

*Size*

PUBLIC OFFICIALS usually work into governmental administration bit by bit, starting with a single function and moving on to others. When one arrives at a center of complexity by that method, one may gain a sense of perspective so gradually as not to be conscious of having acquired it—or one may be enabled to do one's work without very much real perspective. For the most part, students of government have to approach administration in the same way. After a general consideration of history and political theory, they have to examine the actual administrative process bit by bit. Only rarely and after long reflection do they get to the point where they can see it in the large, with all the bits related to each other. It is possible, however, for a person to develop some sense of perspective and proportion rather quickly if he is suddenly plunged into the center of the complexity of modern public administration and makes a genuine effort to look at it from that vantage point.

Perhaps there is no way so well designed to get away from the usual analysis by segments as to go directly to the fact of size. Public administrators and politicians do not like to admit the fact of size. In self-protection they minimize the size of the agencies they direct and control by finding ways to make them appear smaller than they really are. Journalists, for different reasons, participate in this evasion, in order to make their news stories more easily manageable they personalize administrative action. By common practice they report developments that are the product of a functioning and intricate organization simply as the action of Secretary Blank.

My own introduction to public administration was something like the one I propose to offer here. Brought into government unexpectedly in March 1953, into a position of responsibility over a huge and complex Department, my first necessity was to try to understand that Department as a whole. I looked about for individuals who could lend me a day-to-day, Department-wide operating perspective,

even if from single vantage points. As I remember, I found only eight persons who commanded an overview of the entire Department. I never actually counted them. There may have been one or two more, but there probably were less. Today I can remember three. The great majority of the important executives had only segmented responsibilities, running up and down a single hierarchy, but seldom embracing two or three. Limited in function and experience, they were similarly limited in perspective—necessarily so. Moreover, since by training and inclination most of them were specialists, it is not likely that, even had they been charged with broader functions, they would have had the perspective I sought. The Secretary of Agriculture, whose administrative assistant I was, had department-wide and governmental responsibilities. Even with the extraordinary breadth and background he had, however, he could not manage the Department successfully without the aid of a number of strong and able persons who could help him visualize the Department as an entity and as a whole.

*USDA as of March 1933*

For those who can sense problems of interrelationships, a general picture of that Department as it existed in March 1933 will illustrate the nature of the problem we want to examine.

It was the largest research organization in the world. It had the most extensive organization for disseminating to farmers and to the public the fruits of that research. The issuance of crop reports, crop estimates, statistical analyses, and research findings through thousands of press releases and thousands of formal bulletins, and the distribution of this information through agricultural colleges and county agents, tied in with related work done at state experiment stations—these things alone made a great and complex administrative task.

It was a great regulatory agency, if one may use the word “regulation” to cover, among other matters, the whole field of inspection, the fixing of standards, and the enforcement of them. The Department then administered more than sixty statutes of this general nature. Even a smaller list, made some years later after several bureaus had been transferred away from the Department, will convey

some idea of this second great field of administrative authority and responsibility

1. Act of May 29, 1884, 23 Stat 32, secs. 5 and 6 (1927) 21 U S C A. 113, 115. to prevent exportation and interstate transportation of livestock and poultry known to be diseased or from an area found by the Secretary to be "infected"

2. Act of March 3, 1891, 26 Stat 833; May 28, 1928, 45 Stat 789 (1929), 45 U S C A. 75 to provide for safe and proper transportation and humane treatment of cattle, horses, mules, asses, sheep, goats, or swine which are exported from the ports of the United States, to authorize the Secretary to examine all vessels which are to carry such animals and to prescribe rules and regulations regarding accommodations which said vessels shall provide for such animals

3. Act of May 9, 1902, 32 Stat 196 (1935), 26 U S C A. sec. 955 (Renovated Butter Act): to provide for the supervision of the labeling of processed or renovated butter and the sanitary inspection of establishments where renovated butter is made.

