your memorandum of December 10 may, it seems to me, be over the heads of those who are gullible enough to be impressed by the hate campaign. I could be wrong about this. My own inclination would be to state the truth in stronger, more positive terms…When your memorandum is in final form, I would like to have a few copies. I would like to send one to the former governor as the answer to his remark, “I don’t know where he (Dan Smoot) gets his information.”

The memo itself found its way into a more polished PAS publication under the title New Peas in an Old Shell Game in January 1960 (one month later). It is not apparent, based on a search of historical newspaper and journal databases, that this publication (or an article based on it) received wide circulation, so he stayed away from point three in his December 1960 memorandum.

**Willoughby and Detzer**

It is apparent that a lasting casualty of the Landman affair was the close working relationship that had developed between Willoughby and Detzer previously. Willoughby did not share with Detzer the details of his encounters Edison as it transpired—he was probably too proud. In a November 4, 1959 letter to Detzer—apparently a follow up to a previous conversation (or a letter not found in the NML archives)—Willoughby (1959, November 4) argued:

You do our people wrong! I’ll bet we have more liberals and leftists in the NML than the ICMA has. My own feeling is that the League’s officers and Council strike a pretty good balance between right, center, and left, which in my opinion is as it should be. It seems to me that the “far right” people are going to be largely absent…When I see you I must tell you about a luncheon session attended by a former president, the current president,
the future president, and me at which the former president expressed concern over his belief that the League has gone too far to the left! He challenged me to answer each allegation made in two Dan Smoot reports, which I did in ten type-written pages.

Here, Willoughby casually references his previous encounter with Edison. In the last substantial reply on the topic of extremism from Detzer to Willoughby, Detzer (1959, November 9) answered:

I’ve just written and torn up a letter in reply to your good note. It sounded too violent and I don’t want to be violent at my age…You refer to your “far-right people.” Yes, I’ve heard them, read their statements, seen their associates. I have also heard and read the statements of Hitler and his gang. Golly, they sound alike! My son died and I grew old too fast in four years in a war against Hitler, and I just don’t want to associate with Americans with the same warped and dangerous viewpoint. It seems to me that one name of anyone who follows the Smoot-Upton Close-Don Bell-Gerald Smith axis is to many on any letterhead. I think that the NML should be every bit cautious about these birds as about Communists; they are equally dangerous.

Willoughby did not reply to this letter, perhaps out of guilt. It is not clear that he had, at any subsequent point, shared the specific content of the rebuttal of Smoot crafted for Edison with Karl Detzer.26

During the years 1958 to 1961, Detzer dropped hints to Willoughby that he was working on a journalistic piece, possibly as a response to Jo Hindman’s “Terrible 1313” article in the American Mercury. In a letter to Willoughby, Detzer (1961, August 9) stated that

I am doing our own version of “Terrible 1313” and hope we can counteract the lunatic fringe attacks. I find that members of Congress of late have been deluged with attacks on 1313 and some unkind references to the NML. I found one member of the Congress who actually believed the stuff. Not a bad member, either, as such things go…So I have decided to try to get a story out of Nolting & Company.27

To which Willoughby (1961, August 14) replied at the end of a subsequent letter to Detzer: “Now, how about that story re NML?... If you still want to talk with me before you write 1313, it would be a pleasure.” It is not clear that Detzer consulted Willoughby regarding this article in any substantive way.

The article by Detzer appeared in Reader’s Digest in April of 1962. The article read like a combination of a newspaper article and a brochure. Titled “‘1313’: Magic Number for Better Local Government,” the article contained no hint that the institutions at the “1313” address had come under a libelous attack on their credibility during the previous several years. The article focused on the positive work that came out of “1313” such as downtown revitalization plans, developing labor pools for city human resources departments, and developing “cadet” system for local police departments (Detzer, 1962, April). At the beginning of the article, Detzer (1962, 33-34) described the demand for and the nature of “1313” work:
When Fort Worth wanted to modernize its garbage collection, and Oregon its merit system, they called on "1313." When Iowa needed a dollars-and-cents study of its roads and streets it asked "1313." An expert put on his hat, stuck a slide rule into his pocket, filled his briefcase with charts and hurried off to help. There are experts available in designing bridges; in running fire and police departments, parks and public libraries; in sewage disposal, traffic control, assessing taxes, rewriting charters, operating civil service, administering welfare funds. And these are not just theorists but men with solid, on-the-job experience in their fields.

For the entirety of the article, Detzer simply described the good government function of the "1313" organizations from a research and an implementation perspective. Detzer (1962, 38) ended the article with the following statement:

Despite occasional opposition from disgruntled politicians who fight a rear-guard action against improved methods, the people of “1313” are advancing steadily on a broad front. From them citizens are learning the way to better, less expensive, more representative government at grassroots levels, down where democracy begins.

This was a less than resounding defense of “1313,” given the nature and extent of the attack on its constituent agencies over the previous several years, and given the depth of Detzer’s passion for defending the basic principles of civic virtue represented by these organizations. Indeed, based on the sources I have encountered, the politicians, managers, and advocate organizations like the PAS and the NML were the ones who sought implementation of local government reform—such as metropolitan governance change and the council-manager form of government—and the exclusion of mentioning the political extremists misrepresents the source of dissent at the local level. This could have been a function of Reader’s Digest conservative editorial bent. Or perhaps Pope—who as the Executive Director of the PAS was likely involved in assisting Detzer with the article—was combining the advice from Willoughby to keep it positive and then go ahead for wide circulation. Overall, it still kept within their overall passive approach to dealing with the problem of the political extremists who were peddling untruths about important institutions of state and local government administration in the United States.

Discussion: Facts, Values, Pragmatism and Metropolitan Outcomes

This paper represents an initial incursion into examining the effects of McCarthyistic practices on the processes of American public administration during the 1950’s and the 1960’s. The topic is not well studied and the issues encountered therein are ripe for examination. From a broad perspective, this study reveals that American public administration encountered criticisms from the McCarthyistic critics that questioned fundamental roles of local governmental organizations and the reform causes they supported, including for example, metropolitan governance reform and the council-manager form of government. Importantly, this initial research has found that the NML and the PAS were subject to significant and arguably libelous and slanderous assaults on their credibility by political extremists that effectively stated that their missions were part of a larger communist conspiracy advocated by those desiring one-world government.
This work provides greater historical context of the political environment surrounding local government reform by examining how important institutions of American public administration—the NML and the PAS—reacted to these extremist allegations. Despite messages from the field that these extremists were having an effect on the argument over metropolitan government and governance, the overall mode of response by both the NML and the PAS was one of caution if not inaction. The PAS response appears to have been one of speaking to its own member organizations about the extremists. The NML response appears to have been trying to convince Charles Edison of the errors of his ways. The NML (and to a degree the PAS) went against the advice of Glen Peterson and to a lesser extent, Richard Childs, to take the problem head on with an activist response to the scurrilous charges of the extremists. Peterson was familiar with the problem directly in that he had been involved in the early days of the Greater Miami Metro metropolitan government initiative. The NML response may have been colored by the relationship between Reader’s Digest Editor Karl Detzer and Alfred Willoughby, whose once close friendship was harmed by the NML’s firing of Amos Landman who was uncovered as a communist by James Eastland’s Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security in 1955.

On the broad level of public administration theory, part of the explanation for the reaction of the NML can be found in the long standing debate regarding the “facts and values” within the various positive and normative theories that underlay American public administration. To be sure, most public administration advocates of the 1950’s saw themselves as problem solvers without any real ideological motives while their critics interpreted their motives as socialistic at best. This could explain the dumbfounded response of the professional public administration community chronicled in these pages. Interestingly, these events and this study may lie somewhere within the current debate over the influence of pragmatism on public administration during the 20th Century. Snider (2000a and 2000b) has argued that the philosophical pragmatism of William James (1904 and 1908) and John Dewey (1905 and 1908) had minimal impact on theories and practice with regard to the development of American public administration during the first half of the 20th Century, which he characterized as the field’s movement away from a “value-based philosophy” of early progressivism (and pragmatism) toward a “fact-based philosophy” which was exemplified by the logical positivism of Herbert Simon’s Administrative Behavior.

However, this interpretation does not fully account for the reaction of NML, because of its deep historical mission and because of the presence of Richard S. Childs. The National Municipal League and its actions to reform American public administration predate Snider’s account of the intellectual capture of public administration by logical positivism. The NML’s original mission was to reform corrupt and undemocratic cities, a mission loaded with underlying normative values. Hirschhorn (1997, 13-15) has stated that Richard Childs became involved in the NML beginning in 1908 and under their auspices ushered in the council-manager era of local public management in the United States. East (1965, 17-27), in his intellectual biography of Richard S. Childs, explicitly identifies Child’s early work with the council-manager form of government as well as the related short-ballot movement as examples of progressive reform influenced by a pragmatist ideology. Some of Child’s early writings on county government reflect an underlying pragmatic philosophy toward metropolitan government as well (Childs, 1913; Childs, 1925). One may then argue that the surprised reaction of the professional public administration
organizations to the assertions of communist ties were a function of their underlying pragmatism. The answer probably lies somewhere in between.

I would finally suggest that this research begins to present an additional explanation for the lack of strong metropolitan government and governance systems within the U.S. federal system that is dominated by state and local control of municipal structure and service delivery. The powerful market-based and polycentric structural arguments put forth by public choice theorists have little to say about the presence of extremist entities spreading conspiracy arguments to combat the development of such governance systems. This research should encourage these scholars to consider such alternative explanations.

A Lesson for Today

Just as important, the actions of officials in the American public administration community during the late 1950’s present a cautionary tale for public administrators today. Some citizens and activists groups have recently been warning public officials that local government reforms which reflect the principles of sustainable development are inspired by communistic principles. These individuals and groups have argued that state and local governments that seek to implement such management practices are fronts for a broad conspiracy that finds its roots in the UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil in 1992. They specifically reference the “Local Agenda 21” framework that was arrived at during this conference to recommend best practice land, energy, and resource use recommendations for local administrators and planners. A search of Google News for “Agenda 21” yields the latest series of news stories related to this topic—there are many. Those protesting perceived connections to Local Agenda 21 have used the Internet to publish and market their grievances, much like Smoot, Bell, and Hindman used the latest technologies to share their grievances against metropolitan reform in the late 1950’s. A representative example of these grievances can be found at website of the North Western Research Institute (nwri.org) (of Sequim, WA) which provides background on its mission:

North Western Research Institute is a nonprofit corporation, created for the primary purpose of researching and disseminating information about the changes in our form of governance. We have been witnessing increasing numbers of alternate forms of governance that utilize the consensus process and public/private partnerships via the implementation of Sustainable Development through various programs as set forth under UN Agenda 21 and others, to the exclusion of our representative form of government (http://nwri.org/about-us/).

Numerous websites with missions similar to that of the North Western Research Institute exist elsewhere. The content found on these sites has a strong similarity to the statements made by Smoot, Bell, and Hindman regarding metropolitan government in the 1950s—the use of innuendo, suspicion, and smear to call into question the actions of persons and organizations who support sustainable management at the local level.
The actions of these grassroots organizations seem to have made an impact in some of our state legislatures, city councils, and political party organizations, where many have passed resolutions condemning Local Agenda 21. In the face of this rising criticism, the American public administration community—or more specifically its key organizations like American Society for Public Administration (ASPA) or the American Planning Association (APA), for example—have not made it a priority to answer these claims of conspiracy. For example, nothing on the ASPA or APA web sites provides context, background, or official opinion on how to respond to such accusations. In an Atlantic Cities: Place Matters column written by Andrew Whittemore in February 2012 titled “Why Planners Need to Take Agenda 21 Criticism More Seriously” Whittemore exhorts planners to provide pragmatic examples to the criticisms of the conspiracy theorists as to why sustainability as it is practiced in the United States is a function of the interaction between capitalism and democracy—a broad historical theme in American public administration—not some new social development of the last twenty years. It is not clear that we will take on such a task.
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**Endnotes**

1 Howell-Moroney (2008) and Jimenez and Hendrick (2010) present some of the more recent summaries of the influence of the public choice literature on the topic of metropolitan government/governance started by Tiebout. McGinnis and Ostrom (2011, 15-19) provide an essential first-hand account of Vincent Ostrom’s, Charles Tiebout’s, and Robert Warren’s early development of the idea of polycentricity and the rise of the related public choice arguments.

2 No agreed upon definition of McCarthyism actually exists. See for example Reeves (1976) and Schrecker (1988). The definition here is based in part on these resources as well as the empirical evidence found in this research.

3 Michel, et al, (2011) provides an interesting overview of how Google and associated scholars have operationalized part of its digital database to make queries into the nature and use of language of which the Ngram viewer is an example.
The information for this table was gleaned from news, academic, and analytical articles compiled that contained news on metropolitan governmental initiatives. Nearly 400 separate citations were used to construct this table. Perhaps the most complete reference on this topic lies in the PAS’s Metropolitan Communities: A Bibliography with Special Emphasis Upon Government and Politics—first published in 1957 with three subsequent supplements through 1970.

Most of the persons of interest here had biographical files created by the NML and were accessible within the NML archives. The short biographies of Hindman, Smoot, and Bell were built from NML files that contained their works as well as other sources. Alfred Willoughby’s history of the NML written in 1969, The Involved Citizen: A Short History of the National Municipal League had various biographical information for some NML associates. Also, Hendershott (2011) contains an interesting chapter on the career of Dan Smoot. Finally, Karl Detzer’s papers are housed at the Bentley Historical Library, University of Michigan. Finally, the works of East (1964), Stillman (1975), and Hirschhorn (1997) provide essential information on Richard S. Childs.

Details of these events are found in “Landman Says...”(1955, 1-2), one of the many newspaper articles regarding this incident and its repercussions found in the Amos Landman file in the NML Archives. Landman would go on to receive a part time position at the Fund for the Republic just weeks after his firing from the NML. The Fund for the Republic was an organization that advocated for civil liberty protections during the 1950’s. The finding aid for the Fund’s records at the Princeton University Library states that “The Records of the Fund for the Republican document the activities of the Fund for the Republic, Inc. and its defense of civil rights and civil liberties from 1952 through 1961. The records provide an invaluable look at the Fund's struggle to uphold the basic principles of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights during the years of McCarthyism and its aftermath.” Landman worked at the fund temporarily and was able to secure a full time position as a publicist at the National Jewish Hospital in Denver, CO in early 1956 (see Landman, 1955-56). In a death notice regarding Landman published in the New York Times on August 15<sup>th</sup> 2005, it was stated that “He will be remembered for decency, integrity and loyalty, having chosen to endure the blacklist in the 1950s rather than betray his friends.” He retired from Ruder & Finn in 1985 as a corporate vice president. Ruder & Finn was multinational public relations firm at the time.

This importance of this relationship should not be underestimated. During the mid to late 1950’s, the circulation of Reader’s Digest in the United States was between 10 million and 13 million subscribers, the largest circulation of any general readership magazine in the world. See “Reader’s Digest Says...”(1961). Detzer was undoubtedly a major asset to the NML’s mission.

Thomas Graham was a then member of the NML Council (Louisville, KY). Charles Edison, former Governor of New Jersey, was a then NML Council member; Senator Barry Goldwater was a then Regional Vice President of the NML (Phoenix, AZ); and Carleton Tibbetts was a then Regional Vice President of the NML (Los Angeles, CA).

Detzer is referring to Senator James Eastland of Mississippi who took over as the Internal Security subcommittee’s lead interrogator after the fall of McCarthy that resulted from the Army hearings of 1954.

The minutes of the Seattle meeting found in the NML archive corroborate Willoughby’s account.

It was apparent that the Landman affair had a lasting impact on Willoughby. In a letter dated August 31, 1971, five days before Detzer’s 80<sup>th</sup> birthday, Willoughby, who was three years retired from his position with the NML, wrote to Detzer: “Anniversaries seem to be time for taking stock or remembering significant events. But I don’t need the stimulus of your 80<sup>th</sup> to remind me how we met (because you thought Dan Hoan built a great police department), how we collaborated re: Cooking Ham and Victory Gardens, how you and Father Dowling (bless his soul) whipped out your union cards to back me up at the 1946 Philadelphia meeting of the Council, how you resigned from the same council after hearing only the prosecution’s evidence and I was too hurt by your lack of judicial temperament to give you the rebuttal...serving with the League has been deeply rewarding to me in many ways, but mostly, I feel, because it involved me with so many genuine people like you...With warm regards to you and yours, and hoping you’ll follow Childs’ example (he’ll be 90 in May!).” (Willoughby, 1971, August 31)

The following section is based on documents found in the NML Archives Smear File(s). Bell, Hindman, and Smoot each had material contained in separate folders titled “Smear File-Closer Up-Dan Bell Reports”, “Smear File-American Mercury” (for Hindman), and “Smear File-Dan Smoot Report.” See the reference section for exact locations of these files. I have also provided citations that reflect the actual source of their material, whether it be from a specific newsletter or magazine.

Some of these same extremists (especially Hindman) were also against the council-manager form of government, for reasons related to the “expertism critique” outlined below. In that the adoption of the council-manager form of government is inherently a local decision, their argument was at odds with the polycentrism argument put forth by
public choicers. So, on a conceptual level, even though the public choicers and the extremists are both against metropolitan government, their rationales show little overlap.

15 Edward Sofen’s account of Miami, much respected and fully sourced, illustrates a much more subdued interpretation of the Miami metropolitan charter movement. Sofen (1966, 185-186) states that those suggesting that “Metro” was a communist conspiracy did become active during the late 1950’s and into the 1960’s, but argued that their influence was negative by not consequential, even though the conspiracy issue was hotly debated in local print and television media outlets. According to Sofen, the Miami extremists mentioned specifically the work of the PAS as well as “1313” more broadly.

16 The American Mercury, founded by H.L. Mencken in 1927, had been a national magazine on literature and public affairs, with a reputation for sophistication and high-mindedness. It was sold to Russell McGuire in 1952 where it developed a penchant for pursuing stories that trumpeted a patriotic, anti-communist, and anti-Semitic editorial line. See “American Mercury…”(1962).

17 Hindman published this chart at a date later than the readings discussed here. The chart can first be found in her book Terrible 1313 Revisited, published in 1963—although it was copyrighted in 1959.

18 Hendershot’s work provides a quality explanation of the use of the FCC’s Fairness Doctrine first under President Kennedy to challenge the rise of right wing radio commentary and finally under President Nixon, when right wing commentators like Smoot became problematic for local radio stations to carry due to the need to balance their views with others.

19 Later, I will discuss the probable influence of Smoot on Charles Edison, the former governor of New Jersey (I will also analyze the NML response). The influence of Smoot on the actions of New York Metropolitan Regional Council has been discussed previously in Joan Aron’s 1969 work The Quest for Regional Cooperation: A Study of the New York Metropolitan Regional Council. In this work, Aron (1969, 74-81) documents the influence of extremists (one of whom was Smoot) in making regional action difficult in Greater New York City—which included areas from New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey. It is the only academic account I am aware of that details the activities of extremists in the pursuit of stopping metropolitan governance reforms. It is probable that Smoot’s criticism of the New York Metropolitan Regional Council had an impact on Edison.

20 The letter from Crawford to Peterson (or another NML official) does not exist in the NML archive. Manatee is located southeast of Tampa, Florida and east of Bradenton and Sarasota.

21 Here, Detzer refers to Orvin W. “Hump” Campbell, the Metro Manager for Miami-Dade. Coincidentally, just a couple of weeks later, the NML received a copy of message from Harry Toulmin (probably through Glen Peterson, a friend of Toulmin’s), ominously described by Don Bell above, addressed to Hump Campbell regarding the problem of extremist elements. Toulmin, who was a professor at the University of Miami, told Hump that “in my paper presented at the National Planning Conference in Minneapolis last week I remarked upon the anti-Metro hate and lies being peddled by organized fascists throughout the country. During the question period which followed, I was asked to elaborate and I did. This set of a number of statements from the audience which indicated that conference participants, in their several communities, had encountered this neo-fascist literature; that it was extremely hurtful in local campaigns; and that they were concerned about the problem.” This letter was found in the NML Smear File, Miscellaneous Folders.

22 In his one term as governor (1941-1945), Edison is credited for laying the ground work for state constitutional reform in New Jersey (enacted in 1947 under Governor Alfred Driscoll) that modernized state and local governance systems in the state. See New Jersey State Historical Commission (1982, 210-213).

23 In a sanctioned biography of Edison by John D. Venable, Edison’s tenure at the NML is described as one of tremendous success, both administratively and financially (see Venable (1978, 250-253). Venable (1978, 246-249) does discuss Edison’s increasing movement to the right, politically, but only in terms of national politics. No mention is made of how this coincided with his activities in state and local government in general and the NML specifically.

24 I have examined two letter drafts and the third letter actually sent to Charles Edison—there is not a great deal of variation in terms of tone and content across the three.

25 I have examined all incoming and outgoing correspondence to and from Charles Edison found within the NML archives and found no messages, other than Willoughby’s memorandum, related to the work of the extremists. It is important to point out that Edison had become ill in late 1960 with prostate cancer, so that may, in part, explain the end of his involvement with the NML. However, his movement toward a hard-line conservative philosophy continued. Venable (1978, 274-80) chronicles this continued transition which included Edison’s co-founding of the New York Conservative Party (1962) and his financial support for the early operations of the Young Americans for
Freedom (1960), a nation-wide college based organization that was formative in the founding of the modern conservative movement in the United States.

Willoughby would once again reference his encounter with Edison to Detzer in regard to his attempts to use Senator Barry Goldwater as an ally in his battles against political extremism. In a letter dated August 14, 1961, Willoughby stated: “About 1313. After Senator Goldwater spoke at the Phoenix Conference he received a lot of chiding mail. One day when he was in New York, he phoned. Among other things, he remarked that he had the League and 1313 checked out by the FBI, which gave all a clean bill of health. Subsequently, I sent the Senator materials, including a copy of a long letter I had written Charles Edison when he (Edison) challenged me to rebut two “newsletters” written by Dan Smoot. My letter was rather violent, inasmuch as Smoot had scarcely an accurate statement in his stuff. I suggested, incidentally, that the Senator had an obligation to speak up about this. No reply. Maybe I should send you a copy of this letter, confidentially, and will do so after Stella gets back.” It is interesting that, in the letter, Willoughby held Goldwater to a higher standard than he held to himself or the NML. As indicated earlier, Goldwater was a Regional Vice President of the NML at the time. Goldwater was formative during the late 1940’s in bringing a progressive Council-Manager charter to the City of Phoenix and was actively involved in League activities. A response to Willoughby or any correspondence indicating further involvement on Goldwater’s behalf regarding the activities of the extremists could not be found in the NML archives.

Detzer was in Chicago at the time, the location of the PAS. He was specifically referring to meeting with Orin F. Nolting, who was Executive Director of the International City Managers Association (ICMA), a “1313” organization that was part of the PACH.

See Scoones (2007) and Saha (2009) for quality general accounts of the movement toward sustainability management in the United States since the 1990’s.

The Atlantic Cities Place Matters blog is part of the online edition of the Atlantic Monthly magazine. The blog is managed by Richard Florida.
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Roosevelt was fuming, as were his left-of-center supporters. The judicial system had, yet again, declared unconstitutional another law giving more rights and protections to workers. This could not continue. Courts were out of touch with the real world of modern American society and its political economy. Judges seemed to think that nothing could infringe on the private property rights of business. It was time for a change; a major change. The president decided he had no choice but to take on the courts and bend them to popular will. Is this the familiar story of Franklin Roosevelt and his court packing scheme of 1937? No. Theodore Roosevelt in 1912.

Long before FDR sought to find a way to stop the Supreme Court from declaring any more New Deal legislation unconstitutional, liberals and progressives had been angry with the Court. In the first three decades of the 20th century, it was common for reformers to complain about out-of-touch judges who were an obstacle to social welfare and collective bargaining reforms. For example, four years before the Great Depression began in 1929, pro-labor reporter Lowell Mellett wrote a 12-part series for the labor press on “The Supreme Court’s Rise to Power.” In it, he examined the extremes to which the court seemed willing to go to nullify social welfare and worker protections, such as child labor laws (Mellett, 1924). The court acted as though laissez-faire economics had been explicitly written into the Constitution.

Harmonizing economic and democratic aspirations with the judiciary had been an ongoing problem for American political reformers. Court reform seemed the toughest of all their goals. They had been relatively successful with other branches of government. For the administrative aspect of the public sector, their relatively standard list of ideas was largely adopted, including a separation of politics from administration, merit-based civil service systems, municipal research and efficiency bureaus, executive-centered budgeting, reliance on expertise, independent commissions to regulate utilities, and public reporting of agency activities. For the federal legislative branch they urged direct election of US Senators and state primaries for presidential candidates. For municipal government they liked the commission form of government developed in Galveston (TX) after the hurricane there and the short ballot, thereby reducing the number of offices which corrupt urban machines could fill with party loyalists.
In general, Progressives were trying to wrest the control of politics not only from urban machines, but also state and federal governments from the “interests,” the oligopolistic corporations that were inordinately influential with legislators, such as railroads, oil, heavy industry and mining. So, it was not enough to clean up how legislators were elected in the first place. There was also a need to hold them on a short leash to prevent them from the seemingly inexorable dynamic of selling out. Therefore, most Progressives also pushed for recall of legislative and executive officials. Then, as a kind of nuclear option for the time, they promoted the initiative and referendum. This would permit voters to bypass corrupt or conservative legislatures and enact laws and state constitutional amendments directly.

Theodore Roosevelt, in his 1912 campaign for president (first as a Republican, then, upon losing the nomination to President Taft, as a Bull Moose Progressive), proposed wresting control of the judiciary from the conservative laissez-faire economic doctrines the courts were enforcing. He suggested creating the option for voters to recall judicial decisions. Even in relation to the other governmental reforms proposed during the Progressive era, it was an unusual and unorthodox idea. His idea was one of the major issues in the three-way fall campaign, with President Taft attacking it aggressively. Roosevelt went on to lose the election, with the recall of court decisions a major campaign issue. However, it was enacted in Colorado, turning out to be “one of the most unusual experiments in progressivism” (Ubbelohde, Benson and Smith, 2006, 272).

**Purpose and Methodology**

This article recounts a largely forgotten governmental reform idea proposed by Progressives during an era that remade the public sector in the United States (1890-1920), essentially founding the profession of public administration (Lee, 2013, 219-21). The general purpose is to discuss the origins of this now-obscure proposal and its brief life after it was adopted in Colorado. The modest literature on Colorado’s recall of judicial decisions (RJD) has mostly focused on (a) the results of the referendum approving the idea in November 1912 and (b) the undoing of the concept by the state Supreme Court in 1921 (Smith, 1963). This article adds to the narrative elements of the story not heretofore recounted, including (a) the fight over adoption of the initiative by the state’s voters; (b) the 1913 battle in the state legislature over procedural legislation; (c) instances when activists considered using RJD; and (d) the judicial and bar activism against RJD prior to the state Supreme Court’s decisions in 1921. In retrospect, the 1913 fight in the legislature was especially central to either bringing the concept to life or crippling it so fatally that it could likely not be operationalized.

The methodology entailed traditional historical research techniques, including triangulation to create as complete and accurate an historical picture as possible. Relying on several independent primary sources helps to construct a comprehensive and integrated narrative. Individually, archival documents, professional journals, and newspaper coverage each have strengths and weaknesses for historians. Therefore, McNabb recommended triangulation for historical research in political science and public administration (2010, 242). When an archival record is incomplete or suspect as self-serving “researchers are encouraged in such instances to fall back on the tried and true practice of triangulation, validating the remaining archival record using other sources” (McNabb, 2008, 378). For this inquiry, official documents were obtained from the Colorado State Archives and the Colorado Joint Legislative Library. Other primary sources included
popular and professional publications of the time and contemporary journalism, which are now available in searchable databases, such as the Colorado Historic Newspapers Collection. These are sources that earlier researchers could not access as easily or as comprehensively.

Who cares about failed ideas? In this case, the rejected idea of recalling judicial decisions was part of a larger good-government reform agenda, much of which was adopted and then deeply influenced American democracy and public administration. It is hard to imagine modern American government without such reforms as primaries and direct elections of US Senators. Similarly, it is hard to imagine contemporary American public administration without the creation of civil service systems or independent regulatory commissions. These concepts have become so deeply rooted in the civic culture that it is hard to picture them not existing or understanding why there was a major fight about getting them adopted in the first place.

But nothing about history is truly inevitable. When events were unfolding during the Progressive era, no one knew if recalls of judicial decisions would be adopted or not; or if a merit-based civil service system encompassing most governmental employees would be adopted or not. Contingency is a major factor in the unfolding of events. The understanding of what actually happened “must avoid telescoping the actual course of events into a predetermined linear progress” (Foner, 2002, 170). What was at one time unconventional then became the new status quo. A temptation of understanding history is sometimes to propel that status quo backwards, with an underlying theme that what came to be was right and what didn’t shouldn’t have been. According to Starr, current times and institutions thus appear “to be natural and inevitable, as if there could be no other way” (2004, 5). This article seeks to refresh our sense of what the Progressive era offered America and its public sector, with some of those ideas coming into being, while others did not. So, in part, it suggests a ‘might have been’ of what government and administration could have evolved into instead of what it has actually become.

**Theodore Roosevelt’s Proposal, 1912**

The toughest public institution for Progressives to reform was the court system (Shesol, 2010, 223). There was enormous resistance by conservatives, the business establishment, and the status quo-oriented legal profession to any change. Just about any idea for change was viewed as a threat to an independent and apolitical judiciary (which happened to agree with their interpretation of corporate rights). One controversial reform issue was whether state and local judges should be appointed for life (as in the federal template) or elected to set terms. Extending the principle of recalls to elected judges was even more controversial. For example, Arizona’s statehood hinged on that issue. In 1912, President Taft vetoed Congress’s admission of Arizona to the union because its proposed constitution included recall of judges. When that provision was deleted, he withdrew his objections and Arizona became the 48th state. Having the last word, Arizona promptly amended its new state constitution to restore recall of judges (Gould, 2008a, 25-26).

While President Taft was viewed (mostly correctly) as a mainstream conservative, his predecessor and mentor, Theodore Roosevelt was called (somewhat exaggeratedly) a reformer and progressive. During his presidency (1901-1909) he had indeed taken on the ‘trusts,’ sought
fair marketplace competition, economic rights for the working class over corporate power, and social welfare legislation. Still, he was a moderate reformer.

In 1908, TR had opted not to run for a second (full) term. He endorsed Taft as his successor. But, for a mix of reasons, Roosevelt became disenchanted with Taft’s presidency and ran against him in 1912 for the Republican nomination. In the run-up to the party’s convention, Roosevelt was looking to construct a campaign platform that would differentiate him from Taft, co-opt potential progressive presidential candidacy of Senator Robert La Follette, Sr. (R-WI), and clearly identify himself as being at the cutting edge of reformers. Recall of judges was an obvious choice, but Roosevelt shared Taft’s concerns about the principle of judicial recalls. Therefore, TR cast about for a substitute. He wanted an alternative that got to the heart of what he cared about, namely the substantive decisions that were being issued, not the office holders. It needed to appeal to progressives, while still being anathema to Taft and Republican conservatives.

He called his idea ‘recall of judicial decisions.’ His proposal was that the voters could overturn a final judicial decision if they disagreed with it, while keeping the judges who issued the decision in office. Roosevelt deliberately used the nomenclature of ‘recall’ because that would make it easier to present his proposal as a substitute for recalling judges. However, the idea was somewhat misnamed and did prompt confusion, as it was – much more accurately – a referendum on judicial decisions, not a recall.

