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1. **Introduction**

1.1 **The Project**

The idea to give attention to the question, whether administrative sciences have reached a status of maturity that permits the undertaking of an International Encyclopaedia, came up about a decade ago. Since then, several discussions and meetings of scholars from various parts of the world in the field of administrative sciences dealt with that question. Ranging from highly sophisticated topics to very practical questions as financing and modern editing, a vast cluster of relevant issues have been under consideration in order to advance that question.

Thus the idea developed into a relatively amorphous project of a group of internationally and nationally interested scholars of public administration. A bundle of papers and reports has been worked out during this process and within and from outside that group grew the desire to draw a caesura and to concentrate on the aspects of the scientific feasibility of an encyclopaedia of public administration. Combined with a certain optimism, the question was considered being one of the present conditions of public administration as a science. The facilities of the Research Institute of Administrative Sciences at the Post-Graduate School of Speyer have been considered to offer a suitable environment for treating that problem, because its objectives and tradition correspond to general reflections on administrative sciences as well as on highly specialized topics of public administration. At the Speyer School, individual research work in the field of administration is done individually at the professorial chairs. But a major part of research work is done at the Research Institute for Public Administration, which is related to the School of Public
Administration, but disposes of its own budget and facilities as well as a corps of permanent staff. In close cooperation and under the direction of the chaired professors approximately 25 research fellows are working on various projects in the field of organization, personnel, planning, public finance and general issues in public administration. An increasing part of these projects is initiated and financed by public authorities and foundations. Furthermore, important contributions to research activities are elaborated by national and international symposia or conferences. They take place either in spring or in fall, inbetween the terms. Some of these congresses have been payed considerable attention to as international symposia. A lot of research results are published in the school's publication series. The existing institution of the "International Conference" about research issues held in autumn, offered an adequate framework to deal with the scientific aspects of the idea. This does not mean that the prepared contributions and the results of the meeting could be further advanced than administrative science is. Thus it must be emphasized that all papers and contributions to be found in this report have only preliminary character. As it turned out at the end of the workshop, even the final statements referred to the need to continue thinking and discussing about the state of the art of administrative science.

The reports are compiled by
Friedrich Bolay
Robin Haupt
Werner Jann
Michael Protz
from the Research Institute of Public Administration at Speyer.
Since the end of the seventieth a circle of scholars is discussing the question, whether there are possibilities to put the knowledge of public administration together to an international encyclopaedia. Participants of these discussions are primarily representatives of the two Americas and of Western Europe.

Research work about this subject has been done mainly at the University Laval, Québec in Canada. Thereby a multiplicity of editorial, publicational and above all intellectual problems arose.

The difficulties of an international encyclopaedia emerge among others

- from the extent public administration assumed in practice as well as in theory,

- from the functional and territorial differentiation of administration and related practical orientations at the administration of health, education, traffic or administration of local communities, regions, etc.
- from the differentiation of the various disciplines of administrative sciences and corresponding orientations of jurisprudence, economics, sociology, political science, etc.,

- from the national traditions and influences of local socio-economic factors on the public administration,

- from the various political and administrative cultures of the Anglo-American sphere, of continental Europe, the socialist countries, developing nations, etc.

Interests for an international encyclopaedia of public administration reasons among others

- out of the need to retain an overview of the public administration,

- out of the practical necessities of cooperation between the different branches and levels of public administration,

- out of the desideratum to induce a certain integration of those disciplines that are relevant for public administration,

- out of the fact that because of the transnational mobilities the national administrations are more and more dealing with foreigners and problems which include foreign administrative relations,

- out of the facts that regional as well as worldwide inter-connection of public administration, that the extent of international organizations which have to be administered and, especially, that bilateral and multilateral administrative cooperation with developing countries have increased significantly,

- out of developments, mainly of technical and industrial nature which tend beyond local and cultural factors to a certain universalism of administrative work.
The Post-Graduate School of Administrative Sciences in Speyer organizes traditionally - nowadays within the framework of its Research Institute - international workshops in sequences of two years which have become a kind of an international forum for scientific contacts between colleagues of Europe and Overseas within the fields of public administration. Therewith exists a suitable place for a research-discourse on the intellectual problems of an encyclopaedia of public administration. The question is, whether and how the material of public administration could be comprehensively portrayed and systematically structured on the basis of an international and integrative conception and how far the classical idea of an encyclopaedia could be prolific for modern scientific communication. Furtheron should be examined, if with an encyclopaedia the present state of administrative theory and practice could be reflected, a source of information be set up, a tool of education established and an international standard of terminology elaborated. For the referring discussion, the research meeting at Speyer should become a ceaseure.

The workshop is founded on the expectation that all participants collaborate actively by written and oral contributions. Experts are in each case especially invited to comment on partial aspects. For the proceedings different forms of communication will be utilized. Conference-language will be English. The results will be summarized in a research-document which will be at the disposal of interested persons even beyond the participants. Should the occasion arise, it could be used for the solution of editorial and problems of publication of an encyclopaedia which - as such - are not the purpose of the Speyer-meeting.

At the beginning of the workshop an introduction into the problematic nature of an encyclopaedia of public administration will be given by scholars who have been working on this item for a considerable time. The part will be divided on the one hand into those basic problems which are intellectually relevant in our context,
on the other hand there will be reported the hitherto existing scientific preparatory works in a conclusive manner. Subsequently there should be presented the "International Encyclopedia of Comparative Law". So far the idea is to discuss the example of a modern encyclopaedical design. There is to find an answer to the open question how far the idea of encyclopaedia remains valid for today's scientific communication. In a panel discussion then should be considered the problem of systematic knowledge about public administration from the point of view of different basic movements which dominate today political and administrative life. Perspectives of Anglo-American, the continental European, the socialist as well as those of developing countries should become accentuated. One day should be dedicated to the group work. The intention is to acquire out of different approaches a general survey and a systematic organization of administrative aspects. Such approaches are the environment and the tasks of public administration, organization and management of state and administration, and public policy and decision making. Furthermore should be attempted to treat selected key-words in a way that allows to have an impression how they delineate within the framework and the structure of an encyclopaedia. The following key-words are proposed:

- participation of citizens in administrative decision making,
- recruitment of public personnel,
- tasks of local government.

There should be reports about the results of the group work in a plenary session. Going on from this, a final assessment should be discussed about the intellectual problems of an encyclopaedia of public administration.

Prof. Dr. Dr. Klaus König, in charge of the workshop.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>OPENING ADDRESS</td>
<td>EXPOSURE: Basic Problems of an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30</td>
<td>PLENARY DISCUSSION</td>
<td>BERICHTE: Ergebnisse der bisherigen Forschungsarbeit für ein Enzyklopädi der öffentlichen Verwaltung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>PRESENTATION</td>
<td>PRÄSENTATION: Beispiele für die Anlage moderner Enzyklopädien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>PANEL DISCUSSION</td>
<td>PODIUMDISKUSSION: Die Systematisierung des Wissens über die Öffentliche Verwaltung verschiedener Perspektiven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>GROUP WORK</td>
<td>GRUPPENARBEIT: Allgemeine Übersicht und systematische Ordnung von Topoi der Verwaltung aus der Sicht verschiedener Ansätze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>GROUP WORK</td>
<td>GRUPPENARBEIT: Rahmen und Aufriss von exemplarischen Stichwörtern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>REPORTS OF THE GROUP WORK</td>
<td>BERICHT: DER ARBEITSGRUPPEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>GROUP WORK</td>
<td>GRUPPENARBEIT: Rahmen und Aufriss von exemplarischen Stichwörtern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>GROUP WORK</td>
<td>GRUPPENARBEIT: Rahmen und Aufriss von exemplarischen Stichwörtern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Programme for the Workshop**

**Wednesday, 6.9.1981**
- **10.00 h**
  - **OPENING ADDRESS**
  - **EXPOSURE:** Basic Problems of an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration
- **12.30 h**
  - **PLENARY DISCUSSION**
  - **REPORT:** Results of Previous Research Work for an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration
- **14.30 h**
  - **PRESENTATION:**
  - Examples of Modern Encyclopaedical Designs
  - Systematization of Public Administration-Knowledge
  - Civic Culture Administration
  - Classical Continental Administration
  - Socialist Models of Administration
  - Development Administration
- **16.00 h**
  - **Break**

**Thursday, 7.9.1981**
- **9.00 h**
  - **GROUP WORK:**
  - General Survey and Systematic Order of Administrative Topics from the Viewpoint of Different Approaches
  - Group A: Environment and Tasks of Public Administration
  - Group B: Organization and Management of State and Administration
  - Group C: Public Policy and Decision Making
- **14.30 h**
  - **GROUP WORK:**
  - Framework and Disposition of Exemplary Administrative Issues
  - Group A: Citizen Participation in Planning
  - Group B: Recruitment of Public Personnel
  - Group C: Autonomy of Local Administration
- **16.00 h**
  - **Break**

**Friday, 8.9.1981**
- **9.00 h**
  - **REPORTS OF THE GROUP WORK**
  - General Survey and Systematic Order of Administrative Topics from the Viewpoint of Different Approaches
- **10.30 h**
  - **Break**
  - Framework and Disposition of Exemplary Administrative Issues
- **12.30 h**
  - **PLENARY DISCUSSION: RESUME**
Chart of the
Hochschule für Verwaltungs-
Wissenschaften Speyer

Address:
Freiherr-von-Stein-Straße 2
6720 Speyer. Tel. 06232/106-1
2. **Entry into the Workshop**

2.1 **Exposure - The Problems** (A. Leemans)

An *Encyclopaedia* of Public Administration is such a vast undertaking that anyone embarking on it is confronted with such questions as where and how to start, how to proceed, and perhaps equally important, where to stop in expanding its contents.

We should be grateful to professor Aviles who took the initiative for this undertaking several years ago, and kept the process going with great perseverance. In some sense we owe it to him that we are gathered here in this Symposium. We should be equally grateful to the Hochschule für Verwaltungs­wissenschaften, its rector, the Director of the Research Institute and in particular Professor Koenig, who enabled us to meet here in Speyer, in the good tradition of the Hochschule, this intellectual challenge of developing a system for, and contents of, an *Encyclopaedia* of Public Administration.

There is a considerable risk that we will come to realize that Speyer has been turned into a Tower of Babel which may profoundly upset the German liking of order which, undoubtedly is ruling at this Academy. The risks of a Tower of Babel are galore. We are coming from different socio-political systems. Groups of countries which are represented at this conference, have essentially different basic problems of public administration. We have a variety of disciplinary backgrounds which influence our views on the analysis and study of public administration as a societal phenomenon and as an interdisciplinary. Moreover there are often highly conflicting views on this, even within one and the same discipline. Finally, we may represent very different schools of thought or philosophies of society and State.

Having this in mind I deemed it desirable to devote my written introductory report to basic issues of Encyclopaedia in general as they appeared in the history of Encyclopaedia, rather than move immediately to the problems of an Encyclopaedia on Public Administration. I hope that in this way we might reach some degree of consensus on some of these basic issues with special relevance to an *Encyclopaedia* on Public Administration, which
would clearly facilitate our tasks in discussing its set-up and contents. For this reason I formulated a number of questions which may help to focus on the discussions in this general session.

As a number of you will not have received my paper in time, I shall begin with a short summing up of the basic issues of Encyclopaedia in general. After that a few words will be said about the history of an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration. Finally I shall discuss the basic issues with special reference to an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration as a lead into the general discussions.

**Basic issues**

It was evidently impossible to go very deeply into all the basic issues, and only the essentials have been given in my paper.

The semantic problem is the first basic issue. The term Encyclopaedia has been used for very different products. Sometimes an Encyclopaedia has been the product of an effort to determine the relationship and order among sciences. Others presented all available knowledge, in general or on a certain subject, of course with certain limitations. Again others, and in particular Encyclopaedia on certain disciplines, were more or less introductions to the discipline concerned or handbooks.

Of course the format of an Encyclopaedia has always been strongly influenced by the objectives of the composers. This is the second basic issue. Objectives have ranged from gaining an insight in the cohesion and relationships among sciences, to developing a deeper insight in the sources, construction and methodology of sciences, or of a particular science, to the presentation of all available knowledge, and the enlightenment of a larger public and, finally, providing a useful tool for beginning or advanced students.

A third basic issue, which has a philosophical as well as a practical dimension, is the question whether an Encyclopaedia
could attempt to present the knowledge which it is covering in a cohesive way, and if so, what is the source for that cohesion. This problem is probably less acute for an Encyclopaedia for a particular discipline than for a general one; but it is undoubtedly a serious issue for an Encyclopaedia for Public Administration. I shall come back to this later. It is evident that the answer to this problem will heavily influence the structure of the Encyclopaedia.

A fourth basic issue is whether and to what extent a school of thought should, or could, be an integrating factor for presenting knowledge in an Encyclopaedia; or whether a certain paradigm or theoretic analytical framework such as systems theory would be helpful.

The final issue, which has already been discussed in the small working group for the Encyclopaedia of Public Administration, refers to the choice between thematic or logical set-up versus one based on an alphabetical arrangement of knowledge.