4. Act of February 2, 1903, 32 Stat. 791, secs 1 and 2, (1927) 21 U S C A. sec 111 et seq to regulate the exportation, importation and interstate shipment of livestock and poultry from any locality where the Secretary has reason to believe that infectious animal diseases exist.

5. Act of February 1, 1905, 33 Stat. 628 (1927), 16 U. S. C. A., sec. 551 (Transfer Act and Related Statutes): to regulate the occupancy and use of national forests and to preserve them from destruction.

6. Act of March 3, 1905, 33 Stat. 1264 and 1269 (1927), 21 U S. C. A., sec. 123 (Animal Quarantine Act). to prevent the interstate transportation of livestock and poultry from areas which the Secretary has quarantined after he has determined that there are livestock or poultry therein "affected with contagious, infectious, or communicable" diseases.

7. Act of June 29, 1906, 34 Stat. 607 (1927), 16 U. S. C. A., sec. 684 (Twenty-eight-Hour Law) to prohibit the confinement by common carriers of animals in the course of interstate transportation for a longer period than twenty-eight consecutive hours without unloading the same in a humane manner into properly equipped pens for

rest, water, and feeding for a period of at least five consecutive hours

8 Act of March 4, 1907, 34 Stat 1260 (1927), U S C A., sec. 71 (Meat Inspection Act) to prevent the interstate or foreign shipment of meat and meat food products which are unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food by requiring such shipments to bear marks of Federal inspection and approval

9 Act of May 23, 1908, 35 Stat 254 (1927), 21 U S C A., sec. 132 (Dairy Products for Export Act) to prevent the exportation of dairy products unless the same shall have been inspected and certified as to quality, purity, and grade.

10. Act of April 26, 1910, 36 Stat 331 (1939), 7 U S C A., secs 125, 126 (Insecticide Act) to prevent the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded insecticides and fungicides

11 Act of August 20, 1912, 37 Stat. 315 (1939), 7 U. S C A., sec. 154 (Plant Quarantine Act) to regulate or prevent the importation and interstate shipment of plants and plant products capable of bearing plant diseases and pests.

12. Act of March 4, 1913, 37 Stat 833 (1927), 21 U. S C A., sec. 155 (Virus-Serum-Toxin Control Act) to license and supervise the production and to regulate the importation of, and interstate commerce in, viruses, serums, toxins, and analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals.

13. Act of August 11, 1916, 39 Stat 482 (1939), 7 U. S. C A., sec. 71 (United States Grain Standards Act) to establish standards of quality and condition for wheat, corn, and other grains, and, after standards have been established, to prohibit the interstate or foreign transportation of grains not officially inspected and graded by licensed inspectors.

14. Act of August 11, 1916, 39 Stat. 486, July 24, 1919, 41 Stat 266, February 23, 1923, 42 Stat. 1283; March 2, 1931, 46 Stat. 1463, (1939) 7 U. S. C. A., secs. 242 et seq. (United States Warehouse Act) to provide for the licensing by the Secretary of warehouses in which agricultural commodities are stored for shipment in interstate commerce.

15 Act of August 31, 1916, 39 Stat 673 (1939), 15 U. S C A., secs 251, 252 (Standard Container Act) to establish standards for climax baskets, berry boxes, and similar containers for small fruits and

vegetables moving in interstate commerce, to authorize the Secretary to prescribe tolerances and variations and make examinations and tests for the purpose of determining whether such containers meet the requirements of the act, and to prohibit the manufacture, shipment, or sale of containers not conforming to such standards.

16. Act of August 11, 1916, 39 Stat. 476 (1939), 26 U. S. C. A., secs. 1090 et seq. (Cotton Futures Act). to regulate trading in cotton futures by levying a tax on each pound of cotton involved in any contract of sale of cotton for future delivery upon any exchange, board of trade, or similar institution or place of business, unless prescribed types of contract are used.