Roosevelt unveiled his proposal in a speech he was invited to give to the Ohio State Constitutional Convention in Columbus on February 21, 1912. He complained about courts striking down social welfare and worker laws on the grounds that they were unconstitutional. But their interpretations of the constitution (whether state or federal) were narrow and constricted, favoring almost without qualification property rights of business. He suggested that “the decision of a State court on a Constitutional question should be subject to revision by the people of the State. … Actual experience has shown the vital need of the people reserving to themselves the right to pass upon such opinion” (Roosevelt, 1912a, 398-99). He did not provide much detail beyond this statement of principle.

According to the New York Times, the speech “made a tremendous sensation” and the “startling character” of the idea. The conservative New York Tribune quickly editorialized against the idea, saying it preferred “sticking to tested institutions rather than rashly innovating… It is Colonel Roosevelt’s impatience with established institutions that constitutes his ‘radicalism’.” Indicating the stakes at play and the centrality of the idea to the presidential race, President Taft said in a speech that recall of judicial decisions was “a crude, revolutionary, fitful, and unstable way of reversing judicial construction.” It was “utterly without merit” (Taft, 1912, 7-8).

William Draper Lewis, dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School (and a political supporter of Roosevelt), took on the role of fleshing out the concept. He said that potential subjects liable for RJD would be those topics mentioned in a state constitution that were general principles and subject to judicial interpretation. So, for example, the idea of “due process” was quite vague and subject to interpretation (compared to, say, a 2-year term of a governor). He emphasized that only issues of state constitutionality could be subject to RJD, not federal ones.
Lewis argued that Roosevelt’s idea had the advantage of a uniform process for dealing quickly with court decisions, compared to the slower process of amending a state’s constitution, with state legislatures often having the sole power to start such a process. RJD’s goal, he said, was to have “a method of obtaining legislation which does correspond to the prevailing ideas of fairness and social justice” (Lewis, 1912, 319).

Roosevelt also tried to add clarity to his idea. He emphasized that recalls of decisions would not apply to ordinary civil or criminal suits, only to major constitutional questions once a final ruling by the state’s supreme court had occurred. He also refined his proposal to limit it to interpretations of the “police power” of a state. So, for example, if a judge ruled a law passed by the legislature providing for “the general welfare” as unconstitutional (such as workers compensation), then such a ruling could be overturned by a referendum (Roosevelt, 1912b, 620).

RJD became Topic A for the entire national political season, first when Roosevelt was challenging Taft for the Republican nomination, then – when not getting it – bolting to create the Progressive Party and running against Taft and the eventual Democratic nominee, New Jersey Governor Woodrow Wilson. It was the red line that supposedly separated authentic reformers from conservatives (Donnelly, 2012; Gould, 2008a; Goebel, 2002; Forbath, 2006; Farmer, 2001; Hartnett, 1997; Ross, 1994; Stagner, 1980). America took sides and the rhetorical battle raged all year until the November election.10

Proposed in Colorado, 1912

The action on this particular reform idea now shifted to Colorado. In the early 20th century, the state was in some respects typical. During the Progressive Era, its “general pattern of events—and particularly the general aspirations of the population—paralleled those of the rest of the country” (Ubbelohde, Benson and Smith, 2006, 262). Colorado had an economy that was a mix of agrarian and industrial, in this case tilting to mining. Its population was urban and rural. These factors contributed to a relatively typical political profile of well-organized, rich, and powerful business interests which, in turn, funded and kept in power corrupt politicians who protected their privileges. Militant labor unions fought (literally) for worker rights and industry responded in kind. The most famous incident was the Ludlow massacre. In 1914, the governor mobilized the state’s National Guard in response to a strike by coal miners at a Rockefeller-owned mine. In a violent clash, the guardsmen killed over a dozen miners, women, and children. Another example of the conservative establishment’s power occurred in 1906 when Simon Guggenheim, whose family had major silver mining operations in Colorado, bought a US Senatorship by spreading large sums of money around the state legislature (Unger and Unger, 2005, 114-21).11

The symbiosis between business and machine politics in turn led – also typically – to the rise of an indigenous progressive reform movement seeking to clean up Denver municipal politics and state government. According to Cronin and Loey, “the moralistic political culture was in the ascendancy in Colorado between 1900 and 1920” (1993, 48). Some of the accomplishments of these goo-goos (the derisive term used by opponents of good-government efforts) before 1912 included a partial civil service system for state government and an independent state commission to regulate railroads. The most significant win was by the Direct Legislation League of Colorado with the enactment in 1910 of a constitutional amendment permitting initiative and referendum.
(I&R), thus giving voters the option of bypassing the state legislature to enact state laws, even constitutional amendments.

At about the same time that Roosevelt announced his RJD proposal, the League was in the process of determining its I&R agenda for the November 1912 election. It had already made the tactical decision that its first wave of I&R proposals would focus on “perfecting the tools of democracy” (i.e. process) before turning to substantive public policy, such as social welfare. The League promptly decided to consider if it should include in its fall offensive “referring decisions of the courts of last resort to the people when the construction of a statute or constitution is involved” (Gabriel, 1912).

The issue resonated somewhat more in Colorado. In 1899, the state’s Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional a state law limiting the working day for miners to eight hours. Despite a public uproar, it took two years of political combat to enact a constitutional amendment overturning the decision (Lewis, 1912, 318-19). Based on Roosevelt’s new approach, it could have been accomplished much faster and bypassed the legislature. Then, in 1912, the Court ruled that a city charter which established nonpartisan elections for municipal offices was unconstitutional. The reaction by urban residents was prompt and extended beyond goo-goo reformers. There was broad agreement across the ideological spectrum of city dwellers about the need to nullify this court decision. While municipal officials focused on a specific I&R to amend the constitution to permit nonpartisan municipal elections, the ongoing coverage of this issue had the effect of making the case for RJD in general. Here was a tangible example of the rationale for supporting recall of a state Supreme Court decision.

The League also had some political maneuvering room. Newspapers siding with the stalwart wing of the Republican Party reflexively took Taft’s position and bashed Roosevelt’s idea. But, for example, a Colorado Springs paper declared editorially that it was “frankly on the fence. The recall of judicial decisions appears to be feasible when limited to constitutional questions.” Similarly, at a local bar association meeting, former governor Charles Thomas (D) endorsed the idea.

By early May, the League had finalized its I&R agenda for the fall elections. It included ten items, including RJD as a constitutional amendment. Now, the question was if the League could get enough signatures on a petition to place all ten questions on the November ballot. Based on the new I&R option, it needed to collect about 16,500 signatures, equaling 8% of the voters. This entailed a major effort. Using volunteers, it was not able to collect enough signatures. So, it spent $2,000 to pay circulators to obtain the needed amount (Colorado, 1914). Using this expensive tactic worked and all ten initiatives had adequate signatures to be placed on the ballot.

In the midst of the League’s petition effort, a district judge ruled that the 1910 I&R constitutional amendment had not been enacted because the public notice of the constitutional amendment and upcoming referendum had been improper. Therefore it was not in effect and, at the earliest, would need to be correctly published and then placed on the November 1912 ballot. This meant none of the ten I&R initiatives could be on that fall’s ballot. Conservatives chortled and reformers objected. One newspaper was delighted that, among other ideas it opposed, recall of
court decisions was now headed for “the scrap heap.” But another paper perceptively observed that public reaction to the judge’s decision “will make certain” the eventual adoption of RJD. A few months later, the Supreme Court overruled the district court’s decision, stating that the 1910 I&R constitutional amendment had been properly approved and was in effect. Therefore the League’s ten initiatives could be voted on in November 1912.

As placed on the ballot for referendum, the Colorado version of RJD that the League drafted was necessarily complicated because of the need to delimit precisely its scope and the process for consideration. Leaving details unstated was an invitation to annulment, lawsuits or conservative-backed interpretations and procedures. The power to declare any state law unconstitutional was reserved for the Supreme Court, taking this power away from lower courts. A Supreme Court decision about the unconstitutionality of a state law or municipal charter would not go into effect for 60 days. During that period, a petition could be circulated to overturn the court’s decision. To be successful, the minimum number of signatures on the petition needed to be 5% of the votes cast in the most recent gubernatorial election. The petition could focus on the entirety of an overturned law or only on part of that law. If the minimum signatures were obtained, a referendum would be held within 90 days. The court’s decision would be overturned by a majority of the votes cast in that election. A successful referendum thus reinstated the legal status quo ante.

The Colorado RJD also applied to the charter of any municipal or county government. If the state Supreme Court ruled an entire charter or portion of a charter unconstitutional, then a process similar to the statewide RJD would occur. The minimum threshold for signatures would be 5% of the number of votes cast in the preceding general election for, as appropriate, city or county offices, calculated based on the office that received the most number of votes that day. Unlike statewide RJD, the referendum in that city or county would need to be held within 60 – rather than 90 – days of the petitions being certified.

Finally, the language of the RJD constitutional amendment drafted by the League was extremely detailed about the format of petitions, the grounds for rejecting signatures on petitions, and appeals of disputed petitions and signatures. It also included specifics on the publicizing of the upcoming RJD referendum with adequate and accurate information summarizing the issue at hand. Clearly, the League had been on a learning curve about how its opponents had successfully blocked earlier referenda through challenges to the form of the petitions or the validity of signatures. For example, the ballot language stated that the signatures “need not all be on one sheet of paper,” a claim opponents had used in the past. Similarly, another tactic of reform opponents was to sabotage the referendum by presenting the question in unusually dense and confusing legalese, even trying to reverse the “yes” vote to be against the issue on the ballot. So, the RJD constitutional amendment stated that the question shall be placed on the ballot with a “reasonably fair description.” Finally, another tactic by conservatives was to create voter confusion by placing a competing referendum on the ballot that was worded very closely to the reformers’ referendum, but which either had the opposite effect or deliberately contained a fatal error in wording to prevent it from going into effect even if passed. So, another section of the League’s RJD proposal stated that a second petition on the same ballot on the same issue could not be “so similar to the one previously filed as to tend to confuse the voter” (Laws, 1913, 678-81).
The campaign was on and the public debate about recalls of court decisions was sharp. Once the list of initiated proposals for the November ballot was finalized, a newspaper considered RJD one of the two most important questions on the fall ballot (the other was strengthening home rule); another that the subject was probably “the most important.”

The formal platform of the Colorado Republican Party, reflecting Taft, denounced the RJD referendum because the concept was “destructive of every safeguard guaranteed by the state and federal constitutions” (Manhart, 1912). The state’s Progressive Party platform said it was needed to overturn “decisions that are based upon no precedent but are in effect judicial legislation.” Down with activist judges! Examples it cited included laws on employer’s liability laws and limiting the hours of women workers.

The Colorado Democratic Party also endorsed RJD, evidently in part because some of its elected officials from urban areas were reformers and partly as a way to accentuate the Taft-Roosevelt schism and thereby increase the chances of a Democratic victory for all the offices on the November ballot.

Newspapers, then very much party organs, reflected the split. A conservative newspaper mixed news coverage with opinion in an article calling the RJD proposal “jokered” because of the potentially small number of signatures that would be needed for a municipal or county referendum. It also complained opaquely that the reformers “might reap a rich reward off the trouble they are causing the people of the state.”

On the other side, George Creel, then a crusading reporter and editor at the Rocky Mountain News (and soon the elected Denver Police Commissioner), wrote approvingly of RJD. He liked it because of the track record of the state’s Supreme Court (and lower courts) to declare pro-labor and other important public policies unconstitutional. RJD “gives the people the right to reject such decisions if they so desire” (quoted in Colorado, 1912).

Before the election, some newspapers endorsed RJD. One said that “it will give to the people themselves the final right of saying whether any legislation demanded or initiated by the people shall stand.”

The Colorado Secretary of State, in charge of preparing the ballot and wording the referendum questions, tried to avoid partisan crossfire in his wording of the RJD plan. He did not want to be accused of helping or hurting the chances of the referendum. He opted for a plain summary of the subject that was neither confusing nor misleading. It was a plan of “giving the people the right to overrule or recall the decisions of the Supreme Court declaring laws unconstitutional.”

The ballot on November 5, 1912 was unusually cluttered. Besides the ten I&R items from the League, there were proposed constitutional amendments and laws initiated by petitions of other activist groups. The ballot also had some constitutional amendments and proposed laws referred to the voters by the state legislature. Each voter faced 32 separate questions. The sheer volume must have felt intimidating, even overwhelming, to some citizens.

Of the 32, nine passed, including RJD, recall of elected officials (including judges), expanded civil service, and home rule (reversing the Supreme Court decision prohibiting nonpartisan municipal elections). Also passed were laws limiting the maximum number of hours per day that women could be forced to work. Statewide Prohibition was defeated, as was creating a special court to handle cases relating to utilities. Results for RJD were 55,326 votes for and 40,921 votes against. The idea of allowing the public to recall judicial decisions did not make it into law.
against, or 57% to 43%, a relatively decisive majority.\textsuperscript{28} That put it in about the middle of the pack of the other eight that passed. (In the state legislative races, the Democratic Party retained its majority in both houses.) Editorial reaction was, as would be expected, mixed. A newspaper which had supported its passage praised it and predicted that RJD and recalls of elected officials would “revolutionize Colorado politics almost as much” as I&R had.\textsuperscript{29} A (conservative) Democratic paper found solace in that the scope of RJD “does not include all or even many decisions” of the state Supreme Court.\textsuperscript{30}

**Implementation Legislation, 1913**

Colorado’s RJD went into effect on January 22, 1913 (Laws, 1913, 681). Its original sponsor, the Direct Legislation League, had taken care that the new constitutional amendment provided in minute detail the procedures for compelling a voter referendum on a Supreme Court. However, it quickly became clear that there was a part of the process that it had not addressed, namely a formal judicial process that would precipitate the option of a referendum. This was no mere technicality. This was about the viability of the new RJD power, specifically who would define the basis for operationalizing it, as well as what those rules would be. If the supporters of the original initiative got to define the procedures, then it would strengthen RJD and prevent obvious ways to undermine it due to vagueness or lack of structure. If no statute were to pass, then the courts themselves could create it. Given that the judiciary and the Bar were almost unanimously and vehemently against RJD, letting the Supreme Court create the process was an opening to undermine it fatally. In particular, what was missing was how to implement the limitation that only the Supreme Court could declare a state law unconstitutional and banning lower courts from doing so – as had been the practice up to then. But, if a question of constitutionality were central to a case at the trial level, then what? Would the case have to wend its way through the entire judicial and appeals process before reaching the Supreme Court for such a verdict? This scenario seemed unfair. There was a need to know near the beginning of the legal process if a law in question was unconstitutional or not.

The League worked with a pair of legislators-elect, one in the House and one in the Senate, to draft a bill determining such a process. The bill they prepared created an expedited procedure for the constitutional issue(s) of a case pending in lower court to be separated from the rest of the case and quickly moved to the Supreme Court for a decision. The Court would be required to issue such an opinion relatively fast. If it decided that a law was unconstitutional then RJD could occur.\textsuperscript{31} Given a relatively short legislative session and the importance of the subject, the companion bills were introduced as early as possible. Representative William Andrew (D) introduced House Bill (HB) 114 during the “opening hour” of the legislative session.\textsuperscript{32} State Senator Edward Affolter (D) also introduced the identical bill, Senate Bill (SB) 76.\textsuperscript{33}

The Senate bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee. A week later it came back to the full body with a recommendation for adoption (Senate Journal, 1913, 256). Two weeks later, on February 10, it was engrossed, i.e. passed on second reading without any amendments adopted (Senate Journal, 1913, 504). Now it was ready for an up-or-down vote (i.e. third reading; final passage). The smooth sailing of the bill up till then came to a screeching halt. This was where conservatives (Taft Republicans and old-line Democrats) decided to fight RJD.\textsuperscript{34} Both sides recognized what was at stake. One reporter described it as “an exceedingly hot debate;”\textsuperscript{35} another
that the bill “caused a fight.”\textsuperscript{36} At the conclusion of the debate, the roll call was 17 in favor, 14 opposed and four not voting. The general principle of American parliamentary procedure is that, assuming a quorum is present, motions are passed or defeated based on the votes cast. Abstentions, non-voting, and non-attendance do not count as casting a vote. So, in that context, the bill would have passed. However, the Colorado Constitution required that for a bill to pass it needed a majority of the membership of the body. This had the effect of treating abstentions and absences (as well as vacancies) as the equivalent of a ‘no’ vote. With the Senate having 35 members, a bill always needed 18 votes to pass. So, the League’s bill “was declared lost” (Senate Journal, 1913, 518).

But in parliamentary procedure just about any action can be undone by a successful motion to reconsider. Such a motion is limited to those who voted on the prevailing side, in this case the opponents of the bill. Once he realized he had lost, Affolter switched his vote to no so that he would be eligible to move to reconsider. But then an opponent moved to table the motion to reconsider. This was a legislative tactic to have a \textit{procedural} motion kill a bill. The political advantage is that the legislator can then claim to constituents who supported the bill that he (in those days they were all men) had merely cast a procedural vote, not a substantive vote reflecting his views on the merits bill itself: “I simply thought it should be tabled for the moment and perhaps considered later. I’m not sure how I would have voted when it came up later,” the politician could falsely claim. The tabling motion failed 15-16. As a procedural vote, the constitutional requirement of a majority of the membership did not apply. Another vote, on killing the bill (subject to the Constitutional requirement) reversed the yeas and nays of the first roll call vote, 14-17. Clearly, this was as close a question as there could be. The Senate was almost perfectly split between supporters and opponents of RJD. The issue was at a deadlock, with neither side able to prevail. Opponents had the upper hand on substantive votes while supporters on procedural ones. By unanimous consent, the matter was postponed for two legislative days in the hopes that some of the four absent members might be present and would give one side or the other the 18 necessary votes.

On Wednesday, February 12, the Senate took up SB 76 again. The debate indicated the odd politics of RJD, with a conservative Republican opponent claiming that the bill was covertly being pushed by corporate interests, hiding behind the anti-corporation bona fides of the author of the bill.\textsuperscript{37} The motion before the Senate was if its failure to pass the bill two days ago should be reconsidered. The (procedural) vote was 18-15 in favor of reconsidering the Senate’s previous decision of not adopting the bill. The supporters of RJD now had the necessary 18\textsuperscript{th} vote to pass the bill. Then, an odd thing happened. The next motion was on passing the bill. One of the 18 who had voted to reconsider switched sides. The motion for final passage was a tie, 17-17 (Senate Journal, 1913, 552-53).\textsuperscript{38} So, the RJD proposed law was defeated by one vote. It was big news.\textsuperscript{39}

The League’s back-up strategy was to re-start the effort in the House and hope to switch one Senate vote in the meantime. On March 11, about a month after the defeat in the Senate, the House took up HB 114 and passed it without significant debate or controversy.\textsuperscript{40} In fact, the final vote was \textit{unanimous}, 55 votes for it, none opposed, and ten members not casting votes (House Journal, 1913, 975). This was an indication of the political sex appeal of RJD across party and ideological lines, especially to House members who had two-year terms (as opposed to Senate
members who had four). But the unanimous vote did not give the bill any more momentum in the Senate than previously. The Senate Judiciary Committee recommended passage of HB 114 in mid-March, just as it had recommended SB 76 a month earlier (Senate Journal, 1913, 913). It was all for naught. The slim ideological majority of Senators which had barely succeeded in killing the Senate bill now maneuvered successfully not to take up the House bill. They could, justifiably, argue that the Senate had already disposed of the identical bill a month earlier after extensive deliberation and that taking it up again was redundant and unnecessary. So died the legislation to implement RJD.

In retrospect, the 18-15 vote in the Senate in mid-January in favor of RJD and the unanimous House roll call in March were the high-water marks of RJD in Colorado. Absent the procedures they specified for fast-tracking constitutional questions from trial level courts to the Supreme Court, opponents of RJD could argue that the new constitutional language adopted in the 1912 referendum was fatally flawed because it did not deal with this aspect of the process.

**Threats to Use Decision Recall, 1914-1920**

Notwithstanding the failure of the enabling legislation, there were a few times when activists considered using RJD. While Colorado’s RJD was never invoked to the point of triggering a referendum, this option was occasionally part of the state’s political scene in the 1910s. The first time that RJD came into political play was in mid-1914. The issue was the funding of a railroad tunnel westerly from Denver, under the Continental Divide, directly toward Salt Lake City and from there to California. The tunnel would help make Denver the central rail crossroads of the Great Plains, especially for east-west freight. To accomplish this, Denver’s city government adopted a charter ordinance to create a commission to participate in the tunnel’s construction in cooperation with a private railroad. Then, in a referendum in the spring of 1914, the city’s voters approved bonding to finance the tunnel. However, in July 1914, the Colorado Supreme Court ruled that the city’s bonding plan was unconstitutional, specifically that a municipality was not authorized by the constitution to develop and finance a tunnel jointly with a private corporation.41

Isaac Stevens, the city attorney, and the Tunnel Commission immediately announced that they were considering invoking RJD.42 On initial impression, such a referendum would be a **statewide** vote on the legal powers of a municipality to engage in an action that was ostensibly in violation of the state constitution. However, crucially, the thinking quickly shifted to the lesser known aspect of RJD, of the power of city residents to overrule a Supreme Court decision that a charter ordinance was unconstitutional.43 Hence, the voting would have been limited to a citywide referendum, not statewide.

Newspapers quickly weighed in. The *Denver Post* endorsed pursuing RJD noting, “It is the first similar experiment in history, and it should be made an inspiring success.”44 Another agreed, “The people of Denver should get busy with recall petitions – both on the judges and decision – and see how it works on the other side.”45 On the other side, an editorial hoped that “some day the people of this state will realize that the ‘re-call [sic] of decisions’ is nothing more than a very dangerous weapon – the handy weapon of demagogues – and the act making it operative in Colorado should and will be repealed.”46
The Tunnel Commission narrowed down its options to two alternatives: RJD or revising the legal status of the tunnel by making it solely city-owned to get around the Supreme Court decision. It engaged in some political feelers “to ascertain the attitude of the people of Denver regarding the two propositions.” The head of the railroad that was planning to partner with the Commission said his company would not actively participate in a Commission effort to recall the decision (implying he would not finance the campaign), but that he personally thought RJD was a good option. However, the civic activists who had helped pass the original bonding referendum indicated they “are opposed to this procedure, and there seems to be little prospect that it will be resorted to.” That ended the matter. No municipal charter RJD to try to overturn the court’s tunnel decision.

Next came Prohibition. It had been defeated in a referendum in November 1912 (the same election as the RJD vote), but its supporters continued agitating for it. It was placed on the ballot again in November 1914 as a constitutional amendment referendum and passed. Unlike what had happened regarding RJD, the state legislature passed enabling legislation. The new law set the detailed rules for the operation of Prohibition and it would go into effect on January 1, 1916. Unlike some other states which adopted Prohibition, the Colorado version did not have an “opt-out” option. Nonetheless, the wets in Denver thought they found a loophole. Given that RJD applied to charter ordinances as well as state laws, could Denver enact a charter ordinance regarding licensing of bars and restaurants to serve liquor after Prohibition went into effect? After all, in the legal structure of Colorado, Denver had extensive home rule powers and those powers were further buttressed by yet another referendum adopted in November 1912. Playing it out, either the state Supreme Court would rule that such a charter ordinance was constitutional (i.e. compatible with the new statewide Prohibition) or unconstitutional. If the latter, then Denver’s voters could invoke RJD and overturn the court’s decision. This scenario was publicly discussed as early as May 1915 and then throughout the year in the run-up to the New Year’s Day beginning of Prohibition.

One pro-Prohibition paper editorialized that it would be an “absurdity” if such an outcome would occur and even the possibility of it happening proved that RJD was “a gigantic blunder.” Another used it as an opportunity to bash Denver (a popular theme in the state’s rural politics) as, again, the den of iniquity in the state. A third paper was tantalized by the prospect that if Denver were successful with either the potential or actual use of RJD regarding Prohibition, then its city should opt for the same legal status and similarly benefit from such opportunities. Eventually, the Supreme Court accepted original jurisdiction over the Denver charter ordinance. Before the January 1 effective date, it ruled that Prohibition applied to Denver even though it had adopted a charter ordinance permitting liquor to be served and sold within the city limits. Carefully, the court ruled that the liquor license the city had issued under the charter ordinance “is a nullity.” By doing that, the court had not – at least explicitly – declared that the charter ordinance itself was unconstitutional, thus denying the wets the ability to invoke RJD. As a result of that seemingly minor detail in the court’s decision, the matter ended there.

According to Smith, the option of invoking RJD was last raised in 1920 regarding a public utilities corporation (1963, 209n27). This is likely a reference to a large-scale protest in Leadville against a major increase in water rates. The city appealed the rate hike first to the Public Utilities
Commission and explicitly reserved the option of pursuing the case to the fullest possible extent in the judicial system (although it is unclear how RJD would have been relevant).  

**Opposition, 1913-1921**

Given the defeat of the authorizing legislation in 1913, RJD opponents were now emboldened. They sought any and all venues to undermine and reverse it. For example, in the fall of 1913, a supporter of RJD reported to a national journal of reformers that “various state officials are conspiring to now attack” RJD and other populist initiatives, weaken them, even gut them (Colorado, 1913). Confirming that accusation, a front-page newspaper story in October 1913 reported on a plan by a “radical element in the statehouse” of conservative forces to invalidate all the initiatives adopted in the November 1912 elections, including RJD. This plan surfaced in the 1915 session of the state legislature with initiatives to repeal RJD and related populist powers. They were introduced and debated extensively. One reporter dryly described how the House “spent the greater portion of the day in discussing the referring of judicial decisions, the recall and referendum,” but ultimately ended up taking no authoritative or substantive action.

Conservative newspapers also kept up a drumbeat against RJD. One editorial condemned RJD and the many other reforms that were enacted in Colorado by making the state “the recipient of every freak experiment.” The paper criticized the initiators of RJD and like reforms, describing them as “crusaders, hysterical women and long-haired men, the Direct Legislation league, and all the rag-tag and bob-tail of unrest and agitation.” Another paper editorialized against RJD, wondering if it “is workable” and hoping not. Out-of-state conservatives and editorial voices piled on. An opponent of women’s suffrage blamed Colorado’s enactment of RJD on women voters: “They favored the adoption of that evil system, the recall of judicial decisions.” The Los Angeles Times characterized RJD as “a subversion” of republican government because “the decision recall leaves to the whim or caprice of a local or temporary majority.” Now-former President Taft described Colorado’s RJD as “the stranded deposit of the highest tide of opposition to the power of the courts to mark the limit of legislative power and enforce that limit by ignoring seeming legislative acts which transgress it.”

Both the state’s trial-level and appellate judiciary, along with the Colorado Bar, were openly opposed to RJD (Northcutt, 1913, 378-82; Musser, 1916, 22-23; Brown, 1915). Local judges vociferously opposed its diminution in their own power, denying them the ability to declare a law unconstitutional. In one early case, a local judge had ruled that Colorado’s child support law was unconstitutional and therefore a criminal defendant could not be charged. The case quickly came to the state’s Supreme Court with the attorney general filing a brief relating to the possible impact of RJD on the case. However, the test case did not go further, as the court apparently ruled the child support law was constitutional, thus mooting the RJD issue. A year later, another trial level judge in a usury case ruled that the anti-loan shark law was unconstitutional and, further, that RJD itself was unconstitutional because it denied him the right to rule on the constitutionality of state laws. In 1916, the Colorado Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the usury law, but without commenting on the constitutionality RJD’s ban on local courts ruling a law unconstitutional. Again, their decision finessed the option of calling for an RJD referendum.
In at least one case, the trial-level judge accepted the validity of RJD and declined to include in his opinion any expression of whether the law in question was constitutional or not.\textsuperscript{71} The case dealt with property tax assessments and the power of a new state tax commission to override assessments made by county assessors. Denver’s assessor had brought the suit and promptly appealed the decision to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court decided the law was constitutional, but in its decision did not address RJD’s limitation on declarations of constitutionality.\textsuperscript{72} Again, no possible triggering of a referendum to overturn the court’s decision.\textsuperscript{73}

Finally, in 1921, the state Supreme Court found a way to render RJD unconstitutional. “Although no issue about the petition procedure was presented” to it, the Court obliquely found in a series of cases that RJD violated the federal constitution’s due process and supremacy clauses (Oesterle and Collins, 2011, 164). Therefore, RJD was declared wholly unconstitutional, even if there were to be a case ostensibly pertaining solely to Colorado’s laws and Constitution. According to Linde, “The court \textit{finessed} explaining this conclusion by declining to sever referrals of judgments under the state constitution from those under federal law, which the Supremacy Clause puts beyond a referendum” (1994, 729n69, emphasis added). The extant literature, especially Smith (1963, 203-09), provides detailed examination of those cases and decisions. Therefore there is no need to re-present the decisions in detail here. There was little public outcry in Colorado, partly because of the general lapse of popular interest in judicial reform and because the state’s Direct Legislation League, which had birthed it, no longer existed (Goebel, 2002, 131).

\textbf{Conclusions}

Colorado was the only state to enact RJD. Occasionally there were suggestions to do so elsewhere, such as New York State or a variation at the federal level (Ross, 1994). But, generally, by the time the Colorado Supreme Court expunged RJD from the state’s organic law in 1921, the populist interest in judicial reforms had rather abruptly faded (Goebel, 2002, 66). After the 1912 election, some learned journals, such as the \textit{Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science}, tried to give the concept a balanced and rational appraisal (Storey, 1914; Richberg, 1914). But most of the writings about it, especially in the publications of the legal profession, lambasted it in extreme rhetoric. One Bar leader went so far as to state that “recall of judicial decisions is Socialistic” (Brown, 1918, 65). In 1926, a federal district judge who had been nominated by President Coolidge to the federal appeals court testified at his confirmation hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee that Theodore Roosevelt “was not a good American” because of his advocacy of RJD.\textsuperscript{74} Other non-lawyer conservatives piled on. In the post-WWI anti-communist mania, a conservative activist in Minnesota smeared RJD as part of a passel of reforms advocated by “a Bolshevist cult” masquerading as rural nonpartisan populists (Ackley, 1918). Another characterized RJD as reflecting “anarchistic heresies.”\textsuperscript{75}

In 1921, W. W. Willoughby, a prominent political scientist, co-wrote in a textbook on government that reflected the times. He and his co-author conceded that some court decisions overturning laws have “furnished a certain amount of justification for” RJD (Willoughby and Rogers, 1921, 392). That was faint praise, but praise nonetheless. However, a decade and a half later, the new normal had set in. His twin brother, W. F. Willoughby, was an even more
prominent and influential figure in public administration. In a 1936 textbook, he articulated the perspective of the conservative and anti-democratic tilt of the emerging public administration establishment. He wrote that “fortunately” efforts to enact RJD had died out because “had it prevailed, it would have still further strengthened the undesirable intervention of the electorate in the conduct of the judicial branch” (1936, 291-92). This observation reflected his larger and influential dogmas (Lee, 2011). Rather consistently, he felt that Progressive era reform ideas were good when they distanced politics from government (self government as a republic), not when they increased the power of the voters over policy outcomes (self-government as a democracy). The latter should be left to the experts. The Progressive reforms which had been enacted, such as civil service systems, the short ballot, nonpartisan elections, and separation of politics and administration all seemed to jell into a fixed conventional wisdom of the nascent field of public administration. These reforms eventually ossified into a vaguely anti-democratic catechism of the new discipline, with failed ideas such as RJD now safely criticized. The profession of public administration also quickly adopted boundaries for its purview, limiting itself to executive branch reforms and with little interest in the judiciary or judicial administration.

Why did RJD fail? There are probably several reasons. Its origination was in part due to TR’s political needs, although his support for it was consonant with his previous views about the courts striking down social welfare legislation. As he wanted to present it as an alternative to recall of judges, he termed his idea a “recall” of court decisions. That not only led to misunderstanding of his proposal, but also was misleading. It was more akin to a kind of constitutional “referendum” on court decisions, paralleling a relatively common process used by states to amend their constitutions. This misnaming opened RJD up for a fierce and sometimes slyly deceptive opposition by the legal establishment (Stagner, 1980) plus Taft and his conservative supporters. The timing is also an important detail. Many of the Progressive era ideas had been incubating publicly for several decades, such as civil service systems and direct election of US senators. On the other hand, RJD came up relatively late in that reform era and therefore didn’t have quite the momentum other ideas had accumulated over the long term. Finally, of course, contingency played a role. Bad luck and bad timing can be as important as the substance of an idea. Serendipity and caprice can bend the direction of historical developments as much as any other factor.