The history of an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration

The next item is the history of an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration. Perhaps this is too ambitious a title, and in fact the history provides us hardly with a clue how to handle our problems. It is rather the specialized encyclopaedia on social and legal sciences in general that may help us. In this brief history I shall not deal with handbooks on public administration, although, as I explained in the paper, these are sometimes equalled with encyclopaedia. I shall however come back to handbooks in the final item of this introduction.

In a sense the Encyclopaedia of Cameral Sciences (Kameralwissenschaften) which was developed in Prussia in the second part of the 18-th century, could be considered a first ancestor of an eventual encyclopaedia of public administration, and it
was confronted with similar problems as we are now with regard to public administration.

The main problems were that "cameral sciences" were a collection of sciences, and their domain was not clearly defined. Various authors gave different interpretations and they were not unanimous which sciences should be included. The first encyclopaedia of cameral sciences contained: agrarian sciences, technology, commercial sciences, State sciences, including policy and finance. Although one encyclopaedia tried to construct them, in the good old encyclopaedia tradition, as a unity, it was evident that, with the development of certain disciplines, and especially economic sciences, the cameral sciences would fall apart. Economy split of, and State sciences became a group for which several encyclopaedia were developed in Germany in the 19-th century; they sometimes were termed handbooks. An example of the problem of demarcation, which is still relevant for us, was the statement by one author of such encyclopaedia that national economy should not be in such an encyclopaedia, excepting its subdiscipline financial sciences, but then as a part of policy.

Dierse's exposure makes an interesting observation which equally applies to Public Administration. He says that the encyclopaedia of State sciences demonstrates, how an encyclopaedia may serve to help new and changing sciences to find their identity and legitimation vis à vis other sciences from which they split off, or from which they have to be demarcated.
While the basic issues which were analysed in my paper are of a generic nature and apply to any encyclopaedia, we touch here an issue which is typical for the field of study we are concerned with namely public administration, and consequently the thinking about an encyclopaedia on this subject - matter.

The question which has to be posed concerns the very nature of public administration namely whether as an area of knowledge and a field of study it should be conceived as merely a collection of knowledge belonging to sections of other disciplines, or should be considered to be a separate field of knowledge (although partly overlapping with other disciplines). Indeed this question concerns the identity of public administration which has been controversial from its very birth. On the one hand there is the view that the knowledge of public administration, empirical and theoretic, is spread over a number of existing sciences, and that there is no cohesive body of knowledge, let alone of theory of public administration. This is expressed in the notion of administrative sciences. In this view public administration as an object of study is nothing but a collection of knowledge which is part of a variety of other disciplines; these have often been singling out specialisations such as public law, public economy, public finance. In fact, this is approximately the pattern of the encyclopaedia of cameral sciences.

The opposite view rejects this multidisciplinary approach as it can only present a collection of piecemeal unrelated pictures of parts of the object. Public administration is a societal phenomenon which can only be adequately studied as a whole or an unity. Knowledge, empirical but specially theoretic, can, in final resort, only be adequate if cohesive theories are developed on public administration and its constituting parts. In this view an encyclopaedia for our field
should be based on the object, public administration as a societal phenomenon. This does not necessarily mean that we could already speak of a discipline or interdiscipline now, or whether it still has the status of an intra-discipline (e.g. paper of G. Timsit). It seems to be that we could well distinguish between this question, and the question whether we could develop such an Encyclopaedia and whether this should be object-oriented. Even if one holds the view that there does not yet exist an interdiscipline of public administration, an Encyclopaedia on these objects could well be undertaken.

As I explained in my paper the earlier general encyclopaedia had as a main focus the construction of a relationship or a cohesion among the sciences, and a possible unity of sciences. Also many of the later specialized encyclopaedia considered this as one of the important elements. This cohesion concerned two levels of relationship: in the first place the relationship of the science concerned with other sciences; and secondly the relationships among the sub-disciplines and their place in the totality of the science concerned. Both were often rooted in science-philosophical hypotheses.

The two views exposed above lead to quite different conclusions regarding the relationships and cohesion among the sciences involved.

The administrative science's view will tend to look at the object from the point of view of the respective sciences and their theories and methodology. The scientific relationship and cohesion will be sought in the first place with mother science and its disciplines. Administrative law for instance is rather seen in its relationship with public law and law in general, than in relationship to (public) financial science or political science - or to something as an interdiscipline of public administration.

The second view is essentially based on an integrated approach to development of knowledge regarding the object public administration. The object is the integrating element for the
collection, "weaving" and abstraction of knowledge. In this process one has to make use of whatever information and theory there exists in other, in particular the administrative sciences, but surely not only there. This knowledge should be applied and developed and integrated with the object public administration in the focus. Only then public administration theory will do justice to the complexity of the object.

Admittedly this approach is rather contrary the tradition of many disciplines which tended to favour seclusion. Arguments against this approach are often based on puritism of the traditional disciplines, on the difference in nature and methodology among them. However, in recent decades many disciplines have become more open to influences from outside. Again an example from law: decision theory including behavioural ones, have been used for studies of the execution and application of law. And political science would never have been able to develop as it did without the incorporation of theories from many other disciplines.

For an encyclopaedia of public administration the second approach, the object approach, is clearly to be preferred, too. And I would agree with Dierse's statement that such an encyclopaedia would help public administration to find its identity as a discipline and obtain further legitimation vis-à-vis other sciences.

Evidently, such an approach to an encyclopaedia, based on the collection and ordering of knowledge on the societal phenomenon public administration, would demand consideration of the basic issues analysed in my paper. As I illustrated in the paper, schools of thought have been influencing general as well as specialized encyclopaedia. For instance law encyclopaedia of the 19th century were marked by the conflict between the historical school and the advocates of a philosophical foundation of law. Some of the latter saw no place at all for history of law in an encyclo-
paedia. In the case of an encyclopaedia of State sciences its premises and construction would be strongly influenced by a marxist school of thought; history might well be a central feature.

As for public administration it would, in my opinion, be undesirable to adhere to one particular school of thought in spite of the views expressed by some encyclopaedians such as Comte. Another question is, whether a certain paradigm or methodology of analysis could, or should, be used for structuring such encyclopaedia. This would be in line with those encyclopaedians who feel that common concepts and a common language are indispensible for the unity of an encyclopaedia. The most manifest one is, to my mind, systems theory which seems to lend itself for an encyclopaedia on a societal phenomenon like public administration, but not for one on a particular science. It remains to be seen, however, whether systems theory would be fully adequate as a framework for structuring all information to be included in such an encyclopaedia. It would be at least worthwhile considering it at this symposium.

This leads me to the last basic issue in my paper, namely the question of a thematic or logical set-up versus an alphabetic order. This as well as some of the other basic issues are closely related to the objectives of an encyclopaedia. If it is to be primarily a reference work which is easily accessible for anyone who wishes to obtain concise information on certain items of public administration, an alphabetic order is preferable. If, on the other hand, one wishes to present public administration as a more or less cohesive whole, a thematic order would be necessary. An alphabetic order would clearly present us with much less problems than a thematic or logical one. The program for this symposium presupposes the latter approach.
To achieve this is a very difficult task indeed, and the most interesting intellectual challenge for this symposium. If we would have been concerned with designing an encyclopædia for a particular discipline or sub-discipline, our task of designing a logical order would already be a hard one, and the result would probably be subject to controversy. The task of designing such a disciplinary encyclopædia is, moreover, often facilitated by previous products, or by a certain agreement on the set-up of handbooks in the field concerned.

For an encyclopædia on public administration we have little to build on. The only source might be general handbooks on public administration, but a closer look at them shows that most of them are of little avail, although some of them may contain useful elements. The older handbooks have mostly sub-divisions like administrative organisation, financial administration, personnel administration. During the last few decades, in accordance with the development of theory, administration has been examined and presented in the context of its external environment (in particular the socio-political environment) and the internal environment (sometimes with an emphasis on bureaucracy and bureaucratic culture). Others look at public administration as a politico-administrative process, and base handbooks on the structuring of this process - which may sometimes approach a system design.

Undoubtedly these different maps of the domain of public administration - using the terminology of Bacon and d'Alembert - will come up for discussion during this symposium. A visual presentation of such maps would be useful for their global understanding and for comparison among them.

I do not see it as my task now to present a scheme for a logical order. This is the main assignment for this symposium and I do not wish to pre-empt these discussions. I do hope, however, that the discussions will result in acceptable schemes for a total substantive design of an Encyclopædia and for its main sub-divisions. A full agreement, I am sure, can
hardly be achieved. But I would adhere to the view of several encyclopaedians who underline the relativity of any design: it will remain a matter of a choice among alternatives. The final choice can never have a sacred, eternal nature. The eternal value may be rather imposed by financial restrictions to prepare an entirely new pattern of an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration.

Moreover we should see such an effort and eventual Encyclopaedia as a step towards a better insight in the object of Study of Public Administration and in the development of the discipline.
1. Introduction.

Mankind has always strived to create order in things. Sometimes they succeeded, more often they failed, at least in the eyes of the posterity.

Similarly, throughout the history scholars have made attempts to create order among the sciences, or within one particular discipline; or as d'Alembert wrote: "to master the labyrinth of the sciences". These are among others the best intellectual minds who set themselves the task of gaining a deeper insight in the universe of the sciences (and the arts), their origin and relationships: Plato, Aristotle, Bacon, Leibnitz, d'Alembert, Kant and Hegel, Saint Simon and Comte, Popper, Kuhn, to mention some of the most prominent ones. They felt the need to renew the insights in and reconstruct the views on the cohesion, order and systematization of knowledge. Many scholars, and in particular those mentioned here, have tried to lay down their views on the order, cohesion and systematization of knowledge in the form of an encyclopedia, or at least in reflections on an encyclopedia as an instrument for the systematization of knowledge. Their efforts and the encyclopedia or handbooks which were the products of their intellectual work, have contributed considerably to the advancement of science in general as well as of particular sciences or arts.

It would be preposterous to compare our activities and suggestions for an International Encyclopedia of Public Administration with the products of those select philosophic minds. Our efforts are geared towards the development of an encyclopedia for a specialized field of the social sciences and our aims are less aloof. In this paper I shall deal, in a very general and exploratory way, with some of the crucial philosophic and practical issues in the development of encyclopedia in general. I shall formulate a number of questions which require an answer before the factual work on an Encyclopedia on Public Administration can start. These questions are designed to help the participants in the colloquium to prepare themselves for the discussions during that making.

There are no recent examples for an encyclopedia on Public Administration. We have to go back to the "Kameralwissenschaften" for which encyclopedia were made as from the middle of the 18th century, to be succeeded by encyclopedia on state sciences ("Staatswissenschaften") in the 19th century. Since the latter part of the 19th century, however, the study of public administration has undergone such fundamental changes that the examples set by those encyclopedia are of little avail for designing one for the
present era.

Most of the factual and much of the interpretative information in this paper has been derived from the excellent and elaborate historical survey, by Ulrich Dierse: "Enzyklopädie; zur Geschichte eines philosophischen und wissenschaftstheoretischen Begriffs" * The interpretation of this material in terms of basic issues of the development of an encyclopedia, for the purpose of an encyclopedia of Public Administration, are for the account of the author of this paper.

It is not my intention to give here a short historic review for the purpose of background information, as this would be impossible in a few papers, but I refer readers to the treatise by Dierse.

* Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte, supplement heft 2, Bonn 1977, (pp. 1-261)
2. The concept of encyclopedia.

At the outset a warning has to be issued with regard to the use and content of the term encyclopedia. The content has been changed in the course of time and sometimes other terms have taken the place of the original encyclopedia. This has resulted in a considerable confusion which also appears from Dierse's treatise.

In the antiquity and in the period of the 16th up to the middle of the 18th century the term encyclopedia was used for a cohesive and systematic presentation of the whole of knowledge with a strong emphasis on the general order and relationship among sciences. The encyclopedia of that period did not attempt to present all available knowledge.

As from the middle of the 18th century, however, and more or less following the example of the undoubtedly most famous Encyclopedia of Diderot/d'Alembert (1751-1777), the nature of general encyclopedia (with a number of important exceptions such as the encyclopedia by Kant's disciples and Hegel) has been a collection of all available knowledge, frequently with less emphasis on the cohesion of and relationship among sciences. This was partly a consequence of the alphabetic ordering of the items in the encyclopedia, as it began with the French encyclopedia.

Almost without exception, recent general encyclopedia have followed this patterns, which is often termed "lexicon".

For the individual sciences encyclopedic lectures were given as early as the 16th century. However, since the middle of the 18th century specialized encyclopedia have developed at a large scale in most countries. One of the first leading encyclopedia of law from Göttingen (whose rector ordered in 1756 that an encyclopedia be made for the four disciplines taught at this young university) had as its main purpose to give to readers an overview of the various related (sub-) disciplines as part of a whole, and to show the relationship among those disciplines as well as their boundaries. Moreover, an encyclopedia made it possible to treat various parts of the area of study fully and in a natural order. This description and later variations of it show that the contents of these encyclopedia were very similar to an Introduction or to many later handbooks. In fact in Germany in the 19th century the terms encyclopedia and Introduction ("Einführung") were often used alternatively. Nowadays, however, we understand by encyclopedia something very different from Introduction or handbooks. But it is historically correct that Dierse discussed them as well in his article in spite of the confusion that this may create. And the model is also relevant for our discussion.
Questions:
Which model of encyclopedia is to be preferred for an encyclopedia of Public Administration:
- an analysis of the main features of the discipline (multi-, inter-discipline) of Public Administration and the relationship between the relevant disciplines; or
- a presentation of all available knowledge in this field; or
- a handbook type.
3. **Objectives of encyclopedia.**

It is evident that the purpose of developing an encyclopedia is a determining factor for its nature and composition.