17. Act of July 24, 1919, 41 Stat. 241, (1927) 21 U. S. C. A. sec. 96 (Horse-meat Act) to prohibit transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of horse-meat and horse-meat products unless such meats be plainly and conspicuously labeled, marked, branded, or tagged "horse-meat" or "horse-meat product," as the case may be.

18. Act of August 15, 1921, 42 Stat. 159 (1939), 7 U. S. C. A., secs. 181 et seq. (Packers and Stockyards Act), August 14, 1935, 49 Stat. 648 (1939), 7 U. S. C. A., secs. 217 et seq. (Live Poultry Amendment): to regulate the business conduct of packers and stockyards in so far as their transactions are in the current of interstate commerce, and to prescribe the rates to be charged by the owners of stockyards and by the commission men who operate at such yards.

19. Act of August 31, 1922, 42 Stat. 833 (1939), 7 U. S. C. A., sec. 281: to prohibit the importation of adult honey bees, except from countries in which the Secretary shall determine that no diseases dangerous to honey bees exist and then under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Agriculture.

20. Act of February 18, 1922, 42 Stat. 388 (1939), 7 U. S. C. A., sec. 291 (Capper-Volstead Act). to promote associations of producers of agricultural products for collective processing and marketing in interstate commerce of such products and to direct the Secretary, in event any such association monopolizes trade so as unduly to increase the price thereof, to order such association to cease and desist from such monopolization.

21. Act of March 3, 1923, 42 Stat. 1435 (1939), 7 U. S. C. A., sec.

91 (Naval Stores Act): to establish standards for rosin and turpentine and to prohibit the sale of such products inferior to the official standards.

22 Act of March 4, 1923, 42 Stat. 1517 (1939), 7 U. S. C. A., sec. 51 (United States Cotton Standards Act) to establish standards of quality for cotton and, once standards have been established, to prohibit the interstate and foreign transportation of cotton not inspected and sampled by licensed samples.

23 Act of March 3, 1927, 44 Stat. 1855 (1939), 7 U. S. C. A., sec. 491 (Produce Agency Act) to prevent the destruction or dumping, without good and sufficient cause therefore, of farm produce received in interstate commerce by commission merchants and others, and to require them truly and correctly to account for all farm produce received by them.

24 Act of May 21, 1928, 45 Stat. 685 (1939), 15 U. S. C. A., sec. 257 (Standard Container Act) to establish standards for hampers, round stave baskets, and split baskets for fruits and vegetables moving in interstate or foreign commerce; to authorize the Secretary to prescribe tolerances and variations and make examinations and tests for the purpose of determining whether such containers meet the requirements of the act; and to prohibit the manufacture, shipment, or sale of containers not conforming to such standards.

25 Act of June 17, 1930, 46 Stat. 689, sec. 306 (1937), U. S. C. A., sec. 1306 (Imported Meat Act) to prevent the importation of cattle or meats from any foreign country in which the Secretary shall determine that rinderpest or foot-and-mouth disease exists, and to prohibit the importation of fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, pork, bacon, and ham and prepared or preserved meats of all kinds unless they are "healthful, wholesome and fit for human food," and contain "no dye, chemical, preservative or ingredient which renders the same unhealthy, unwholesome or unfit for human food."

26 Act of June 10, 1930, 46 Stat. 531 (Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act of 1930) April 13, 1934, 48 Stat. 584, June 19, 1936, 49 Stat. 1533, August 20, 1937, 50 Stat. 725, (1939) 7 U. S. C. A. sec. 499a: to require the licensing of commission merchants, dealers, and brokers handling fresh fruits and vegetables in the current of interstate commerce.

The Department was also a great custodial agency, administering national forests and wildlife refuge lands worth more than a billion dollars. It also operated two great public service agencies not included in the categories mentioned—the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Weather Bureau.

A tabular review of the Department from the standpoint of its bureaus and offices and their expenditures would have revealed the facts given in the table on page 18.