Whatever the ultimate reason for its failure, a century later RJD seems like an alien concept. But that impression is largely due to the roaring opposition to it by so many conservative stakeholders who managed to make it seem wholly outside the bounds of democratic reform. As always, winners get to write history or, at least, history makes losing ideas seem wrong. After all, otherwise they would have been adopted, right? There is a kind of inexorable historical gravity that “the way things turn out is often interpreted as the way things had to turn out” (Murphy, 2012, 115, emphasis in original). Even as influential a leader and as skilled a politician as Theodore Roosevelt was unable to harmonize the concept of the independence of the courts with the heritical view that all governing institutions should ultimately be subject to the will of the people. In a sense, it was a resounding victory for republican vs. democratic government. And public administration has seemed perfectly happy with it since.
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The Highway Coalition Revisited: Using the Advocacy Coalition Framework to Explore the Content of the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials’ *Daily Transportation Update*

Richard Watts, Russell W. Mills, and Robert Fish

An emphasis on the private automobile to provide individual mobility has long characterized transportation policy in the United States (Cervero, 1996; Jones, 2008; Kay, 1997). While the conversation has expanded recently to include concepts of access (Cervero, 1996) and livability (US DOT, 2011), funding and policy attention continues to focus on building and maintaining infrastructure that supports automobility (Jones, 2008). Personal transportation is dominated by the private automobile (87 percent of all trips) with walking a distant second (9 percent) followed by transit (1.5 percent) (National Household Travel Survey, 2001). A complex set of factors have led to the dominance of automobility, including land use development patterns, the interstate highway system, growth in GDP, household size, travel behavior, the domestic auto and oil industry and cultural factors (Jones, 2008; Gutfreund, 2004; Lewis, 1997; Seiler, 2008; Lutz, 2010; Coughlin, 2009).

One factor that researchers have pointed to is an effective lobby and “iron triangle” around support for road building and motor vehicle infrastructure over other less capital-intensive transportation mobility approaches (Goddard, 1994; Lewis, 1997; Stich & Miller, 2008). The so-called “highway coalition” comprised of the road building and trucking industries, state and federal transportation officials, automobile associations and congressional allies has dominated transportation policy during the twenty-first century (Goddard, 1994; Lewis; 1997; Gutfreund, 2004). An organization with powerful influence across this time has been the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), directed by the chief executives of each of the 50 state departments of transportation plus Puerto Rico and Washington, D.C. Formed in 1914, AASHTO, along with the American Automobile Association (AAA), other trade associations, state and federal transportation officials and federal legislators, has played a core role in promoting highways as the primary transportation mobility approach (Goddard, 1994; Kay, 1997; Lewis; 1997; Gutfreund, 2004). As a representative of state transportation agencies, AASHTO—which bills itself as “the Voice of Transportation”—provides education and outreach and disseminates a broad range of information (AASHTO, 2012; Lloyd Brown, 2012). One of the tools AASHTO uses to communicate with the external world is the *Daily Transportation Update*—an electronic news headline service circulated to...
23,000 users each day (David Dubov, 2012). By analyzing the choice of headlines over a six-year period, we examine how AASHTO has used external communication tools to reinforce a transportation policy agenda focused on automobility over other less motorized and less capital-intensive transportation mobility solutions.

**AASHTO & the Daily Transportation Update:** Founded in 1914, the organization was called the American Association of State Highway Officials (AASHO) until 1973, when the organization’s leaders renamed it the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials to reflect an effort to broaden the organization’s scope (ASSHTO, 2012). AASHTO’s policy positions are ultimately decided upon by its member DOTs, but the policy statements to be voted upon are first discussed by a committee consisting of several other pro-road-construction organizations, such as the Associated General Contractors (AGC) and the American Road & Transportation Builders Association (ARTBA) (AASHTO, 2012). AASHTO produces various publications for public consumption, including the *Daily Transportation Update*, the weekly *AASHTO Journal*, the monthly *Marketing Transportation E-News* and Transportation TV, an online TV channel. The organization’s web site (www.transportation.org) contains more than 95,000 pages of information.

Advocacy coalitions influence the policy process through lobbying activities, participation in decision-making structures, providing information to coalition members and government officials and promoting their core beliefs in the mass media (Gandy, 1982; Berger, 2001; Priest & Talbert, 1994). There is a rich field of research that examines the role of the media in influencing public opinion and policy outcomes, through agenda setting (Cobb & Elder, 1972; McCombs & Shaw, 1972) and issue framing (Entman, 1993; Iyengar, 1991). In addition to influencing the content of the news, organizations and coalitions increasingly are turning to providing their own news content by aggregating information from multiple sources (Brown, 2012). Government officials and coalition members receive information from members of advocacy coalitions that reduce the costs of information gathering and processing. AASHTO’s *Transportation Update* brings attention to issues and issue characteristics, providing a daily dose of digestible information for policy makers and coalition members, underscoring AASHTO’s core beliefs. The *Transportation Update* allows AASHTO to “tell the story” from the organization’s perspective (Brown, 2012).

AASHTO launched the *Daily Transportation Update* in 2005, linking readers to transportation news across the nation. The service is comprised of a daily e-newsletter, consisting of headlines, linked to news stories, culled from a variety of news sources every weekday morning. Among the approximately 23,000 users are state and federal transportation officials, legislative offices, the media and interest groups. The open rate is approximately 15 percent, with about 88 percent of those who open the newsletter clicking through to an article. Articles for the daily newsletter are chosen by an AASHTO contractor and then reviewed by AASHTO’s public affairs office before dissemination (Lloyd Brown, 2012; David Dubov, 2012). The same AASHTO contractor has provided the service since it began in 2005. (See Figure 1 as an illustration of the *Daily Update*).
Advocacy Coalition Framework: This paper is grounded in the advocacy coalition framework (ACF), a theoretical perspective providing insight into the process of policy stability and change (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993). ACF posits that beliefs (deep core, policy core and secondary) explain the behavior of advocacy coalitions, whose membership is comprised of actors from all levels of government, consultants, scientists, the media and others who have a vested interest in a particular policy outcome and are part of a larger policy subsystem. Long periods of policy stability and periods of change are explained by ACF through external shocks to the subsystem (changes in electoral coalitions and macro-economic shifts), policy-oriented learning (technological advances) and internal subsystem events (large-scale events that directly impact the subsystem). ACF has been used to explain periods of policy stability and change across a variety of policy domains including energy policy (Heintz, 1988; Fenger & Klok, 2001), education (Stuart, 1991; Mintrom & Vergari, 1996), water (Munro, 1993; Weible & Sabatier, 2006), forestry (Boscarino, 2009) and transportation (Kingdon, 1995; Marzotto, Burnor & Bonham, 2000; Stich & Miller, 2008).
The key component of ACF is the focus on deeply held beliefs within advocacy coalitions. Within the transportation policy subsystem, members of the highway coalition—such as AASHTO, the American Road & Transportation Builders Association (ARTBA) and the Associated General Contractors (AGC)—have crafted a core belief that the primary way to support mobility in the U.S. is the development of infrastructure that supports the personal automobile. Researchers have characterized the dominant core beliefs of the transportation policy subsystem as:

1. More and better roads is the best public solution for mobility
2. A dedicated gas tax is required for road construction
3. Public funds should pay for roadway acquisition and construction
4. Negative externalities (e.g., environmental impacts) are not part of the calculation (Marzotto, Burnor & Bonham, 2000; Stich & Miller, 2008; Lewis, 1997).

Commonly, representatives of these organizations appear in the news discourse framing issues and promoting their core beliefs. However, news aggregators and social media, such as blogs, have shown that, beyond the specific outlets that produce news, it is also important to consider how news is being packaged by third-party organizations. Those organizations, in essence, are applying their own values and core beliefs to choose and select information that is then rebroadcast to a greater audience to reinforce and promote those beliefs.

In this study, we reviewed 27,609 headlines and subheadlines that AASHTO selected between 2006 and 2011 and sent to 23,000 subscribers of the organization’s daily news feed. We argue that how an organization, in this case AASHTO, selects and aggregates news about transportation helps to shape and reinforce the dominant core beliefs of a policy subsystem. We test that proposition by examining the AASHTO communications around an external shock—a change in presidential administrations—and two internal policy shocks—the turnover in authorizing committee leadership and the collapse of the I-35W bridge in Minnesota. We ask whether changes in the selection of headlines for the Daily Update provide evidence of change in the relatively stable advocacy coalition beliefs that ACF theories predict.

**Literature Review**

The ACF was developed in the late 1980s by Paul Sabatier and Hank Jenkins-Smith to provide policy scholars with a theoretical framework to examine policy change that was both more rigorous and more flexible than the existing policy stages heuristic framework, allowing for the incorporation of scientific and technical information into the policy process. Specifically, the ACF is structured around five core tenets:

1. The central role of scientific and technical information in policy processes
2. A time perspective of 10 years or more to understand policy change
3. Policy subsystems as the primary unit of analysis
4. A broad set of subsystem actors that include the traditional “iron triangle” members as well as government officials, consultants, scientists and members of the media
5. A perspective that policies and programs are best thought of as translations of beliefs
The ACF is based on the centrality of policy subsystems that are comprised of actors from a variety of public and private organizations who are actively concerned with a policy problem or issue such as air pollution, health care or transportation. There are multiple policy subsystems within a single political system, and each subsystem is organized according to specific problems or issue areas (Marzotto, Burnor & Bonham, 2000). Since each policy subsystem contains a group of people with diverse perspectives on the problems and solutions, each subsystem is comprised of advocacy coalitions, which are made up of individuals “who share a particular belief system, basic values, causal assumptions, and problem perceptions and who show a nontrivial degree of coordinated activity over time” (Sabatier, 1993, p. 17).

The focus on beliefs as driving political behavior is the key explanatory variable within the ACF. The ACF uses a three-tiered belief system for its actors (Weible, Sabatier & McQueen, 2009, pp. 122-123):

1. **Deep-core beliefs**: These are the broadest and most stable among the beliefs and are predominantly normative. Examples include liberal and conservative beliefs and the relative concern for the welfare of present versus future generations that are applicable across many subsystems.

2. **Policy-core beliefs**: These are of moderate scope and span the substantive and geographic breadth of a policy subsystem. The subsystem specificity of policy-core beliefs makes them ideal for forming coalitions and coordinating activities among members. Policy-core beliefs are resistant to change but are more likely to adjust in response to verification and refutation from new experiences and information than deep-core beliefs.

3. **Secondary beliefs**: Compared to policy-core beliefs, secondary beliefs are narrower in scope. The ACF predicts that secondary beliefs, compared to deep-core and policy-core beliefs, are the most likely to change over time.

Since deep-core and policy-core beliefs are relatively stable, most advocacy coalitions within policy subsystems form around these beliefs.

One of the key contributions of the ACF is the ability to help explain policy change within subsystems. The ACF defines major policy change as a change in the policy-core aspects of the policy subsystem and minor policy change as a change in the secondary core aspects of a policy subsystem, such as a shift in budget priorities from one sub-program to another (Weible, Sabatier & Flowers, 2008). There are three primary scenarios by which the dominant beliefs of a policy subsystem can be challenged and thus result in policy change:

1. **External subsystem events** are events such as broad changes in socioeconomic conditions, public opinion, governing coalitions and other subsystems. External shocks can foster change in a subsystem by shifting and augmenting resources, tipping the power of coalitions and changing beliefs (Weible, Sabatier & McQueen, 2009).

2. **Policy-oriented learning** refers to new technical and scientific information within the
subsystem that can change secondary beliefs and can lead to changes in deep-core beliefs as the new information becomes assimilated into the subsystem and advocacy coalition.

3. **Internal subsystem crises** are events which occur within the subsystem and are expected to highlight failures or inadequacies in current subsystem beliefs.

An important theoretical distinction that has implications for the type of policy change predicted by the ACF is whether the crisis or event is external or internal to the subsystem. Nohrstedt and Weible (2010), for example, illustrate the distinction between external and internal events that impact the dominant beliefs of subsystems. Specifically, they use the geographical and policy proximity to the subsystem to develop a two-dimensional typology of events and crises. Geographic proximity refers to the actual distance between the event and the subsystem (e.g., the collapse of the I-35W bridge in Minnesota had a greater impact on the Minnesota transportation subsystem than on the national transportation subsystem). Policy proximity refers to the degree that policy subsystems share policy design components—such as a subsystem’s statutes, laws and policies, including the instruments, ideas and symbols therein (Nohrsted & Weible, 2010). Using the work of scholars such as Birkland (2006) as a theoretical point of departure, the authors argue that the closer a crisis is to a subsystem in terms of geographic and policy proximity, the greater the impact on the core beliefs of a subsystem. The primary impact within the subsystem comes from those members with nondominant beliefs who try to use the event to push their agenda among the other members of the subsystem (Nohrsted & Weible, 2010).

Scholars have also closely examined the causal mechanisms that link external and internal events to major policy changes. The first causal mechanism following an event is a redistribution of political resources, including financial resources, public opinion and scientific and technical information within the subsystem (Sabatier & Weible, 2007; Nohrstedt & Weible, 2010). If the event is proximate enough to the subsystem in terms of geography and policy, this redistribution of resources may be significant enough to shift the core beliefs of the subsystem and lead to a new dominant coalition. The second causal mechanism that takes place following an event or crisis is that those in minority coalitions often act as policy entrepreneurs by trying to use their core beliefs as a solution to the problem identified through the crisis or event (Kingdon, 1995; Boscarino, 2009). Whether a crisis or event leads to significant policy change depends upon the degree to which minority coalitions are able to match their beliefs and policy proposals to the problem highlighted by the crisis (Nohrstedt & Weible, 2010). The third and final causal mechanism between events and policy change is that events often lead to a reconsideration of the core beliefs of the dominant coalition through policy-oriented learning. However, it is unlikely that any new information highlighted by the crisis will change the core beliefs of the dominant coalition.

ACF is a powerful policy framework that has been used across a variety of policy domains to explain how dominant beliefs within policy subsystems are able to remain stable over time and why occasionally policy change does occur. One policy subsystem that has received little scholarly treatment (Marzotto, Burnor & Bonham, 2000; Stich & Miller, 2008) is transportation. This study builds on the ACF literature by examining the role that the external communication tools used by the highway coalition play in ensuring the dominance of the beliefs of that coalition in the face of external and internal crises.
The Transportation Subsystem and the Highway Coalition

The transportation subsystem in the United States is comprised of a variety of public sector organizations across all levels of government, interest group organizations, media outlets, private companies, consultants and academics interested in a variety of modes of transportation including aviation, rail, highways and public transit. At the federal level, Congressional committees, including the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Senate Committee on the Environment and Public Works and both House and Senate Appropriations Committees, exert considerable influence over policy and the financing of all modes of transportation in the United States. Federal agencies organized under the U.S. Department of Transportation (US DOT), such as the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) and the Federal Maritime Commission (FMC), provide oversight of the transportation industry. At the state level, departments of transportation (DOTs), legislative committees and regional metropolitan planning organizations plan and develop infrastructure. A variety of consultants, private companies such as trucking operators and construction firms, interest groups and associations representing those industries, media outlets specializing in transportation and a network of academic actors such as the University Transportation Centers (UTC), all comprise the transportation subsystem in the United States.

The dominant deep-core belief within the transportation subsystem has been that of the highway coalition, which believes that building automobile-related infrastructure is the primary way to meet mobility needs (Goddard, 1994; Kay, 1997; Lewis, 1997; Gutfreund, 2004; Jones, 2008). Scholars have pegged the roots of this coalition to the early 1900s with the emergence of the domestic auto industry and road construction industry, the growth in private automobile use and automobile lobby organizations such as the AAA (Goddard, 1994; Kay, 1997; Lewis, 1997; Gutfreund, 2004). A core member of the highway coalition is the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, AASHTO (originally known as AASHO), the organization representing state DOTs.

Through the twentieth century, the highway coalition’s authority grew as automobility increased. Goddard (1994) and Lewis (1997) trace this history in detail, highlighting the role of AASHTO in the emerging Highway Coalition. The influence of the “highwaymen” was felt in the 1916 Federal Aid Road Act, which first authorized $75 million to a national road-building program and then in subsequent laws increased funding, standardized road systems and institutionalized the use of public funds to pay for road projects. AASHTO and its member state DOTs, then known as highway departments, were extremely influential in maintaining a focus on roads, working closely with the federal agency, the Bureau of Public Roads and the agency’s longtime director, Thomas McDonald (Goddard, 1994; Lewis, 1997). AASHTO’s influence was felt through the development of road standards and regulations, its role in state and federal transportation funding decision-making and the organization’s prioritization of roads over other mobility approaches (Goddard, 1994; Lewis, 1997).

The development of the Interstate Highway System was a crowning achievement of the highway coalition. The idea that public funds should be used to build roads was a core part of the coalition’s beliefs. President Roosevelt’s Interregional Highway Committee (IHC) recommended
a 32,000-mile highway system to link urban areas across the United States. The highway coalition was able to redirect the IHC report to include more roads in rural areas. The revised IHC study became the eventual blueprint for the Eisenhower Interstate Highway System (Goddard, 1994). The 1956 Federal-Aid Highway Act further institutionalized a steady stream of funds for road building. By using gasoline taxes, the law effectively used dollars raised in urban areas to subsidize the building of roads in rural areas. Between 1956 and 1980, when the system was finished, vehicle miles traveled grew 198 percent (Jones, 2008). After signing the law, President Dwight Eisenhower distributed two pens, one to the lead Congressional sponsor and the other to AASHTO (Lewis, 1997).

Over the years, the highway coalition has been able to maintain a relative position of strength within the transportation subsystem for a variety of reasons. First, the ability of members of Congress to claim credit (Mayhew 1974) for securing local infrastructure projects has resulted in a consistent stream of funding for road projects in the United States (either through gasoline tax revenues or general funds). The building of roads and local infrastructure is a distributive policy arena, (i.e., one that has many beneficiaries and diffuse costs) and is popular with members of Congress because they can engage in securing a local project for their district without harming another member of Congress (Mayhew 1974). Second, the dependence on automobile production as a component of the national economy (both in terms of GDP and employment) has resulted in a steady supply of new and innovative automobiles appealing to American drivers and cultural aspirations (see also Seiler, 2011; Lutz, 2010). Finally, the ability of groups such as AAA and AASHTO to effectively communicate and reinforce road-oriented priorities to their members and to government officials through information subsidies helps to ensure that the highway coalition remains the dominant coalition within the transportation subsystem.

**Methods**

This study utilized content analysis to sort through and analyze the more than 150,000 words collected in the 27,609 headlines during the six-year period of 2006-2011. Researchers have frequently relied on the analysis of headlines to study large text corpora (see Blood & Phillips, 1997; Hughes, 1995; Althaus et al., 2001; Taylor-Clark et al., 2007). Andrew (2007) defines headlines as “simplifying mechanisms” that function to summarize stories and attract readers.

AASHTO provided the initial database of all the electronic headlines as they appeared in the *Daily Transportation Update*. The *Update* also includes AASHTO press releases and TV programs and Federal Registry information, which were removed from the data set. Also removed were the subject headings such as “State DOT News.” The news headlines were exported into DataMiner and WordStat, content analysis software produced by Provalis Research.

Researchers then built a series of dictionaries to categorize the information, a technique frequently applied when sifting through large word databases (Riffe et al., 2005). In the dictionary approach, researchers group words or phrases together that are related or share a common theme (Riffe et al., 2005). In this study the researchers created categorization
dictionaries around the following concepts: 1) Geography; 2) Transportation mode and 3) People & Organizations.

To create each of the three dictionaries, researchers examined each word and phrase that occurred with a frequency equal to 2 or greater. Words and phrases were then checked against their use in the context of the headline and assigned to a unique dictionary. The process was iterative with the goal of assigning as many words as possible. The extensive variability of human language required checking many of the words within the context of the headline. Final rankings used to compare the words and phrases within each category were based upon the number of cases in which any word within a category appears. Words or phrases can appear in multiple dictionaries but only once within each dictionary. The final dictionaries and a detailed code book are available from the lead author.

Analysis

We first present some summaries of the data, then turn to the advocacy coalition theoretical questions, looking at how the data reflects changes or non-changes in AASHTO’s headline selection based on an external shock (change in U.S. presidential administration) and two internal shocks (Congressional transportation committee leadership change and the collapse of the I-35W bridge in August 2007).

Geography: The geography dictionary allowed the sorting of the headlines by geographical location. In this dictionary, all place names were coded (e.g., bridges, roads, towns, counties, states, tunnels, airports, ports and transit systems) to a U.S. state or non-U.S. country. Ninety-six percent of the headlines originated in the U.S., followed by Canada, Europe and Mexico with about 1 percent each. China was next with a fraction of a percent, followed by Panama and Japan.

States with large populations were the most prominent. The top 15 states mentioned—including the infrastructure and agencies within those states—were California, New York, Illinois, Texas, Florida, Washington, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Michigan, Missouri, Minnesota and Arizona. State prominence corresponds fairly well with their population size. California is by far the most prominent state in the database, appearing in five percent of all 27,000 cases and in 11 percent of the cases within which a state is identified, more than twice as frequently as the next state, New York. In total, these 15 states appear (see Table 1 below) in about one-quarter of all 27,609 headlines and in more than half of the headlines in which a state is mentioned.

People & Organizations: The second dictionary examined the prominence of organizations named in the headlines. In this case, all organizations were collected and a categorization framework was created that placed each organization in a category corresponding to state, federal, nonprofit or private company. Individual names were also collected and assigned to organizations. (Unlike the first dictionary, place names were not included.) The headlines reflect AASHTO’s emphasis on the role of government in transportation issues and transportation policy. In about two-thirds (65%) of the headlines, the state and/or the federal government is
named as an actor. The states remain the dominant actor, appearing in 42 percent of all headlines, with the federal government second at 24 percent, followed by private companies (8%) and non-profits (4%). Table 2 shows the prominence of states in headlines that name people or organizations.

Table 1: Top 15 states in prominence in AASHTO’s Daily Transportation Update, 2006-2011 (n=12,484)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO. CASES</th>
<th>% CASES SELECTED</th>
<th>% ALL CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALIFORNIA</td>
<td>1407</td>
<td>11.27%</td>
<td>5.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
<td>2.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLINOIS</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXAS</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORIDA</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
<td>1.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON STATE</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEORGIA</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNSYLVANIA</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRGINIA</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSACHUSETTS</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>3.12%</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSOURI</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>2.36%</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINNESOTA</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARIZONA</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>2.21%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER STATES</td>
<td>5257</td>
<td>42.11%</td>
<td>18.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12484</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>45.10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the federal government category, the US DOT is by far the most prominent, appearing in about three-quarters of the captured cases, followed by the Department of Homeland Security and the White House. The Office of the US DOT Secretary dominates the US DOT category (36%) with the modal agencies as follows: FAA (27%), FHWA (12%), RITA (6%) and the FTA (4%). Within the nonprofit category, the top three organizations are the National Research Council (25%), AASHTO (16%) and the Republican Party (10%).

In terms of individuals, US DOT Secretary Ray LaHood is by far the most prominent, appearing 457 times or in about two percent of all headlines, followed by President Barack Obama (255 citations) and then by Representatives Oberstar and Mica, President George W. Bush and former US DOT Secretary Mary Peters.
Modal breakdowns: When we break down the headlines into categories that examine the prominence of different types of transportation, we find that motorized transportation is dominant. The headlines reflect an emphasis on motorized transportation and infrastructure to support those forms of transportation. In this case, the dictionary includes all motorized forms of transportation and the related infrastructure (e.g., roads, bridges, tunnels, shipping, cars, buses, trains, trucks, freight) and compares this to a category that includes specific mentions to nonmotorized transportation such as walking, biking, and land use changes to reduce sprawl.

About 94 percent of the captured headlines refer to a form of motorized transportation, leaving less than six percent to address other forms of mobility. Within the nonmotorized category – keeping in mind that the total numbers are small – quality of life/land use type issues are cited in about 42 percent of the cases, followed by bikes (34%) and pedestrians (22%).

This dictionary also includes subcategories of the major modes. In this case, we created subcategories that aligned with the number of headlines. The subcategories include roads (all
mentions of cars, trucks, bridges, tunnels, roads, etc.), air travel (airports, air travel, etc.), marine shipping (ports and related freight issues) and freight rail and transit (passenger rail, commuter rail, buses, transit systems). Issues related to roads and road travel were the most prominent within the captured cases (36%), followed by air travel (20%), transit (15%), freight rail (14%) and marine shipping (9%).

Over time, the prominence of nonmotorized modes has increased within the selected articles. Figure 2 shows changes in these categories over time.

**Changes during U.S. Administrations:** The headlines cover the last three years of the administration of President George W. Bush and the first three years of the administration of President Barack Obama. Here we compare the modal breakdown during these two administrations. Table 3 shows the percentage breakdown of nonmotorized vs. road-related AASHTO headlines during both the Bush and Obama administrations. The percentage of headlines mentioning nonmotorized transportation more than doubled from 2.42 percent of AASHTO headlines during the Bush administration to 5.60 percent during the Obama administration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROADS</td>
<td>3894</td>
<td>37.88%</td>
<td>4569</td>
<td>36.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR</td>
<td>2152</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
<td>2570</td>
<td>20.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSIT</td>
<td>1615</td>
<td>15.71%</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>14.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREIGHT RAIL</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>1740</td>
<td>13.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARINE SHIPPING</td>
<td>1136</td>
<td>11.05%</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>9.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONMOTORIZED</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>10280</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>12673</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AASHTO headlines focusing on roads were the most frequent modal category in both the Bush (38%) and Obama (36%) administrations. While the shift in the percentage of AASHTO headlines dealing with roads only decreases between the Bush and Obama administrations, there is a slight increase in the nonmotorized category, with its emphasis on quality of life, biking and walking.

In addition to a change in U.S. presidential administrations, the data provides an opportunity to examine potential changes in the context of a change in leadership of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee (House T&I Committee)—the authorizing committee of several transportation-related agencies including the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal
Aviation Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration and the Department of Transportation. In November 2010, the chairman of the House T&I Committee, James Oberstar (D-MN), was defeated in his reelection bid. The Republican majority, which gained control of the House of Representatives following the 2010 election, nominated John Mica (R-FL) to become the chair of the House T&I committee in January 2011.

Table 4 shows the percentages of AASHTO headlines in the nonmotorized and road transportation modal categories for both Oberstar (from 2008-2010) and Mica (2011). This table shows an increase (~6.00%) in nonmotorized transportation headlines from Oberstar’s chairmanship to that of John Mica.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>JAMES OBERSTAR (2008-10)</th>
<th>% SELECTED CASES</th>
<th>JOHN MICA (2011)</th>
<th>% SELECTED CASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTORIZED</td>
<td>13753</td>
<td>96.32%</td>
<td>3891</td>
<td>91.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NONMOTORIZED</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>3.68%</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>8.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>14278</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>4266</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Prominence of “crumbling infrastructure” news stories in AASHTO headlines for the period 18 months prior to the August 1, 2007, collapse of the I-35W bridge and the 18 months following the collapse (n=280)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NO. CASES</th>
<th>% SELECTED CASES</th>
<th>% ALL CASES IN SELECTED TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 months prior to Bridge Collapse</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>28.93%</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 months after Bridge Collapse</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>71.07%</td>
<td>2.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases in Time Frame</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>2.35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another internal shock to the transportation subsystem that occurred during the span of the collected AASHTO headlines was the collapse of the Interstate 35W bridge span in Minneapolis, Minnesota. During the evening rush hour on August 1, 2007, the I-35 West bridge span that takes the highway over the Mississippi River collapsed, killing 13 and injuring 145. The bridge was the fifth-busiest bridge in the state, carrying over 140,000 vehicles per day (MPR News, 2007). Immediately following the collapse, there was significant media coverage focusing on the state of American transportation infrastructure and particularly the decaying of bridges across the country (Watts & Frick, 2012). In this category we searched for words related to compromised infrastructure, e.g. crumbling, collapse, falling apart, etc.
Table 5 shows an increase in the number and percentage of AASHTO headlines relating to repairing crumbling infrastructure in the year and a half following the Minnesota bridge collapse.

**Discussion**

We turn now to examining the *Daily Transportation Update* in the context of the theoretical expectations of the Advocacy Coalition Framework. As an important provider of information within the transportation subsystem, AASHTO plays a critical role in shaping and reinforcing the dominant policy and core beliefs within the subsystem. From the descriptive statistics presented in Tables 2 and 3, it is clear that the news headlines reflect the core beliefs of the dominant advocacy coalition within the transportation subsystem—support for road-building and support for motorized modes of transportation. By examining the relative changes in the content of AASHTO’s *Daily Transportation Update* over time, we were able to gain insights into the role of external and internal shocks in changing or reinforcing the dominant beliefs of the subsystem.

One of the major theoretical expectations of the ACF is that external shocks to the subsystem such as a change in administrations or authorizing committee leadership can lead to a change in the dominant belief system within the subsystem. There is no larger external shock to a subsystem than a change in a presidential administration (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1993). New presidential administrations bring a sharp change in beliefs and agendas within government as political appointees who head federal agencies are typically replaced with new officials who are responsible for monitoring bureaucratic activity and communicating the president’s vision to the media, stakeholders and employees (Lewis, 2008). As many of the communications represented in AASHTO’s *Update* deal with coverage of or reaction to news produced by heads of transportation agencies, it is likely that the turnover of presidential administrations, particularly when moving from an administration of one political party to another, will result in some change in the content of AASHTO’s selection of stories and therefore a change in the beliefs within the transportation subsystem.

As the dataset of AASHTO daily transportation headlines ranges from 2006-2011, it covers the last three years of the administration of President George W. Bush and the first three years of the administration of President Barack Obama. By comparing the modal breakdown of the AASHTO *Daily Update*, we can gain insight into the core and policy beliefs of the transportation subsystem during these two administrations and see how, if at all, the relative dominance of the highway coalition changed between presidential administrations.

Table 4 (above) illustrates that the percentage of headlines about nonmotorized transportation more than doubled, from 2.42 percent of AASHTO headlines during the Bush administration to 5.60 percent during the Obama administration. Table 4 indicates a potential shift in the secondary beliefs of the transportation subsystem towards nonmotorized transportation alternatives between the Bush and Obama administrations.

While the shift in the percentage of AASHTO headlines dealing with roads only decreases slightly (from about 38 percent to 36 percent) between the Bush and Obama administrations, the increase in the percentage of headlines dealing with nonmotorized transportation indicates a
potential minor shift in the belief system of the transportation subsystem. The increase in nonmotorized headlines was consistent with the Obama Administration’s increased emphasis on “livability” measures, often translated as making cities more pedestrian and biker friendly.

Still, this analysis suggests that the highway coalition withstood the external shock of a change in presidential administrations and remained the dominant coalition within the transportation subsystem. For example, during the debate over the Obama Administration’s “livability” transportation initiatives, AASHTO Executive Director John Horsley said: “What’s been missing from the national dialogue on livability is what can be accomplished through road-related improvements...The next authorization bill must take into account the important role played by road-related investments in enhancing communities” (Streetsblog, 2012b).

In July 2012, Congress approved a two-year reauthorization of federal transportation funding. State DOTs and AASHTO were seen as the policy winners, while organizations calling for increased funding on alternatives to automobility were the losers. As the transportation news service, Streetsblog, reported: “For Americans who want federal policy to support safe streets, sustainable transportation, and livable neighborhoods, there were few bright spots in the transportation bill... But state transportation departments are celebrating. They scored victory after victory, getting a bigger share of federal funding with fewer rules and regulations attached” (Streetsblog, 2012c).