As was stated above the search for an order and cohesion among the sciences has been one of the main objectives and motivations of scholars. In the antiquity several of the most prominent scholars such as Plato and Aristotle made designs for this order. The idea of encyclopedia was taken up as an important concept by the humanists of the 16th century and their objective was to gain an insight in the cohesion and general relationships among sciences. Comenius for instance emphasized that an encyclopedia should not be an unrelated collection or survey of the area of the various sciences, but a system in which all parts are interconnected and referring to each other. In the beginning of this period many designers of an order among the sciences based themselves on schemes by philosophers of the antiquity, but gradually in the course of the 17th century they designed their own schemes. The philosophic approach to sciences of the scholar (or school of thought) concerned influenced greatly his conception and approach to encyclopedia (see section 5), but the emphasis on the general cohesion remained.

The strong development of the sciences in the Renaissance and rationalist era together with the multiplication of sciences were bound to blur the insight in the totality, cohesion and relationships among sciences. Gradually a shift could be observed in the predominant emphasis on the cohesion and interrelationship, towards a more elaborate presentation of specific knowledge. Thus Leibnitz made a plea for the incorporation of an explanation of the most frequent words and symbols, the general experiments of the natural sciences and a Compendium of history and geography.

In the 18th century another trend sets through, a trend which most authors emphatically rejected in an earlier period. The purpose of an encyclopedia is to collect and present all available knowledge and possibly the complete contents of the sciences (d'Alenbert, who includes "arts et métiers"). This objective of an encyclopedia, which has been a main trend in encyclopedia development since, leading to the lexicon concept and system, had a number of effects on the composition of encyclopedia. In the first place the information contained in an encyclopedia grew drastically. As a result of this, in the second place, a new set-up of an encyclopedia, became desirable, namely an alphabetic ordering. In fact d'Alenbert was consciously confronted with the dilemma and perhaps fundamental ambiguity, on the one hand wishing
to preserve the element of the cohesion among the sciences, on the other hand following the encyclopedia policy of a collection of all available knowledge.

In fact the great French encyclopédie marked the beginning of another objective: namely an easily accessible source of information on all available knowledge for an ever growing public. The use of an encyclopedia, wrote an early 19th century scholar (Guizot), is the promotion of civilisation and the improvement of the Social State. The great encyclopedia of the 20th century, often popularized, are typical representatives of this trend.

This trend deviates very much from and is incompatible with one of the most important objectives of the work of philosophers and scholars in the context of encyclopedia. The search for order among the sciences was not solely an objective in itself, but was also inspired by the desire to gain and develop among scientists, a deeper insight in the sources, construction and methodology of knowledge. For that reason it is understandable that a strong encyclopedic interest existed as from the 16th century, when a rapid development of the natural sciences took place, and of rationalism which embarked on a new search for truth, facts and ideas and became an important school of thought.

A systematic ordering of the existing truth was, and is, considered to be a precondition for future discoveries, and a logic ordering of knowledge the surest way for developing new knowledge (Bentham). Encyclopedia for specific disciplines, possibly in the form of handbooks, have often contained a strong element of this, and in fact many such handbooks published in different countries have been marking the road to new views and theories on the discipline concerned.

Besides, many encyclopaedia were developed with a view to the needs for teaching. From earlier centuries on professors prepared encyclopedic series of lectures to teach students the main lines of their own subject, as well as the relationship of their own discipline with other sciences. Such collection of lectures were later often elaborated into encyclopedia, originally with an emphasis on the discipline concerned, and their main purpose was of a pedagogic and didactic nature. They were intended to give beginning students an overview of the discipline concerned, on its history, contents and methods without confusing details. In fact they could be considered as an introduction to the discipline although some of them developed towards a more advanced level to be used by students at the end of their studies.

Especially the latter type of encyclopedia lays an emphasis on the process of
abstraction and the general principles or rules of the sciences. Some scholars rejected a strong emphasis on a pedagogic and didactic character as this risked to link the presentation of knowledge too much to the rather arbitrary division of universities in faculties.

This observation occasions to suggest that often encyclopedia were a reflection of the existing powerstructure of universities or of the desire to change this powerstructure. The classification of sciences and their order as laid down in encyclopedia as well as the specialized collection of encyclopedic lectures mostly reflected the existing division of universities in faculties. It is likely that the place in the order of science which was assigned in an encyclopedia to a certain discipline determines to some extent its status at least at the university concerned. The later concept of a genealogy of sciences often leads to a certain hierarchization of sciences as did the classifications in earlier encyclopedic works. In short, designs of the order among sciences in encyclopedia may well have been related with powerstructure among sciences and faculties. An indication of this can be found in the remark of one designer of an encyclopedia, that creating such order may help to establish peace among sciences. In fact, in modern times, we can observe a similar phenomenon of struggle among others with regard to the place and possible independence of newly developed social sciences including public administration.

Question:
What should be the objective or objectives of an International encyclopedia of Public Administration and on what should the main emphasis be put?

What are the effects of the objectives of such international encyclopedia on its structure and contents?
4. Universal character of science and encyclopedia.

As I have indicated in previous sections many scholars have delved into what was conceived as a universe of the sciences. Two approaches can be observed which are partly overlapping.

The first approach, which may be termed the cohesion of sciences approach is mainly based on the existence of separation of sciences, which are growing in number. It searches for the construction of some order in which all sciences find their place. This generally leads to the assumption that there are a few sciences of the first order. In the earlier period these were mostly derived from classifications designed by scholars in the antiquity, (e.g. Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics). The concept of primary sciences assumes a construction of subordinate sciences. These subordinate sciences often developed in a later period as a specialisation of or split of from existing sciences. It was in fact this proliferation of sciences and subsiences, and the manifold, incoherent and even chaotic development of new sciences which necessitated the search for some logic cohesion (Coleridge).

This leads to the concept of a genealogy or a tree of sciences (Bacon, d'Alembert and others). Some thereby took as a criterium the time when each of the sciences came into being, others tried to construct some logic order. In the latter case especially the symbol of a world map of the sciences was used. The construction of a logic order was based on the assumption that the sciences or groups of sciences have common properties and it is the task of the encyclopedic scholar to detect these (Novalis).

Several authors, however, rejected the concept of a cohesion among all sciences. It is impossible to present all knowledge as a unity. Any suggested unity or cohesion is arbitrary and designing it surpasses human capacity (Guizot).

Nonetheless, a number of scholars have continued to give attention to the cohesion of the sciences. As Dierse states, about half a century ago, some philosophers used the term encyclopedia for a philosophic science-theoretic program for the establishment of a university of sciences and in 1945 a conference was held on this subject. Fears were sometimes expressed that the unity of sciences movement would lead to a totalitarian tendency in the sciences in favour of a certain approach.

It seems that authors on and of encyclopedia who were representatives of an cohesive approach towards the sciences followed mostly an inductive methodology, although in many cases very general assumptions with regard to sciences or science in general, such as concerning the source of science, more or less
influenced their conceptualization of the cohesion and relationships.

The second approach is based on the concept of a "scientia scientiarum" or a general science. Logically it is impossible to construct a cohesion among the sciences, as suggested in the first approach, without a scientific theory. And this cannot be derived from the individual disciplines. It is therefore understandable that scientist, have been searching for fundamental principles for sciences and for general theories of scientific development. In modern terminology we could speak about a meta-science.

Such a science of sciences can have at least three main objects: the source of science (and of meta-science), the main properties of sciences and the methodology of scientific development. As is true for hypotheses regarding the cohesion of and relationship among sciences, the ideas about the science of sciences have been heavily influenced by schools of thought and these determine to a large degree the conclusions regarding the three main objects. We shall come to the influence of schools of thought later.

The source of sciences is viewed differently by the various scholars. Some consider the Divine as the major source; the source of science is consequently of a transcendental nature. They tend, though, to relate the Divine directly with human mind, being inspired by God. God is the highest principle of human intellect; mankind can only imitate God's order.

Reason has been a second basic source for encyclopedic orientations. This is clearly an offspring of the rationalism revived by the Renaissance. As early as mid 17th century one scholar (Sorel) spoke of the universal science according to the right Reason. Leibnitz, who planned an elaborate encyclopedia, views a "scientia generalis" as a system of fundamental concepts of real and ideal world. Such fundamental concepts could be expressed in symbols (such as figures).

He based this system on fundamental concepts, which cannot be broken up further, on rational thinking ("Vernunft").

Reason as a source for a general science - and for the sciences in general - has been very influential throughout the later centuries, through Kant French thinkers of before and after the Renaissance, Hegel onto logic positivism.

The adherents of a science of sciences, be it a science sui generis or philosophy as a primordial science are by definition following a deductive line of thought.

The search for the fundamentals of and relationship among sciences in general
and of a general science in particular has been primarily and at the highest level of abstraction an activity of philosophy. Invariably philosophy has been described as the science of sciences. D'Alembert saw philosophy as a science which should stand above the labyrinth of sciences. It is its task to oversee the other sciences and to develop their interrelationship. It should have this pre-eminent position, because philosophy as a science is not bound to a particular object as the other sciences are. Many others have made similar statements. Philosophy as theory of science is the substance of other sciences. Disciples of Hegel, as Hegel himself implicitly, underlined this role of philosophy. Philosophy is the science of sciences. An encyclopedia of philosophic sciences is the centre, a higher authority which has as a function to create a systematic unity among the sciences, which can be subject to philosophic treatment. An encyclopedia of philosophy has therefore a special position above the other disciplinary encyclopedia and presents the system of the sciences.

An important element of a science of sciences, whether a science sui generis or philosophy, is methodology. Many philosophers of science have in fact been heavily engaged in scientific methodology which provided a philosophic basis as well as a technical instrument for developing their theories. Some laid an emphasis on the need of a methodologic theoretic program for developing a science of sciences or setting up a scheme of relationship among sciences.

Science language has always been considered an important aspect of the methodology (see above Leibnitz, symbol language). In the earlier part of this century Carnap hypothesized that a uniform scientific language would dispel the disintegration of the sciences; theory on protocol language and physical language should be further developed. In fact behaviouralism and systems theory can be considered to provide such uniform language. Undoubtedly the systems theory, perhaps more than other schools of thought, has contributed much to a common approach to common concepts and common understanding of many sciences of a very different nature.

The disadvantage of such science of sciences, based on certain schools can, however, not be denied, unless one sees such fundamental principles as a base in scientific development, as Neurath emphasized. Without such a development-

al view of science, such principles risk to obtain a monopolistic absolutistic and conservatory trait.

The search of a universal methodology and of the methodology of the respective sciences towards the principles of a universal methodology is an essential step towards a unity of sciences or towards the development of a science of sciences. The behavioural school in the social sciences, based on empiric, in
accor·ding, Neurath - one of the most prominent and perseverant advocates of the unity of science movement - has promoted the advancement of a unity of sciences, which according to him should be founded on positivism.

An encyclopedic issue which is related with the source of knowledge and with the debate between the cohesion of sciences and general science approach, is the question whether an encyclopedia should be constructed in a deductive way on the basis of general principles or inductively from experiences and the observation of facts.

The last mentioned approach is clearly presented by Appel, who was appointed to the newly established chair of General encyclopedia at the University of Mainz in 1784. According to him the ultimate purpose of general encyclopedia is to trace the cohesive scientific truths; these are the final stage of a process of abstraction based on experience and observations, leading to ideas and perceptions from which truths can be construed. This cohesive knowledge is dispersed in the various disciplines, and insight in their common properties should lead to the acknowledgement of the unity of sciences.

Many other scholars base their encyclopedic thinking on the detection of common properties of disciplines. D'Alembert seems to follow the same approach. An encyclopedia should contain the general principles of the respective sciences and lay down the most important elements determining their construction and contents.

Kant and Hegel are outspoken representatives of such deductive approach. Kant is of the opinion that a system of knowledge makes a science. A conception of the whole should precede any science. Its parts are the product of the division of the whole. A general theory of science should likewise be conceived as a whole with subdivision.

Questions

Should an International Encyclopedia of Public Administration move into the realm of relationship among sciences?

Should it assume or try to develop a system of cohesion of the knowledge concerning public administration?

If so, what should be the cohesive or integrative framework?
5. Schools of thought and encyclopedia.

In the previous section I have referred to the relationship between schools of thought and encyclopedia. Some further attention will be given here to this important aspect of encyclopedia although it is not my intention to go into the details of the effects of certain schools of thought on the nature and composition of encyclopedia.

The relevance of a school of thought for an encyclopedia follows from d'Alembert's statement that the division and classification of the sciences is arbitrary and depends on the viewpoint of the observer concerning a field of science or sciences in general.