Formally reported personnel in 1933 numbered 26,544. This figure did not, however, include temporary workers employed under field authority, of whom fire-fighters employed during the forest-fire season may be mentioned as examples. Nor did it include persons on state and county Extension Service staffs, nor persons in state experiment stations, working on co-operative research projects. Such personnel were and are paid in part with money appropriated to the Department, but they are not normally hired directly by the Department and are not subject to discharge by the Department.

The most widely experienced veteran in the Department in those days consistently affirmed that after twenty-five years he did not by any means "know the Department." He did know it broadly and had a fine understanding of its general management, but he did not by any means know its intrinsic detail.

Even in 1933, then, it was not possible for members of Congress, who had responsibility over the whole field of government, to "know" or to "understand" the Department of Agriculture in the sense that the public would expect. And certainly the same was true for them with respect to other departments and the government as a whole. Even the subcommittees of the two Houses handling appropriations for the Department could not really know it thoroughly or well, although they and a few veteran members of the Committees on Agriculture knew it best. For all of these members had a great deal to do besides learning about this one Department.

They had to be concerned, because of the interests of their constituents, with all departments and agencies. They had to acquaint themselves with Congressional organization and procedures—the whole vast field of legislative bureaucracy. They had to take time for dealing with each other, the general public and their own con-

BUREAUS AND OFFICES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE AND THEIR EXPENDITURES  
IN THE FISCAL YEAR 1933

Office of the Secretary . . . . .	\$ 970,336 55
Office of Information . . . . .	1,126,934 25
Library, Department of Agriculture . . . . .	102,887 13
Total, Office of Experiment Stations . . . . .	4,582,913 50
Payments to States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for agricultural experiment stations . . . . .	4,358,915 17
Salaries and expenses . . . . .	223,998 33
Total, Extension Service . . . . .	10,141,151.90
Payments to States, Hawaii, and Alaska for agricultural extension work . . . . .	8,607,325 94
Salaries and expenses . . . . .	1,533,825 96
Weather Bureau . . . . .	3,695,617 37
Bureau of Animal Industry . . . . .	13,062,780 33
Bureau of Dairy Industry . . . . .	626,584 27
Bureau of Plant Industry . . . . .	4,636,867 89
Forest Service . . . . .	20,839,885 01
Bureau of Chemistry and Soils . . . . .	1,602,627 52
Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine . . . . .	4,596,271 32
Bureau of Biological Survey . . . . .	1,784,158 54
Bureau of Public Roads . . . . .	168,214,964 65
Bureau of Agricultural Engineering . . . . .	496,176 17
Bureau of Agricultural Economics . . . . .	5,899,740.94
Bureau of Home Economics . . . . .	214,312 94
Enforcement of the Grain Futures Act . . . . .	174,056 60
Food and Drug Administration . . . . .	1,582,712.66
Miscellaneous (including forest roads and trails, collec- tion of feed and seed-grain loans, soil erosion investi- gations, special construction, etc.) . . . . .	11,103,547.39
<b>TOTAL</b> . . . . .	<u><u>\$255,474,520.83</u></u>



stituents. They had to worry about primary campaigns and general elections. Thirty-two of the 96 Senators had come to the Senate since 1928 (hardly a dozen are still there), 151 members of the House were just beginning their first term in Congress and 62 more were just beginning their second term.

#### *Addition of New Responsibilities*

On top of the 1933 departmental situation of complexity and size, the next few years brought an enormous new load of responsibility and diversified activity. There were transferred away from the Department (though, let me point out, not from the still more complex field of governmental management) the Weather Bureau, the Bureau of Public Roads, the Bureau of Biological Survey, and the Food and Drug Administration. But there were established or brought within the Department action agencies of great scope. These included:

The Agricultural Adjustment Administration, with programs of crop adjustment and fertility conservation, having direct contractual relationship with 6,500,000 farmers.