Nohrstedt and Weible (2010) note that one factor in determining whether a shock to the subsystem will change the dominant policy beliefs is the policy and geographic proximity to the subsystem. Given this assumption, we might have expected that a change in presidential administrations may not have had an impact on the core or policy beliefs of a subsystem while a change in the Congressional committee responsible for authorizing transportation-related agencies would have had a greater impact on the beliefs of the subsystem. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee (House T&I Committee) is the authorizing committee of several transportation-related agencies including the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Aviation Administration, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the Department of Transportation.

Table 4 (above) shows the percentages of AASHTO headlines in the nonmotorized and road transportation modal categories for both Oberstar (from 2008-2010) and Mica (2011). This table illustrates an increase (from 4 percent to 9 percent) in nonmotorized transportation headlines from Oberstar’s House T&I Committee chairmanship to that of John Mica. Based on their transportation policy preferences, one would expect a higher number of daily headlines related to nonmotorized transportation during Representative Oberstar’s tenure as chairman than during Chairman Mica’s. However, the increase in nonmotorized headlines may be more directly related to the switch in party control in the House of Representatives and in the U.S. presidential administration. When the Republicans took over the majority in the House of Representatives following the 2010 midterm elections, Chairman Mica came out as a staunch opponent of the Obama Administration’s high-speed rail program and threatened to cut funding for pedestrian and bike-related projects (Snyder, 2011). The high proportion of nonmotorized headlines during the first year of Chairman Mica’s tenure may have been related to his opposition to the Obama
administration’s policies rather than to his attempt to proactively set a transportation policy agenda as the Chairman of the House T&I Committee.

Another internal shock to the transportation subsystem that occurred during the span of our AASHTO dataset was the collapse of the I-35W bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota. Immediately following the collapse, there was significant media coverage of the state of American infrastructure and particularly the decaying of bridges across the country. Given that both the policy and geographic proximity of the Minnesota Bridge collapse to the transportation subsystem and particularly the highway coalition, one would have expected a drastic shift in AASHTO headlines before and after the collapse. Specifically, we would have expected the number of headlines related to infrastructure, repairs, deferred maintenance, etc. to increase following the collapse.

Table 5 illustrates an increase in the number and percentage of AASHTO headlines relating to repairing crumbling infrastructure in the year and a half following the Minnesota bridge collapse. Specifically, we see that the percentage of infrastructure-related stories more than doubled in the year and a half following the collapse, when compared to the year and a half preceding the collapse. This example provides evidence of the ability of the dominant coalition within the transportation subsystem to reinforce its agenda and position of dominance following a large internal shock to the subsystem. However, the total number of headlines related to this category remains a small subset of total headlines. This may be because headlines related to transportation policy, funding, repair and investments are already incorporated into the headline selection database as part of the subsystem’s existing core beliefs.

Conclusion

Our analysis contributes to the advocacy coalition framework (ACF) literature in several ways. Overall, the selection of the news headlines illustrates the transportation subsystem’s continued core beliefs in motorized forms of transportation over nonmotorized. In total, about 94 percent of the selected headlines emphasize automobility over other approaches to transportation mobility. Furthermore, the emphasis on state DOTs and the federal government underscores core beliefs promoting the use of public funds for road building and maintenance.

Turning to the analysis of external and internal shocks, we find first that the transition of presidential administrations resulted in a shift in AASHTO’s selection of news headlines covering transportation policy. Specifically, headline selection shows a shift from the Bush Administration’s focus on motorized highway transportation towards the Obama Administration’s nonmotorized and livability agenda. Secondly, we examined the impact that the change in the heads of powerful Congressional authorizing committees has on reinforcing the core and policy beliefs of the subsystem. Here the results are harder to interpret, suggesting that the external shock of the change in presidential administrations may have had greater impact on news headline selection than the change in committee chairs. Finally, we confirm and expand upon the findings of Nohrstedt and Weible (2010) by showing that the I-35W bridge collapse was an internal shock to the transportation subsystem that led to a reinforcement of the dominant core and policy beliefs of the subsystem.
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“Reinventing” Higher Education: Symbolism, Sloganeering, and Subjectivity in the Lone Star State

Staci M. Zavattaro and Terence M. Garrett

Faculty performance data released by Texas A&M University and the University of Texas – the only two major public research universities in the country to have released such detailed data – for the first time shines a bright light on higher education’s faculty productivity gap. The data shows in high relief what anecdotally many have long suspected, that the research university’s employment practices look remarkably like a Himalayan trek, where indigenous Sherpas carry the heavy loads so Western tourists can simply enjoy the view.

—Richard O’Donnell, former consultant to the University of Texas Board of Regents

Introduction

Higher education is part and parcel of a market spectacle (Debord 1967/1994; Garrett and Sementelli 2012) that follows some prescriptions of reinventing government (Osborne and Gaebler 1993), essentially charging these institutions with inefficient operations and minimal customer service standards. Following the “reinventing government” qua business model, any semblance of public service (Denhardt and Denhardt 2007) – now including public colleges and universities – that ignores “customers” is under attack. While governance values shifted with these business-based movements (Box, et al 2001), higher education values, too, have moved universities from producing academic capital to economic capital (Naidoo and Jamieson 2005).

The professorial ranks, in particular, are being scrutinized as part of a politically charged agenda that makes an explicit assumption that could possibly lead to their employment “restructuring” or elimination if they do not succumb to prescriptions of individuals who, and organizations that, advocate that teaching duties are more important to the general public than research activities. Traditionally, in the academy, these aspects are part of a seemingly equal triumvirate – research, teaching and service. Attacks on higher education throughout the United States, and elsewhere,
threaten to kick out important legs of the professoriate’s responsibility to society and the profession.

One person who promotes the teaching-above-all approach is Richard “Rick” O’Donnell, quoted above, who gained notoriety in Texas for making controversial remarks regarding faculty productivity within the state’s public higher education institutions. The quotation at the outset of this paper is an introduction to a 2011 report O’Donnell released regarding the costs of higher education in Texas. O’Donnell, a well-known conservative who once worked for the Texas Public Policy Foundation (TPPF) pushing for higher education reform by devaluing research, analyzed faculty productivity within the above-mentioned report (O’Donnell 2011).

To classify faculty productivity, O’Donnell developed a 2x2 matrix based on teaching (“course load based on credit hours taught”) and research (“dollar value of externally funded research”) (p.1). Labels in the matrix include Coasters (low teaching and research), Pioneers (high research, low teaching), Sherpas (high teaching, low research) and Stars (high teaching and research). The attempt by the TPPF – a non-profit research organization that aims to promote liberty and free enterprise – is to extract surplus value from the work of the Texas professoriate, categorized as productive laborers (Harvie 2006).

A special dot off the 2x2 matrix indicates faculty who are Dodgers, “the least productive faculty, who bring in no external research funding, teach few students and cost nearly ten times as much as Sherpas to teach one student one class; in essence they’ve figured out how to dodge any but the most minimal of responsibilities” (O’Donnell 2011, 1). As one potential solution, O’Donnell recommended eliminating said faculty Dodgers and increasing the student population in a Coaster’s classes by 97 students per year. (We acknowledge here that Dodgers do exist, but, we believe, they are the minority and an enticing image used to promulgate the “lazy professor” myth. The Dodger classification could work within any organization, not just academe.)

He identified these unproductive faculty members within both the University of Texas and the Texas A&M systems, imploring lawmakers to take immediate measures to remove such academics to save students, parents and taxpayers money. Gov. Rick Perry is taking seriously these suggestions and others like them from the Texas Public Policy Foundation, even before the O’Donnell 2011 report. For example, the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, the state agency overseeing higher education programs, recommended modifying funding formulas for universities, colleges and community colleges to be commensurate with results (graduation) rather than enrollment (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board 2010).

As such, it becomes prudent to examine effects of business-based interventions into higher education, as business values often run counter to values of higher education (Delucchi and Korgen 2002; Naidoo and Jamieson 2005). Our paper, then, explores the following question: How can Morgan’s images of organization (2006) help explain the transformation of higher education policies and organizational practices in Texas? Essentially, we focus the answer of this question on politicians, administrators and faculty. We leave aside, except anecdotally, the effects of marketization on students, as we feel that students ultimately are directly impacted by what happens to those three groups who are, for all intents and purposes, in control of their educational futures.
We analyzed the University of Texas and Texas A&M systems, the state’s largest, using three images from Morgan (2006): organizations as cultures; political systems; and psychic prisons. Each lens explained part of the transformation of higher education within Texas, but came together to frame the effects on higher education values in general. We chose to use Morgan as a foundation because of his concepts’ recognition in organizational studies, even including higher education settings (Simsek 1997). More specifically, we found the three lenses to be particularly useful in explaining the situation in Texas simply because of the myriad players involved. We did not choose, for example, Morgan’s brains or machines metaphors because they did not provide us with the kind of insight we were looking for when trying to better understand the political, decision-making, business climate in the state.

We admit here our approach might be a bit biased toward the faculty side, as we serve in that capacity. Some might describe our piece as polemical, and we indeed embrace that label. We further submit that making our case – that of defending traditional academe, the protection of academic freedom, and faculty governance on behalf of the professoriate – is important to the ultimate survival of the public university based on corporatist-ideological attacks on those institutions (Garrett and Sementelli 2012). We welcome the debate as to the shape of the American academy in the present and future and offer suggestions and questions for future research in this regard.

The paper begins with a brief overview of reform movements within an American higher education context. Then we outline the University of Texas and Texas A&M Systems before turning toward Morgan’s images as mechanisms to understand the rhetoric taking place in Texas – and throughout the country. In our concluding section, we offer a possible solution as well as a future research agenda in this area.

“Reinventing” Higher Education

As we noted in the preceding section, cushioned within an overall move of public administration toward commodification and marketization is a parallel transformation within higher education. Similar to popular bureaucrat bashing, especially that arose with management movements encouraging governments to run like businesses, came academia/academic bashing. (The quote at the outset of this paper illustrates this point.)

Many reform movements get lumped under the reinvention umbrella (Frederickson 1996) – Total Quality Management, New Public Management and Reinventing Government itself. We do not go into nuances of each, or engage in the debate about differences between the theories. (For a critique of these management movements, see, for example, Garrett 2006; Zavattaro Forthcoming.) The major takeaway from each we employ here is the notion of pushing business practices and values, especially efficiency, as central tenets of public administration, a notion considered antithetical to a well-functioning democracy (Waldo 1948/2007), which, at its core, serves pluralistic interests in a messy fashion.

Scholars have critiqued market movements in myriad manners. To illustrate, Fox (1996) argues that reinventing government is internally logically inconsistent. “Market theory is based on
atomistic individualism whereas community is based on group solidarity-deeply contradictory social philosophies. Paperying over them with an epiphenomenal one-liner [embracing both business markets and community] is at best naive, at worst cynical; either way, it is postmodern’ (Fox 1996, 258). The problem with such a “reorganizational” goal, however, is that business values and practices marginalize the organization-public relationship at the expense of public participation and substantive democracy (Box et al 2001; Zanetti and Adams 2000).

Within higher education, market-based reform movements also have taken hold, becoming part of an overall market spectacle (Garrett and Sementelli 2012). Universities traditionally are structured to provide “available knowledge” (Miller 2003, 898) to interested students, delivered by professional instructors and administrators. Miller puts in bluntly: “Colleges have transformed into big businesses” (902), effectively morphing academic organizational culture from one of public good delivery to one of commodity production.

Institutionally, public higher education has a culture and history of engendering trust with the public, as members collectively provide service to society. As Carnevale (1995, 22) notes,

> For [a public] organization, how it chooses to organize and operate symbolizes its assumptions about how much it trusts its members. An organization makes choices about whether communication systems are open or closed, decides whether jobs allow some measure of autonomy or are carefully regulated, shows confidence in the knowhow of its members by encouraging participation in decision making or devalues the intelligence of staff by ignoring their advice. It reaches for moral involvement and mutual commitment or relies excessively on transactional or contractual means to enforce agreements. It encourages or suppresses voice and demonstrates a tolerance or resistance of dissent. It drives at ensuring procedural justice or is arbitrary in disciplining members. It earns a reputation for ethical conduct in dealings with employees and clients or is greeted with well-deserved cynicism by both. It favors either explicit formalisms or implicit values.

As such, knowledge within many organizations (not only higher education) has become commodified (Suddaby and Greenwood 2001; Garrett and Sementelli 2012). Knowledge commodification takes expert-level, managerial knowledge out of its contextual frame and reduces it into transferable goods (Suddaby and Greenwood 2001), effectively negating the benefits of tacit knowledge. Professionals often are the ones driving institutional change and reform (Suddaby and Viale 2011), so altering professional culture in academia at the street-level (here, professors) could influence knowledge management and transfer. To illustrate, economic and capital production (pushing professors to bring in external funding) could eclipse traditional spheres of knowledge production, student learning and the social charter (Nickolai, Hoffman and Trautner 2012).

Moreover, there also is a shift in how students see their roles in the university. Especially when constructed as customers, students are more likely to feel entitled to a grade or even take a course that guarantees a higher grade without learning substantive material (Delucchi and Korgen 2002). This clashes with how faculty view their roles, which is to proffer public service values, teach critical thinking, and help master discipline-specific knowledge (Higher Education
Ultimately, student/professor/community ties become transactional rather than transformational (Gibbs 2001).

Examining the literature regarding reform movements and higher education, several patterns emerge that neatly parallel (naturally?) with critiques levied against reform movements in public administration in general – shifts in service provision, accountability, and equity.

First, service provision values took a new focus from delivering competent students and developing competent researchers to providing more not necessarily better qualified students to “a citizenry that is ready to produce consumables, as well as become comestible” (Giberson and Giberson 2009, 3). Society is meant to benefit from higher education both from the professoriate producing research and students becoming employees in chosen specialties and actively engaged citizens. Second, accountability shifted from the societal, political and plural (academia, in general, is accountable to myriad audiences) to the political only (Romzek and Dubnick 1987), as performance measures and quantitative data replaced broader, less easily measurable effects of higher education. The market-based shift in higher education took place when “public policies combined with market mechanisms particularly in the 1970s and 1980s when political accountability took professional judgment in universities as the quality mechanism” (Huisman and Currie 2004, 532).

Externally controlled accountability measures took responsibility out of the institution’s hands and placed it within political confines, be it state legislatures or other funding agencies. Institutions were left, largely, at the whim of political shifts (McLendon, Deaton and Hearn 2007). Broadly speaking, students become “customers” who should perceive value for dollars invested (Huisman and Currie 2004, 533; see also Wills 2009). Customers are put into a passive, take-it-or-leave-it, often non-dialogic role with organizational masters; this is antithetical to substantive democracy (Box et al, 2001).

Accountability should have many pillars, lest one form of accountability overshadow another (Romzek and Dubnick 1987). Government policy makers are imploring universities to produce more output (graduating students) with fewer inputs (budget allocations) in the name of increased accountability (ACE 2010). Overall, reform movements made higher education institutions and employees accountable to political masters alone (Huisman and Currie 2004), instead of bureaucratic, political, professional and legal (Romzek and Dubnick 1987). All four together should, ideally, improve democratic decision making.

Finally, equity often is sacrificed in the name of efficiency under the managerialist (or new public management) approach (Rosenbloom, Kravchuk and Clerkin 2009) – what is efficient is not necessarily effective or fair (McLendon, Deaton and Hearn 2007; Garrett 2006). To address the equity issue, for example, the World Bank recommended overhauling tertiary education so countries can compete in a globalized, knowledge-based society (World Bank 2002). The report addressed equity in higher education, noting that most students worldwide do not have access to adequate, or any, financial assistance, leaving them behind in the knowledge-driven society – unequal access to a commonly public good. Equity as a value construct, perhaps tied conceptually in citizens’ minds to tenets of socialism in the current era of corporatization, may be taboo as a viable alternative to efficiency and runs counter to American ideals of capitalism.
As such, corporate values in the American ideology prevail—especially in higher education (Garrett and Sementelli 2012).

Organizational Images and Texas Higher Education

With foundational and background material given, we can now turn to Morgan’s (2006) lenses through which scholars and practitioners can examine organizational development and behavior. For example, when one speaks about organizations as machines, the idea of a closed, rigid system comes to mind. Contrast this with an organization as organism, and one thinks more about a dynamic, open system interacting with, and feeding off of, its environment. Looking at the manipulation of imagery to achieve an organizational point already has precedence within the literature (see Fox 1996).

This paper utilizes Morgan’s images of organizations as cultures, political systems, and psychic prisons to explore how business values potentially change the culture, maneuvering and decision making within academia. Each metaphor is treated one by one but come together to understand organizational development and behavioral effects of rhetorical prescriptions noted above. While there are several metaphorical approaches we could have taken, for space limitations we chose the metaphors we believe were most apt to analyze public management of higher education in Texas. We focused attention on politicians, administrators and faculty, as each should, ideally, work together to foster goals of higher education. As we saw—and continue to see—in Texas, that is not always the case.

Before delving into the images, we offer a brief background on the two Texas systems upon which our analysis focused. We turned our attention toward the University of Texas and Texas A&M Systems because, taken together, institutions within each statistically reach most of the state either by directly educating students, interacting with the community (service learning), employing people, or contributing to an overall field (via research).

The University of Texas System (UT System) is made up of nine universities and six health institutions (The University of Texas System 2011a). An appointed Board of Regents supervises the system, with the chancellor reporting directly to the board. An 1876 Texas constitutional mandate established, along with legislative action five years later, an education system to be called the University of Texas, which has since grown to include the branches given above (The University of Texas System 2011b). UT Austin is the state’s flagship institution, and other system universities are located throughout the state. The system includes more than 18,800 faculty members and more than 68,500 staff members. Student enrollment tops 211,200, with 43,274 students earning degrees (The University of Texas System 2011c).

The UT System’s overall budget for Fiscal Year 2011 was $12.8 billion, with $2.37 billion going toward research expenditures in Fiscal Year 2010 (The University of Texas System 2011c). Within the system, most of the money goes toward the healthcare institutions, followed by instruction and research, respectively. Depending upon the institution, tuition costs remain relatively low, with many students receiving some kind of financial assistance, thus reducing the
cost of per-year attendance for students (The University of Texas System 2011c). These figures will later play into statistical representations of faculty efficiency.

Rivaling the UT System is the Texas A&M System (A&M System), which comprises 11 universities, seven state agencies, and a health science center (Texas A&M System 2011a). The A&M System reaches more than 120,000 students and employs more than 28,000 faculty and staff. The A&M System also has a Board of Regents and chancellor to govern its operations. Though universities date back to 1876, the system was officially recognized in 1948 (Texas A&M System 2011b).

During Fiscal Year 2011, the A&M System, like all other public agencies in the state, faced mandatory budget reductions. Cutting five percent from the system totaled an $80 million loss, supplementing that with only a marginal 2.41 percent tuition and fee increase (Texas A&M System 2011c). During Fiscal Year 2009, the system spent more than $731 million on research-related activities such as equipment and maintenance (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, 2010). Texas A&M University, the largest institution within the system, invests $652 million in research activities (Texas A&M System 2011d).

With this background given, we can now begin to utilize Morgan’s images of organizations as cultures, political systems and psychic prisons (2006) to shed light on the relationship between faculty, administrators and politicians within the systems. Ultimately, these discourses and constructions affect student learning, the social contract, morale, productivity and much more within a university setting.

**Texas Higher Education as Organizational Culture**

We begin with the organizational culture lens, which refers to: the development of organizations as cultural phenomena, societal culture, and culture within the organization itself. We focus on the latter conceptualization. Organization culture is germane to the particular organization and serves as an overarching guiding principle “created and sustained by social processes, images, symbols, and ritual” (Morgan 2006, 128; see also Bolman and Deal 1991). Social cues become institutional myths that guide overall employee and organization practices.

There can be cultural divisions within the organization, which often are referred to as subcultures. For example, the UT and A&M Systems have cultures at the macro levels, and each system institution (i.e. UT Austin, UT Arlington, etc.) has its own organization culture and subcultures (micro level). Overall, micro, institution-level cultures should relate back to respective system macros cultures.

In light of reinvention/business methods affecting higher education service delivery, there is an organizational culture clash taking place within Texas between: 1) Boards of Regents-favored business norms and the 2) traditionally more democratic and collegially based norms favored by professors and staff. (We mean more democratic when compared to business-based models of higher education that, as we noted, place efficiency above a social contract.) To illustrate the root of these cultural clashes, we looked at the backgrounds of politically appointed Board of Regents members. The A&M system board included (as of this writing) a
dentist, insurance salesman, a former ExxonMobil executive, a bank executive, lawyer, and accountant (Texas A&M System 2011d). UT System Regents included former oil executives, a real estate developer, an engineer, and business owners (The University of Texas System 2010). None, at least according to available biographies, have direct experience in higher education.

What most had in common, though, was a tie to Texas Governor Rick Perry. For example, UT System Regents Chairman Eugene Powell recently came under fire for actively campaigning for Perry’s presidential campaign in 2011. Despite a seeming conflict of interest, Regents remain private citizens who can donate to, and actively participate in, political campaigns (Hamilton 2011a). Indeed, “regents appointed by Perry have given more than $5.8 million to his campaigns over the past decade” (Hamilton 2011a, para. 7). Such conflicts led the State of Texas to examine conflict of interest policies governing the Regents (Hamilton 2011b).

Another controversy surrounded UT System Regent Alex Cranberg, an energy company executive who became a Regent two weeks after moving to, and registering to vote in, Texas (Hamilton 2011c). Cranberg had ties to Governor Perry and other political allies who wished to revamp higher education by making universities operate more efficiently by raising class sizes and devaluing research (Hamilton 2011c). Moreover, Cranberg was linked to Jeff Sandefer, “a board member at an influential Austin-based conservative think tank known as the Texas Public Policy Foundation – the source of many of the reforms being implemented at A&M that have set the old academic guard off kilter” (Hamilton 2011d, para. 3). UT Regent Brenda Pejovich also is on the TPPF board.

The second element present in the cultural conflict involved professors and professional staff. Considering that universities are diverse in reach and scope, there cannot be one universal definition of academic culture. Several characteristics, perhaps, are shared: broad, discipline-specific and institution-specific goals are difficult to measure; internal and external stakeholders are diverse; professional staff are varied and require myriad and varied training; university environments change frequently; and belief systems often differ between professors and administrators (Bartell 2003). “Professors tend to place a high value on autonomy and academic freedom, while administrators are oriented to maintenance of the administrative system and the associated procedural requirements” (ibid, 53).

As such, universities are not ideal places to implement rigid business-based structures of governance (Bartell 2003). Faculty often are loath to give into an organizational cultural change that counters those norms and values. Within universities, beliefs about what constitutes good teaching – and how to effectively measure it – are at the core of the current struggle between university administrators (driven by external boards and politicians) and higher education teachers transmitting knowledge in their respective disciplines to their students (Entwistle, Skinner, Entwistle and Orr 2000).

To illustrate the cultural clash manifesting itself in policy recommendations, the aforementioned Texas Public Policy Foundation devised what it called Seven Solutions to reforming higher education. The Seven Solutions are: “measure teaching efficiency and effectiveness”; “publicly recognize and reward extraordinary teachers”; “split research and teaching budgets to encourage excellence in both”; “require evidence of teaching skills for tenure”; “use ‘results-based’
contracts with students to measure quality;” “put state funding directly into the hands of students;” and “create results-based accrediting alternatives” (Texas Public Policy Foundation n.d.). Academic research often is the backbone of academia, generating grant funding and publications in journals or books. The TPFF argues that separating research and teaching budgets “allows for excellence in both but others worry [it] merely lays the groundwork to choose the latter over the former, particularly because it is less expensive” (Hamilton 2011d, para. 14).

To reiterate, organization culture is socially constructed (Morgan 2006). Symbolic elements of each side clashed in Texas, showcased by Regents using symbols of wastefulness and professors using symbols of democracy to further their respective points. As one TPFF adviser put it: “It is commonplace now for professors to teach only two classes, or six hours a week, per semester, with release time from the classroom to conduct research. And what are we getting? A recent study issued by the American Enterprise Institute reveals, for example, that from 1980 to 2006, 21,674 scholarly articles were published on Shakespeare. Do we need the 21,675th?” (Trowbridge 2011, para. 4).

Texas Higher Education Organizations as Political Systems

As we can tell from the analysis above, there is a clash between traditional political and academic cultures taking place in Texas. The second organizational lens we employed was organizations as political systems. The political systems image alludes to “the activities of rulers and ruled” within an organization (Morgan 2006, 150). It gives credence to power and authority relations between managers and employees, as well as to the supposedly “dirty” dealings between organization members. Overall, this image of organization refers to hierarchical relationships between executives, boards, supervisors and employees, as well as lateral exchanges between members of the organization. Such interrelations make this an appropriate lens to employ when examining the Texas higher education case.

Morgan (2006, 153) offers several systems of rule within organizations, all the way from autocracy to direct democracy. Within a university, faculty, through the collegial educational model of governance, would exhibit something close to a representative democracy, whereby elected officers act on behalf of the people; the parallel is a faculty senate. Cultural changes noted briefly above threaten to turn that collegial system in a technocracy, whereby knowledge and expert power rule the day (Hummel 2004; 2006).

Instead of organizations being neat, rational systems, organizations, within the scope of this image, appear as coalitions that “arise when groups of individuals get together to cooperate in relation to specific issues, events or decisions to advance specific values and ideologies” (Morgan 2006, 162). In other words, the metaphor sheds light upon the network approach to governance. Networks come together to tackle issues or concerns, in theory trying to prevent one coalition from dominating and controlling the organization. Within this framework, there is recognition that debate is healthy, that dissensus can emerge (Mouffe 1999).

We saw this pluralistic lens eroding in Texas in terms of accountability, which seemingly favored strictly political accountability. This happened because politically appointed Regents in each system carry out a politically driven agenda. Therefore, accountability, which should
consist of bureaucratic, political, professional and legal (Romzek and Dubnick 1987) aspects, became majority political. Bureaucratic and professional accountability were virtually removed amidst the rhetoric painting people, especially faculty, as wasteful. Faculty credibility was being diminished under such attacks, so accountability to them also waned.

We return to our two competing networks within the Texas case – politically appointed boards, and administrators and university faculty. Ultimately, it trickled down to students who might not receive personalized attention from professors teaching larger classes. Such is a concrete example of the efficiency versus effectiveness battle – it might be efficient to teach classes of 150 but not necessarily effective in terms of producing writing or critical thinking skills. (Note that we purposefully use qualifiers such as “could” and “might” throughout so we do not generalize that ALL professors who teach large classes do not get to know students. Generally, however, the former has been our experience and that of our colleagues.)

It is no secret that Governor Perry is a fiscally conservative Republican who traditionally derides federal intervention and extols states’ rights. Not surprisingly, Perry appointed political allies to each System’s Board of Regents. (We write not surprisingly because politicians, no matter the party, appoint like-minded supporters to key positions all the time.) These appointments, though, put the Regents at odds with university administrators. For example, UT System Regents Chairman Powell, who donated more than $56,000 to Perry’s past campaigns, “pledged to cut costs and to do all he can to hold tuition level or even lower it. That echoes themes sounded by Perry, whose proposed budget for higher education essentially mirrors the House and Senate versions. In contrast, UT System Chancellor Francisco Cigarroa warned last month that proposed reductions would have ‘immediate and future devastating consequences for our students, patients, faculty, staff and the communities of Texas’” (Haurwitz 2011, paras. 21 and 22, emphasis added).

Political leanings, and suggestions to reform higher education based upon them, of Regents also put them at odds with other lawmakers in the state. For example, State Sen. Judith Zaffirini, a Democrat who chaired the body’s Higher Education Committee, took issue with Powell’s assertions that: the UT System should increase enrollment at system schools, especially UT Austin; reduce tuition costs by nearly half; and add a low-cost bachelor’s degree – in the ballpark of $10,000 total – to current offerings (Hacker 2011). (The $10,000 degree, though, apparently has been accomplished as of March 2012 (Caldwell 2012).) Zaffirini wrote: “I am dismayed by the extensive negative publicity caused by the actions of Chair Powell. Since his election in February he has caused a firestorm of negativity that is detrimental to UT-Austin, to the system, to higher education in general—and to his relationship with legislators” (Hacker 2011, para. 7).

In terms of implementing these political suggestions, the A&M System produced a report based on the TPPF’s “Seven Solutions” regarding faculty cost-benefit to the university. The report was based on an analysis that looked essentially at professor salary, versus students taught, versus research dollars brought in (Mangan 2010). When salary outweighs these supposed benefits, the professor is seen as inefficient. “Critics say the measure is simplistic and doesn't take into account much of the work faculty members do, including advising students, grading papers, and serving on committees” (Mangan 2010, para. 6).
Critics of the A&M report believe that the A&M System has implemented, in spirit or practice, some of the Seven Solutions (Patel 2010). For example, Patel (2010) reported that A&M embraced the TPFF’s suggestion of merit raises based on student evaluations, which are often anonymous, as well as measured professor efficiency based on number of students taught. The more students a professor teaches, the less he or she costs the university, as each student represents a dollar figure – according to the TPFF. One professor quoted in the article “taught 561 students that year in large classes. He generated more than twice his salary in just student tuition dollars” (Patel 2010, para. 25). The politically inspired economic emphasis of these cost-benefit comparisons amounts to a truncated depiction of the work of professors and instructors in the academy and their overall value to their institutions and the public.

To reiterate, these examples showcase a one-sided political debate centering on efficiency, as defined by politically appointed, business-minded boards of regents, and a silencing within the political sphere of those ideologically opposed to these changes. Accountability, then, shifted to solely political rather than political, bureaucratic, professional and legal (Romzek and Dubnick 1987).

**Texas Higher Education Organizations as Psychic Prisons**

The final image used was organizations as psychic prisons, which “joins the idea that organizations are ultimately created and sustained by conscious and unconscious processes, with the notion that people can actually become imprisoned in or confined by the images, ideas, thoughts, and actions to which these processes give rise” (Morgan 2006, 207). The image is a direct tie to Plato’s allegory of the cave (Reeve 2004). Within that story, people are confined within an underground cave, bound only to look forward. Light from a fire behind them casts shadows on the wall, which the prisoners perceive as reality. Emergence from the cave upsets this frame of reality, leading to confusion and skepticism. The metaphor “[explores] some of the ways in which organizations and their members become trapped by constructions of reality that, at best, give an imperfect grasp on the world” (Morgan 2006, 208).

We applied this frame to analyze differences in the relationships and perceptions of the two main constituencies upon which our research has focused – politicians and faculty. Each group has the potential to get stuck in ideological views, thus casting proverbial shadows on the wall that represent a fictionalized reality and a stalemate toward deciding how to best execute higher education objectives in Texas. Within this frame, all three lenses come together to paint an overall picture of the effects of market-minded changes in higher education. Within the cave, shadows become reality for the prisoners (Reeve 2004). Ideologically speaking, the same is happening when higher education in Texas is scrutinized, especially through the political systems and culture lenses. Each side – faculty, administration, politicians, students, the community, etc. – has its own view of the world that becomes reality. In this case, we focused on political ideologies clashing with faculty ideologies, thus creating two divergent views of reality. As with any competing tales, perhaps somewhere in the middle lies the truth.

One Truth being proffered is the “lazy academic.” As noted above, one insider termed these faculty members Dodgers (O’Donnell 2011). Dodgers do not bring in research funding and teach few classes – essentially wasting taxpayer dollars as the narrative goes. Regents for both systems
embraced this rhetoric, as discussed above, and tried to find data that supported their claims of inefficient university operations.

For example, at the request of the Regents, the UT system released a draft spreadsheet reporting faculty compensation, research expenditure, grade distribution and student satisfaction (The University of Texas System 2011d). Faculty, though, examined the data and uncovered numerous inaccuracies (June 2011). As one commenter on The Chronicle of Higher Education’s website noted: “Is this exercise in accountability a search for truth or a political tool?” (Hawki72 2011). The A&M System took similar steps, releasing the faculty report cited above.