Throughout the centuries, and also within one and the same period, views on the sciences and on individual fields of science have differed and altered. The view on the ultimate source of science strongly influences the design of an encyclopedia. Evidently a theological or metaphysical school of thought produces a different order of sciences and arts than a rationalist and positivist school and follows a different methodology. For instance, Görres (1841), who sees God as the ultimate source of science, emphasizes the divine element and gives a rather central place to theology in the order and classification of the sciences.

On the other hand rationalists and positivists either deny theology altogether, or give it a sub-ordinate place under some other discipline, in particular philosophy.

Comte, a positivist, has underlined this problem of the effects of the schools of thought on encyclopedia. For the 17th and 18th century he noted the crisis in encyclopedic thinking because the positivation of sciences lead to a partly break with the former theological and metaphysical based encyclopedia. Only when theology and metaphysics will have been expelled from their last refuges, he hypothesized, is it possible to found a system based on homogeneous ideas, and can a real comprehensive positivist philosophy be created. It is in vain, he continued, to try to construct an encyclopedia which contains at the same time theological, metaphysical and positivist elements as this would be an attempt to compare a whole from elements which are mutually exclusive. Carnap when stating that the development of behaviouralism in the social sciences permitted them to be integrated in the unified science (see previous section) expressed a similar opinion as Comte a century earlier.

Whilst the controversy between schools of thought sketched above is perhaps the most fundamental and historically the most important one, there are many other examples of schools of thought influencing encyclopedic thinking. As an example can be mentioned the Utilitarian school of which Bentham was a prominent representative. Bentham base his order and classification
of the sciences on the role which each of them plays in the well-being of mankind on the ground that the function of science is to increase human well-being. A similar line of thought was followed by others.

The development of an encyclopedia on the basis of one school of thought, at the exclusion of others, certainly contributes to, or is perhaps a precondition for, a systematic and coherent composition of the encyclopedia. On the other hand this approach risks to be one-sided and to limit its comprehensiveness as regards the presentation of ideas (and facts). Criticism of this kind has for instance been voiced on Hegel's approach to encyclopedia during the 19th century.

In order to avoid such one-sided domination of a particular school of thought or approach to the relationship among sciences, several earlier authors on encyclopedia have advocated a historic treatment of the development of sciences in encyclopedia. Others have underlined the relativity of its scientific approaches. Neurath, quoted earlier, rejected the commitment of all sciences to one model, but believes in the gradual historic development of sciences towards a stronger methodological regime and a greater unity.

An encyclopedia is an incomplete and provisional collection of knowledge. In fact this coincides with Comte's view: "La marche de la science va de l'Encyclopédie à l'Encyclopédie".

Questions:
Should the Encyclopedia be based on a particular school of thought?

If so, what school should be its basis?

If not, how could the various schools of thought be given adequate attention?

And could a certain paradigm or theoretic analytic framework such as system theory be used for systematisation of knowledge?
6. Order and classification.

The order and classification of the sciences has been a core issue of all encyclopedia until the development of the universal lexicon as a more or less popularized form of presentation of all knowledge for a larger public. The importance of this issue appears from Dierse's survey which places a strong emphasis of this issue. The search for the cohesion of the sciences (and arts) as sources of knowledge and the relationship among the sciences demands order and classification. Authors of and on encyclopedia have exhausted themselves in presenting new arrangements. Initially these were mostly based on either philosophers of the antiquity or on the existing division of universities (see previous sections).

Leibnitz was among the first to make a new division of the kinds of knowledge: on the one side philosophy or theology, on the other side empiric and history, the latter being observation of historic facts and ideas. A similar division, which emphasized empirical knowledge, can be observed in d'Alembert's "idées réfléchies" and "idées directes".

As was stated earlier the growth of number and complexity of sciences lead to mapping the sciences and to the construction of a genealogy, which had sometimes a clearly hierarchical nature. Some of these classifications were very elaborate. Schmidt (1979), for instance, who rejected the classification according to faculties but searched for an order according to the nature of the sciences, gave a classification containing 151 sciences.

It would be impossible to give here a survey of the classifications suggested by scholars throughout the centuries.

Encyclopedia aimed at ordering knowledge. The existing sciences have always been considered as clusters and producers of knowledge. It is therefore understandable that encyclopedia used the sciences as framework for presenting knowledge. In fact they thus constituted in a sense the basis for a thematic subdivision of encyclopedia. We will see that many of the specialized encyclopedia or handbooks followed an analogous pattern.

This brings us to perhaps the most important question regarding the encyclopedic presentation of knowledge, at least for the purpose of our symposium, namely the dilemma between a thematic and an alphabetic presentation of knowledge. In fact, as has been indicated earlier, this became an encyclopedic issue with the encyclopedia of d'Alembert/Diderot. D'Alembert was clearly confronted with this dilemma. He saw an encyclopedia as a system and not as a collection of articles. Nonetheless he opted mainly for an alphabetic ordering, however, for purely utilitarian reasons (see section 2): such encyclopedia
would be easier for readers to consult. And an alphabetic ordering has since been widely used, especially for the large general encyclopedia, which were increasingly oriented towards a presentation of all knowledge for a wider public. For these encyclopedia practical considerations of making knowledge easily accessible to the readers have clearly been prevailing over the desire of an ordering of knowledge according to its nature.

The idea of an alphabetic order was strongly refuted by most scholars who aimed at a systematic ordering of scientific knowledge and the sciences. Coleridge for instance gave as his opinion that this leads to a complete disorganisation of sciences in encyclopedia.

Questions:
1/ Is an alphabetic order to be preferred above a thematic order for an international encyclopedia of Public Administration?
2/ If a thematic order is preferred, what then should be the basis of it?
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INTRODUCTION

This paper has three main purposes:
- To present a summary of the preparatory work carried out during 1978-80. This work involved activities directed towards a) conceptualizing the project for an encyclopedia of public administration, and b) providing a rationale for it.

In order to explain the steps taken, a brief outline of each activity is offered in this report.

- To explore some of the key issues to be reckoned with in the design, implementation, and pre-evaluation of the project.

In some cases, answers have already been found; in other cases, limited options have been left open. Finally, ways of approaching the remaining issues are profiled.

- To outline the future development and implementation stages of the project.

We trust that everyone, and above all the project itself, will benefit from our discussions.
I - REVIEWING THE PREVIOUS WORK

From 1978 to the present, most of the project activities have been centred on the gathering and analysis of basic data. These activities are:

1) The analysis of 350 questionnaires answered by professors and administrators from 32 countries. These questionnaires covered issues concerning the need, goals, contents, plan, format, and readers of the Encyclopedia.

2) A review of general encyclopedic works -- some of them not yet published -- and of specific information in public administration literature and data-banks. This has enabled us to:
   - compile the acceptations of 129 key-words taken from 133 different books,
   - compile the general outline and order of contents of eighty widely-used text-books,
   - draw up a list of 25,000 bibliographic references appearing in 125 journals (this was done using 2,000 key-words),
   - make an inventory of the key conceptual and operational issues as described in twelve existing encyclopedic works,
   - compile 2,000 key-words appearing in specialized dictionaries, thesauri, and public administration literature,
- propose an organizing general plan for the Encyclopedia,
- prepare a reference list on encyclopedic works, using a recent bibliography on the subject.

Furthermore, the need to exchange views, learn from previous experiences, and advance the project has lead us to:

1) Have meetings and interviews with representatives of 55 institutions devoted to research, training, teaching, and publishing.

2) Create a Study Group, composed of ten scholars with relevant experience in research, editing, training, and field work in both developed and underdeveloped countries. This group has met on three occasions.

3) Incorporate a non-profit organization under the provisions of the Canadian Corporations Act, for information and fund-raising purposes.

4) Prepare a roster-network of 4,500 names and addresses of members of institutions concerned with research, education, and exchange of information. It will be possible to increase this number to 50,000.
5) Store in a word-processing system most of the material already gathered and produced. This material includes working papers, lists of individuals and institutions, newsletters, and information to be used later on.

As progress is made, working documents have been prepared for discussion purposes. These concern: the findings of the surveys, certain problems related to encyclopedic works, definitions of public administration key-words, various organizational aspects, bibliographic references, a check-list for a plan of entries, a proposal for an encyclopedia of public administration, and excerpts from comments on the proposal paper.
II - RESULTS OF THE PREPARATORY WORK

a) On the need

From the very beginning of the preparatory work, this basic issue was analyzed in order to find out:
- whether the lack of a structured and comprehensive body of knowledge on public administration give rise to a project of this kind and dimension.
- whether the encyclopedic approach was the appropriate answer to that need.
- whether the present decade was the suitable time for this undertaking.

The results of the preparatory work reflected only a very few voices raising doubts about the actual need of such an intellectual work. There was also broad agreement on the suitability of the project regarding the current state of the theory and practice of public administration.

It was from the marketing and more from editorial points of view that suggestions related to this issue were made. They came from well known publishing houses, to the effect that in the development of the project, existing as well as up-coming technologies should be taken into account.
Therefore, it could be said that there is a wide consensus of opinion in favour of developing a new kind of encyclopedia in the field of public administration.
b) On the goals

There has been wide agreement on the typical, if not conventional, functions of an encyclopedia, namely to reflect the current state of the art and to serve as an informational tool. It was also accepted that the project should serve as an educational tool.

On the other hand, the development of a project with international character raised questions about increased complexity and costs. However, it was unavoidable to try to reach this objective. Thus, as one of its many implications, the Encyclopedia of Public Administration will deal with administrative practices on different levels of development and socio-political systems.

It was also evident from the preparatory research work that the encyclopedia should offer both historical and cross-cultural perspectives.

c) On the users and uses

The views of librarians, information specialists, and data-bank experts regarding the encyclopedia's readers have, since the very beginning of the project, been considered to be of crucial importance, particularly on this issue.
There were various opposing points of view. However, on one point, agreement was easily reached: the specialized character of the encyclopedia would naturally direct this work to three categories of readers. These are: civil servants at top and intermediate levels, students in public administration programs, and, eventually, specialists and practitioners from other fields of knowledge.

Conventional standards for evaluating encyclopedic works were accepted, but there was also need to explore other potential uses of the encyclopedia. Furthermore, ways and means of perfecting the work had to be foreseen as the project stages were accomplished.

Specific issues to be reckoned with included:
- points relating to continuous vs periodical and partial vs complete revisions, alphabetic vs thematic ordering of entries, single volume vs multivolume editions, comprehensiveness and authoritativeness,
- whether the propaedia-macropedia-micropedia format could be considered suitable for information and educational purposes,
- whether the issuing of periodic installments would be acceptable as an intermediary step between a sort of data-bank and the final and first bound edition.
For conceptual as well as practical considerations, it was considered advisable to:

- acknowledge the overriding importance of continuous updating,
- reserve the strict thematic classification (or modified forms of it) for later editions of the encyclopedia,
- choose the multivolume option,
- strictly comply with the most stringent conditions on authoritativeness and comprehensiveness according to world-wide established standards,
- reject the propae-macro-nicropedia format as a model,
- carry on with the installments approach.

**d) On the format**

Regarding this aspect, the Encyclopedia of Public Administration as a result of both the preparatory work already carried out and the examination of comparable undertakings should constitute a clear-cut departure from most past and current experiences.

It was considered advisable to:

1) make full use of today's available technology,
2) develop first a storage and retrieval format which would offer the widest possible range of uses and adaptations,

3) rely on the feedback coming from users of the encyclopedia,

4) make provisions in the design of the project to anticipate future modifications and additions, and to expand the potential of the encyclopedia.

Thus, the specific proposal can be summarized as follows:

- The first version of the encyclopedia should be stored in a computarized sort of data-bank. Information contained in the Encyclopedia of Public Administration could thereby be obtained in different forms: printed output, visual display, magnetic tapes, video-disc, etc.
- Preliminary versions of the entries could be introduced into the memory of a central computer as they are received and then electronically circulated for feedback purposes or advance information.
- After sufficient revised material has been received or after related subjects have been gathered together, instalments could be prepublished.
The first bound, updated, and complete edition, together with supplements, would be available no later than one year after all the instalments had been published.

e) On the language and adaptations

From the very outset it was felt that such an encyclopedia should be made available in different languages and that provisions be made for its adaptation to regional or national needs. This would help to attain one of the encyclopedia's paramount objectives: its international character.

Therefore the organizing scheme to be followed in this aspect calls for formal arrangements with regional networks entrusted with the task of translating the main body of the encyclopedia into other languages, and adapting it to other cultural-political contexts.

f) On the outline

The basic topic here is to repeat or adapt models of existing encyclopedic works, or to innovate.

It is not for the mere sake of innovation that the proposed outline should depart from the rigidity inherent in
conventional printed works. Rather, it is because of

1) The need to present public administration in its multidisciplinary context and to incorporate central themes of sectoral administration, since these needs are rather neglected in current literature and no encyclopedic work presently satisfies them.

2) The fact that today's data-processing and retrieval technology make it possible to instantaneously extract and combine segments of information contained in the encyclopedia, which correspond to specific needs.

3) The possibility of providing more information by indicating pertinent references to current literature and other related materials.

Concerning these points, a three-part organizing plan has been prepared for discussion.