The Farm Credit Administration, sponsoring some 8,000 semi-governmental corporations and farmer co-operatives making loans of various kinds to well over a million farmers.

The Commodity Credit Corporation, making loans to producers on various commodities as a support to prices and as a means of maintaining the ever-normal granary. Its borrowing power is \$2,650,000,000. Its transactions number millions annually.

The Soil Conservation Service, carrying on first demonstration projects and then co-operatively helping organized farm districts in programs of physical conservation. There are 785 such districts, comprising 2,153,548 farms and about 460,000,000 acres.

The Farm Security Administration, responsible for special aid to low-income farmers, having direct contractual relations with some 700,000 farmers.

The Surplus Marketing Administration, with responsibility for the disposal of surpluses to consumers.

The Rural Electrification Administration, making power available to 1,002,177 farm and non-farm establishments in rural areas, of which approximately 800,000 are farms.

The Crop Insurance Corporation, handling a new type of insurance on over 600,000 farms producing wheat and cotton.

Various other governmental programs also have been administered in part through this Department. The work projects of from a maximum of 2,000 CCC camps to a minimum of 1,000 (personnel involved, including emoltees, ranging from 408,897 down to 206,319) were carried on at their peak through six bureaus. Civil works and WPA projects administered by the Department employed at a maximum over 100,000, and for a considerable period numbers ranging downward from 60,000 to 30,000. Food purchases under the Lend-Lease Act have been handled by the Surplus Marketing Administration (now incorporated in the Food Distribution Administration), and these purchases in the first year amounted to \$706,323,313.

About two years ago I had occasion to make a list of the principal programs of the Department. It included the following

*USDA Program before Pearl Harbor*

*Office of Experiment Stations*

Grants for state and territorial experiment stations (grant-in-aid)

Operation of Puerto Rico Experiment Station

Nine co-operative regional research laboratories (with states)

*Extension Service*

Grants to states for extension work (grant-in-aid)

*Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations*

Collection of information on foreign agriculture and trade

(statistical)

(descriptive)

*Agricultural Adjustment Administration*

Agricultural conservation program

Range and naval stores conservation program

Conservation materials program

Parity payment program

Sugar Act program

Emergency cotton program

*Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering*

General research program (research)

Four regional laboratories—new uses for agricultural products (research)

*Bureau of Agricultural Economics*

Co-operative land use planning program  
 Economic research and investigations (research and statistical)  
 Regional and national program development

*Agricultural Marketing Service*

Statistical and research programs  
 Crop and livestock estimates  
 Market-price news service and statistics  
 Marketing and distribution research  
 Program for inspection, grading, and classing of farm products (compulsory and voluntary under various special acts)  
 Fruits and vegetables  
 Processed fruits and vegetables  
 Dairy and poultry products  
 Rice, hay, beans, etc.  
 Livestock and meat  
 Cottonseed  
 Tobacco  
 Cotton  
 Grain  
 Seeds  
 Naval stores  
 Insecticides  
 Cotton classification for the Commodity Credit Corporation  
 Programs for the regulation of markets, handlers, processors, and manufacturers (under various special acts)  
 Handlers of perishable agricultural commodities  
 Warehouses  
 Packers and stockyards  
 Contamei manufacturers (standard sizes)

*Bureau of Animal Industry*

Disease control and eradication programs  
 Tuberculosis and Bang's disease eradication  
 Cattle-tick eradication (co-operative with states)  
 Hog-cholera control (eradication and demonstration)  
 Inspection and quarantine (inspection and control)  
 Eradication of foot-and-mouth disease (inactive: appropriated funds are available for emergency need)

*Research programs*

Animal husbandry  
 Disease of animals  
 Meat inspection (regulatory)  
 Administration of hog-cholera virus and serum marketing agreement

*Commodity Credit Corporation*

Loan and ever-normal granary program

*Commodity Exchange Administration*

Commodity exchange regulation program (regulatory)