To counter these images, faculties within the UT and A&M systems have issued reports regarding efficient operations – the faculty version of Truth. Marc Musick, associate dean for student affairs in the UT Austin College of Liberal Arts (as of this writing), compiled a report (Musick 2011) that detailed that institution’s efficient operations. According to the document, UT Austin is the “second most efficient public research university when considering graduation rates and comparing the amount of public money received to the percentage of students who graduate and the number of professors employed” (Musick 2011, 6). (Topping the list is the University of Florida.) Musick compiled the study based on data from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. Based on tuition dollars and state funding received, coupled with the number of professors instructing students, UT Austin’s efficiency ranking came out second. One shortcoming noted in the report is the relatively low graduation rate at the institution.

Interestingly, each side often utilized the same set of numbers yet came to wildly different conclusions to further its reality. These brief examples, within this section and throughout, showcased how faculty battle administrators who are in turn combatting political appointees working closely with the governor. Seemingly, image control problems within the state are masking the reality that both faculty and administrators are not necessarily opposed to reducing costs of delivering a service, being more transparent about salary, and increasing quality skills given to students. Images, though, become powerful tools, thus stalling critical debate regarding this issue. In other words, each group gets stuck in its own cave, only seeing the shadows on the wall as reality.

Comments and Discussion

Assaults on higher education, and public service in general, come when there is a (real or perceived) waste of scarce resources. Governments at every level still are striving toward striking a balance between quality and efficiency. It is a never-ending tug of war that has found its way into the higher education discourse throughout the U.S. We focused attention specifically on the situation in Texas, drilling down into the state’s two largest systems – The University of Texas System and the Texas A&M System. To explore the effects of such rhetoric on higher education, we employed three images of organization: cultures, political systems and psychic prisons (Morgan 2006).
Each frame was independent but combined to paint a fuller picture of what was – and still is – taking place in Texas. Politicians and appointees seek to deliver services to customers (students) at the most cost-effective price. In turn, professors (specifically tenured or tenure-track faculty) argue they will have less time to focus on research endeavors and pedagogical improvement.

Professors being labeled as inefficient by the TPPF and others are the ones with reduced course loads for reasons that do not appear in, say, the UT system spreadsheet. For example, that data do not reflect: (1) if the person has an appointment in addition to being a professor (department chair, dean, other administrator, etc.); (2) student advising and working with graduate students (thesis chair, committee member, etc.); (3) number of publications; (4) departmental, college, university, and community service; and more. In other words, key aspects of the professoriate often get left out in favor of dollars in, dollars out data.

Morgan’s (2006) cultural, political systems and psychic prisons images provided our framework. Others, e.g., organizations as instruments of domination, organizations as brains, etc., could conceivably have been used to analyze the clash. We could have, for example, pursued an “instruments of domination” approach where we would have “employ[ed] a ‘radical,’ or critical, interpretation based primarily on concepts and social critiques developed by [Karl] Marx, by [Max] Weber and by [Guy] Debord, to offer a position, polemic, and perspective regarding the nature and effects of public management on the American polis” and higher education in general (Garrett and Sementelli 2012, 456). However, we thought that the political systems, culture, and psychic prisons frames best explained the conflict between political actors – the UT and A&M regents – and faculty.

So what are academicians to do? While we do not attempt to claim our suggestions are panaceas for change, we do think they are places to begin a logical discussion about the role of all the actors in the higher education process. To that end, we suggest revisiting complementarity (Svara 2001) to bring parties – students, faculty, staff, political actors, the public, interest groups, alumni and other stakeholders – into more of a mutual relationship that one dominated solely by the political group.

Svara (2001) argued that complementarity involves elected officials and administrators working together while retaining their own spheres of expertise to achieve mutual governance goals. For complementarity to work, administrators must be dedicated to accountability and responsiveness, while politicians understand administrative expertise and organizational commitment (Svara 2001). The underlying key to complementarity is mutual dialogue and shared work, so “the knowledge and values of those who do the ongoing work of government complement the knowledge and values of those who ultimately set the course for government and ensure that it stays on course” (180). By recognizing that all stakeholders in the learning community can engage together, the following could occur:

1) Organizations can begin changing cultures from adversarial to cooperative. Morgan (2006) noted that culture is a powerful driver for organization success. By working together, faculty and administration can ideally increase buy in and morale throughout the institution. Overall organizational culture change would need to occur
with top management and disseminate toward deans, department chairs, faculty and other campus leaders.

2) Faculty senates would be seen as legitimate sources of institutional knowledge. If complementarity is in place, faculty senates would be given a pronounced role in university policy making and in turn would be open to working with administration to design, pass and implement policies. In some universities, this might already be the case. Where it is not (where, for example, there remains an Academic Senate rather than a Faculty Senate), faculty and administrators should respect each other’s areas of expertise when working together.

3) Decision making would include faculty, students, staff, administrators and politicians. It would more resemble proposed models of inclusive citizen participation (King, Feltey and Susel 1998; King 2011). This would open up potential for engagement and participation across campus from these stakeholders. If culture changes, the university as a whole could be more open to transparent and inclusive decision making rules that, again, could engender increased buy in as opposed to decisions made in secret. Now, we certainly do not advocate that every single decision must be executed in this manner. Clearly that is not feasible. We suggest, for example, that sweeping policy changes should go before students, faculty, staff, administration and political actors who can work symbiotically to produce a policy outcome.

4) Each production sphere (Nickolai, Hoffman and Trautner 2012) would be considered equal. In a marketized state, generating research dollars and producing more, not necessarily better, graduates is the key to (perceived) success. Ideally, we should have universities that balance knowledge production, student learning and social obligation fulfillment. By understanding, as we have attempted to do here, underlying discourses from faculty, administrators and politicians, we can begin to speak the same language to possibly move toward this balance.

Each of these propositions, naturally, leads to further questions that should be addressed when thinking of American academy’s future:

1) How can Morgan’s other images (2006) be utilized to understand the current climate of U.S. higher education?
2) How can organizational culture shifts take place in a marketized environment?
3) What role does organizational communication play in either exacerbating or hindering complementarity?
4) How can each sphere – faculty, administration and political – work better together to achieve mutually beneficial goals?
5) What aspects of marketization can be harnessed to further the goals of each production sphere?
6) What role do students play in developing educational institutions? How can students be more involved in the discussion about the university’s role? How does their social construction as “consumers” affect how they feel about university life?
7) How can faculty and administrators improve the image of research in the university? In other words, is more community outreach needed in a knowledge economy (Nickolai Hoffman and Trautner, 2012) to: 1) better explain the purpose of research and 2) better connect town with gown in an applied manner?

9) How can we move higher education from a transactional basis to transformational one? Is such a shift even possible in light of marketization?

10) What role might traditional administrative values such as justice, fairness and democratic ethos play in higher education reform?

We welcome an ongoing political discourse on the fate of the academy, especially public higher education institutions in the twenty-first century.
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Reflections

Finding My Way

Margaret Morrissey

This self-study took place over an eight hour period on three weekend days. I took photographs as I walked along the five mile length of High Street that begins in Alameda at the San Francisco Bay and ends at the base of the Oakland Hills.

This is not starting out very well. Now I feel suspect too, besides conspicuous and self-conscious.

The tidal flats and shoreline beach, my favorite places, are just a block away. A man watches me from across the street. His arms are crossed over his chest and his feet are planted on his driveway beside his trimmed lawn. I am taking my first photograph at High Street’s beginning in Alameda, of a tree’s shadow in the morning light cast on the street. It might look from where he stands like I am taking a photo of him and/or his house. I reposition myself to make it clear that I am not aiming my camera at him. I do not acknowledge him. I finish what I am doing and walk nonchalantly on, maintaining what sense of private space I have under his watchful eyes. I could wave and go over and explain what I am doing. I have placed myself on the street with the wish to connect to people and observe myself relating to my surroundings, to pay attention to what I do and what I think as I do it. I refuse to engage him. He intimidates me. The street acts as a boundary, separating us like an unfordable river. I hope he does not know how to swim.

I have decided to explore how I experience isolation and belonging in new situations by walking four times the five-mile length of High Street, connecting the bay to the hills, while taking photographs with a borrowed camera of shadows cast on the street. Four times because I want to move beyond my first impressions, beyond isolation to relationship. Photographs of shadows because they symbolize the impressions I both receive and cast onto the street, but mostly because I like them and because I want something to do as I walk along. I have been traveling this route by car for almost a year, all the while making up stories about what and who I see along the way. Some stories are ongoing, with each commute adding a new chapter. Sometimes I include myself.
I have spent as many hours on this road as hours at my destination, if not more, a significant amount of time with a vast accumulation of impressions. A background anxiety infiltrates my emotions; I feel within my isolation a subtle fear of nothing in particular and everything in general. I consider what I have been told and heard—that Oakland is unsafe. I wonder if there is a real threat and what it might be. High Street has twice been closed by police with crime scene tape. I am ignorant, a stranger, not having lived here for decades. Am I also naïve, like the tourists along the beach where I used to live, picking bouquets of colorful poison oak?

I am curious about and suspicious of these impressions, stories, and feelings formed while inside of my car, outside of where I am, looking out on the street as if watching a movie. It feels strange to never slow down, never feel my feet on the street’s ground. Driving and creating stories about everything I see reminds me of the people in Plato’s cave mistaking reflections for reality. I want to have a real relationship to High Street from the ground in real time, to be a pedestrian among pedestrians. I want to notice how becoming familiar with a place influences my relationships formed within and to a new location. The occasional nod or wave to another driver as a means to negotiate the road, a fleeting moment of eye contact with someone on the street has been the full extent of my connection to High Street until now.

**Day One. Saturday morning. 9:30 – 11:00 am.**

I walk along imagining what I am unable and too timid to say to people who are out walking their dogs, strolling with kids and friends, and jogging.

Excuse me. Good morning. Hi! I am taking shadow portraits... I am... Would you mind if I took a photograph of your silhouette? Yes! Say silhouette! Do not say shadow... that calls up stories of Lucifer, temptation, and the stealing of souls... I am working on a project... for.... about.......

I avoid the Seventh Day Adventists whom I take to be out doing what I am doing—looking to enlist people in their project. I look at everyone’s shadows as they walk, skateboard, and bike along, trying to remember what the shapes look like so I can draw them when I get home. I am afraid I will not have a cordial interaction with another human being all day and will have evidence only of my failure, not a single person’s silhouette to show. Maybe it is too early in the day. I am not very talkative at this hour. I do not like taking photos in public spaces and approaching strangers on the street is very unappealing. It is entirely possible and completely natural for me not to talk to people on the street. It is a strange idea that I would. I hatched this plan while driving—as a way to observe how I navigate private space within public space, and to see how I cross boundaries between each, by asking people along the way if I could take photos of their silhouettes.

Not realizing my fear has derailed me before I even begin, I become preoccupied with the notion that pictorial evidence is important. I forget that connecting with people is the point—the camera is a device, an excuse, its purpose is as a prop to allow me to engage. I swerve off course. I hold the image in my mind of a photographer I saw in a documentary film which
followed him as he wandered through a city talking to people and taking pictures with extroverted ease. I want to be just like him. I remember the last time I took a street photo. I was in art school and living in an apartment above George Kaye’s Bar on Broadway. I was too young to go in but fascinated with what I took to be assigned seats, as I saw the same people sitting in the same places in the dark cavernous space day after day through the opened door. On class assignment I stopped with my camera at the door and the bartender yelled at me for my thoughtless invasion of his patrons’ privacy. I felt shamed and slunk away. Maybe that experience explains why I did not consider taking portrait photographs for this project.

I am picking up where I left off; the past almost seems to have been awaiting my return. This time I will ask for permission before taking pictures, though in the film I saw the photographer did not ask. I think about this as I walk from Otis Street across the High Street Bridge where a pelican roosting below street level view on the bridge’s foundation keeps a half opened eye on me. I continue walking without seeing other pedestrians until I reach the 880 freeway interchange where a man waves at me from his island between traffic lanes panhandling for change. I wave back. I could meet him on his island and ask to take a photograph of his shadow and share some change, but I do not. I do not want to be that close to the societal dispossession he represents to me. I turn back towards home for lunch realizing I turned away from every opportunity I had to connect to people.

**Saturday afternoon. 1:30-3:30**

The day has become glorious. It is warm and sunny with just enough breeze to cool the air. I stop in the neighborhood consignment shop and buy a floppy tan and black striped sun hat lined in persimmon orange, a hat that could be considered either stylish or ridiculous and buy a pair of comfortable sandals to relieve my sore feet. I drive to Tompkins Hill Road and from there begin to walk towards the glistening bay in the distance.

“Hi, would you mind if I took a photograph of the silhouette of you holding your orchid?” “No problem,” he replied. I did it! I talked to a stranger! He does not even blink at my request as I meet him coming up hill beside a woman carrying a baby, as I walk down. He looked at his shadow and posed with the orchid he was carrying as if a shadow portrait was a perfectly reasonable subject for a photograph. I thank him and we all continued on our way. Crossing MacArthur Boulevard I see kites flying above two pink houses enclosed together within a shared iron fence. The kites ascend from the thin raised arms of children disappearing behind a house. Adults stand out front talking. People are out working on their homes and yards, or sitting in the sun, just out to be out after so much rain. Before I realize I have spoken, I ask a little girl if I can take a silhouette of her playing with her giddy puppy pulling on its leash. I am delighted by her delight. A woman sitting in the sun with her says the dog loves to show off. I show the girl the digital photo I took and continue to walk.
“Where did you get that hat?” A woman about my age asks me as I approach the bus stop where she is waiting. Her hat is classic and speaks of good taste. She asks me if I am an artist, and we begin to talk and discover we both love to draw and have, as far back as we can recall. She tells me she is taking her first art class and is learning about negative space. She introduces herself and extends her hand along with a blessing. I almost forget to ask if I can take a photo of her silhouette. I do not really care about that. It was a connection, a conversation I craved. It is a pleasure to stop and chat with her and feel the ground shared beneath our feet. I feel my sense of isolation evaporate, my orientation shifts. For a few timeless moments I reside completely inside the day without a defined sense of self—in the blink-of-an-eye my normal boundaries reinstate themselves—boundaries subtly redefined by this experience.

Brookdale Park is full of people playing baseball or watching from bleachers. I can see basketball players on the court in the depths of the park off the street. I do not usually commute on Saturdays so maybe it is always like this in nice weather. During the week the park is quiet, but today it feels like a community celebration of spring—people gathered together to share the day. I am moving slowly enough to notice discreet gardens tucked in beside homes. I wonder how I missed the Brookdale Discovery Center advertising afterschool science and art along with homework tutoring, on my innumerable commutes. The batting cage at the high school is lined with players taking turns batting, practicing with their coach. A soccer game is going on behind them in the school yard.
When I reach Foothill Boulevard, I turn around and walk back toward the hills. I stop and ask a man about the mosaic he is creating of pyramids on a street-side trash container. He tells me he is a member of the Brookdale Neighborhood Watch group, volunteering his time to gift the street with his art. We talk for a bit and I continue towards the end of the street. I realize the two conversations I had today were both with artists. A certain resonance made talking with them effortless. I feel nurtured by the contact. I hear a beautiful woman’s voice, her singing wafting out of the open doors of a church as a procession of men and boys in white suits enter side by side with women and girls in white gowns overlaid with sheer blue overskirts. The girls are wearing blue tiaras. I assume this is a wedding, the bride and groom last in line, standing together in the warm twilight. I drive home from the street’s end.

*I am in LOVE with High Street! It feels so wonderful to be outside walking and enjoying this beautiful sunny day! I have missed so much from the car! I love everyone!*

**Day Two. Sunday. 3:00-3:30**

*I am tired, bored. I do not have any energy. I do not want to wander up and down this street, or any other street. My eyes hurt.*
It is warm and sunny, a beautiful day. I am re-walking the section of High Street I covered yesterday. The few people I see out this late afternoon look as flat in expression as I feel. A few people are carrying home groceries, on errands. Nothing interests me. I look for something to engage with. I give up my effort after a half hour. As I drive home I notice the cash store is open, as always. A woman with arms raised to the heavens stands at the corner across the street, body swaying. The day laborers are standing in wait of work on Sunday too, even this late in the day. A woman catches my attention entering a warehouse with boarded up windows and door with what looks like a bag of groceries. Could she be living there? I notice after she closes the door behind her that it has many locks. She becomes lodged in my mind.

**Day Three. Saturday. 12:00-4:00**

After a week of mostly being indoors I am anxious—in an eager and excited way—to get outside and to walk from Central Avenue in Alameda to MacArthur Boulevard in Oakland. Last week’s walk has dissipated the anxieties I had about my safety on the street and my ability to connect with others. I am full of confidence and free of apprehensions. I have become infatuated with the photos I took last week and have expectations of taking more interesting and varied silhouettes today. I feel on task and set out on the first day of spring! I have covered all of High Street except for the section between 880 and Foothill Boulevard since I began at both ends and did not make it to the middle. Today I will. The morning fog lingers casting soft shadows on the quiet street, wisteria is just opening into bloom, and so are the leaves on trees. A few yard maintenance crews are out, a few people walking.

I see a man working on his upside-down bicycle on the corner across the street. I walk right over to him and startle him by my quiet approach. He jumps just a bit; I did not intend to sneak up on him. I ask if I can take a photo of his silhouette as he works. He asks if he should pose and how he can help me. I apologize for interrupting his focus, and he says something about a blessing, but I don’t catch everything he says and do not know what he means. I wish him good luck fixing his bike and continue on my way.

The bridge is reverberating with car traffic; the pelican is preoccupied with preening and does not take notice today, of my passing by. I walk along looking through the camera at shadow after shadow on the theme of chain-link fences topped with barbed-wire spirals. My focus remains narrow as I walk under the roaring cement overpass of the 880 expressway until I see a yellow swallowtail butterfly striped in black floating through too.

I once watched from my car as a well-dressed man waved the backs of his down turned hands at the day laborers saying “Go away” while stamping his feet at the gas station property line. Now I am on foot, walking by the gas station and day laborers waiting for work. I am bursting with questions that I do not ask.
Why are you here, right here on the street? Is it because of U.S. foreign policy destroying your homes, economies and livelihoods? Where are you from? Where are your families? How do you survive? Do you earn enough to support yourselves and your families? How do you protect yourselves? Do you only work in groups so you are not so vulnerable? Where do you live? Why can’t I at least ask you if you speak English and how you are doing today, from my heart—and forget the interrogation I hold in my head?

I tell myself these men are not here to satisfy my curiosity and that I could only call it concern if I am willing to act on what I learn. Maybe that is why I do not ask. I do not want the responsibility of knowing. I seem to prefer to keep my distance. I walk by at a loss of how to cross the differences between us, not even knowing what the differences really are. I offer a smile and a hello. I am no closer than if I was driving by.

The Los Palmas Car Wash is quiet, more men waiting for work. I see a man on a bike knocking on the door of the boarded up warehouse where I saw a woman entering last week. The cash store always seems busy, always seems open, it is both as I walk by. I am moving faster than a trio of teenage boys talking more than walking along; as I pass them they look over their shoulders at me, looking threatened by my approach and adult gaze, even coming from a woman old enough to be their grandmother and wearing a silly hat. I do not ask them for their silhouettes. I leave them be. A few blocks later I walk by a group of young men gathered in front of a house, talking and watching passersby. This time I feel threatened, feel caught in their critically accessing gaze. I do not say hi. I walk on and become interested in the shadows of gates along the street.
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Just as I am taking a photo of a shadow cast by a wrought-iron fence a man in a pickup truck pulls out of the house’s driveway. I notice him noticing me. He very slowly drives along at the same pace I am walking and rolls down his window and says, “It has been years! How have you been?” I walk over to his now parked and idling truck and answer “I don’t think we know each other.” “Didn’t you work on the creek years back?” “I never worked on the creek.” “Really…” “No…” I am sure he is politely assessing what I am up to. I do not believe he thinks I am someone he knows. He has great tact though, and I like his technique. He does not mention my camera or ask what I am doing. We each go our separate ways. Maybe I do look like someone he has not seen for years. Each time I am watched by men from their property I feel that I am held suspect. I do not feel this way with women and I did not feel suspect of anything when I walked by the day laborers, but they are men without much in the way of territory to defend.

As I come to the end of my eastbound walk I stop to see what a man has on his table in front of Walgreens. He asks if I am out enjoying a stroll after he tells me about his bottled fragrances. I mention my camera and ask if I could include his silhouette. He asks what the project is about, and I find myself spinning an intellectual and contrived rational for what I am doing and why. I feel dishonest as I talk though nothing I say is a lie. The words “projections” and “deconstruction” seem beside the point, but I say them anyway. I am embarrassed for talking like this. Not that I don’t construct conceptual frameworks while I think sometimes, but when I
do I am left feeling hollow inside, like I have built a house of cards. I could have shared with him that it is just nice to be out and about with an excuse to enjoy shadows and talk to people, including him. He wishes me good luck. I appreciate it. I am surprised at how quickly I have reached MacArthur Boulevard, a little less than an hour’s walk from Alameda; I thought it would take at least two, driving distorts a lot of things.

On the way back toward Alameda I am passing some stretches of the street for the fourth time. A new anxiety arises, that people will be saying to themselves: There she goes again, that woman in her hat taking photographs of the street. I imagine I look rather strange. I remember years ago staying with friends in Italy. People named me the Walking-Signora-In-The-Hat and when they finally met me explained they had seen me many times wandering the roads nobody walked and had aptly given me a name. The name fits me today.

I realize I have only taken a few silhouettes of people, a lot of fences, power-lines, and trees. I am surprised by the business at the carwash this afternoon; the lot is full of cars and trucks gleaming, music filling the air, a good day for their business after all. Back in the commercial district I feel tired out by the dust, grit, and noise and try not to slouch and cringe as I walk alongside the traffic. I am the only pedestrian here and being seen from the perspective I have been seeing others, I am the character in the movie now. I wonder what role I am playing for people passing in cars that catch me in their peripheral vision. I try to walk with dignity as if I know just why I am here at Panhandler Intersection. Years and years ago early one morning, while waiting in a low rent urban neighborhood for the artists I was working with to arrive, I sat in my work/paint clothes on the gallery’s front stoop with a cup of coffee in hand. A passerby offered me some change. I looked to him like a homeless person or at least a person in need. I do not remember my response except for the thought that it would have been a good idea to have brushed my hair that morning instead of just pulling it up into a sloppy knot. I remember this as I stand alone and exposed at the red light that is taking forever to say WALK among six lanes of traffic and on-ramps to the freeway.

Crossing the bridge once again, I forget to look for the pelican. I am focused on some people in the near distance: if I was a cat my eyes would give me away by showing pupils dilated in preparation to pounce. I pick up my pace to choreograph a chance meeting with three pedestrians coming my way; they turn a corner and disappear. I have not met my expectations to collect more data—interactions and silhouettes—I am getting tired and almost to the end of the day’s walk. I have not accomplished what I set out to do. I see more people and attempt to coordinate a chance crossing of paths, again trying to catch up on the sly. I do this a number of times to no avail. I am frustrated by achieving nothing but a series of near misses. People seem to veer away from me, as if they can feel me invade their privacy from a block away. I begin to feel queasy and when I ask myself why, I realize that I am viewing people as nothing more than the means to my end. My aggression meets me face to face, not hiding in my shadow today.

I have become a stalker! I am shadowing people to take their shadows! Have I been a predator all along and just now noticed? I am horrified... Why is everything about photography framing, pointing, aiming, taking, shooting? It makes me sick!!! How have people become my prey?
I feel nauseous and toxic and am frightened that I became a monster without even noticing. I am stunned and ask myself how this happened and how can I prevent this from ever happening again? I do not have an answer which makes me feel even worse.

Two incidents arise in my mind; the first one happened when I was as a child. I refused to get out of the car while sightseeing with my family. My parents had stopped at a roadside wildlife reserve where elk were grazing, and a sign warned onlookers that elk took direct eye contact as a sign of aggression and might attack. I did not want to look at the elk if they did not like to be looked at. I understood how they would feel that way, as I did not like to be stared at either. The other incident was years later when I was driving and stopped at a red light. I was looking at a woman on the street thinking “She’s a crazy one!” In the very same instant I had this thought she turned and shot me a look of pure hate and launched a rock in my direction as the light turned green. These two memories remind me that looking and watching are not neutral acts; the observer’s thoughts emanate along the line-of-sight to the subject gazed upon.

I fall back into myself as I give up the idea of taking more photos and notice what a beautiful afternoon it is. I wonder if I could train myself like a search and rescue dog and re-direct my hunting instinct to locate life at risk to nurture and protect it. I walk by Lincoln Park and can not help but cross paths with a woman with two toddlers and ask her if I could take a few silhouette photos as she walks along. She says sure. At the next corner while waiting at the light I find myself standing next to a woman with two kids. I ask if I can take a snap shot of their group silhouette. I say I am gathering reflections of the first day of spring.

As the light turns green, I realize that I have just taken my project’s last photograph. Relieved to be done, I happily put the camera away. I feel emotionally exhausted from witnessing my actions this afternoon and want to relax. I meander home by way of the mud flats and beach. The water’s edge is dotted with people who are reading, swimming, flying kites, picnicking, playing volley ball, running around, and just lying around. I join in with everyone engaged in leisure pursuits and walk along listening to the soothing sound of the bay lapping against the sand. San Francisco is in the background silhouetted against a rising curtain of fog.

Months Later

I set these pages down for awhile. At first, I read as though I was looking at the narrative through a magnifying glass. I winced and marveled at the glimpses I caught of myself in-the-act of one thing after another; while the photographs refused to reveal any meaning at all. Confused, I set it all aside. When I returned, I read as though I was gazing into a mirror. This time, I was willing to wait for a unifying image to be reflected back to me.

Now I understand my walk along High Street as a metaphoric snapshot of how I move through the world. The details of what I do, have become background to my understanding of why I do, what I do. Within the experience of this self-study—I have been able to re-align myself with the trustworthy and quiet nudging of my soul’s inclinations—that compels me to pursue what I am curious and/or anxious about. Although seemingly irrational, this quiet voice guides me through my life.
Now I understand my shadow photographs as a self-portrait of my world view. They remind me that I am opaque to myself, that I have only a vague understanding of whom I am, and that I have only transient reasons to explain my thoughts and actions. The silhouettes also reflect back to me my feeling that life is ephemeral, solid as I may be for a time. I see in the photographs how I am drawn into engagement with the world through an aesthetic orientation that focuses my attention on ethereal beauty, and by way of an existential puzzlement that pulls me along by the hand.

**The Commute**

I could not hear, beyond the stories I told, to anchor in my suspended mind, a place to be between here and there, outside of where I was, going too fast to belong, without moving at all, through boundary and passage both, formed of the street.
My soul insisted that my feet find the earth
to ground the growing tension I felt as a threat.
I walked five miles back and forth on concrete
with one eye turned inward and one eye turned out.

Resonate exchange along the street
harmonized within me the forces of love and fear.
Maybe tension keeps the world from collapsing in onto itself.
What else could hold the earth in the sun’s embrace
and cast shadows at our feet?

Margaret Morrissey lives in the Bay Area where she works at a public high school. She previously taught visual arts as a teaching artist, in kindergarten through twelfth grade classrooms in school districts on California’s Central Coast. The desire to understand the cacophony of impressions she received while working within public and private schools led her to Mills College, where she received a master’s in educational leadership.
Bureaucratic Adage

Yonel Pierre

Don’t speak to those
Who sit on the bench!

If you do so, you’ll break
The silence,
The peace,
The magic,
The distance,
The spell…!
The line is drawn
Where we name you and them.

You may walk down the stairway,
Walk in the hallway,
Smile at them,
Wave to them,
Talk to them…!
Sit in the Cafeteria,
Eat with them,
Walk down the street,
Hold their hands,
Hug them,
Kiss them…!

But, once you walk down the hallway
And enter the room,
Never speak to those who sit on the bench
For they belong to this other world!
It is us against them.
No relationship,
No connection,
Except servitude!

We are their servants.
And the moment that the line is broken,
They may never understand.

You may address them by their last names.
And even Sir!
But, never speak to those who sit on the bench
Unless to ask how you may help them
For we are their servants.

Yonel Pierre is a Ph.D. student at the School of Public Affairs and Administration (SPAA), Rutgers University-Newark. His research interest spans from government performance measurement, to organizational network effectiveness, to the analysis of public policy. Yonel’s poem is the 2012 1st prize winner in the All Arts Matter-sponsored poetry competition in the adult poet category.
Movie Review

Won't Back Down Misfires on Parent Trigger, but Gets the Politics, Organizations Right

Reviewed by Robert Maranto

The School Films

Since the 1930s the vast majority of Americans have spent their formative years in school, typically public school (Tyack and Cuban 1995; Maranto and McShane 2012). The simultaneous familiarity with and, at least for creative types, frequent horror of schooling has produced no end of great and not so great movies about public schools, most since the 1960s when a far less hierarchical pop culture knocked schools off their pedestals. Leaving aside high school sports movies, which are more sports than school, notable schooling movies include funny but mostly banal flicks like Buffy the Vampire Slayer, Mean Girls, Fast Times at Ridgemont High, Ferris Bueller’s Day Off, and perhaps the best and most humane of all, Amy Heckerling’s modern Hollywood version of Jane Austin's Emma, Clueless, which led to a likeable and semi-successful TV series. Then are the films of teen angst among middle and upper income kids, films including Orange County and anything involving the late director John Hughes and actress Molly Ringwald. Other films focus on teachers, like the sappy Mr. Holland’s Opus which presents a serious and growing teacher, the grossly funny Bad Teacher and the oddly heartwarming Summer School; the last two about slacker teachers who eventually mature. Perhaps best of all is Alexander Payne’s hilarious and irreverent Election, built around the ultimately self-destructive hatred megalomaniacal teacher Matthew Broderick feels toward too perfect junior Reese Witherspoon.

Urban Schools as High Noon

Dating back to Blackboard Jungle, a far harsher genre depicts urban schooling, typically seen as dangerous and academically floundering. Still, until the 1980s such films usually portrayed both urban youth and urban school systems as salvageable. In contrast, as Shelbie Witte and Todd Goodson (2010, 12) put it, later films like Arthur Hiller’s 1984 black comedy Teachers, offer a far more dystopian vision of urban schooling:
Teachers was the first film to represent an education system so corrupt it could only be salvaged by drastic intervention from outside interests. More films and television series would extend the dystopian narrative...Eventually, films like Lean on Me, Stand and Deliver, and Dangerous Minds would serve to demonstrate exactly how this new vision of education might come about.

School apologists Witte and Goodson disagree, but in fact the dystopian vision reflects urban public education realities. While one can argue that suburban public schools produce adequate social and educational outcomes, few say the same about urban public schools, often fairly characterized as "dropout factories." Urban public schools have high dropout rates, low student proficiency, and safety issues. While urban public schools face difficult missions educating the children of the disadvantaged, considerable research also suggests that they can and should do better. As an extensive literature shows, urban public schools tend to misallocate resources (Roza, 2010; Whitmire 2011), tolerate poor teaching and leadership (Brill, 2011; Payne 2008), make few serious efforts to recruit talented staff (Shuls and Maranto Forthcoming), have dispirited staff who doubt their students can learn (Payne 2008; Whitmire 2011), suffer from overly restrictive labor agreements (Moe 2011), value adult employment over student learning (Rich 1996; Moe 2011), mishandle discipline (Thernstrom and Thernstrom 2003), intimidate or ignore parents (Henderson, Mapp, Johnson, and Davies, 2007), use inappropriate teaching methods for their disadvantaged clientele (Chall 2000; Petrilli 2012), and suffer revolving door superintendents (Hess 1999) and teachers (Grossman and Loeb 2008; Roza 2010).