Furthermore, for practical reasons -- namely to obtain a well balanced work and to provide for comparisons -- it would be advisable to prepare an uniform framework for each type of theme.
g) **On contributors**

To develop an encyclopedic work of the highest quality, to make it truly internationally oriented and as balanced as possible, is a hard task. Add to this the objective of reflecting the current state of the art -- including controversies -- and the goal appears virtually unattainable.

Therefore, the project has to assemble the capabilities of all categories of contributors, individuals, groups of scholars and institutions. At the same time, it will be necessary to provide a framework for suitable combinations of these categories.

The project requires articles written
- by outstanding scholars, who would prepare articles within their recognized fields of study,
- by groups of researchers when, e.g., comparisons have to be made,
- by leading personalities presenting various approaches to major topics which are the subject of fundamental controversies,
- by research and educational institutions that have studied specific themes or are equipped to deal with related topics.
- with the help and advice of consultants contributing ideas towards not only these articles but also towards logistic activities,
- by a permanent team of editor-researchers who would prepare various minor entries.
CONCLUSIONS

If this report requires a conclusion, it will be an unorthodox one, since I would like to express our belief concerning the balance between the work already done and that yet to be done.

As for the activities to be carried out in the short term, these include:

a) The reviewing and drawing up of basic documents, namely:
   - editing policies and guidelines,
   - a general organizing plan,
   - procedural instructions and outlines for the presentation of articles,
   - thesaurus - plan of entries,
   - guidelines for revision, updating, and adaptations,
   - instructions for the preparation, storage, and retrieval of computerized information,
   - work programs and budgets for the data bank and instalments phases.

b) The establishment of key organizational organs
c) The submission of formal requests to financing and sponsoring institutions.

Bearing all this in mind, it is not surprising that both the work of those who initiated this project and the comments of those who were consulted, were characterized by one main concern: given the amount of effort required, the time and resources to be invested, the risks of open-ending, and the complexities of the project, would it now be feasible to develop and complete a truly commendable encyclopedic work in public administration?

To start to answer this question, it can be said that although the biggest effort has yet to be made, some crucial steps have already been taken, such as the considerable amount of information already obtained, lessons drawn from comparable experiences, the latent institutional support detected, and the expressed willingness to contribute on the part of most of the distinguished specialists invited to participate in this project.

Therefore, what remains to be answered is: can this project be completed before the end of this decade?

We believe the answer to be yes.
Plenary Discussion on Conceptualization - Report

The first phase of discussion, after the recapitulation of the preliminary work having been performed, the description of the existing state of problems and the comparison with similar projects, necessarily had to refer to the prepared working program.

It was asked whether and how it would be possible to concentrate on the substantial issues.

It was accepted that two steps had to be done at the beginning:
1. to create a common understanding of public administration
2. to integrate socialist and developing countries in this understanding.

The idea of doing this by "testing" relevant topics and issues from different approaches seemed to be adequate and very difficult at the same time. One participant from Asia additionally remarked that the basic concept of the project appears to him as being of "Anglo-American" nature.

While the institutional aspects in public administration contain a broad variety and many differences, the technological development in the Western hemisphere is much more universal in its nature and has many similarities.

From an African view it was said that scientists there cannot even put together their multiplicity within the existing institutions. So it was felt to be very difficult putting together an even wider range of languages, systems, traditions and so on into one framework.

In reaction to this it was formulated as strong interest to find out, what the true "internationalisms", the "multinationalism" and interdisciplinarities are. This should not be seen as judgements of different cultures, but as a setting or survey of the existing variety of public administration.

Such a compilation would be an alternative to the existing handbooks on public administration.

The mentioned example at a conference, where participants had been asked to express their view about the nature of international public Encyclopaedia as a point between the two poles of
culturalism versus universalism and where the majority put their points in the middle between them (what created a cross), was not accepted as a reflection of reality, but only of personal preferences. From this high demand on an Encyclopaedia, it was questioned how to structure entries first for the input of information and second for the access to users. It was added that everybody must accept the concept of an international Encyclopaedia and that it would be a tremendous service to mankind, putting together all relevant knowledge about public administration; but any experience in science forces to minimize reality. Even then it will cost decades to do such a work and it will become not more than summaries of the State of the Art which will have to be revised every 6-10 years.

Looking for answers to the questions of the Exposure, would only tend to emphasize differences and increase the mass of information. That leaves as "residual possibility" the search for and the approach from common grounds.

A discussion participant from a socialist country stressed the need of having all data about public administration and added that the last idea seems realizable to him only in a first superficial way. But even the "family" of socialist systems contains a variety where many elements would not be acceptable to other "relatives", what creates need for a superior framework.

A formalistic framework like an alphabetic order was seen then adequate for International Public Law with its many topics in relatively isolated positions, but not for such a manifold interrelated subject a public administration, where a systematic order is necessary for any use.

Now the discussion referred to the stream of technical public administration, which could be traced in the political history. There the core of government has always been the administrative apparatus.

The Greek authors with their theories and philosophies of State dominated for centuries at least American political science, whereas the example of Rome never found similar recognition.
But it seems to be clear that the basis of the modern state is Roman, what makes the topic "imperial" to one of the most important for any understanding. It was added and accepted then that in European history the concept of state needs not only government, but also an important sector of society. The relation of this background to 2/3 of the world considered as being underdeveloped but in communication with the now industrialized successors demonstrates what is needed most today: Isolating the universal problems of public administration and concentrating on them to enable less developed countries to reach the historical standard in a denser period.

For development administration it was seen as far more important to clarify what to do first and then talk about how to shape it. For practical purposes this means that planning is of more significance for developing nations than even for socialist countries.

Out of this discussion it was plead not to exclude the basic and simple needs of the developing world in an Encyclopaedia of public administration.

It was suggested then to examine whether the item "Bureaucratic Ethos" could present an adequate framework. Dealing with age old problems that go beyond Aristotle of classifying regimes, politics, governmental systems, public administration systems, this term was suggested as being possibly useful for the purpose of the workshop. The entry can be done by culture, regime, institutional forms or by location, whatever agreement can be reached. The approach can lead to complications by using different approaches to the question how bureaucracy views itself, how it is viewed by society and how it behaves, in other words, it has to be distinguished between administration of the public and administration for the public. The first distrusts the masses, tries to manage them, makes decisions for them, educates, is management oriented, prefers secrecy, stresses law and order
regulation and concentrates on processes. The latter trusts the masses, allows participation, formulates limitations of the bureaucratic state, stresses objectives and concentrates on results. This proves that "Ethos" clarifies these characteristics, irrespective of the actual regime. At the same time "Bureaucratic Ethos" opens the field for criticism. In all bureaucratic states, senior public servants see themselves and are seen by outsiders as a guardian class, that is, custodians of social ideals, dedicated to the common good and advancement of the public interest who have to educate, guide and lead the rest of society. It was said that in practice, they act more as a caste bureaucracy than a guardian bureaucracy because (with exceptions) senior public servants are a closed elite recruited from the same restricted social class, usually upper class, that monopolises public life to protect the status quo generally and its own special interests when threatened, thus careful to preserve its status and privileges and tending in its conduct of public affairs to be antiquarian, formalistic and heavy handed.

The interest then changed for the last series of comments to the suggested conceptual scheme of organizing plan which had been prepared in advance to the purpose of discussion. It was accepted as catalogue of subjects that have to be given attention to in an Encyclopaedia of Public Administration. Nevertheless, it was regarded as being more advanced than the course of discussion and the discussion participants wanted to refer to it later on. The following scheme prepared by R. Wolfs, was considered by the author as problematic in Part I, as difficult in Part II and as relatively problem-free in Part III.
PART I

GENERAL AND RELATED SUBJECTS

The thought here is to present treatments of subjects that are either central to the enterprise of public administration or relate importantly to it - and which do not "fit" into Part II or Part III.

Subjects for inclusion would be, for example, the following:

- History of public administration
- Development administration
- Comparative administration
- Systems theory
- Decision-making
- Policy analysis
- Computers/automation
- Operations research
- Ethics/graft
- Management science
- Control of public administration
- (presentation of major alternatives)
- Disciplines related and contributing
- (pieces on the several social sciences, psychology and .?)
- Law (in general and major legal systems)
- Administrative law (major systems and perspective)
- Bureaucracy (ideas and theory of)
- Planning (as a concept, and major division of)
- Organization theory (the various approaches and perspectives)
- Territorial-spatial dimensions
- (federalism, regionalism etc.)
- Participation (ideas of and varieties in practice)

Plainly, there are problems of inclusion and exclusion, as well as overlapping. But does the idea make sense?

Regarding overlapping, I regard this as inevitable. It can be made a virtue by good planning and cross-referencing.
PART II

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS, ORGANS
AND PROCESSES

The thought here is to present what has conventionally been the main body of textbooks of both public administration and business administration.

**Cluster A - Personnel - suggested topics**

- Recruitment
- Education/training
- Classification/ranking
- Compensation
- Duties/discipline rights

**Cluster B - Financial - suggested topics**

- Budgeting
- Fiscal management and control
- Auditing

**Cluster C - Organization and Management - suggested topics**

- Organizational principles/alternatives
- Delegation/supervision
- Motivation/discipline
- Communication
- Inspection/inspectorates

While these three clusters are relatively conventional and "sensible", they don't (or don't easily) include some things that need to be included.

What, for example, to do about unions in and of the public work-force? Collective bargaining in the public service could be in Cluster A, but probably needs separate treatment - treatment in Cluster A and separate treatments?
PART III

SECTORIAL ADMINISTRATION

The thought here is to present treatments of all reasonably general sectors of public administration. The following is a random, but representative, list.

Agriculture
Industry and Commerce
Labor
Public works and public domain
Communications (post, telegraph, etc.)
Transportation
Military
Law enforcement/peacekeeping
Judicial
Education
Social programs/human services
Health and sanitation
Government enterprises/corporations
Science and technology
Energy
Culture and recreation
Taxation
Religion.

Obviously, there are serious problems arising from differing systems, cultures, and governmental systems. I see three means of dealing with these problems.

1. Pieces as objective and inclusive as possible.

2. Pieces on the same subject by differing authors, when the subject is very sensitive or controversial.

3. Criticism of pieces by persons of differing persuasions. This can be done either with the idea of "adjustments" of the piece by its author; or of critical note to be appended to the original piece.

The three ways are not mutually exclusive. Use of all three?
3. Presentation of Examples of Modern Encyclopaedical Design

3.1 The International Encyclopedia of Comparative Law -

U. Drobnig

I am pleased to have been invited to present to this distinguished group, in brief outline, the IECL. I shall limit myself to those essential features that may be relevant for your deliberations and decisions concerning an Encyclopedia of Public Administration.

1) Let me start by indicating a few external data in short summary: The Encyclopedia is appearing in 17 lexicon-size volumes with approximately 1 000 to 1 600 pages each. Each volume deals with a major topic of civil and commercial law, such as contracts, torts, family law, companies, etc. But also certain fringe areas, such as civil procedure and labour law have been included, although coverage here is not as complete as in the two central fields. Each volume is divided into chapters, between 10 and 20 per volume. These chapters are the basic working unit which is entrusted to an individual author, or sometimes to two or even three co-authors. The contents and borderlines of the chapters have been planned in a somewhat involved process.
A special rôle is assigned to the first of the 17 volumes. It is not comparative but merely descriptive. It contains more or less comprehensive reports of varying length on each legal system of the world. All these reports are written according to a uniform scheme, and they are arranged alphabetically.

I hope that these external data convey to you some ideas about the outer structure of the IECL. You will have noticed, that the Encyclopedia is limited in essence to civil or private and commercial law and does not cover criminal or public law. I shall not burden you with technical details, such as the general organisation of the enterprise, the organisation of the academic work, financial aspects or editorial processing. Although, of course, all of these aspects are vital for the success of the whole enterprise.

Turning now from the outer appearance to the inner structure, the guiding ideas, the soul of the enterprise, I would like to raise and to reply to three simple questions: Why? How? And for whom? is the work being done?
2) Why has it been undertaken? I must confess that, when the idea of the IECL was conceived and discussed in the middle of the sixties, little attention was paid to general principles or modern achievements in compiling encyclopedias. All the attention was focussed on the specific demands of comparative law in general and in the central fields of private and commercial law in particular. What were the specific demands, as we conceived them? There were two major reasons which induced us to conceive the Encyclopedia.

First, there was need for a consolidated, comparative analysis of our present legal systems in the two major areas covered by the Encyclopedia. Such a broad presentation, it is true, could in part build upon a great number of comparative studies, mostly with a bilateral coverage that had been undertaken in Europe since the beginning of the century. But the results of these studies had been spread over many books and articles and in many countries and languages. It was desirable to consolidate and to examine under modern auspices and with a new method, and to update and integrate the more important achievements of earlier work.
At the same time, a consolidated, complete comparative coverage of private and commercial law implied the necessity of filling the many gaps which earlier individual spontaneous research had left. The topics of doctoral theses are not distributed according to a global design, and even less follows research work by mature scholars a master plan. Consequently, many details and even wider areas of law have received but small comparative attention or none at all. Only a comprehensive enterprise such as an encyclopedia can furnish the desirable complete coverage, including many hitherto neglected areas.