*Bureau of Dairy Industry**Research programs*

Milk and butterfat production investigations  
 Market milk investigations  
 Manufactured milk products investigations  
 Enforcement of Renovated Butter Act (regulatory)

*Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine*

Insect and insecticide research programs (research)  
 Insect control programs (with varying amounts of state co-operation)

Japanese beetle  
 Sweet-potato weevil  
 Mexican fruit fly  
 Gypsy and browntail moth  
 European corn borer  
 Pink bollworm and thurberia weevil

Disease control and eradication programs (with varying amounts of state co-operation)

Citrus canker  
 Dutch elm disease  
 Phony peach and peach mosaic  
 Blister rust  
 Barberry

Program of foreign and domestic plant quarantine and certification of exports

*Farm Credit Administration*

Land-bank loan program  
 Commissioner loan program (Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation)  
 Production credit loan program

Intermediate credit program (Federal intermediate credit banks)

Loans to co-operatives program (banks for co-operatives)

Emergency crop and feed loan program

Credit union program

Programs in liquidation

Regional agricultural credit corporations

Agricultural credit stock purchase loans

Agricultural Marketing Act revolving fund

Joint-stock land banks

Research programs (operating research)

Economics and credit research

Co-operative research and service

*Farm Security Administration*

Tenant purchase program

Rehabilitation program (loans and grants)

Farm debt adjustment program

Migratory labor camp program

Wheeler-Case program—joint irrigation programs with the Department of the Interior

Resettlement programs

Management of suburban projects

Management of co-operative farm projects

Special Lakes States program to enlarge farms

Program in co-operation with WFA

Defense housing program

*Federal Crop Insurance Corporation*

Wheat crop insurance program

Research on crop insurance for other commodities (research)

*Forest Service*

National Forest program

Research programs

Private forestry co-operation (research and education)

Forest and forest-products research

Forest-fire co-operation (grant-in-aid)

Forest highways, roads, and trails

New England timber-salvage program

Shelterbelt program

*CCC Program*

- On national forest lands
- On state, municipal, and private lands
- TVA camps

Co-operative work with states in tree distribution and fire protection

*Bureau of Home Economics*

Research program

*Bureau of Plant Industry*

Research and investigation programs

- Plants
- Plant exploration and introduction
- Soils and fertilizers
- Soil survey
- South American rubber-development program
- National Arboretum

*Rural Electrification Administration*

Loan program

- For line construction or reloan to members of co-operatives for wiring, plumbing, appliances

*Soil Conservation Service*

- Districts erosion control program
- Demonstration erosion control program
- Submarginal land purchase program
- Isolated settler removal program (Wisconsin)

Flood-control program

CCC program

- Erosion-control demonstration camps
- Drainage camps

Nursery program

Emergency Everglades erosion-control program

Water-facilities program

Research program (research)

Physical land surveys

Co-operative farm forestry program

*Surplus Marketing Administration*

- Food-stamp plan
- Cotton-stamp plan

Relief-distribution program  
 School-lunch program  
 Mattress program  
 Export-subsidy program  
 Diversion program  
 Marketing-agreement program  
 Refugee-relief program (purchases for Red Cross)  
 Marketing quota compliance for AAA  
 Freight-rate adjustment program  
 Lend-Lease program

Certain illustrative details may make this picture of size and complexity even more impressive. The figures cited were accurate at the time of calculation, but are not necessarily correct or even approximately correct as of the present.

In the AAA program 97,000 community and county committeemen are engaged on a per diem basis in local administration. Employees in county offices in addition number about 21,000. Beyond these are a good many other thousands who work about three months each year checking the conformance of each farmer to his agreed program.

Regular employees of the Department number 89,000, but persons paid wholly or in part with money appropriated to the Department—such as extension workers, local AAA personnel, and persons employed by the various Farm Credit Corporations and REA co-operatives—for all of whom the public holds the Department responsible even in ways in which it is not—bring the total number participating in the work of the Department to some 300,000.