Accordingly, efforts to reform public schooling tend to focus on urban schools. Indeed, the most successful urban schools are typically private or charter schools which have escaped dysfunctional bureaucracies in order to serve kids. The 125 KIPP charter schools are the most storied examples of such mission driven schools (Maranto and Shuls 2011; Matthews 2009), but there are many others (Merseth 2009). Unfortunately, as Maranto and Paige (2012) grouse, for all the reasons noted in the prior paragraph unsuccessful public schools make few efforts to copy their more successful peers. In short, substantial research suggests that all too many urban public schools are in fact as dystopian as Teachers portrays, with self-centered, mission indifferent staffs operating much along the lines of doctors and nurses in Paddy Chayefsky's The Hospital.

Still, because it resembles The Hospital, Teachers is not quite the normal urban education film. More typically, urban school films resemble westerns, where the hero principal or teacher comes to town to save disadvantaged young people through tough love and boundless grit, confronting the bad guys, and either converting them or making them leave town by sundown. Many of these films are based on true stories, including Lean on Me (principal Joe Clark), Freedom Writers (teacher Erin Gruwell), Dangerous Minds (teacher LouAnne Johnson), and the best of all, Stand and Deliver, a lightly fictionalized account of Jaime Escalante's AP Calculus program at Los Angeles's rough Garfield High School.

As Rod Paige (2006) documents, in the true story Escalante built a program which led more than 100 disadvantaged children annually to pass the challenging AP Calculus exam—something considered miraculous, and gaining no small press attention. In a good school district, or any good organization, Escalante would be honored and his program cloned. Unfortunately, in a dysfunctional urban school system like Los Angeles Unified, success brings resentment from...
teachers and administrators who are psychologically invested in low effort failure, and reluctant
to even admit the possibility of high effort success. There is in fact a long line of organization
theory about such permanently failing organizations dating back (at least) to Downs (1967).
Regarding urban schools, in particular, see Foote (2008) and Payne (2008). At Garfield,
Escalante's program evoked jealousy from less dedicated educators. Escalante was too famous to
be attacked directly, so instead the school district transferred his protective principal to an
unappealing central office post (Asbestos mitigation), starved the Calculus program of resources
until Escalante eventually left for Sacramento in disgust, and then killed the program outright.
Unfortunately bureaucrats with sensitive egos and long memories not infrequently react in like
fashion. Indeed the first KIPP campus was nearly closed down by a jealous central office, only to
be rescued when then Houston Independent School District Superintendent Rod Paige directly
intervened. Quite sensibly, Paige decided to keep and indeed expand KIPP, a program popular
with parents and effective at bringing disadvantaged students up to and beyond grade level
(Matthews 2009).

Won't Back Down—School Reform as After School Special

The latest entry in the dystopian urban schooling movie ranks offers novelty, a story in which the
hero is not an educator but a mere parent. This in itself is something new since until very
recently, educators were trained to see parents more as nuisances than partners (Henderson et al.
2007). The most talked about education movie of the year, Won't Back Down stars Maggie
Gyllenhaal as Jamie Fitzpatrick, a feisty bartender/receptionist single mom determined to rescue
her academically and socially floundering daughter from a lousy Pittsburgh public elementary
school. Fitzpatrick teams with veteran teacher Nona Alberts (played by Viola Davis) to
overcome endless bureaucracy and a powerful teachers union in order to activate a "parent
trigger" rule allowing parents who gather enough signatures to take over their failing school and
convert it to a public charter school with a new principal and at-will teachers (Bast and Behrend
2010). In the movie a majority of the teachers need to sign as well.

As the film's Wiki site (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Won't_Back_Down_(film) and Lubinski,
Scott, Rogers, and Welner (2012) chronicle, while Democrats For Education Reform backers
like Andy Rotherham (2012) generally like the film, or at least its message, those farther left
dismiss it as union bashing, and complain that it was funded in part by a conservative billionaire
Philip Anschutz. (Anschutz and others have also funded pro-reform documentaries about urban
schooling.) Given the many Hollywood films are funded and created from the left, this seems an
odd criticism. It seems more suitable to evaluate films first on their artistic merits as films,
secondly by whether their political portrayals are, at least in part, accurate, and only finally if at
all by their funders.

As a movie Won't Back Down is in fact pedestrian, with great performances, at least a dozen fine
scenes capturing bureaucratic politics, and a very serious message somehow coming off as an
after-school special, as Rotherham (2012) put it in his review. The movie was not a hit, and
suffered mixed reviews according to its IMDb website (http://www.imdb.com/title/tt1870529/),
for good reason. Jamie Fitzpatrick not only creates a new school for her daughter and the other
children left behind; she also finds a new love, a hunky Teach For America (TFA) teacher along
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the way. For her part, Nona Alberts has a deep dark secret which, once off her chest in the last 15 minutes, helps heal her broken family. Also in the final minutes, Jamie self-diagnoses the dyslexia which had hampered her own schooling, something her teachers had never bothered to notice. Jamie's daughter will be saved from such a fate. In the last reel, through hard work and amazing little luck, the good guys somehow win. The parent trigger is approved and the old, mediocre school is reopened as a new charter school, albeit with the best of the old teaching staff and Nona as principal. As Seinfeld's Kramer would say, it's a Festivus miracle!

Won't Back Down also misses much of the social psychology of internal school politics. At a key point Nona Alberts has gone behind the backs of her teacher colleagues to work with Jamie Fitzpatrick, a mere parent, on the parent trigger. When other teachers discover her betrayal they are outraged; yet all is soon forgiven. In the real world of dysfunctional school politics, breaking ranks is not soon forgiven. Teachers, particularly unionized teachers, prize solidarity (Moe 2011). Save in one brief scene, the movie does not address racial conflict, which is seldom far below the surface in most urban school systems (Petrilli 2012; Payne 2008). (Nona is African American while Jamie and most of the other characters are white.) Further, as fieldwork by Payne (2008) suggests, most dysfunctional schools are very dysfunctional—the better staff are dragged down, or else leave for less depressing settings. Yet most teachers of Won't Back Down's Adams Elementary seem reasonably effective. Other than the principal there is but one notable lemon in the lot, Deborah, whose uncaring incompetence prompts another teacher to complain that she has to teach students two years of material to make up for the year wasted in Deborah's class. In a truly dysfunctional school Deborah would be the norm, not the pariah. Still, the movie is right to say that teachers matter, and because they matter schools really can overcome many of the effects of poverty (Winters 2012; Thernstrom and Thernstrom 2003).

Moreover, as policy the parent trigger is so easy to block that while it exists in seven states (though not Pennsylvania), the trigger has yet to be pulled successfully (Lubienski et al., 2012). Parents who sign on to a trigger can be "persuaded" to un-sign. After all, do you really want to anger the school officials that have your kids seven hours a day? This is difficult enough for middle class parents, who may fear that causing trouble will get their kids assigned to the rookie teacher or worse still, the RIP (retired in place) teacher for years to come. School officials almost always know the rules better than parents, and at times use that knowledge to avenge perceived slights (Williams 2005) even when, as in the case of special education, the rules are designed to protect parents (Ong-Dean 2009). Middle class parents may also fear to seem disloyal to their communities since airing a school's dirty laundry might not be good for property values. These fears are worse still for disadvantaged parents, who are less likely to know how to negotiate bureaucratic procedures, less apt to have friends in high places, and less likely to have the money to hire attorneys or advocates. In several parent trigger tries, the parents were helped and even organized by outside foundations—something opponents complain about and which the movie fails to mention. (One can speculate as to why.) Even so, opponents have managed to block implementation in the courts. Further, as supporters of traditional (and in my view very flawed) democratic accountability in public education insist, parent groups may prove as undemocratic as existing school boards and bureaucracies (Lubienski et al., 2012). It is true that parents have more skin in the game than other actors, but even if parents did take over a bad school, could they run it? The movie’s last line is "hope," which is the best a trigger can offer.
In short, the enormous risks and vast time commitments parents must face to attempt political change of their school (much less a whole school system) and the highly uncertain results almost certainly inhibit pulling a parent trigger, or indeed any sustained use of voice to improve schooling. For parents, it is more cost effective to find a second job to afford Catholic school tuition, which is usually quite modest; to move to a different attendance zone; or to eschew systemic efforts and instead pressure school officials to arrange an individual transfer for their child. Indeed the latter is quite common. School administrators who may find it difficult or even impossible to change a school find it quite easy to permit individual troublemakers to escape that school (Petrilli, 2012; Kelly and McGuinn 2012).

Politics and Bureaucracy—What Won’t Back Down Gets Right

Despite these caveats, there is much that Won’t Back Down gets right. First, some bureaucrats really are low energy, self-centered "conservers" as Downs (1967) calls them, out to maximize their own security and convenience. The Adams principal, well played by veteran (and Pittsburgh born) actor Bill Nunn, captures the type, as does the aforementioned Deborah, played by newcomer Nancy Bach. Jamie first became outraged since Deborah refused to meet with her for even a minute after work to discuss her daughter's problems at school, and certainly would not take the effort to have the child's learning difficulties diagnosed—they she did find time to mistreat Jamie’s daughter in revenge. Parenthetically, such vengeful acts are not unheard of in the real world of schooling (Williams 2005). Essentially, a bad principal and bad teaching by Deborah and a few others sparked Jamie's parent revolt. In a notable scene in which teachers begin to support the parent trigger, the bone lazy Deborah harangues her colleagues with the taunt that if they lost job security their next stop would be the welfare office. In the end most of her colleagues vote to take the risk, in part just to get rid of her. While this sort of thing hardly ever happens in the real world, it is true that the competent vast majority of public servants often resent the incompetent minority they must work alongside (Maranto 2008).

The movie also gets right the Kafkaesque bureaucracy of school central offices. The Pittsburgh central office is a large, imposing, confusing building not meant to help members of the public. Buying a fellow receptionist coffee, Jamie finds out the basics of how to get around, and then goes from office to office to get the massive forms needed for the parent trigger, at each office told by a basically uncaring bureaucrat, one peering over a mound of paper, that her efforts were doomed. The school board president, who is soon leaving for a job in Miami-Dade tells Jamie and Nona that she will let them have a hearing at her last board meeting, while warning that they might be better off with another year to work on the proposal. (Jamie says her daughter cannot waste another year.) In any event, the board president warns, the body had turned down proposals in the past if even a footnote or Appendix was out of place. The president also candidly assesses her colleagues, noting that two will certainly vote no since they are beholden to the union, one member will support it "because it's new, and she likes anything new"; yet another sleeps through meetings but wakes up shortly before votes, only to issue thoroughly unpredictable pronouncements. Anyone who has watched school board meetings in small towns and even some big cities like Atlanta can relate (Maeroff 2011). The movie also captures how to organize, with Jamie and Nona using tactics right out of Saul Alinsky to build relationships and outlast the establishment.
More than anything, the movie seems on the mark in its assessments of big city teachers unions, in several key ways. First, teachers unions are not filled with awful people. As the union president puts it, unions make a convenient scapegoat, but why pick on them rather than Wall Street? On a less ideological level, teachers have difficult and sometimes controversial jobs. Unions may protect teachers that really need protection. That's why Jamie Fitzpatrick's love interest, a dedicated TFA teacher, resists joining her effort for most of the movie. Further, unions are often reacting to the past misdeeds of educational administrators who abuse their power. Multi-hundred page collective bargaining agreements often reflect conflicts past. Unfortunately, as Moe (2011) details, those contracts make it difficult to manage schools, and have deleterious long term impacts on school culture. As in the movie, I have known of unionized schools where dedicated teachers would be yelled at for staying after 3:00 without pay, or even for breaking up fights on the playground, since anything other than teaching or assigned duties does in fact violate contracts than unions worked hard to win. As Moe shows, union politics, even more than politics generally, stresses group solidarity—not individual initiative.

Second, teachers unions use Nixonian tactics to win at any cost. In the film a union rep tries to bribe Jamie to sell out her friends, offering a scholarship for her dyslexic daughter to attend a private school. (Jamie asks: "How exactly did you know my daughter is dyslexic?") The union and the lackluster Adams principal set up Nona Alberts, putting her under investigation for "fixing" attendance records—after the principal had ordered her to do that very thing. The union personally attacks opponents, and makes it crystal clear that school board members who back the parents will pay come Election Day. The teachers union warns its own members that backing a parent takeover means they will never work in Pittsburgh again, blackballing teachers just as companies blackballed union workers back in the day of Norma Ray. At this point the union overplayed its hand, pushing the better Adams teachers into the arms of reformers. One of the better lines is when an ethical union official played by Holly Hunter wonders "When did Norma Ray get to be the bad guy?"

While American Federation of Teachers President Randi Weingarten complains that “I don't recognize the teachers portrayed in this movie, and I don't recognize that union” (http://www.aft.org/newspubs/news/2012/083112wbd.cfm), many others do. As Steven Brill (2011) details in Class Conflict, for years Weingarten's own United Federation of Teachers in New York City made it essentially impossible to fire or discipline low performing teachers. Until recent contract changes, almost none of the 70,000 New York teachers were fired for bad teaching. Superintendents who tried to install evaluation systems were labeled as attacking teachers rather than attacking bad teachers. Principals who moved to fire teachers had a union "hit" put on them: Anonymous allegations of corruption appeared before state officials, and suddenly the principal came under investigation. Those who didn't play nice with the UFT were even blackballed from jobs in other school districts by union friends on school boards. I know one principal who had a private eye tail him in search of material. He is pretty sure he knows who paid for that.

So when did Norma Ray become the bad guy? When Norma Ray got too much power. The real message of Won’t Back Down is that teachers unions and education bureaucrats must be at the table; but if they or any other alliance own the table, children lose. That is a useful message, and
that alone makes the film worth seeing to better understand education policy, and public policy generally.

In short, despite its failings as a movie, Won't Back Down offers a useful and in part accurate assessment of urban school politics, certainly suitable for use in classes on bureaucracy, education policy, interest groups, organizing, and political film. Film junkies might limit it to one star, but for education and political junkies it is just the ticket.
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Art Exhibit Review

Review of
Rise and Fall of Apartheid: Photography and the Bureaucracy of Everyday Life

International Center of Photography, New York,
September 14, 2012 – January 6, 2013

Reviewed by Jonathan Woolley

Apartheid is perhaps better chronicled through pictures than through words. One can describe the effects it had upon people, but the true magnitude of those effects is not always as well-conveyed through the printed word as it would be through a few well-composed, expressive pictures. People’s reactions to the situation they are in – their facial expressions, their frustrations and their fears, their hopes, and their relationship to the world around them – sometimes can be better expressed visually than orally. A picture can indeed be worth the proverbial thousand words, and few books on apartheid do not include at least one picture to buttress their discussions of the topic.

Bureaucracy, on the other hand, doesn’t always lend itself to being chronicled photographically. A photo essay of welfare benefit administrators, for instance, is likely to show people in similar clothes doing similar jobs in similar surroundings (unless someone is photographed while on a field visit). One can get a feel for whether a particular public administrator likes or dislikes a particular aspect of their job from a photograph of the administrator’s gestures or facial expressions, but, when all is said and done, a viewer is likely to see an essay predominated by photographs of government employees working at desks. The paperwork the administrator is processing may be very important, but the messages on those papers are not usually conveyed photographically. Successfully documenting bureaucracy photographically, therefore, can pose a challenge, unless one is documenting a bureaucrat in the field (such as a policeman).

This exhibit, which is curated by Okwui Enwezor with Rory Bester, attempts to photographically chronicle the effects of apartheid on South Africans’ everyday lives between the election of 1948, which brought about the passing of apartheid’s laws, and the end of apartheid in the 1990’s. The majority of photographs are in black and white (a few are in color) and the exhibit is supplemented by the inclusion both of film and video footage and of magazines (whose articles are usually next to a large photograph), along with a few contemporary documents. The exhibit is arranged chronologically and incorporates two floors of New York’s International Center of Photography.
From a public administration point of view, the exhibit looks at apartheid’s bureaucracy through two angles: the effects of its regulations upon South Africa’s inhabitants and the relationship between those inhabitants and South Africa’s street level bureaucrats. Neither relationship was positive, the exhibit says, unless your ancestry happened to be solely European. Apartheid worked by emphasizing the differences between those who benefited from its restrictions and those who didn’t; any attempt to recognize the similarities between the beneficiaries and the non-beneficiaries threatened to undermine its entire ideology. It was the job of the bureaucracy, therefore, to ensure these differences were maintained.

The exhibit could explain the reason for apartheid’s imposition better. Malan’s celebration of his 1948 election victory is shown on a series of continuously-replaying newsreels, and the passing of the various apartheid laws is chronicled elsewhere in explanatory text, but there is no particular explanation as to why the laws were passed after World War II as opposed to previously, even though previous white-led governments also looked down upon non-whites. The exhibit implies that Afrikaners had a history of viewing themselves as superior to blacks and as harassed by nineteenth-century white rulers, but it doesn’t connect the dots to ’48 as well as it could. (One newsreel shows people waving Boer republic flags as Malan enters office but the accompanying text stating Malan’s support was Afrikaner-based is in very small print; if apartheid was indeed a result of Afrikaners gaining political power, one might expect this to be stated a little more overtly.) A photographic exhibition is not a place for a written discussion of a nation’s history, but a few explanatory sentences might help a person unfamiliar with South African history.

Similarly, the exhibit does not explain the movie African Jim (Jim Comes to Jo’burg). While some scenes in the film, which at first glance might strike some to be comic, bring to mind the scene in Cry, the Beloved County when the minister travels to Johannesburg to look for his son, the exhibit doesn’t make clear whether the film is meant to be humorous look at a country bumpkin seeing a city for the first time, a demeaning look at a non-white seeing the benefits of white civilization, or a sympathetic – and serious – story of someone who experiences trials and tribulations in an unfamiliar racial and social-economic environment. This is not helped by the location where the film is displayed. It is displayed on a television screen in a long room that was obviously designed for exhibiting still photographs; the consequent echo of other people’s conversations makes it difficult to hear the movie’s dialog (and so to realize the film was meant to have a serious meaning). A South African probably could understand the film easily as he likely would be familiar with it (it was made there in 1949), without some accompanying descriptive text a North American probably could not.

The exhibition does far better – and devotes far more space to – displaying the effects of the bureaucracy’s efforts to maintaining apartheid’s racial differences. The effects of the bureaucracy’s regulations upon South Africa’s inhabitants are extremely well-documented. As it should be, the emphasis is upon the effects upon the non-white community; they suffered the most, so they should get the most attention. Some of the most powerful are the mundane scenes of daily life. The black nanny seated behind the white girl in Peter Magubane’s Nanny and Child, Johannesburg, for instance, emphasizes the pettiness of apartheid’s enforcement far more than a mere display of a sign saying “Whites Only” ever could. Apparently, it was considered dangerous for a nanny to be next to – or even to face the same direction as – a small child.
Children, the bureaucracy felt, had to start learning early and even a caring nanny had to keep her distance (who knew what might happen if a nanny was allowed to comfort a nervous child by placing her on her lap?). As a result, the bureaucracy had a strong interest in the positioning and utilization of park benches to ensure the ideology of separateness was maintained. No issue, the photograph says, is too small for government regulators.

This is not to say the larger events of apartheid are not also well-documented in the exhibit. Relocations of non-whites are documented, both in still and in moving pictures. Efforts to avoid the restrictions on group protests during the 1980s’ State of Emergency are also shown, as well as pictures of potential miners from the homelands getting the necessary permits and fingerprinting allowing them to work in officially white-administered areas. The photographs documenting these effects (and other effects of apartheid’s bureaucratic regulations) cover most of the exhibition’s upper floor and part of its lower floor (the fall of apartheid covers most of the rest of the lower floor). Of particular note are two paired Gideon Mendel photographs of coffins from 1985, one of which contains a six month old baby killed by tear gas, which serve to illustrate the human toll of the government’s enforcement of apartheid.

Interspersed among these displays are those documenting the relationship between ordinary people and South Africa’s street level bureaucrats. Of these, the majority shown are law enforcement officers. This is not surprising. Apartheid was essentially a system by which the few repressed the many; police officers, therefore, would be critical backbones of such a system. In the exhibit, they are primarily shown trying to control non-white crowds, often during riots. Given the fact that news photographers like to photograph where the action is, this is understandable. However, more photographs of the mundane (for instance, of these police officers harassing non-whites for minor infractions on ordinary days) might have done a better job of conveying the message that street level bureaucrats made apartheid a reality on a day-to-day basis. Fighting riots was only part of the police’s job, keeping the downtrodden down on a daily basis was another.

Nonetheless, the intensity of feeling by both sides in the protests is well-documented. The 1976 Soweto uprising receives ample wall space (Hector Pieterson is shown), and is supplemented by television video footage. The accompanying descriptive information provides good context for the viewer. The conflicts of the 1980’s also receive excellent coverage. In both cases, the emphasis is on the role of the police and the military in forcing the protesters into submission. Neither the police nor the military come out looking good, but the military, because of their tactics, weapons, and uniforms, appear worse than the police. Repression is a harsh business, and the harsher one is, the photographs say, the better one is at repressing the people the bureaucracy is responsible for.

This exhibit is recommended for anyone who wants to see the effects of apartheid upon the lives of ordinary South Africans. It provides an excellent introduction to the era, even if the accompanying descriptive text is sometimes missing a few sentences. In terms of displaying bureaucracy, it displays the effects of the apartheid bureaucracy upon ordinary people rather than serving as a photo essay on the bureaucracy itself. In addition, it often fails to distinguish between the effects of the bureaucracy’s implementation of apartheid laws and the direct effects of the laws themselves. (This failure to distinguish between the two should be an important issue
both to public administration scholars and to historians, as it raises the question of the culpability of policymakers versus the culpability of policy enforcers.) As a result of these deficiencies, the title of the exhibit could be viewed as misleading, but a photo essay concentrating on the bureaucracy itself might not be able to convey the true nature of apartheid as well as this exhibition does. This exhibition does do a good job of conveying the true nature of apartheid, and for that reason is recommended to anyone interested in learning how a bureaucracy can be used to repress people.

[Note: A catalog of this exhibit is available for purchase at amazon.com.]

Jonathan Woolley is a financial and policy analyst specializing in citizen involvement, public transportation, capital infrastructure, and performance measurement. He has served on oversight bodies in municipal government dealing with issues extending from ethics to recycling, worked in corporate, non-profit, and public finance, been affiliated with various advocacy groups working on transportation, and has offered testimony in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania on transportation and budgetary concerns. He is currently pursuing a doctorate at Rutgers University’s School of Public Affairs and Administration where he is researching capital infrastructure projects at airports.
Works of fiction can be accessible and exciting. That's why we read them. We also read them because they offer examples, parables, metaphors, and lessons that give additional purpose to and trigger insights about our lives, relationships and activities.

This series of case studies takes advantage of those virtues. It is designed for students and instructors interested in the challenges of leadership, management, and administration found in organizations everywhere — whether in government, business, education, or the blossoming nonprofit sector.

It turns out that Herman Melville, Gene Roddenberry, and even Mother Goose have something unique and important in common with town managers, tax auditors, police officers, park rangers, and government executives: All share pragmatic and articulate insights into the intricacies, the ethical dilemmas, and the professional frustrations and satisfactions of career public administrators — women and men who unobtrusively keep our communities and our society operating smoothly. In fact, public administrators themselves enjoy wonderfully diverse backgrounds and intellectual interests. (I recall a group of computer programmers and program analysts I once knew whose backgrounds included a former museum curator, a philosophy instructor enjoying a second career, a pair of indefatigable thespians, and someone who, as a part-time business, translated international documents.)

Notwithstanding our rich backgrounds, too few people consider — let alone take advantage of — enjoying timeless, provocative authors as vehicles for understanding the discipline we call public administration. So, in presenting a sampling of literary selections that feature administrative issues, challenges, and practices, this fascinating edge of public administration is actually the antithesis of a demarcation line. It illustrates that no fences exist between the liberal arts and the everyday professional and civic activities that occupy our lives.
Here is the bottom line: What you’re about to read is unreal — that is, fiction — but it is also colorfully, imaginatively, entertainingly, and even grittily true. And it’s all about the invaluable and inescapable world of administration.

**Dwight Waldo’s Challenge to Us as Teachers of Administration**

It’s very difficult to teach students who have not had a maturing experience in the field of administration. I emphasize again that this maturity can be achieved in different ways; it needn’t be government work, i.e., an administrative agency. But the maturing experience helps a great deal. Only once, I may say, did I try to teach public administration to an undergraduate class — in 1960. I found that a frustrating, sobering experience, because it was impossible to make these students, many of them still in their teens and inexperienced in organizational life, aware of the things that seemed to me to be important in public administration. *I knew, we knew,* that the matters addressed were important. But how to convey this sense of importance to the students? The textbook was there before us like a leaden lump; it didn’t do the job of motivating or explaining or instructing the students in a way which one hoped that it would. I concluded that either you shouldn’t teach public administration to undergraduates, or it should be done on some other basis than that of the then-existing textbooks. I have not changed that opinion.


Dwight Waldo issued quite a challenge to us, whether we are teachers of administration or writers of textbooks about administration. Waldo is exactly on point: Students who have little opportunity to experience being part of the fabric of an organization do indeed have great difficulty figuring out why this “administration stuff” is minimally relevant, let alone important enough to be the focus of serious study. A dozen years of public or private schooling are not, by themselves, sufficient experience; traditional and online textbooks, well designed and well researched as they may be, are also insufficient; and experiential learning, as desirable as it can be, is too frequently impractical.

*The Unreal Administrator* series of case studies cannot truly fill that experience gap — nonetheless, it can help narrow the gap by tapping experiences brought to life through poetry, lyrics, and the prose of interesting fiction. Each selection in the series has been chosen for its enjoyableness and for its case-study value in illustrating an aspect of management, administration, or public policy — specifically, the functions of government, ethics, leadership, planning and budgeting, performance evaluation, law enforcement and justice, communication, organizational and small-group behavior, actions and consequences, diversity and multiculturalism, democratic principles.

The aim of this project, undertaken through support by the Adelaide C. and Alan L. Bird Fund for Instructional Development, is to draw upon fine examples from North American and English literature to help students understand and appreciate administrative skills and issues. Perhaps most important, a collection of this kind serves to integrate overall academic experience by
helping students appreciate that, in reality, no gulf exists between liberal arts and the myriad activities that make up our civic and professional lives.

Dr. Kenneth Nichols is professor emeritus of public administration at the University of Maine.
Case Study #1:  
*A Rose for Emily*  
by William Faulkner

Developed by Kenneth Nichols

William Faulkner is one of the twentieth century’s preeminent fiction writers. In 1950, he won the Nobel Prize for literature. Faulkner spent most of his life (1897-1962) in Oxford, Mississippi, where he brought to life the people and the communities of the Deep South. Faulkner describes them in ways that, at once, make them both unique and universal. His places and characters represent us all — reflecting our hopes, our ordinariness, our tribulations, and our humanity.

In “A Rose for Emily,” Faulkner discusses the relationship of the individual and the community — things that an UNREAL ADMINISTRATOR may to have to confront. So assume, for the time being, that you live in a modest town, possibly in Yoknapatawpha County somewhere in rural America. Not only are you a long-time member of the community, but you are also one of the several people who keep town government operating smoothly. You might be the town’s clerk, its manager, or its mayor. Those townspeople are your friends and your neighbors as well as being the public you serve. The era could be the early 1900s, as it is here in “A Rose for Emily”; in certain respects, however, it could almost be today.

Holding in mind that frame of reference, read William Faulkner’s short story. After all, although the story’s characters are drawn from Faulkner’s fertile imagination and its locale is Faulkner’s mythical county in the middle of Mississippi, we might as easily find Miss Emily’s community just up the road from where you or I live right now. In fact, Miss Emily’s house might only be a few blocks away.

**The Selection: A Rose for Emily**
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When Miss Emily Grierson died, our whole town went to her funeral: the men through a sort of respectful affection for a fallen monument, the women mostly out of curiosity to see the inside of her house, which no one save an old man-servant—a combined gardener and cook—had seen in at least ten years.

It was a big, squarish frame house that had once been white, decorated with cupolas and spires and scrolled balconies in the heavily lightsome style of the seventies, set on what had once been our most select street. But garages and cotton gins had encroached and obliterated even the august names of that neighborhood; only Miss Emily's house was left, lifting its stubborn and coquettish decay above the cotton wagons and the gasoline pumps—an eyesore among eyesores. And now Miss Emily had gone to join the representatives of those august names where they lay in the cedar-bemused cemetery among the ranked and anonymous graves of Union and Confederate soldiers who fell at the battle of Jefferson.

Alive, Miss Emily had been a tradition, a duty, and a care; a sort of hereditary obligation upon the town, dating from that day in 1894 when Colonel Sartoris, the mayor—he who fathered the edict that no Negro woman should appear on the streets without an apron—remitted her taxes, the dispensation dating from the death of her father on into perpetuity. Not that Miss Emily would have accepted charity. Colonel Sartoris invented an involved tale to the effect that Miss Emily's father had loaned money to the town, which the town, as a matter of business, preferred this way of repaying. Only a man of Colonel Sartoris' generation and thought could have invented it, and only a woman could have believed it.

When the next generation, with its more modern ideas, became mayors and aldermen, this arrangement created some little dissatisfaction. On the first of the year they mailed her a tax notice. February came, and there was no reply. They wrote her a formal letter, asking her to call at the sheriff's office at her convenience. A week later the mayor wrote her herself, offering to call or to send his car for her, and received in reply a note on paper of an archaic shape, in a thin, flowing calligraphy in faded ink, to the effect that she no longer went out at all. The tax notice was also enclosed, without comment.

They called a special meeting of the Board of Aldermen. A deputation waited upon her, knocked at the door through which no visitor had passed since she ceased giving china-painting lessons eight or ten years earlier. They were admitted by the old Negro into a dim hall from which a stairway mounted into still more shadow. It smelled of dust and disuse—a close, dank smell. The Negro led them into the parlor. It was furnished in heavy, leather-covered furniture. When the Negro opened the blinds of one window, they could see that the leather was cracked; and when they sat down, a faint dust rose sluggishly about their thighs, spinning with slow motes in the single sun-ray. On a tarnished gilt easel before the fireplace stood a crayon portrait of Miss Emily's father.

They rose when she entered—a small, fat woman in black, with a thin gold chain descending to her waist and vanishing into her belt, leaning on an ebony cane with a tarnished gold head. Her skeleton was small and spare; perhaps that was why what would have been merely plumpness in another was obesity in her. She looked bloated, like a body long submerged in motionless water, and of that pallid hue. Her eyes, lost in the fatty ridges of her face, looked like two small pieces
of coal pressed into a lump of dough as they moved from one face to another while the visitors stated their errand.

She did not ask them to sit. She just stood in the door and listened quietly until the spokesman came to a stumbling halt. Then they could hear the invisible watch ticking at the end of the gold chain.

Her voice was dry and cold. "I have no taxes in Jefferson. Colonel Sartoris explained it to me. Perhaps one of you can gain access to the city records and satisfy yourselves."

"But we have. We are the city authorities, Miss Emily. Didn't you get a notice from the sheriff, signed by him?"

"I received a paper, yes," Miss Emily said. "Perhaps he considers himself the sheriff . . . I have no taxes in Jefferson."

"But there is nothing on the books to show that, you see We must go by the—"

"See Colonel Sartoris. I have no taxes in Jefferson."

"But, Miss Emily—"

"See Colonel Sartoris." (Colonel Sartoris had been dead almost ten years.) "I have no taxes in Jefferson. Tobe!" The Negro appeared. "Show these gentlemen out."

So She vanquished them, horse and foot, just as she had vanquished their fathers thirty years before about the smell.

That was two years after her father's death and a short time after her sweetheart—the one we believed would marry her—had deserted her. After her father's death she went out very little; after her sweetheart went away, people hardly saw her at all. A few of the ladies had the temerity to call, but were not received, and the only sign of life about the place was the Negro man—a young man then—going in and out with a market basket.