The second, perhaps the greater and certainly the most difficult demand was for a global comparative coverage of the legal systems of the world. Individual comparative work is of necessity limited, due to the many limitations imposed upon each human being, to cover a very small number of countries; comparative works are usually binational or trinational, but not multinational nor universal. The time seemed ripe to attempt realising an old dream of comparative idealists, namely a global coverage of all legal systems (which, to make matters worse, have about doubled in the last 20 years), which may eventually lead to the finding of universally valid principles and rules of law.
The attempt to comply with these two major demands, i.e. full coverage subjectwise and global coverage geographically, has shaped the characteristic features of the IECL, as an encyclopedia.

3) I am therefore now turning to the "how", i.e. to the ways of implementing the above mentioned two major demands.

The salient features of the IECL have been developed in distinguishing it from a predecessor, an uncompleted "Comparative Dictionary of Private and Commercial Law" (Rechtsvergleichendes Handwörterbuch für das Zivil- und Handelsrecht). This dictionary was published in German in six complete volumes and one incomplete volume in Germany between 1927 and 1940. Apart from its national connotations—i.e. exclusively German authors writing in German, also the structure and the coverage of this predecessor were different. It was a dictionary of approximately 300 key words (with an average length of 16 pages per article), and these key words were arranged alphabetically. The geographical coverage centered upon Continental Europe, dealing with the Anglo-American orbit on a more limited scale, and barely mentioning the Soviet Union (then the only representative of a socialist legal system) or even non-European legal orders.
The IECL deliberately deviates in all these respects from the earlier dictionary. I shall demonstrate this with regard to three major aspects, namely internal structure, geographical coverage, and terminology.

a) In its **structure**, the IECL has deliberately decided against a system of alphabetically arranged key words. This decision against a dictionary and for an encyclopedia is in part also influenced by its international character.

In the beginning, attempts had been made to design an improved dictionary. However, it proved impossible to find specialised key words which would be valid for all, or a majority of, legal systems and therefore meaningful for readers from every country. Divergent terminology, incidentally, is due, in part, to the surprising fact that divergencies among legal systems are usually much more pronounced in regard to details than they are with respect to the delineation of major subjects. This is the first point where the lack of an international terminology was clearly felt. It is possible and indeed to be hoped that the Encyclopedia may help to create a generally accepted supranational terminology that is presently lacking. Such new, autonomous terms
should be the result of the comparative analysis; but they do not serve well as sign posts to an uninitiated, international readership of very different legal background. For them, only the most basic categories can be used, which are fortunately known almost everywhere.

Apart from this major linguistic obstacle, there is one additional basic objection against the use of key words. We were afraid that even a large number of individual key words might not exhaust a given field and thus would fail to assure the desired full coverage.

These considerations led to the conclusion that the Encyclopedia should be divided into 16 relatively untechnical topics, each comprising a full volume of 1 000 to 1 600 pages of lexicon format. The material in each volume is then further subdivided into chapters, of which there are 10 to 20 in each volume; but this subdivision can be explained, where necessary, within the volume. It goes without saying that the internal subdivision of a volume (or of its various chapters) must not follow any particular national classification, but must be the fruit of a broad comparative analysis and therefore cosmopolitan.
An alphabetical order is merely observed in the first, descriptive volume containing the national reports.

This division of the comparative volumes of the Encyclopedia according to functionally chosen topics rather than alphabetically arranged key words has proved entirely practicable. Incidentally, it seems to be in keeping with a general trend of modern encyclopedic compendia.

b) The attempt to achieve world-wide coverage is probably the most ambitious idea of the whole enterprise. Its implementation has had the most decisive impact upon the character of the encyclopedia.

First, it was necessary to work out a special method. It goes without saying that the claim of universal coverage cannot be fulfilled literally. Neither our present state of legal documentation nor our traditional method of writing permit us to cover an innumerable mass of national legal systems that differ more or less from each other.

The decisive question then is, which criteria should be used for selecting the legal systems to be compared? The general treatises on comparative law usually advise that out of the five great so-called "families of law" the respective
leading system must be chosen; practically speaking, this is French, Anglo-American, German, Soviet, and perhaps Islamic law. This advice is based upon the implied assumption that the so-called leading systems have a monopoly on discovering and developing original solutions. However, this assumption is not borne out, neither in theory nor in practical experience.

It was therefore necessary to develop a new approach to this key issue. The new method of selection and presentation which has been adopted is that of the so-called "typical solutions". It is based upon the observation that in fact the legal solutions that have been developed for any given social or economic problem (such as disruption of a marriage; or defects of goods sold) are limited in number. The essential task is to find these typical solutions. This necessitates first a very broad survey of the existing state of the law throughout the world. In many areas, existing literature can be helpful for this first step. Each of the typical solutions so found is then described. This description, in order to be thorough, realistic and well rounded, must rely upon one particular national system of law. To be selected is that legal system which is regarded as representative for the specific typical solution. Other legal orders that have adopted the same approach are only mentioned in summary form, but important deviations are
explained in detail. The description of various typical solutions to a given problem is then followed by an intensive comparison and critique.

This method of "typical solutions" is possibly the only realistic means of achieving the claimed worldwide coverage of the Encyclopedia, without submerging the reader under an avalanche of details and references. Apart from the aesthetic advantage of preserving readability, the main virtue of the "typical solutions" approach is the limitation of the legal systems that have to be investigated and analysed in detail. This limitation also facilitates the subsequent comparative process because it allows to concentrate on a limited, manageable number of legal systems. The expectations that were placed in this method have been fully honoured by our experience. It should be mentioned, though, that the integration of fundamentally different legal systems, such as those of the socialist world in some respects and especially of the religious laws into the method of "typical solutions", sometimes poses difficult problems.

There is a second, more organisational than intellectual consequence of the claim of global coverage, even as qualified by the method of "typical solutions". We have to
overcome the individual limitations of each author. The encyclopedia is therefore conceived as a collective enterprise. Thus the individual author is enabled to draw upon the knowledge of experts in various countries which are inaccessible to him. And each contribution is subjected to thorough examination by the editor-in-chief of each volume, by the advisory group attached to each volume and by the Responsible Editor for the whole Encyclopedia.

c) Connected with the problem of worldwide coverage are the problems of language and of terminology that should at least be alluded to.

At the outset of the project the language problem was debated strenuously. Not the least for reasons of national prestige, various multilingual solutions were initially considered. But finally, financial and commercial constraints forced us to opt for a single language solution, namely English. The linguistic unity is also crucial for the desirable terminological consistency of the work; on the other hand, it necessitates many, difficult and expensive translations which are a considerable burden.

The linguistic unity is a precondition for another important objective, i.e. consistency of terminology. On the other hand, the necessity of selecting a national language
has the grave drawback that at least any lawyer from the Anglo-American orbit may automatically associate any technical term with English or American rules or institutions. Wherever necessary or desirable to avoid confusion, we have therefore attempted to develop independent comparative terms.

4) I shall very briefly deal with the final question: whom do we envisage as our readers?

We do not think of legal practitioners. The Encyclopedia does not, and cannot purport, to offer the solution to any legal problem that may arise under the law of any country of the world. The Encyclopedia is neither exhaustive nor loose-leaf nor permanent.

The primary beneficiaries of the Encyclopedia should be lawmakers, both on the national and the international level. They are offered a multitude of possible solutions of traditional as well as of novel problems. Especially legislators in countries without extensive collections of foreign and comparative law will welcome the wealth of information, experience and ideas collected in the various volumes.
Another major beneficiary will be the academic community everywhere. The Encyclopedia will serve as a handbook for the teaching of comparative law on a broad, global basis. And it will help and stimulate comparative research since it will constitute in many fields a definite point of departure.

I hope very much that my description of the basic design and the guiding ideas of the IECL may stimulate and fructify constructive thinking about the planned Encyclopedia of Public Administration. I am, of course, available for any further information that may be desired.
It is a great pleasure for me to describe briefly before this distinguished audience an Encyclopedia of Public International Law, the publication of which started this year and which is scheduled to appear in 12 instalments during the next 3-4 years. After the publication of all the instalments, a final edition will be printed containing all the articles in continuous alphabetic order in four volumes, and an additional volume will comprise indices, lists and other supplementary material. The whole work will cover about 4000 pages and will be published according to a time schedule.

Some brochures with a description of the whole undertaking are available here. The brochure contains the complete list of entries. A copy of the first instalment, which appeared a few months ago, should be circulating around the table.

I would like to begin with some basic information and considerations, and thereafter I intend to describe some details and more technical matters.

Our Encyclopedia is not a comparative law dictionary or encyclopedia; it concentrates on one legal order, although a special order, namely public international law. About 1300 articles of different sizes will describe all the important organizations existing in the international community, all basic questions of the international legal order, and all major decisions of international courts and arbitral tribunals. When completed, the Encyclopedia should provide comprehensive information about the present state of international law; also, the history of international law will be treated in a number of substantial articles.

We have, for instance, articles on the subjects of international law, from the States and the Holy See to the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies, as well as the regional organizations in the different parts of the world. (NATO, OAS, Arab League etc.). The laws of war, the law of the sea,
air law and many other fields are covered. The first instal-
ment which, as already mentioned appeared some months ago,
contains 45 articles on the settlement of disputes. The next
instalment will be on the market in a few weeks; it contains
175 articles on decisions of international courts and tribun-
als. The next instalment, the manuscript of which has just
been finalized, will contain 93 articles on the law of war
and related subjects.

You see, it is a very ambitious undertaking, and we are
sometimes a little bit afraid as to how we can solve hundreds
of problems. But, since the publication has started and the
subscribers have already paid a substantial amount of money,
we are condemned to succeed.

Let me now describe the different steps of our work.

We started by compiling a more or less complete list of all
the entries which should be included in the Encyclopedia.
It is important to know that the present Encyclopedia has
a forerunner. Between the two world wars and again in the
early sixties, the Wörterbuch des Völkerrechts edited by
Karl Strupp and later by Hans-Jürgen Schlochauer, was pub-
lished in the German language. This Wörterbuch has been our
model and starting point. But many new entries had to be se-
lected, and many entries in the Wörterbuch had to be deleted.
And all articles contained in the Wörterbuch had not only
to be revised but in many cases completely rewritten. The
new list of entries has been discussed several times in an
Advisory Board which is composed of some 15 members. They
are outstanding scholars in international law, coming from
different countries.

The next step after the selection of articles and the solution
of many other questions during the period of preparation
was (and partly still is) the selection of authors. At the
end we will probably have at least 300 contributors. For
more than one half of the 1300 articles, the authors have
been selected in the meantime, for the other half, the authors still have to be found. This is a consequence of the instalment system; since the instalments appear over several years and since we successfully tried to publish the first instalments as soon as possible, we had to postpone the selection of authors for instalments which will appear only in later years. But I hope that nearly all authors can be contacted and secured in the next months.

There are no hard and fast guidelines or criteria for the selection of the authors. In general, they should be experts in the field they are describing in the Encyclopedia. If they are not yet experts, they must be able and willing to read the relevant material and literature and to write a condensed report. This last remark should indicate that we are including in our work young scholars, mainly research fellows from the Max Planck Institute, but also university research assistants. For some subjects, for instance for the main articles on the history of international law, the authors must have a broad knowledge and experience; for other articles, e.g. on more technical matters like patent law or the international protection of plants against diseases, the expert with practical experience in these fields is the person in first place qualified to write on the subject concerned. For other tasks, like the description of a certain decision of an international court, a younger member of our staff might contribute a better article than the widely-known professor with a high reputation but very little time.

The authors come from different countries, although the majority are from Western Europe. Please remember that the Wörterbuch des Völkerrechts was a product of German-speaking authors. The new Encyclopedia is a successor work of the Wörterbuch and it is, although written in English, a work designed and prepared in Europe, primarily in Germany. But we are inviting authors also from other continents, and a good number of scholars from different parts of the world have already accepted our invitations.
In this context another remark might be useful. We are not asking authors to describe and develop their personal convictions about what the present state of the law is and what changes they consider necessary. The Encyclopedia should give reliable information about the present state of international law as reflected in legal documents and in State practice and as interpreted by the most representative authors. As far as necessary, minority views may and should also be mentioned and, quite obviously, the author of an article may state which view in his opinion is the one to be preferred. But more important than any author's convictions is reliable information on State practice and the international opinio iuris.

We all know that there is no clear borderline between the rational collection and the pure description of given materials on the one side and personal convictions and preferences on the other. We try in our Encyclopedia to give information as objectively as possible, but I must admit, without being a Marxist, that this is at least partly influenced by personal convictions and interests and it is mainly the Western view which finds expression in our work. There will of course be articles on Islamic international law, on the socialist conception of international law and on the conceptions in Third World countries, and on the problem of an international economic order, etc. Information is needed on all aspects of our present world order, but, I repeat, this information is given primarily, not exclusively, by Western European scholars.

Let me drop in a footnote: Before we started our work, an international society of highest reputation intended to undertake a similar work, but it soon transpired that it was impossible to do this without a solid institutional framework and competent staff.