Merely in Washington, where present employees number little over three per cent of the 300,000, the Department occupies space in eighteen buildings in addition to most of the two great buildings that are its central headquarters. In Washington alone the Department receives 13,000,000 pieces of mail a year, handles (at the largest peacetime single-establishment switchboard in the world) 13,000,000 telephone calls a year, has the largest duplicating plant in the world, and the largest aerial photographic laboratory. Field offices of various sizes and functions, for which the public regards the Department as responsible, number some 14,000.

In such a Department any single operation—purchases or travel,

for example—is a subject of such proportions as to require organized attention. In such a Department, administrative change is a continual process. When the Byrd Committee on Administrative Management called on the Department a few years ago for all “memoranda, orders, reports, etc.,” on structural and managerial changes that had been issued in the preceding eight years, the Department had something of a problem even to keep the volume of assembled material down to two truckloads—still far more than any Congressional committee could actually use.

*Probability of Continued Growth*

This picture has been made life-size in full realization that the tendency on the part of anybody who sees it will be to throw up his hands in futility and despair. Yet society cannot throw in the sponge. Solemn declaration that co-ordinated management of so many functions is impossible will not solve the problems that have called forth these activities. Dividing the whole into an even greater number of parts—it already is divided into many parts—will not make the whole more manageable. The managing responsibility of the President is vastly greater than that of the head of one of his departments, and while the President knows the need of and consistently has tried to organize for better over-all management, there is no solution *per se* in requiring him to work through more department heads. That would increase the Presidential job.

Nor is life going to be made any simpler by refusing to face complexity or refusing to take responsibility for achieving a necessary degree of unity. Civilization has been achieved by a process of specialization, and that process ultimately calls, in a geometric ratio, for a process of synthesis or generalization. Must we admit that man has now reached his upper limit in dealing with size and complexity or can he make further progress by directing to the business of managing complexity some of the attention that has hitherto gone to increasing specialization?

It ought to be a reassuring fact that without any special help, without popular or even limited public understanding of the present size of the task, the bureaucrats have done a job of the most impressive sort. Their mistakes have been klieg-lighted for all the world to note.



But although here and there persons or groups have contended that the job was too big and that there has been perilous and wasteful "overlapping and duplication" of effort, the public has shown no particular alarm. Some of the programs of the Department have provoked heated argument—they seem gradually to win acceptance, however, and to become less and less controversial—but there has been no evidence of a popular feeling of hopeless confusion or irritation. There has been no cry of serious corruption—and no sign of it. The country over, it is generally felt that the Department of Agriculture has been more than ordinarily well administered. Students of government, best informed of citizens with respect to this particular problem, even though they have not been in a position to see the immense reality, have generally agreed that the biggest government departments are at least as well run as the smaller ones. Originally expecting to recommend breaking the Department into smaller units, the President's Committee on Administrative Management, on the basis of its own research, gave up any such thought.

To sum up: it seems plain that both within government and outside of government, and probably for the same reasons, the trend is toward bigness. Responsible citizens, including those who like bigness least, have therefore the duty of helping to give it form and content. It is not sufficient even for those who hate bigness to resist and cry out against it. It is for us all to consider and examine the big organizations we have and the bigger ones that are being built, and to try to make sure that they will provide in the future the same quality of service provided by the most efficient of our smaller institutions.

Inevitably we shall strive to deal with these demons of size and complexity by exercising our powers of simplification. For simplification enables us to organize our affairs and reduce them to manageable proportions. But simplification on what basis? We have big government and clearly we are going to have bigger government. But with what spirit will it be motivated? On what terms and by what technique can we develop the unity our complexity demands and do it in a way that will harmonize with our history of freedom and our ideals of individual worth? Our hopes for genuine progress lie largely in the answers to these questions.