"Just as if a man—any man—could keep a kitchen properly, "the ladies said; so they were not surprised when the smell developed. It was another link between the gross, teeming world and the high and mighty Griersons.

A neighbor, a woman, complained to the mayor, Judge Stevens, eighty years old.

"But what will you have me do about it, madam?" he said.

"Why, send her word to stop it," the woman said. "Isn't there a law?"

"I'm sure that won't be necessary," Judge Stevens said. "It's probably just a snake or a rat that nigger of hers killed in the yard. I'll speak to him about it."
The next day he received two more complaints, one from a man who came in diffident deprecation. "We really must do something about it, Judge. I'd be the last one in the world to bother Miss Emily, but we've got to do something." That night the Board of Aldermen met—three graybeards and one younger man, a member of the rising generation.

"It's simple enough," he said. "Send her word to have her place cleaned up. Give her a certain time to do it in, and if she don't. . ."

"Dammit, sir," Judge Stevens said, "will you accuse a lady to her face of smelling bad?"

So the next night, after midnight, four men crossed Miss Emily's lawn and slunk about the house like burglars, sniffing along the base of the brickwork and at the cellar openings while one of them performed a regular sowing motion with his hand out of a sack slung from his shoulder. They broke open the cellar door and sprinkled lime there, and in all the outbuildings. As they recrossed the lawn, a window that had been dark was lighted and Miss Emily sat in it, the light behind her, and her upright torso motionless as that of an idol. They crept quietly across the lawn and into the shadow of the locusts that lined the street. After a week or two the smell went away.

That was when people had begun to feel really sorry for her. People in our town, remembering how old lady Wyatt, her great-aunt, had gone completely crazy at last, believed that the Griersons held themselves a little too high for what they really were. None of the young men were quite good enough for Miss Emily and such. We had long thought of them as a tableau, Miss Emily a slender figure in white in the background, her father a sprawled silhouette in the foreground, his back to her and clutching a horsewhip, the two of them framed by the back-flung front door. So when she got to be thirty and was still single, we were not pleased exactly, but vindicated; even with insanity in the family she wouldn't have turned down all of her chances if they had really materialized.

When her father died, it got about that the house was all that was left to her; and in a way, people were glad. At last they could pity Miss Emily. Being left alone, and a pauper, she had become humanized. Now she too would know the old thrill and the old despair of a penny more or less.

The day after his death all the ladies prepared to call at the house and offer condolence and aid, as is our custom Miss Emily met them at the door, dressed as usual and with no trace of grief on her face. She told them that her father was not dead. She did that for three days, with the ministers calling on her, and the doctors, trying to persuade her to let them dispose of the body. Just as they were about to resort to law and force, she broke down, and they buried her father quickly.

We did not say she was crazy then. We believed she had to do that. We remembered all the young men her father had driven away, and we knew that with nothing left, she would have to cling to that which had robbed her, as people will.

She was sick for a long time. When we saw her again, her hair was cut short, making her look like a girl, with a vague resemblance to those angels in colored church windows—sort of tragic and serene.
The town had just let the contracts for paving the sidewalks, and in the summer after her father's death they began the work. The construction company came with riggers and mules and machinery, and a foreman named Homer Barron, a Yankee—a big, dark, ready man, with a big voice and eyes lighter than his face. The little boys would follow in groups to hear him cuss the riggers, and the riggers singing in time to the rise and fall of picks. Pretty soon he knew everybody in town. Whenever you heard a lot of laughing anywhere about the square, Homer Barron would be in the center of the group. Presently we began to see him and Miss Emily on Sunday afternoons driving in the yellow-wheeled buggy and the matched team of bays from the livery stable.

At first we were glad that Miss Emily would have an interest, because the ladies all said, "Of course a Grierson would not think seriously of a Northerner, a day laborer." But there were still others, older people, who said that even grief could not cause a real lady to forget noblesse oblige—without calling it noblesse oblige. They just said, "Poor Emily. Her kinsfolk should come to her." She had some kin in Alabama; but years ago her father had fallen out with them over the estate of old lady Wyatt, the crazy woman, and there was no communication between the two families. They had not even been represented at the funeral.

And as soon as the old people said, "Poor Emily," the whispering began. "Do you suppose it's really so?" they said to one another. "Of course it is. What else could . . . " This behind their hands; rustling of craned silk and satin behind jalousies closed upon the sun of Sunday afternoon as the thin, swift clop-clop-clop of the matched team passed: "Poor Emily."

She carried her head high enough—even when we believed that she was fallen. It was as if she demanded more than ever the recognition of her dignity as the last Grierson; as if it had wanted that touch of earthiness to reaffirm her imperviousness. Like when she bought the rat poison, the arsenic. That was over a year after they had begun to say "Poor Emily," and while the two female cousins were visiting her.

"I want some poison," she said to the druggist. She was over thirty then, still a slight woman, though thinner than usual, with cold, haughty black eyes in a face the flesh of which was strained across the temples and about the eyesockets as you imagine a lighthouse-keeper's face ought to look. "I want some poison," she said.

"Yes, Miss Emily. What kind? For rats and such? I'd recom—"

"I want the best you have. I don't care what kind."

The druggist named several. "They'll kill anything up to an elephant. But what you want is—"

"Arsenic," Miss Emily said. "Is that a good one?"

"Is . . . arsenic? Yes, ma'am. But what you want—"

"I want arsenic."
The druggist looked down at her. She looked back at him, erect, her face like a strained flag. "Why, of course," the druggist said. "If that's what you want. But the law requires you to tell what you are going to use it for."

Miss Emily just stared at him, her head tilted back in order to look him eye for eye, until he looked away and went and got the arsenic and wrapped it up. The Negro delivery boy brought her the package; the druggist didn't come back. When she opened the package at home there was written on the box, under the skull and bones: "For rats."

So the next day we all said, "She will kill herself"; and we said it would be the best thing. When she had first begun to be seen with Homer Barron, we had said, "She will marry him." Then we said, "She will persuade him yet," because Homer himself had remarked—he liked men, and it was known that he drank with the younger men in the Elks' Club—that he was not a marrying man. Later we said, "Poor Emily" behind the jalousies as they passed on Sunday afternoon in the glittering buggy, Miss Emily with her head high and Homer Barron with his hat cocked and a cigar in his teeth, reins and whip in a yellow glove.

Then some of the ladies began to say that it was a disgrace to the town and a bad example to the young people. The men did not want to interfere, but at last the ladies forced the Baptist minister—Miss Emily's people were Episcopal—to call upon her. He would never divulge what happened during that interview, but he refused to go back again. The next Sunday they again drove about the streets, and the following day the minister's wife wrote to Miss Emily's relations in Alabama.

So she had blood-kin under her roof again and we sat back to watch developments. At first nothing happened. Then we were sure that they were to be married. We learned that Miss Emily had been to the jeweler's and ordered a man's toilet set in silver, with the letters H. B. on each piece. Two days later we learned that she had bought a complete outfit of men's clothing, including a nightshirt, and we said, "They are married." We were really glad. We were glad because the two female cousins were even more Grierson than Miss Emily had ever been.

So we were not surprised when Homer Barron—the streets had been finished some time since—was gone. We were a little disappointed that there was not a public blowing-off, but we believed that he had gone on to prepare for Miss Emily's coming, or to give her a chance to get rid of the cousins. (By that time it was a cabal, and we were all Miss Emily's allies to help circumvent the cousins.) Sure enough, after another week they departed. And, as we had expected all along, within three days Homer Barron was back in town. A neighbor saw the Negro man admit him at the kitchen door at dusk one evening.

And that was the last we saw of Homer Barron. And of Miss Emily for some time. The Negro man went in and out with the market basket, but the front door remained closed. Now and then we would see her at a window for a moment, as the men did that night when they sprinkled the lime, but for almost six months she did not appear on the streets. Then we knew that this was to be expected too; as if that quality of her father which had thwarted her woman's life so many times had been too virulent and too furious to die.
When we next saw Miss Emily, she had grown fat and her hair was turning gray. During the next few years it grew grayer and grayer until it attained an even pepper-and-salt iron-gray, when it ceased turning. Up to the day of her death at seventy-four it was still that vigorous iron-gray, like the hair of an active man.

From that time on her front door remained closed, save for a period of six or seven years, when she was about forty, during which she gave lessons in china-painting. She fitted up a studio in one of the downstairs rooms, where the daughters and granddaughters of Colonel Sartoris' contemporaries were sent to her with the same regularity and in the same spirit that they were sent to church on Sundays with a twenty-five-cent piece for the collection plate. Meanwhile her taxes had been remitted.

Then the newer generation became the backbone and the spirit of the town, and the painting pupils grew up and fell away and did not send their children to her with boxes of color and tedious brushes and pictures cut from the ladies' magazines. The front door closed upon the last one and remained closed for good. When the town got free postal delivery, Miss Emily alone refused to let them fasten the metal numbers above her door and attach a mailbox to it. She would not listen to them.

Daily, monthly, yearly we watched the Negro grow grayer and more stooped, going in and out with the market basket. Each December we sent her a tax notice, which would be returned by the post office a week later, unclaimed. Now and then we would see her in one of the downstairs windows—she had evidently shut up the top floor of the house—like the carven torso of an idol in a niche, looking or not looking at us, we could never tell which. Thus she passed from generation to generation—dear, inescapable, impervious, tranquil, and perverse.

And so she died. Fell ill in the house filled with dust and shadows, with only a doddering Negro man to wait on her. We did not even know she was sick; we had long since given up trying to get any information from the Negro.

He talked to no one, probably not even to her, for his voice had grown harsh and rusty, as if from disuse.

She died in one of the downstairs rooms, in a heavy walnut bed with a curtain, her gray head propped on a pillow yellow and moldy with age and lack of sunlight.

The Negro met the first of the ladies at the front door and let them in, with their hushed, sibilant voices and their quick, curious glances, and then he disappeared. He walked right through the house and out the back and was not seen again.

The two female cousins came at once. They held the funeral on the second day, with the town coming to look at Miss Emily beneath a mass of bought flowers, with the crayon face of her father musing profoundly above the bier and the ladies sibilant and macabre; and the very old men—some in their brushed Confederate uniforms—on the porch and the lawn, talking of Miss Emily as if she had been a contemporary of theirs, believing that they had danced with her and courted her perhaps, confusing time with its mathematical progression, as the old do, to whom all
the past is not a diminishing road but, instead, a huge meadow which no winter ever quite touches, divided from them now by the narrow bottle-neck of the most recent decade of years.

Already we knew that there was one room in that region above stairs which no one had seen in forty years, and which would have to be forced. They waited until Miss Emily was decently in the ground before they opened it.

The violence of breaking down the door seemed to fill this room with pervading dust. A thin, acrid pall as of the tomb seemed to lie everywhere upon this room decked and furnished as for a bridal: upon the valance curtains of faded rose color, upon the rose-shaded lights, upon the dressing table, upon the delicate array of crystal and the man's toilet things backed with tarnished silver, silver so tarnished that the monogram was obscured. Among them lay a collar and tie, as if they had just been removed, which, lifted, left upon the surface a pale crescent in the dust. Upon a chair hung the suit, carefully folded; beneath it the two mute shoes and the discarded socks.

The man himself lay in the bed.

For a long while we just stood there, looking down at the profound and fleshless grin. The body had apparently once lain in the attitude of an embrace, but now the long sleep that outlasts love, that conquers even the grimace of love, had cuckolded him. What was left of him, rotted beneath what was left of the nightshirt, had become inextricable from the bed in which he lay; and upon him and upon the pillow beside him lay that even coating of the patient and biding dust.

Then we noticed that in the second pillow was the indentation of a head. One of us lifted something from it, and leaning forward, that faint and invisible dust dry and acrid in the nostrils, we saw a long strand of iron-gray hair.

**For Students**

**Questions**

- Does the evidence Faulkner shares with us suggest that Miss Emily killed her beau? At what point (if at all) would the town’s law enforcement officials have had reason to suspect foul play? What action should they have taken at that time?

- In Miss Emily’s time, communities had no safety net of social services and economic assistance for people in need. Colonel Sartorius attempted a makeshift version by inventing a loan that Emily’s father supposedly made to the town and that the town was repaying by waiving (that is, forgiving) Miss Emily’s property tax. What are the practical and ethical strengths and weaknesses of the Colonel’s attempt at kindness?

- If the story’s main character had been a man — say, a *Mr. Emerson Grierson* — rather than a woman, would the townspeople and town officials have handled events in the story differently? What if the protagonist had been Miss Emily, but the story had taken place
Would Miss Emily’s household employees be described in the same terms now as Faulkner employed in the 1930s? To the extent that those descriptions might differ, does this reflect the times, the characters themselves, or other people’s perception of the characters?

What concerns might you have with the Grierson household if you worked for the town’s department of environmental protection?

**Exercises**

1. **Social Services.** You are a social worker assigned to the Emily Grierson case. Your supervisor tells you Miss Emily may have an income low enough to qualify her for the state’s workfare training and placement. The file also indicates that Miss Emily might be suffering from agoraphobia, which is a fear of going outside and being in contact with other people.
   a. What approach do you take with Emily Grierson on your first visit?
   b. What is your judgment of Miss Emily’s potential in the state’s workfare program?
   c. Based on your visit, would you say your new client is or is not suffering from health impairment, including her mental health?

2. **Urban Neighborhoods.** Miss Emily’s house and neighborhood deteriorated over time. The town’s Board of Alders has hired you as an urban design and renewal consultant, and, as you go about town, you notice the Grierson neighborhood and the infrastructure situation that Faulkner describe. (A city’s infrastructure includes its utility conduits and transmission lines, its roads and bridges, and even its public transportation systems, along with other civil engineering concerns.) Miss Emily’s neighborhood has become semi-commercial over time, and the street in front of her house is now a truck route.
   a. Create a brief technical description of Miss Emily’s neighborhood as you imagine it, its current condition, and the trend you anticipate if the town makes no changes in zoning or development policies.
   b. Suggest a plan for making the neighborhood more prosperous, either as a commercial or a residential locale.
   c. Advise the Board of Alders on the legal actions your plan would require of them as lawmakers and of the town’s law and regulation enforcement officials.

**Other Works by the Author**

*The Sound and the Fury* (1929), Faulkner's fourth novel, is considered his first masterpiece, and many consider it to be his finest work. It was Faulkner's own favorite novel, primarily, he says, because it is his "most splendid failure." Depicting the decline of a once-aristocratic family, the novel is divided into four parts, each told by a different narrator.
As I Lay Dying (1930). As with The Sound and the Fury, this novel is told in stream-of-conscious fashion. Fifteen narrators relate the story of the Bundren family's quest to Jefferson to bury Addie, their matriarch among her people. The novel explores the nature of grieving, community, and family.

Absalom, Absalom! (1936), also often proclaimed Faulkner's greatest masterpiece, tells the story of a young man from a poor white family in western Virginia who has a grand "design," and the effect his actions have on future generations in Faulkner's fictional Mississippi setting of Yoknapatawpha County, especially on one of the characters from The Sound and the Fury. Absalom is written in dense, intricate prose; for the reader who is willing to tackle it, the novel offers a compelling exploration of race, gender, and the burdens of the past.

Internet Sites

THE WRITINGS OF WILLIAM FAULKNER, UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI (www.mcsr.olemiss.edu/~egjb/faulkner/faulkner.html) – This site includes much information about Faulkner, his environment, and his works, along with links to other Faulkner-oriented resources in the U.S. and elsewhere.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR HISTORIC PRESERVATION (www.preservationnation.org) – This nonprofit organization acts to preserve important historic sites and structures.

HOUSING RESEARCH (www.housingresearch.org/) – Housing Research (housingresearch.wordpress.com), a small nonprofit organization, provides research and information helping public housing agencies deliver decent housing and suitable living conditions to low-income families. The housing policy research arm of the MacArthur Foundation (www.macfound.org/programs/housing-policy-research/) produces, collects, and publishes “compelling findings from a range of fields are revealing critical links between housing and other national policy issues.”

OBSESSIVE-COMPULSIVE FOUNDATION (www.ocfoundation.org/) – OCF provides a support network along with education and research on obsessive-compulsive disorders such as agoraphobia.
For the Instructor

“A Rose for Emily” is a short story written in 1930 by William Faulkner.

Discussion Points and Themes

O Faulkner laces “A Rose for Emily” with a rich selection of themes. Dominating this story is the theme (■) of organizational and small-group behavior as seen through the lens of a community. Also major (■) are themes of the functions of government, especially in terms of social services; law enforcement and justice; and policy evolution (if not calculated policy development). Notable minor themes (+) include diversity and multiculturalism (both in terms of race relations and gender relations), ethics (pertaining to citizens with special situations), societal change over time, and even urban renewal planning.

O The “law enforcement and justice theme” can be viewed as having a light, a medium, and a heavy aspect. Light describes community policing aspects of the town’s interaction with the protagonist and her father. Medium characterizes regulation enforcement elements implicit in the story. Heavy deals with the unrealized potential for investigating and prosecuting a probable homicide.

O This story can be approached as a mystery or as social commentary. Work through the issue of Miss Emily as probable murderer and necrophile, then ask the class to consider other issues Faulkner imbeds.

Themes

- Organizational/ Societal Change
  ■ Functions of Government
    ◦ Democratic Principles
    ◦ Ethics
    ◦ Leadership
    ◦ Decisionmaking
    ◦ Planning/Budgeting
    ◦ Performance Evaluation
  ■ Policy Development/ Evaluation
  ■ Law Enforcement/ Justice
    ◦ Communication

- Organizational/Group Behavior
  ◦ Diversity/ Multiculturalism
  ◦ Human Resources Management
  ◦ Personal/ Professional Development

Questions

Any of the questions can be used in classroom and online discussion, assigned as homework, worked either individually or in small groups, and/or adapted as questions for essay or objective tests.

The commentaries below are brief reflections on each question; however, they are not intended as comprehensive.
Question (from student section) | Comment
--- | ---
1. **Does the evidence Faulkner shares with us suggest that Miss Emily killed her beau?** At what point (if at all) would the town’s law enforcement officials have had reason to suspect foul play? What action should they have taken at that time? | Oh, yes, Faulkner certainly leads us to consider this possibility, even though he does not confirm the reader’s speculations. Potentially, law enforcement officials could have tried to trace the boyfriend’s whereabouts through his family and acquaintances, they could also have sought a warrant to search the house and premises, and they could have questioned Miss Emily, her neighbors, and her household employee.

2. **In Miss Emily’s time, communities had no safety net of social services and economic assistance. Colonel Sartoris attempted a makeshift version by inventing a loan that Emily’s father supposedly made to the town and that the town was repaying by waiving (i.e., forgiving) Miss Emily’s property tax. What are the practical and ethical strengths and weaknesses of the Colonel’s attempt at kindness?** | In terms of **ethics**, one strength is that the Colonel was attempting to provide a makeshift safety net for Miss Emily, fashioning it in a way that preserved her dignity; one weakness is that the **ad hoc** approach apparently applied only to one member of the community and, thus, was not fairly applied to others with a similar need. In terms of **practicality**, the approach worked only as long as Colonel Sartoris was around as mayor to manage the tax exception he had created; long-term, it created an awkward and unresolved situation both for Miss Emily and for the Colonel’s successors at the town office.

3. **If the story’s main character had been a man — say, a Mr. Emerson Grierson — rather than a woman, would the townspeople and town officials have handled events in the story differently? What if the protagonist had been Miss Emily, but the story had taken place this year?** | Although the largess of waiving the Grierson’s residential property tax was triggered by the regard in which Emily’s father had been held, the story probably wouldn’t have worked if the protagonist were male. Part of the plot depends on the societal relationship between women and men — then, certainly, and, even now, to a degree. Other characters would conceivably have been less tolerant of a male protagonist and less likely to underestimate a male character. Both in fiction and in real life, we react to one another at least in part on the basis of stereotypes. The good news is that our stereotypes — including our stereotypes of women — are becoming more sophisticated and less restrictive than in the past.

4. **Would Miss Emily’s household employees be described in the same terms now as Faulkner employed in the 1930s? To the extent that those descriptions might differ, does that reflect the times, the characters themselves, or other people’s perceptions of the characters?** | Later twentieth century Southern writers (e.g., William Styron, Maya Angelou, Truman Capote, Tony Morrison, John Grisham) don’t rely on race as the major description of a character, whether major or minor. This reflects not only the times, the characters themselves, and other’s perceptions of the character, but also today’s readers and writers.

5. **What concerns might you have with the Grierson household if you worked for the town’s department of environmental protection?** | The smell and, eventually, the overall poor condition of the house itself are likely to concern you. You may have the authority and responsibility for investigating. You may be forced to issue a citation or, ultimately, bring court action against the owner for noncompliance with environmental and safety ordinances.
Exercises

As with the questions, above, any of these exercises can be used in the classroom, online, or assigned as homework. They are usually best worked in small group settings. Some can be adapted as examination questions.

The commentaries below describe the potential utility of each exercise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise (from student section)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Social Services. You are a social worker assigned to the Emily Grierson case. Your supervisor tells you Miss Emily may have an income low enough to qualify her for the state’s workfare training and placement. The file also indicates that Miss Emily might be suffering from agoraphobia, which is a fear of going outside and being in contact with other people.  
a. What approach do you take with Emily Grierson on your first visit?  
b. What is your judgment of Miss Emily’s potential in the state’s workfare program?  
c. Based on your visit, would you say your new client is or is not suffering from health impairment, including her mental health? | This exercise and the one below permit students to view the situation from the perspectives of officials with differing responsibilities to the public. 
This exercise places students in the role of a social services provider. |
| 2. Urban Neighborhoods. Miss Emily’s house and neighborhood deteriorated over time. The town’s Board of Alders has hired you as an urban design and renewal consultant, and, as you go about town, you notice the Grierson neighborhood and the infrastructure situation that Faulkner describe. (A city’s infrastructure includes its utility conduits and transmission lines, its roads and bridges, and even its public transportation system, along with other civil engineering concerns.) Miss Emily’s neighborhood has become semi-commercial over time, and the street in front of her house is now a truck route.  
a. Create a brief technical description of Miss Emily’s neighborhood as you imagine it, its current condition, and the trend you anticipate if the town makes no changes in zoning or development policies.  
b. Suggest a plan for making the neighborhood prosperous, either as a commercial or a residential locale.  
c. Advise the Board of Alders on the legal actions your plan would require of them as lawmakers and of the town’s law and regulation enforcement officials. | Students have an opportunity to indulge their creativity, consider the evolution of neighborhoods and the role officials play in influencing that evolution, and the legal implications involved. |

Other Classroom Activity

TAX INCENTIVES FOR SOCIAL SERVICE ASSISTANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
Use the case of Miss Emily Grierson to consider whether and how the town should establish —  
a. a homestead exemption* at some level for taxes on real property held by individuals; and/or
b. an incentive that waives real property taxes at some level to qualifying new business enterprises relocating into the town; and/or
c. a line of industrial development bonds (IDBs) to assist qualifying local businesses.
*(Note: Also sometimes called a “circuit breaker,” a homestead exemption lessens a homeowner’s property tax by not taxing the first several thousand dollars worth of the assessed value of the residential property. For example, if the first $20,000 of a home’s estimated value were exempt, the owner of a $150,000 home would owe property tax only on $130,000 and the owner of an $18,000 home would owe no property tax at all. Consequently, homestead exemptions have the effect of making property taxes less regressive.)*

Divide the class into teams. For smaller class sizes, assign one issue to each team. Have the team prepare a brief on the purpose of that proposal, how it might be implemented, its pros and cons, and their recommendation. (Variation I, for medium-to-large classes: Double the number of teams, assigning each team a position — i.e., in support of or in opposition to — as well as an issue. Variation II, for even larger classes: Triple the number of teams. Designate three teams as staff; assign each a different proposal and have each team prepare a brief on the purpose of the proposal and how it might be implemented. Then, as in Variation I, assign each team an issue and a position on that issue.) Allow each team time to present its brief to the town council (that is, to the rest of the class); then have the council deliberate and vote on the options set before it.

**Bottom Line.** This activity encourages students to

- Explore the use of tax policy as an instrument of social policy.
- Weigh strengths and weaknesses of example policy proposals.
- Experience the confluence of policy-making, policy-implementing, and policy-advocacy perspectives.

**Further Reading**

Beyond the references elsewhere in this study, you may wish to identify relevant textbook or reading selections assigned for the course. Below are several more:


Discussion and Essay Questions

The questions and exercises in the student section of this case study are readily adaptable for online or classroom discussion and as examination questions. Other possibilities:

- Use Faulkner’s “A Rose for Emily” to discuss everyday ethical issues officials face in dealing with the public.
- If you were Miss Emily’s neighbor, what actions might you take on your own or ask town officials to take regarding Miss Emily’s behavior and apparent situation?
- Use Faulkner’s story to discuss the value and difficulties involved in zoning and rezoning.
Every era has had its scourge, contagion, pestilence, or plague. And every age has had to deal with such problems in the best way it could at the time. Edgar Allan Poe creates for us a leader whose method of “dealing” was, at best, ill considered.

Poe’s career as journalist, editor, and author was frequently beleaguered and riddled with bouts of alcoholism and poverty. It is hard to say to what degree Poe’s personal tribulations influenced his literary perspective, but his output was rich and intense. He was a master storyteller. His gothic tales of horror — and his poems of beauty as well as darkness — have entertained us, nonstop, for more than a century and a half. “The Masque of the Red Death” was written in 1842, seven years before Poe’s death at the age of 40.

The Selection: The Mask of the Red Death

(Edgar Allan Poe, “The Masque of the Red Death,” Graham’s Magazine (May 1842).)

The "Red Death" had long devastated the country. No pestilence had ever been so fatal, or so hideous. Blood was its Avatar and its seal — the redness and the horror of blood. There were sharp pains, and sudden dizziness, and then profuse bleeding at the pores, with dissolution. The scarlet stains upon the body and especially upon the face of the victim, were the pest ban which shut him out from the aid and from the sympathy of his fellow-men. And the whole seizure, progress and termination of the disease, were the incidents of half an hour.

But the Prince Prospero was happy and dauntless and sagacious. When his dominions were half depopulated, he summoned to his presence a thousand hale and light-hearted friends from among the knights and dames of his court, and with these retired to the deep seclusion of one of his castellated abbeys. This was an extensive and magnificent structure, the creation of the prince's own eccentric yet August taste. A strong and lofty wall girdled it in. This wall had gates of iron. The courtiers, having entered, brought furnaces and massy hammers and welded the bolts. They
resolved to leave means neither of ingress or egress to the sudden impulses of despair or of frenzy from within. The abbey was amply provisioned. With such precautions the courtiers might bid defiance to contagion. The external world could take care of itself. In the meantime it was folly to grieve, or to think. The prince had provided all the appliances of pleasure. There were buffoons, there were improvisatori, there were ballet-dancers, there were musicians, there was Beauty, there was wine. All these and security were within. Without was the "Red Death."

It was toward the close of the fifth or sixth month of his seclusion, and while the pestilence raged most furiously abroad, that the Prince Prospero entertained his thousand friends at a masked ball of the most unusual magnificence.

It was a voluptuous scene, that masquerade. But first let me tell of the rooms in which it was held. There were seven — an imperial suite. In many palaces, however, such suites form a long and straight vista, while the folding doors slide back nearly to the walls on either hand, so that the view of the whole extent is scarcely impeded. Here the case was very different; as might have been expected from the duke's love of the bizarre. The apartments were so irregularly disposed that the vision embraced but little more than one at a time. There was a sharp turn at every twenty or thirty yards, and at each turn a novel effect. To the right and left, in the middle of each wall, a tall and narrow Gothic window looked out upon a closed corridor which pursued the windings of the suite. These windows were of stained glass whose color varied in accordance with the prevailing hue of the decorations of the chamber into which it opened. That at the eastern extremity was hung, for example, in blue — and vividly blue were its windows. The second chamber was purple in its ornaments and tapestries, and here the panes were purple. The third was green throughout, and so were the casements. The fourth was furnished and lighted with orange — the fifth with white — the sixth with violet. The seventh apartment was closely shrouded in black velvet tapestries that hung all over the ceiling and down the walls, falling in heavy folds upon a carpet of the same material and hue. But in this chamber only, the color of the windows failed to correspond with the decorations. The panes here were scarlet — a deep blood color. Now in no one of the seven apartments was there any lamp or candelabrum, amid the profusion of golden ornaments that lay scattered to and fro or depended from the roof. There was no light of any kind emanating from lamp or candle within the suite of chambers. But in the corridors that followed the suite, there stood, opposite to each window, a heavy tripod, bearing a brazier of fire that projected its rays through the tinted glass and so glaringly illumined the room. And thus were produced a multitude of gaudy and fantastic appearances. But in the western or black chamber the effect of the fire-light that streamed upon the dark hangings through the blood-tinted panes, was ghastly in the extreme, and produced so wild a look upon the countenances of those who entered, that there were few of the company bold enough to set foot within its precincts at all.

It was in this apartment, also, that there stood against the western wall, a gigantic clock of ebony. Its pendulum swung to and fro with a dull, heavy, monotonous clang; and when the minute-hand made the circuit of the face, and the hour was to be stricken, there came from the brazen lungs of the clock a sound which was clear and loud and deep and exceedingly musical, but of so peculiar a note and emphasis that, at each lapse of an hour, the musicians of the orchestra were constrained to pause, momentarily, in their performance, to hearken to the sound; and thus the waltzers perforce ceased their evolutions; and there was a brief disconcert of the whole gay
company; and, while the chimes of the clock yet rang, it was observed that the giddiest grew pale, and the more aged and sedate passed their hands over their brows as if in confused reverie or meditation. But when the echoes had fully ceased, a light laughter at once pervaded the assembly; the musicians looked at each other and smiled as if at their own nervousness and folly, and made whispering vows, each to the other, that the next chiming of the clock should produce in them no similar emotion; and then, after the lapse of sixty minutes, (which embrace three thousand and six hundred seconds of the Time that flies,) there came yet another chiming of the clock, and then were the same disconcert and tremulousness and meditation as before.

But, in spite of these things, it was a gay and magnificent revel. The tastes of the duke were peculiar. He had a fine eye for colors and effects. He disregarded the *decora* of mere fashion. His plans were bold and fiery, and his conceptions glowed with barbaric lustre. There are some who would have thought him mad. His followers felt that he was not. It was necessary to hear and see and touch him to be *sure* that he was not.

He had directed, in great part, the moveable embellishments of the seven chambers, upon occasion of this great *fête*; and it was his own guiding taste which had given character to the masqueraders. Be sure they were grotesque. There were much glare and glitter and piquancy and phantasm — much of what has been since seen in "Hernani." There were arabesque figures with unsuited limbs and appointments. There were delirious fancies such as the madman fashions. There was much of the beautiful, much of the wanton, much of the *bizarre*, something of the terrible, and not a little of that which might have excited disgust. To and fro in the seven chambers there stalked, in fact, a multitude of dreams. And these — the dreams — writhed in and about, taking hue from the rooms, and causing the wild music of the orchestra to seem as the echo of their steps. And, anon, there strikes the ebony clock which stands in the hall of the velvet. And then, for a moment, all is still, and all is silent save the voice of the clock. The dreams are stiff-frozen as they stand. But the echoes of the chime die away — they have endured but an instant — and a light, half-subdued laughter floats after them as they depart. And now again the music swells, and the dreams live, and writhe to and fro more merrily than ever, taking hue from the many-tinted windows through which stream the rays from the tripods. But to the chamber which lies most westwardly of the seven, there are now none of the maskers who venture; for the night is waning away; and there flows a ruddier light through the blood-colored panes; and the blackness of the sable drapery appals; and to him whose foot falls upon the sable carpet, there comes from the near clock of ebony a muffled peal more solemnly emphatic than any which reaches *their* ears who indulge in the more remote gaieties of the other apartments.