This leads me to a more technical aspect and to the infrastructure of our Encyclopedia. Besides the Advisory Board,
which meets not more than twice every year (usually for one day), we have a small staff of full-time collaborators who are working only or at least mainly on the Encyclopaedia. This staff consists of 3-5 members, one of them is a librarian responsible for bibliographical questions and aspects; all the other full-time collaborators are lawyers, and they have all English as their mother-tongue. Since a great number or the majority of our authors come from other than English-speaking countries, the manuscripts have to be checked, revised and sometimes profoundly altered under linguistic considerations. As regards the procedure for checking articles, we speak in our daily work about the first, the second and the third reading of every manuscript.

It is important to note here that there are different kinds of encyclopedias. Our Encyclopaedia is a particular type of a dictionary not in the sense of short interpretations of different notions, but in the sense of condensed scholarly descriptions of legal institutions and norms. Such a work requires, in my opinion, different considerations and practical steps than an encyclopaedia with comprehensive articles on whole branches of the law. In this respect the Hamburg and the Heidelberg Encyclopedias have only two things in common: the name Encyclopaedia and the fact that two institutes of the Max Planck Society take editorial responsibility.

Let me make some additional remarks on technical matters. We have not only a small staff of full-time collaborators, but a considerable number of ordinary members of the Max Planck Institute - research fellows, typists, the editorial staff responsible for our other publications - who participates to a greater or lesser degree in the preparation and the revision of manuscripts. I do not think that a similar work is impossible without human resources on the same scale. But it must be kept in mind that an Encyclopaedia requires not only high spirits and intellectual capacity, but also technical craftsmanship.
You are probably interested to hear a few words on the financial implications of our Encyclopedia. Without divulging upon confidential matters, I can say that the publisher does not get any subsidies, instead he has to pay a small percentage of royalties. On the other hand, I had to find financial means for the employment of the staff mentioned before.

I think it might be best to close my description now. The only thing I would like to say at the end of my presentation is: our Encyclopedia is an extremely complicated undertaking, but it seems to me to be an easy one when compared with an international encyclopedia of public administration.
By "Civic Culture Administration" in the present context is meant centrally Anglo-American administration, as is indicated by posing it against "Classical Continental," "Socialistic" and "Development" administration. However, if this were all that the term "civic culture" were meant to designate, then "Anglo-American" presumably would have been the term chosen by the conference organizers. In any case, I shall assume—and argue for—a somewhat wider meaning.

Subject to qualifications that will be indicated, I shall argue that the administrative heritage and practice of Western civilization can be viewed as a historical "stream" in which two currents meet and mix, with now one, now the other, predominant. These two currents may be designated "imperial" and "civic". Of the two, the imperial is more central, more dominant, even in "civic culture" countries. On the other hand, the "civic" current has an influence, sometimes a very significant influence, in the "imperial" countries.

Again, subject to qualifications that will be indicated, I shall argue that it makes sense to view the history of administration in the West, and thus the present practice of administration, in the following perspective: The main stream of development, the imperial, rises in the ancient empires of the Near East and Mediterranean. This stream crests in imperial Rome. When, after the decline and fall of Rome, the Dark Ages and the Medieval period, the modern state system was created the main inspiration and exemplar was imperial Rome.

The civic stream rises in Greece, above all in Athens; and is fed by Republican Rome. It is fed from various other sources, including the experience of late medieval—early modern cities that did not become "empires." For a number of reasons the civic stream has been
influential and/or has been generated afresh in England and, perhaps even more so, in some countries where English overseas expansion was decisive. But, to repeat, what is involved is relative emphasis: any modern state is at core "imperial."

Perspectives and Theses

I shall, of course, attempt to identify the features of Anglo-American administration that are distinctive or characteristic. This is best done by viewing these features as a product of historical development. So viewed, one sees better what is shared with the "main stream" of development and what is more or less distinctive.

Obviously, I cannot "write a history"—even a capsule one, as a part of a brief presentation. Rather, I shall proceed by setting forth summarily a number of perspectives and theses that shape and color my view of the development of administration. By no means is it necessary that you agree entirely with what is set forth—I am still searching for the truth myself. If you believe that I am seriously in error with one or more of the summary statements, then I must re-examine my intellectual base and perhaps alter my conclusions.

1. Related terminological and conceptual problems make an exercise such as this extremely difficult. In English every term that seems relevant and presumptively useful has several meanings, and may not denote or connote to the reader or listener what is in the mind of the user. Thus: administration, management, bureaucracy.

A word on some of these problems at this point: So far in the discussion I have used the term administration without the adjective public. I have done this because of my feeling that "public" has meanings given by Western history, beginning in the classical period, that make it inappropriate as an adjective in some contexts in which there is by my definition unquestionably "government" administration. I mean by government administration effective rule, the exercise of control, by means of an administrative apparatus. Thus, as I conceive the matter, the Mayan-Aztec civilizations had "government" administration, but this government administration was deficient in the qualities given by such concepts as citizenship, welfare and equity, concepts that
impart meaning to "public." This was generally true also, as I see it, of the Near Eastern civilizations that developed the administrative technology that became, through evolution, our "public" administration.

A fundamental question for us is posed by the question: What is the entity, or the context, in which "public" administration takes place? Polity and state of course come to mind. But polity, derived from polis, has connotations that make it inappropriate for, say, Ming Dynasty China; and the Greeks would say, for us also, State is a modern term with meanings given to it by distinctive qualities of the modern state system. Indeed, "modern state" is a redundant expression.

For my part, I customarily solve this problem by using the term "government administration" as the term of widest applicability. The meaning given to government was indicated earlier: effective rule, the exercise of control. Administration is the chief means through which the rule, the control, is effected. More on this shortly.

2. In my view a close connection of mutual stimulation and support has existed between government administration and civilization. Indeed, they have a symbiotic relationship. By civilization is meant high population density in urban areas—cities—with accompanying social differentiation and technological complexity. Culture is distinguished from civilization. A complex and "advanced" culture can exist without government (though not without other modes of social organization and control); but so far in history not civilization.

3. What is government? That is, what does it imply to say that government is effective rule, the exercise of control? It is fairly easy, I believe, to specify what government is at core, what is essential; but difficult—and controversial—to specify all of its attributes.

Three things, at least, are essential. One is an apparatus to exercise force, to defend—or aggress—externally, and to maintain order internally. Another is an apparatus to interpret and enforce the rules/laws either permitted or created by the government. Another is an economic apparatus exercising mingled productive/distributive function.

Beyond this core that (to me) identifies government, questions arise. Certainly other customary functions and activities can be identified. But are they essential? Are they best conceived as attributes or exten-
sions of the triad? All governments of any significant scope and
duration engage in "public works": hydraulic works, roads, building,
fortifications. But are these activities to be conceived as part of the
military and economic activities? I know of no government that has not
had or does not have a religious component. (In the present perspective
it does not matter whether there is an official separation of "church"
and "state," or whether the government is avowedly atheistic, with some-
thing deemed doctrine or science, replacing deemed theology.) But is the
religious function realistically conceived (even if it has a significant
separate apparatus) as an adjunct of the core triad?

4. How should "administration" be conceptualized? What term or
terms best serve to delineate and designate the phenomena to which this
word directs attention?

First, let me observe that, in English, administration is a legiti-
mate, useful word, as good as any to direct attention to the means by
which governments function. This may seem a strange and unnecessary
observation. But I make it because in the United States there is
nowadays a strong movement to refer not to "public administration" but
to "public management"—for reasons that need not be explicated here.
Management I also regard as a proper and useful term, but I view it as
narrower in meaning than administration, a part or aspect of adminis-
tration; more directly concerned with action, with "line" supervision,
than some aspects of administration.

For some purposes bureaucracy is more useful than administration
or management. Of course, one must reckon with the various invidious,
emotional meanings the work invokes. But within the circle of scholarly
inquiry, the likelihood of serious misunderstanding can be greatly reduced.

The great usefulness of "bureaucracy" as against "administration"
is that it gives us a way to deal with the psycho-sociological aspects of
administration and its environment, as against its formal, instrumental
aspects. True, even within the scholarly circle one needs to make clear
what meaning is being given to the term. Generally, this means indicating
whether the term is being used in a broad and relaxed sense, which would
include (for example) the "patrimonial" administrative apparatus of a
medieval duke; or whether it is being used in the strict sense to indicate
an administrative apparatus that ranks high on a scale of legal-rational
attributes. It is my understanding that Max Weber, whose work did so much
to promote the scholarly use of the term, used it in both the broad and the strict senses. Both, I think, have their uses.

Obviously, inasmuch as I have been using the term "administrative apparatus" I regard it as useful. In using it my intent is to refer both to the administrative means in a strict sense and to the human context in and by which the administrative means are operated. Happily, both usages have dictionary sanction: apparatus is both (1) tools, equipment, and so forth, and (2) "the functional machinery by means of which a systematized activity is carried out."

Related to "administrative apparatus" is a term, and concept, that I find very useful: administrative technology. This expression puts together the "hardware" and the "software," the physical means and the human agents, the administrative operations strictly concerned and the psycho-social context in which they are carried on. For me, it solves many of the problems of referring meaningfully to administrative phenomena through time and across space: in different places, different contexts, different styles.

5. I view administrative technology in the West as a "stream" that finds its origins in the ancient empires of the Near East. This stream is sometimes enlarged, sometimes diminished, in the course of history; but on the whole and in the long run the stream is enlarged as the result of improved physical technology (e.g., paper and printing) and the development of new social technology (e.g., an alphabet and legal-rational bureaucracy) that provide more effectiveness, or at least more options. The interaction is continuous and intimate, and it takes place in a total environment in which there is continuing physical and social change.

Throughout history and until the mid to late modern period the main stream of development for administrative technology was government. With the rise of modern commerce and industry, and the accompanying instruments and institutions of capitalism, the situation has changed. The development of double-entry bookkeeping (in northern Italian banking and commerce) signals a shift that the Scientific Management movement made clear.

6. Resulting from the "accidents" of history, there is in the West what I am inclined to refer to as a "profound disjunction" between our politics and our administration: Our politics are Greek but our administration is Roman. This short blunt statement is of course an overstatement and a partial misstatement. But it points to an important truth, one little perceived and understood.
As has been indicated, I believe the main stream of administrative technology flows from Rome (with the Church as a significant channel) into the modern state. The main source of our consciously practiced and studied politics, on the other hand, is classical Greece: where administration was small in scale, relatively simple and amateur; and unless citizen engagement "at the top" to be regarded as administration, any apparatus was not much appreciated.

Of course, the full truth is much more complicated. To understand the total "mix" one must take into account the contribution of such "inputs" as Christianity and feudalism, and reckon with the results of diverse historical forces such as the Renaissance and the Reformation.

The force of many qualifications acknowledged the generalization stands I believe, as an important truth. As I view it, the "disjunction" results in continuing and sometimes severe problems: How to join the political and the administrative is a question always close to the center of our collective lives. The decisions on how to join the two are of extreme complexity, as "realms" other than these two necessarily enter into the calculations: the economic, the social, the technological. In non-socialist Western countries the public-private dichotomy—nowadays more of a spectrum, really—gives shape and emotional tone to the decisions and in turn is shaped and given emotional tone by them.

But the disjunction also may be seen not as a problem, but as a "gift" of history. The word "totalitarian," so far as it indicates a complete union of the two realms, indicates why.

Civic Culture Administration: Characteristics

The characteristics of civic culture administration set forth below are to be regarded as hypotheses to be tested, nothing more. Indeed, let us regard it as an open question whether "civic culture administration" is a valid, useful conceptualization.

My own reservations on the matter run in opposite directions. When I contemplate the history of administration I am impressed, as has been indicated, by the continuities, the convergences, and the uniformities. This sense of "oneness" is reinforced by some conceptual schemes that have been used widely in recent social science. One is that administration, whenever and wherever it appears, has certain generic components and aspects. In the United States, the "made-up" word or symbol PC3DCORB (Planning,
Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting) represent this point of view; it is the orienting concept in much administrative research.

Another is the Weberian ideal-typical representation of legal-rational bureaucracy, the the qualities of hierarchy, fixed and official jurisdictions, and so forth; with this representation of legal-rational bureaucracy sited in a "philosophy of history" that makes it appear as more or less inevitable. A third is the "pattern variable" schema of Parsonian sociology (obviously related to the Weberian perspective and so widely accepted in liberal-rational social science) according to which social interactions can be conceived as varying on scales of opposites, including universalism v. particularism, achievement v. ascription and specificity v. diffuseness; and by the use of which history, "progress," can be viewed as movement toward "modernity." A fourth is the schema developed by Ferdinand Tönnies, opposing Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft, and equating modernity with a movement from the former toward the latter.

But on the other hand, when I "reverse the glass" and observe carefully the public administration of any two countries that are presumably similar, what I find impressive is not the similarities but the differences. The contrasts between Britain and the United States, observed at close range, can be striking. Can the two be regarded as belonging to one class or category? What criteria could possibly apply meaningfully not only to these two but to a larger number of "instances"?

Finally—I submit the following as the characteristics of Civic Culture Administration:

1. Citizenship in the political entity is broadly based and citizenship—"membership"—is positively valued.

2. There is a widely held belief that the advantages of citizenship are accompanied by obligations of service to and participation in the political entity. To exaggerate, to put it in ideal-typical language: In a civic culture entity every private citizen is a public official.