But these other apartments were densely crowded, and in them beat feverishly the heart of life. And the revel went whirlingly on, until at length there commenced the sounding of midnight upon the clock. And then the music ceased, as I have told; and the evolutions of the waltzers were quieted; and there was an uneasy cessation of all things as before. But now there were twelve strokes to be sounded by the bell of the clock; and thus it happened, perhaps, that more of thought crept, with more of time, into the meditations of the thoughtful among those who revelled. And thus, too, it happened, perhaps, that before the last echoes of the last chime had utterly sunk into silence, there were many individuals in the crowd who had found leisure to become aware of the presence of a masked figure which had arrested the attention of no single individual before. And the rumor of this new presence having spread itself whisperingly around,
there arose at length from the whole company a buzz, or murmur, expressive of disapprobation
and surprise — then, finally, of terror, of horror, and of disgust.

In an assembly of phantasms such as I have painted, it may well be supposed that no ordinary
appearance could have excited such sensation. In truth the masquerade license of the night was
nearly unlimited; but the figure in question had out–Heroded Herod, and gone beyond the bounds
of even the prince’s indefinite decorum. There are chords in the hearts of the most reckless which
cannot be touched without emotion. Even with the utterly lost, to whom life and death are
equally jests, there are matters of which no jest can be made. The whole company, indeed,
seemed now deeply to feel that in the costume and bearing of the stranger neither wit nor
propriety existed. The figure was tall and gaunt, and shrouded from head to foot in the
habiliments of the grave. The mask which concealed the visage was made so nearly to resemble
the countenance of a stiffened corpse that the closest scrutiny must have had difficulty in
detecting the cheat. And yet all this might have been endured, if not approved, by the mad
revellers around. But the mummer had gone so far as to assume the type of the Red Death. His
vesture was dabbled in blood — and his broad brow, with all the features of the face, was
besprinkled with the scarlet horror.

When the eyes of Prince Prospero fell upon this spectral image (which with a slow and solemn
movement, as if more fully to sustain its rôle, stalked to and fro among the waltzers) he was seen
to be convulsed, in the first moment with a strong shudder either of terror or distaste; but, in the
next, his brow reddened with rage.

"Who dares?" he demanded hoarsely of the courtiers who stood near him — "who dares insult us
with this blasphemous mockery? Seize him and unmask him — that we may know whom we
have to hang at sunrise, from the battlements!"

It was in the eastern or blue chamber in which stood the Prince Prospero as he uttered these
words. They rang throughout the seven rooms loudly and clearly — for the prince was a bold and
robust man, and the music had become hushed at the waving of his hand.

It was in the blue room where stood the prince, with a group of pale courtiers by his side. At
first, as he spoke, there was a slight rushing movement of this group in the direction of the
intruder, who at the moment was also near at hand, and now, with deliberate and stately step,
made closer approach to the speaker. But from a certain nameless awe with which the mad
assumptions of the mummer had inspired the whole party, there were found none who put forth
hand to seize him; so that, unimpeded, he passed within a yard of the prince’s person; and, while
the vast assembly, as if with one impulse, shrank from the centres of the rooms to the walls, he
made his way uninterruptedly, but with the same solemn and measured step which had
distinguished him from the first, through the blue chamber to the purple — through the purple to
the green — through the green to the orange — through this again to the white — and even
thence to the violet, ere a decided movement had been made to arrest him. It was then, however,
that the Prince Prospero, maddening with rage and the shame of his own momentary cowardice,
rushed hurriedly through the six chambers, while none followed him on account of a deadly
terror that had seized upon all. He bore aloft a drawn dagger, and had approached, in rapid
impetuosity, to within three or four feet of the retreating figure, when the latter, having attained
the extremity of the velvet apartment, turned suddenly and confronted his pursuer. There was a sharp cry — and the dagger dropped gleaming upon the sable carpet, upon which, instantly afterwards, fell prostrate in death the Prince Prospero. Then, summoning the wild courage of despair, a throng of the revellers at once threw themselves into the black apartment, and, seizing the mummer, whose tall figure stood erect and motionless within the shadow of the ebony clock, gasped in unutterable horror at finding the grave-cerements and corpse-like mask which they handled with so violent a rudeness, untenanted by any tangible form.

And now was acknowledged the presence of the Red Death. He had come like a thief in the night. And one by one dropped the revellers in the blood-bedewed halls of their revel, and died each in the despairing posture of his fall. And the life of the ebony clock went out with that of the last of the gay. And the flames of the tripods expired. And Darkness and Decay and the Red Death held illimitable dominion over all.

**For Students**

**Questions**

- When a serious health crisis strikes a community, what is the responsibility of the community’s leaders? How did Prince Prospero’s response vary from that ideal?

- Do you think the reaction of the prince and his court — trying to wall themselves away from the problem — is a natural response to an uncontrollable situation? Why or why not? Can you cite a less extreme example you have read about or know of personally?

- Was justice done in the story? What is your basis for holding that view? Can there be justice without rule of law?

**Exercises**

1. **Civic Responsibility.** Often, in a less extreme fashion, a population seems to divide into those who “have” and those who “have not.” Assume you are a private citizen and you are one of the “haves.” What would you do (and what should you do) to help your community come close together rather than cleave into factions?

2. **Containing Contagions.** Compare and contrast Prince Prospero’s attempt to deal with “the red death” with the methods by which contemporary health authorities have approached recent contagious outbreaks that devastate farm animals (such as hoof-and-mouth disease, mad cow disease) or humans (such as West Nile virus, Ebola, HIV/AIDS). Consider such factors as deadliness, extent of spreading, speed of transmission, means of transmission, availability of countermeasures, cost of countermeasures, apparent effectiveness of countermeasures, other possible remedies than those taken by health authorities, and underlying philosophy regarding public health threats. What governmental and nonprofit health authorities have become involved?

3. **Project Planning.** You are Prince Prospero’s Commissioner of Public Works. The prince has assigned you responsibility for building the castle Poe describes in this story. Create a high-level plan for commissioning, siting, designing, funding, building, and decorating the
castle. Use these labels or labels of your own to establish the major headings of the plan. Identify two or three key actions under each heading. Set up the plan to include the following columns: Item number (use traditional outline numbering), action description, responsible party or parties, and target completion date.

**Other Works by the Author**

Edgar Allan Poe wrote scores of short stories and poems. Among the best-loved of his poems are “The Raven” (1845), “The Bells” (1849), and “Annabel Lee” (1850). Among Poe’s most famous short stories are “The Tell-tale Heart” (1843), “The Pit and the Pendulum” (1842), and “The Murders in the Rue Morgue” (1841). Poe’s stories have found their way into films, television episodes, and even cartoons.

**Internet Sites**

**The Edgar Allan Poe Society of Baltimore** ([www.eapoe.org](http://www.eapoe.org)) provides a website rich with excellent materials in their own right, with links to many more Poe-oriented sites.

**Federal Emergency Management Agency** ([www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov)) — FEMA is part of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. “FEMA’s mission is to support our citizens and first responders to ensure that as a nation we work together to build, sustain and improve our capability to prepare for, protect against, respond to, recover from and mitigate all hazards.” The agency’s website provides news on current disaster-relief efforts and extensive information on preparing for natural disasters.

**Centers for Disease Control and Prevention** ([www.cdc.gov](http://www.cdc.gov)) — This federal agency’s mission is “to collaborate to create the expertise, information, and tools that people and communities need to protect their health – through health promotion, prevention of disease, injury and disability, and preparedness for new health threats.” CDC is part of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The CDC website offers health and disease statistics, health alerts for travelers, and news and information on health and disease topics.

**National Institutes of Health** ([www.nih.gov](http://www.nih.gov)) — NIH is one of the world’s foremost biomedical research centers, and the federal focal point for biomedical research in the United States. It is part of DHHS. “Simply described, the goal of NIH research is to acquire new knowledge to help prevent, detect, diagnose, and treat disease and disability, from the rarest genetic disorder to the common cold.”

**World Health Organization** ([www.who.int](http://www.who.int)) — This arm of the United Nations takes a global perspective on access to basic health services for all people and works toward a level of health that permits all of us, everywhere, to lead productive lives.
RED CROSS — Among nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) we have come to rely on when health crises and natural disasters arise are the American Red Cross (www.redcross.org), a volunteer organization operating in the United States, and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (www.ifrc.org), which “provides humanitarian relief to people affected by disasters or other emergencies and development assistance to empower vulnerable people to become more self-sufficient.”

For the Instructor

The story is “The Masque of the Red Death.” The author is Edgar Allan Poe, publishing it in 1842.

Discussion Points and Themes

- Dominating the story are the themes (■) of ethics, organizational and group behavior, decisionmaking, and functions of government. Also major are the themes (■) of policy development, planning (emergency), and law enforcement and justice (particularly, rule of law). Important minor themes (▪) are diversity and multiculturalism, and leadership.

- Collections of Poe’s works are widely available, as are biographies, critiques, and study guides.

- When it is practical to have students read the story aloud, do so. Even if time is short, students find it engaging to read selected passages.

Themes

- Organizational/Societal Change
  - Functions of Government
  - Democratic Principles
  - Ethics
  - Leadership
  - Decisionmaking
  - Planning/Budgeting
  - Performance Evaluation
  - Policy Development/Evaluation
  - Law Enforcement/Justice
  - Communication
  - Organizational/Group Behavior
  - Diversity/Multiculturalism
  - Human Resources Management
  - Personal/Professional Development

Questions

Any of the questions can be used in classroom and online discussion, assigned as homework, worked either individually or in small groups, and/or adapted as questions for essay or objective tests.

The commentaries below are brief reflections on each question; however, they are not intended as comprehensive.
**Question (from student section)**

1. **When a serious health crisis strikes a community, what is the responsibility of the community’s leaders? How did Prince Prospero’s response vary from that ideal?**

   In line with Abraham Lincoln’s maxim that government exists to do what the people need but cannot or will not do for themselves, community leaders would arrange for someone to identify the cause of the problem, contain it, correct it insofar as possible, and see that individuals who had been affected received treatment. Prospero tried to hide from the problem, deny it if he could, and perhaps, through the red room, even mock it.

2. **Do you think the reaction of the prince and his court — trying to wall themselves away from the problem — is a natural response to an uncontrollable situation? Why or why not? Can you cite a less extreme example you have read about or know of personally?**

   Denial is frequently an early reaction to an unpleasant situation. It is an altogether human response, though not a mature response.

3. **Was justice done in the story? What is your basis for holding that view? Can there be justice without rule of law?**

   Justice involves trying to make things (or keep things) right, thus it has strong moral and ethical overtones. Natural laws (including the ultimate death of living things) involve inevitability — and, in that sense, evenhandedness — but whether or not justice is served would be coincidental. In our society, the rule of law is basic for justice to exist.

**Exercises**

As with the questions, above, these exercises can be used online, in the classroom, or assigned as homework. They are usually best worked in small group configurations. Some can be adapted as examination questions.

The commentaries below describe the potential utility of each exercise:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exercise (from student section)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Civic Responsibility. Often, in a less extreme fashion, a population seems to divide into those who “have” and those who “have not.” Assume you are a private citizen and you are one of the “haves.” What would you do (and what should you do) to help your community come close together rather than cleave into factions?</td>
<td>This exercise gives students an opportunity to consider their roles as members of a community in supporting the overall community. Students might use this question to talk about multiculturalism, volunteerism, education, economic development, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Containing Contagions. *Compare and contrast Prince Prospero’s attempt to deal with “the red death” with the methods by which contemporary health authorities have approached recent contagious outbreaks that devastate farm</td>
<td>This comparison and contrast study helps students recognize that epidemics are complex, very real, timeless, and essentially</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Exercise (from student section)  
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molecules (e.g., hoof-and-mouth disease, mad cow disease) or humans (e.g., West Nile virus, Ebola, HIV/AIDS). Consider such factors as deadliness, extent of spreading, speed of transmission, means of transmission, availability of countermeasures, cost of countermeasures, apparent effectiveness of countermeasures, other possible remedies than those taken by health authorities, and underlying philosophy regarding public health threats. What governmental and nonprofit health authorities have become involved?  

3. Project Planning. You are Prince Prospero’s Commissioner of Public Works. The prince has assigned you responsibility for building the castle Poe describes in this story. Create a high-level plan for commissioning, siting, designing, funding, building, and decorating the castle. Use these labels or labels of your own to establish the major headings of the plan. Identify two or three key actions under each heading. Set up the plan to include the following columns: Item number (use traditional outline numbering), action description, responsible party or parties, and target completion date.

Sample Project Plan for Exercise 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item#</th>
<th>Category/Action</th>
<th>Responsible Parties (* = primary)</th>
<th>Completion Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Commission principal project participants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 1.</td>
<td>Identify and select architect.</td>
<td>Commissioner*</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 2.</td>
<td>Identify and select contracting firm.</td>
<td>Commissioner* Architect</td>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Determine castle site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 1.</td>
<td>Survey current land holdings.</td>
<td>Architect* Contractor Minister of Natural Resources</td>
<td>May 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Etc.

Other Classroom Activity

1. Disaster Planning: Addressing It in Your Community  
Invite a representative from the local health and safety office, emergency services unit, fire department, or police department to talk with the class about emergency preparedness planning. Then have the class stage a disaster planning session that looks at your community. Assign students specific aspects and responsibilities to discuss — e.g., medical services, utilities, transportation. Use flip charts to record major issues and decisions.
**Bottom Line.** This activity gives students a chance to —

- Listen and talk with a public official involved in emergency preparedness plans.
- Consider the roles and responsibilities of government agencies, nonprofit organizations, businesses, and the public at large.
- Contribute to a disaster planning session.
- Engage in small-group activities.

2. **MEDICAL SLEUTHING: UNMASKING THE LONDON CHOLERA EPIDEMIC OF 1854**
On every continent and in every century, humanity has been plagued by forms of “the red death”: AIDS, Legionnaires’ Disease, and a flesh-eating streptococcus virus exemplify scourges from recent decades. Identifying the source or the cause, then effectively dealing with the public health crisis itself become truly herculean tasks.

Assign the class to read an account of how, in 1854, John Snow identified the source of cholera in London. (One reference is Edward R. Tufte’s presentation and analysis of “John Snow and the Cholera Epidemic,” cited below in “Further Reading.”) Then lead students in a discussion of difficulties involved in medical sleuthing; the value of reasonable theories and accurate, clearly presented information; and the crucial elements of awareness, understanding, and appropriate decisionmaking on the part of public officials.

*Variation:* Have students select and analyze a recent environmental or public health situation, such as tainted foods or pharmacological products. The CDC website ([www.cdc.gov](http://www.cdc.gov)) is a fine starting point.) Ask students to focus on the scientific sleuthing required to determine the cause and to identify an effective corrective action.

**Bottom Line.** This activity helps students appreciate the responsibilities, potential pitfalls, and significance of safeguarding public health.

**Further Reading**

Beyond the references elsewhere in this study, you may wish to identify relevant textbook or reading selections assigned for the course. Below are several more:

*Poe Studies*


Emergency Preparedness


Schneider, Sandra. (1995) *Flirting With Disaster: Public Management in Crisis Situations*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe. Using information from journalistic and scholarly sources in addition to her own research, Schneider investigates the question of why the government handles some natural disasters successfully but completely fails in other cases.

Tufte, Edward R. (1997) *Visual & Statistical Thinking: Displays of Evidence for Making Decisions*. Cheshire, Connecticut: Graphics Press. This unique booklet contains two case studies on the good and bad presentation of data about the root cause of catastrophic situations. One case is about the Challenger space shuttle disaster of 1986; the other, which is more relevant to Poe’s “the red death,” looks at the cholera epidemic that struck sections of London in the late 1800s.

Society, Class Structures, and Responsibility


only) the intended effect. Teller illustrates this through tales drawn largely from contemporary technology.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. (1835) *Democracy in America*. Bruxelles: L. Hauman; and, New York: G. Dearborn, 1838. Written only a few years before “Masque of the Red Death,” Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America* presents a thoughtful contrast to Poe’s view of the separation between classes and the separation between a ruler (government) and the people (citizens).


**Discussion and Essay Questions**

The questions and exercises in the student section are readily adaptable for online or classroom discussion and as examination questions. Other possibilities:

- Discuss how Poe’s “The Masque of the Red Death” relates to leadership.
- Discuss how Poe’s story relates to diversity and discrimination.
- Discuss how Poe’s story relates to emergency management and preparedness.
- Discuss how Poe’s story relates to the functions of government.
“When I Was a Lad” is from H.M.S.Pinafore, a nineteenth century British operetta by librettist William S. Gilbert and composer Arthur Sullivan. It is sung by a man who has become “the ruler of the Queen’s Navy.” Through the song, he tells about his climb to success. His rise involves many stages and begins with his time as “office boy” in a law firm. For those of you who have read “Bartleby, the Scrivener,” this is the same job Ginger Nut filled in Herman Melville’s story about a nineteenth-century American attorney’s firm.

“I Am the Very Model of a Modern Major-General” is from Pirates of Penzance. Sung by the major-general, it extolls his many qualifications and hints at his ambition. Try speaking these lyrics aloud, rapidly, and you’ll find that in addition to the major-general’s other talents, he is indeed articulate.

Gilbert and Sullivan’s comic operas often involve political satire, and this is the case with both of these songs. Both songs describe the talents, experience, qualifications of a government official. Both songs poke fun of officials and their self-importance. Both songs point to the benefit of having a broad, generalist education for higher-level positions. And both songs make the point that public officials need appropriate qualifications and experience. But the characters singing these songs display many differences as well, and very different outlooks on how to succeed. As you follow the lyrics, what do you make of the two gentlemen? For whom would you want to work? Who would you want working for you?

William S. Gilbert, the lyricist, and Arthur Sullivan, the composer, were wildly successful in their day and have remained popular ever since. They were also notorious for not getting along with one another. Besides Pirates of Penzance and H.M.S. Pinafore, which are about the Great Britain’s commercial and military dominance of the oceans at the time, Gilbert and Sullivan wrote The Mikado, Iolanthe, and other operettas. Because most of us are unfamiliar with Victorian politics, portions of the satire have just a little less sting; but the characters are still sharp and colorful, the situations, identifiable and absurd, and the music and lyrics as delightful as ever. If you have a chance to see one of their operettas on a stage near you — or, better still,
an opportunity to become involved in a production — you will enjoy it thoroughly. For now, here are two examples of the charm and wit Gilbert and Sullivan offer their audiences: “When I Was a Lad” and “Modern Major-General.”

**The Lyrics: When I Was a Lad**


When I was a lad I served a term
As office boy to an Attorney's firm.
I cleaned the windows and I swept the floor,
And I polished up the handle of the big front door.

**CHORUS. — He polished, etc.**

I polished up that handle so carefullee
That now I am the Ruler of the Queen's Navee!

As office boy I made such a mark
That they gave me the post of a junior clerk.
I served the writs with a smile so bland,
And I copied all the letters in a big round hand—

**CHORUS. — He copied, etc.**

I copied all the letters in a hand so free,
That now I am the Ruler of the Queen's Navee!

In serving writs I made such a name
That an articled clerk I soon became;
I wore clean collars and a brand-new suit.
For the pass examination at the Institute,

**CHORUS. — And that pass examination, etc.**

And that pass examination did so well for me,
That now I am the Ruler of the Queen's Navee!

Of legal knowledge I acquired such a grip
That they took me into the partnership.
And that junior partnership, I ween,
Was the only ship that I ever had seen.

**CHORUS. — But that kind, etc.**
I grew so rich that I was sent  
By a pocket borough into Parliament.  
I always voted at my party's call,  
And I never thought of thinking for myself at all.  
I thought so little, they rewarded me  
By making me the Ruler of the Queen's Navee!

CHORUS. — He thought so little, etc.

Now landsmen all, whoever you may be,  
If you want to rise to the top of the tree,  
If your soul isn't fettered to an office stool,  
Be careful to be guided by this golden rule—  
Stick close to your desks and never go to sea,  
And you all may be rulers of the Queen's Navee!

CHORUS. — Stick close, etc.

The Lyrics: Modern Major-General

(William S. Gilbert, with music by Sir Arthur Sullivan, “Modern Major-General,” The Pirates of Penzance, or, The Slave of Duty. Opening performance, December 31, 1877, in New York at the Fifth Avenue Theater; it opened in London at the Opera Comique on April 3, 1880.)

I am the very model of a modern Major-General,  
I've information vegetable, animal, and mineral,  
I know the kings of England, and I quote the fights historical  
From Marathon to Waterloo, in order categorical;  
I'm very well acquainted, too, with matters mathematical,  
I understand equations, both the simple and quadratical,  
About binomial theorem I'm teeming with a lot o' news,  
With many cheerful facts about the square of the hypotenuse.

ALL: With many cheerful facts, etc.

I'm very good at integral and differential calculus;  
I know the scientific names of beings animalculous:  
In short, in matters vegetable, animal, and mineral,  
I am the very model of a modern Major-General.

ALL: In short, in matters vegetable, animal, and mineral,  
He is the very model of a modern Major-General.
I know our mythic history, King Arthur's and Sir Caradoc's;
I answer hard acrostics, I've a pretty taste for paradox,
I quote in elegiacs all the crimes of Heliogabalus,
In conics I can floor peculiarities parabolous;
I can tell undoubted Raphaels from Gerard Dows and Zoffanies,
Then I can hum a fugue of which I've heard the music's din afore,
And whistle all the airs from that infernal nonsense Pinafore.

**ALL:** And whistle all the airs, etc.

Then I can write a washing bill in Babylonic cuneiform,
And tell you ev'ry detail of Caractacus's uniform:
In short, in matters vegetable, animal, and mineral,
I am the very model of a modern Major-General.

**ALL:** In short, in matters vegetable, animal, and mineral,
He is the very model of a modern Major-General.

In fact, when I know what is meant by "mamelon" and "ravelin",
When I can tell at sight a Mauser rifle from a javelin,
When such affairs as sorties and surprises I'm more wary at,
And when I know precisely what is meant by "commissariat",
When I have learnt what progress has been made in modern gunnery,
In short, when I've a smattering of elemental strategy,
You'll say a better Major-General has never sat a gee.

**ALL:** You'll say a better Major-General, etc.

For my military knowledge, though I'm plucky and adventury,
Has only been brought down to the beginning of the century;
But still, in matters vegetable, animal, and mineral,
I am the very model of a modern Major-General.

**ALL:** But still, in matters vegetable, animal, and mineral,
He is the very model of a modern Major-General.

**For Students**

**Questions**

○ The official from “When I Was a Lad,” tells us how he acquired his knowledge and experience; however, where and when did the major-general in the song “Modern Major-General” acquire his knowledge?
○ How do the knowledge and experience of both gentlemen contribute to their qualifications for the positions they hold?

○ In “When I Was a Lad,” the official says proudly that, in Parliament, he always voted at his party’s call and he never thought of thinking for himself at all. Was that the best thing to do? What would you advise him?

○ It is probably fair to say that both of Gilbert’s characters are generalists. What are the strengths and weaknesses of generalist backgrounds for executive positions? What about lower-level positions in an organization?

Exercises

1. You are part of a task force charged with establishing the qualifications for the position of Ruler of the Queen’s Navy (RQN).
   a. What work experience should the candidate have?
   b. What formal education and training?
   c. What job skills?

2. Your task force did such fine work in establishing qualifications for the RQN position that you’ve been assigned several other positions as well. Among them is the position of major-general (MG).
   a. What work experience should the candidate have?
   b. What formal education and training?
   c. What job skills?

3. Use the criteria you developed in Exercises 1 and 2 to rate William Gilbert’s two characters as though they were applicants for the positions they now hold (MG and RQN). How does each candidate rate? How would the current U.S. Secretary of Defense fit the qualifications for RQN?

Other Works by the Author

H.M.S. Pinafore, first performed in 1878, originated as a vehicle for good-humored laughter at the expense of the British Navy and its ruler-in-chief, the First Lord of the Admiralty. The comic opera follows the shenanigans of the crew of the H.M.S. Pinafore and several other characters, and all are drawn with a sardonic wit that translates almost as well today as it did well over a century ago.

Pirates of Penzance (1880) is outrageous adventure about a band of pirates. This time Gilbert’s satire targets the British Army and the police force.

Iolanthe, or The Peer and the Peri (a peer is a high-ranking noble and a peri is a fairy) was first performed in 1882. At the time in England, the House of Lords was the subject of bitter controversy, so the target of Gilbert’s libretto was that of the goings-on of the legislative bodies of the time. Iolanthe (pronounced eye-oh-LAN-the) is a fairy in this tale.
The Mikado (1885) marked a departure for librettist W. S. Gilbert and composer Arthur Sullivan. Rather than England, the duo drew their inspiration from the culture of Japan. Even so, the opera’s wonderful wit and broadly drawn caricatures are quintessential G&S.

Internet Sites

Gilbert and Sullivan — The Gilbert and Sullivan Archive (diamond.boisestate.edu/gas/ ) is “devoted to the operas and other works of William S. Gilbert and Arthur S. Sullivan”; the collection includes biographical material, librettos, photos, and sound recordings. YouTube offers a variety of performances of “Modern Major-General” (www.youtube.com/watch?v=R1dy44yV8EM ) and “When I Was a Lad” (www.youtube.com/watch?v=eUZ-0o8wL8A ), of which these are two examples.

Royal Navy (www.royalnavy.mod.uk) — Official web site of the British Royal Navy.

Résumé Writing — University websites (umaine.edu/career/studentsalumni/job-search-assistance/resume-guide/) often offer guides and samples useful for preparing résumés.

Case Study #3: When I Was a Lad & Modern Major-General by William S. Gilbert

For the Instructor

“When I Was a Lad” and “Modern Major-General” are songs from two of Gilbert and Sullivan’s most popular comic operas.

**Discussion Points and Themes**

- The predominant administrative theme (■) in these lyrics is of personal and professional development. Also major (■) is the theme of human resources management and, for “When I Was a Lad,” decisionmaking. Important minor themes (•) are leadership, communication, performance evaluation, and organizational behavior.

- These selections are available on audio tapes and compact discs. Play them for the class if you can. Read the lyrics aloud (or have students do so) as you begin the discussion.

- “Modern Major-General” is about knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs); “When I Was a Lad” is about the progression.

**Themes**

- Organizational/Societal Change
- Functions of Government
- Democratic Principles
- Ethics
- Leadership
- Decisionmaking
- Planning/Budgeting
- Performance Evaluation
- Policy Development/Evaluation
- Law Enforcement/Justice
- Communication
- Organizational/Group Behavior
- Diversity/Multiculturalism
- Human Resources Management
- Personal/Professional Development

**Questions**

Any of the questions can be used in classroom and online discussion, assigned as homework, worked in class either individually or in small groups, and/or adapted as questions for essay or objective tests.

The commentaries below are brief reflections on each question; however, they are not intended as comprehensive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question (from student section)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The official from “When I Was a Lad,” tells us how he acquired his knowledge and experience; however, where and when did the major-general in the song “Modern Major-General” acquire his knowledge?</td>
<td>Allows the student to speculate on the character’s formal education and prior experience, and to contrast the differences in what they share with their audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do the knowledge and experience of both gentlemen contribute to their qualifications for the positions they hold?</td>
<td>Certainly, much of what they talk about is valuable, even though some of it is esoteric. Much, of course, is not very relevant — but that is true for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
most of us. The key is not their irrelevant qualifications, but their relevant qualifications.

3. In “When I Was a Lad,” the official says proudly that, in Parliament, he always voted at his party’s call and he never thought of thinking for himself at all. Was that the best thing to do? What would you advise him? Though not a dilemma for this character, it is for many people in the real world. In practice, each issue — along with its political ramifications — needs to be considered on its own merits.

4. It is probably fair to say that both of Gilbert’s characters are generalists. What are the strengths and weaknesses of generalist backgrounds for executive positions? What about lower-level positions in an organization? Typically, people in organizations begin as technical specialists and grow into generalists. Broad, integrative knowledge and experience are especially important for management positions that integrate many disciplines or specialties.

Exercises

As with the questions, above, any of these exercises can be used in the classroom, online, or assigned as homework. They are usually best worked in small group settings. Some can be adapted as examination questions.

The commentaries below describe the potential utility of each exercise:

**Exercise (from student section)**

1. You are part of a task force charged with establishing the qualifications for the position of Ruler of the Queen’s Navy (RQN).
   a. What work experience should the candidate have?
   b. What formal education and training?
   c. What job skills?

2. Your task force did such fine work in establishing qualifications for the RQN position that you’ve been assigned several other positions as well. Among them is the position of major-general (MG).
   a. What work experience should the candidate have?
   b. What formal education and training?
   c. What job skills?

3. Use the criteria you developed in Exercises 1 and 2 to rate William Gilbert’s two characters as though they were applicants for the positions they now hold (MG and RQN). How does each candidate rate? How would the current U.S. Secretary of Defense fit the qualifications for RQN?

**Comment**

The exercises give students an opportunity to look at qualifications needed for specific positions and how individuals rate.

Although these exercises feature the employee’s knowledge, skills, and abilities, they do not focus on duties and responsibilities of the position — add that element if you wish. You can also expand this set of exercises to have students place these positions on a career ladder, perhaps in which the MG is an intermediate step and the RQN is the journey position.
Other Classroom Activity

1. **EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT: A LARGE- AND SMALL-GROUP EXERCISE**
   The Queen has asked her Royal Navy to create a new executive development (XD) program for top-ranking naval officers — up to and including the ruler of the Queen’s Navy. First, ask the class to develop specific, measurable objectives for the XD program. Have them do so through brainstorming and multivoting (in traditional and blended courses). Then divide the class into teams to work on aspects of the program: Candidate recruitment and selection, classroom topics, developmental field assignments, and evaluation and placement criteria. In a subsequent session, have the teams present their recommendations. Have the class consider each team’s report in terms of the XD objectives they developed earlier. Finally, have the class adopt and, if need be, modify the recommended segments to create a streamlined overall program.

   **Bottom Line.** This activity permits students to —
   - Consider what goes into an employee development program.
   - Experience nominal group techniques in action.
   - Work in teams and participate in briefings
   - Integrate the work of several teams.

2. **ORGANIZATIONAL Culture: A Role Play**
   Have students assume the roles of the head of the navy, the major-general, and two or three of their subordinates. Use two other students to interview this “diagonal slice” group about their own morale and morale within the organization. **Variation 1:** Separate the interviews of the senior officers from their subordinates. **Variation 2:** Hold the number of subordinates to no more than two and undertake individual rather than group interviews.

   **Bottom Line.** This activity encourages students to consider how the style and attitude of superiors affects the overall organizational culture, including morale. It also considers the morale of individuals in the context of the larger organization.

3. **RésuméS: In Verse**
   Use this exercise as part of a lesson sequence on the elements of a résumé.
   Have the class, individually or in teams, write comic résumés — either fictitious or based upon themselves — using Gilbert-and-Sullivan-style lyrics. Students may adopt melodies from Gilbert and Sullivan, from other sources, create their own, or simply focus on the verse. (Dr. Seuss is always great; Edgar Guest’s poetry and T.S. Eliot “McCaverty, the Mystery Cat” can also offer good rhyme scheme models.) Have students present their verses online or in a subsequent session. **Variation:** Have students come to the front of class in threes, presenting their verses back to back before next trio comes forward.

   **Bottom Line.** Encourages students to consider the strengths and follies in the content of a résumé.
Further Reading

Beyond the references elsewhere in this study, you may wish to identify relevant textbook or reading selections assigned for the course. Below are more:


Discussion and Essay Questions

The questions and exercises in the student reader are adaptable for online or classroom discussion and as examination questions. Other possibilities:

- What would happen if Herman Melville’s Bartleby worked for William Gilbert’s major-general? For the ruler of the Queen’s Navy?
- The major-general touts his many qualifications (setting aside modern military skills, about which he admits he is a little shy). Is there such a thing as being overqualified for a position? Why or why not?
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