3. Citizens have legal equality and a substantial amount of liberty. Both equality and liberty, whatever their compatibility or incompatibility, have a high value in the political culture.

4. In the making of policy decisions for and by the administrative apparatus there is a comparatively high component of amateurism as against professionalism/expertise.

5. The exercise of power (political-legal-administrative) is restrained by theoretical-constitutional factors, whatever the ultimate force of "sovereignty."
6. There is a weak "sense of State." What may be the same factor stated differently: the boundary between Society and State is indistinct, porous, shifting.

7. De jure or de facto, or both, there is considerable regional-local autonomy for government activities and functions.

8. The organization of the administrative apparatus tends to be "untidy" in appearance, more "organic" or pragmatic, less logical or formally rational.

9. The functions of government are to an important degree performed through secondary groups or intermediate associations, i.e., groups or associations between the family on one side and official state bureaucracy on the other.

10. Much of the above can be summarized thus: Civic Culture Administration does not as closely approximate Weber's ideal-typical presentation of legal-rational bureaucracy as does Continental Administration.

These characteristics of Civic Culture Administration, as I conceive them, will no doubt provide opportunity enough for doubt and disagreement. Better not to venture into the area that would be opened up by trying to argue that Civic Culture Administration is more—or less—"responsive," "responsible," "democratic," "effective" or "efficient."

English-British Administration

The awkward "English-British" designation seems necessary because of an awkward fact: First and centrally what we focus on here is English, but the English experience broadens as the modern era advances to become the British experience. Since most of the formative experiences were English I shall use this designation except when speaking of some recent and contemporary administration.

I shall say something first about the decisive formative factors for English administration, and then make some observations regarding its "fit" with the designated Civic Culture characteristics. A minimum list of formative factors would include:

1. The base of medieval-feudal institutions and ideas, which were an amalgam of Germanic (Gefolgschaft), late Roman (commendatio, beneficium) and Christian (legitimate authority as divine) institutions and ideas.

2. The Norman Conquest, which brought (a) an early experience of comparatively strong rule and (b) an increase in "Roman" influence.
3. The presence of the Church, which in general I regard as "matrix and model" for modern hierarchical (loosely "bureaucratic") organization.

4. The Wars of the Roses, which so weakened the feudal magnates that the Tudors were able to establish comparatively strong centralized rule. In England, the Ständestaat did not precede the Absolutist State. Rather, ständisch institution that were "used" by the strong Tudors were able to check the Stuarts and became de facto state.

5. England's island location. This has many aspects. The central ones are (a) that after the Conquest England was never conquered, (b) the Welsh and Scots apart the English did not have "Continental type" boundary problems, and (c) the main instrument of royal power was a navy, not an army.

6. Henry VIII's break with Rome, formally joining the sacral and the secular. This was in an important way a "reversion" to antiquity, in both its imperial and its civic strains.

7. The accession of the Stuarts, under whom the centralizing monentum was halted and reversed.

8. The rise of commerce and industry, with attendant changes in class structure and social structure.

Other formative factors both prior to and after the crucial seventeenth century could of course be added. But what has been set forth is enough to make the central point: Developments in England proceeded early in the direction of the creation of strong centralized government; but in the seventeenth century important countervailing forces came decisively into play. The result was the creation of a "balance" between centralizing-decentralizing, centripetal-centrifugal tendencies: A complex mixture of ancient and novel, difficult for the English to understand and easy for foreigners to misunderstand.

The imperial-Roman base of the state was not as great for England as for the Continent. But it was present and important. It has been put this way, metaphorically: England received early an "innoculation," which gave protection from the later "epidemic" of Roman influence. Geopolitical factors and unique cultural-historical factors permitted the addition to the imperial-Roman base of the "civic culture" characteristics. To repeat: these characteristics are not absent on the Continent, but are not so prominent. What we address are matters of emphasis.
Turning to contemporary English-British administration, some cursory observations, rather than systematic and exhaustive analysis, regarding its conformity to the characteristics of Civic Culture Administration set forth above:

The role and status of citizenship, with attendant rights and obligations, is clouded by terminology and by the cluster of emotions and ideas known as nationalism. I believe that the continued use of "subjects" to designate formal membership in the nation-state need not be taken seriously—but on that I may be corrected. English nationalism, by my reading of the record, developed comparatively early, and gave a sense of belonging to a "community," reinforcing a sense of obligation to the Sovereign and of a special relationship to the Sovereign's government.

An important datum is that the concept of the "rights of Englishmen" developed early and was put firmly in place with the Bill of Rights. Another important datum is that the concept and practice of a "public" responsibility, strongly connected in its origins with noblesse oblige, has been important in English governmental development. Central to much, as I perceive the matter, has been the political reform and enlargement of the suffrage that began in 1832. Recent years have probably witnessed a depreciation of the suffrage, but when it was achieved it signified, formally and psychologically, a full "citizenship," implying a cluster of related rights and obligations.

The generalization concerning amateurism was framed, after some hesitation, in terms of "policy decisions for and by administrative agencies," not in terms of "amateurism in administration." This in view of the fact that in the past century both Britain and the United States have moved over a broad front to subject entrance and promotion in the public services to tests of education and competence. Much depends, of course, on definitions. What is professionalism? Is it to be distinguished from specialization, expertise? Is there such a thing as professionalism/expertise in administration as much as against professionalism/expertise in the service of administration?

The tradition, and practice, of amateurism in British administration has been prominent, of course, both in local government and in central government. Despite the movement in recent years to increase the professional/expert component in central administration, amateurism is still prominent—at least at the level of the Administrative Class if the traditional Oxbridge education be "amateur."
And what of political control?—"policy making"? Here there are so many questions of fact to be added to questions of definition that I will only ask the question and note that it is critically relevant.

Regarding restraints on the exercise of power by theoretical-constitutional factors, this is the case to a considerable degree in Britain, despite the legal supremacy of Parliament (or the Crown in Parliament). While power here (and in any other government?) can be arbitrary and absolute in its exercise (especially in foreign affairs), the ordinary exercise of power operates under various real restraints. These include: long-established understandings (in a society in which these are taken seriously), rights embedded in the law, previous Acts of Parliament, and a tradition of substantial judicial independence. Perhaps most important is a comparatively free and active political life, and a party system that presents any Government with a competitive challenge. Whether the absence of body of administrative law in the Continental sense together with a specialized court system to interpret and apply the law is conducive to control of government and personal liberty is, of course, an old dispute; and I make no pronouncements on it—except to say that the belief that no public person is above the "ordinary" law of the land is regarded as a restraint on public power and thus in itself may be regarded as a restraint.

To speak of a weak "sense of State" in Britain may seem ridiculous, and certainly it is questionable. But have three centuries of restraint of royal power, and even of power generally, created a distinction between appearance and reality? A case can be made, certainly, that the boundary between State and Society has long been and now is reasonably porous.

With regard to regional-local autonomy, there is little problem. The legal situation, central-Parliamentary supremacy, must of course be distinguished from tradition and practice. But unquestionably considerable regional-local autonomy has been the case and, comparatively, still is.

Regarding administrative organization: The English are by legend and stereotype more inclined to rely on tradition and experience, less on reason and rationality, than their cross-Channel neighbours. A comparative historical look at organization and reorganization and a comparison of organization charts would seem to confirm this view. But the matter is not simple if one compares—as one should—not just formal rationality but functional, substantive rationality.
Turning to the matter of the use of secondary groups or intermediate associations, we can begin by noting an important and confusing fact: use of these is a characteristic both of pre-modern and of late (post?) modern governments. In the first case one can say that society and state were not yet disentangled and separated one from the other. In the second case one can say that various technological and social forces seem to be creating a "gray" area in which society and state are increasingly blended.

Historically, England made much use of "intermediates," at least if one assumes a loose definition that includes, for example, aristocracy and gentry; and some of the usage survives. Meanwhile, the newer type of usage is growing, as indicated by the recent attention to QUANGOS: Quasi Non-Governmental Organizations.

In summary: While many doubts and reservation have been expressed in this summary review of the English-British reality as set against some presumptive criteria of Civic Culture Administration, nevertheless it may be possible to assert plausibly that English-British administration does not score as high as Continental Administration on a Weberian scale of legal-rational administration.

American Administration

Let me begin the discussion of American administration by setting forth some broad generalizations for critical examination. But first an explanation for using "American" to refer to one entity on two American continents: There is no adjective that stands in relation to United States of American as Canadian does to Canada, Mexican to Mexico.

In perspective of history and institutional development, American administration stands in relation to English-British administration as English-British stands to Continental. In both cases the relationship is that of branch to stem. American administration is thus in the main line of development of government and administration in the West. But as English-British is more in the Civic Culture mode than Continental, American is more in the Civic Culture mode than English-British. However: the course of development through two centuries has been in the "imperial" direction.

Major determinants of American administration include the following:

1. English concepts and institutions. This is obvious, and massively important, as can be seen by imagining that the Mother Country had been, say, Spain or Russia.
2. Ideas concerning forms of government, justice, liberty, and so forth, from classical Greece to the late eighteenth century. The Founders were educated men who had read widely. Especially appealing and influential were writings extolling "balanced" constitutions, "republican" virtues and institutions, and the "natural" (or God-given) rights of man.

3. A constitutional system that divided and shared powers in a complicated manner (1) as between "the people" and government, (2) as between branches or organs of government, and (3) as between the federal government and the states. Final power is not so much centered as continually shifting and disputed.

4. "Space": relatively great distances, relatively small populations in proportion to space (and resources?).

5. The various "movements" and "forces" that are central to American history. These include (but are not limited to) westward expansion, massive immigration, industrialization and urbanization.

6. A movement toward democracy, beginning early, having many causes and manifestations, and significantly altering the operation of government. The Founders' intent and design is best indicated by the phrase "extended republic," i.e., a government in the "republican" (in my term, "civic") tradition or mode; but "extended" via the representative principle from city-state scale to large-scale. The Founders did not intend to establish a democracy as they understood the term (largely as "rule by the poor"). However, "democracy" became a major force in the nineteenth century, became by the early twentieth century generally accepted as the "meaning" of the American experiment, and became as its ideas and sentiments advanced a force that significantly altered the system of government.

Patently, there is much else that a thorough review would include—I have not mentioned capitalism, the growth of the political party system, the rise of science and of specialization—professionalism, and other factors that are relevant. Perforce, I must paint with a broad brush.

What is the "fit" of American administration to the characteristics set forth as those or Civic Culture Administration? Again, I offer some cursory observations.

Citizenship in the United States is widely held, very inclusive: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States—" Of course, one must distinguish between a legal-technical citizenship and citizenship of a more positive, meaningful nature. The right to vote is one of the indices. Severely restricted when the Constitution was adopted, the suffrage has been progressively enlarged [legally and actually] and now includes most adults.
Whether citizenship is highly valued is a complicated question. I believe the answer is affirmative, but one must deal with various kinds of evidence to the contrary, among them that the exercise of the suffrage is comparatively low. Whether citizenship is felt to carry with it obligations as well as rights (and privileges) is again complicated. One would have to make many distinctions; and certainly among Americans the question would provoke much argument.

There is formal and legal equality of citizens—of course. Beyond this, the situation becomes very complicated. Formal legal equality does not equal realistic equality before the law; and equality has many aspects other than legal. The case for liberty is clearer. Even after all the complications have been noted and all the qualifications acknowledged, America is comparatively a place of much freedom.

Regarding the amount of amateurism in administrative decision making, the case for a high component is strong. The amount of professional-technical-scientific competence in the public services is great and its contribution to the decisions is far from negligible. But if it is allowed that "political" factors, those identified with party politics but also those identified with "interest" and even "personal" politics are to be defined as amateur, then the case for amateurism is overwhelming.

Political-legal-administrative restraints on the exercise of power are many and potent. Some of them are ideological or cultural (e.g., a belief in liberty in a historical situation favorable to the belief). Some are based in "bills of rights," federal and state, explicitly restraining government from doing certain things or specifying the manner ("due process of law") in which they can be done. Still others flow from constitutional "architecture": the division of powers and organs, the checks and balances, which create barriers to the swift, arbitrary exercise of power.

A strong case can be made for a weak "sense of State," of the sense there is an entity somehow outside and above society in general—perhaps having an aura of past glory and majesty. While the "people" who prefaced the Constitution with "We the people—" were generally prestigious and wealthy (and some of them slave owners), we reckon with the fact that a government designed as a "republic" became by evolution a "democracy." True, "the Government" is often perceived negatively, even very negatively; but this must be evaluated in comparative terms. In the beginning of the republic there was something of a governing class of the "rich, the wise, and the able" who had led the Revolution and framed the Constitution.
But this situation was quickly "eroded" by history, and there is little significant connection between identifiable, stable segments of the population and government office.

Regarding regional-local autonomy, here the case for both de jure and de facto autonomy is strong. Federalism as a legal principle was accentuated as a fact by many historical circumstances. Of course, the Civil War and much that has happened since have forwarded centralizing action (at all three "level": federal, state and local). But again, speaking comparatively, regional-local autonomy is prominent.

What of the style of American administrative organization, does it incline toward the pole of the organic-pragmatic or the logical- rational? Toward the former, I should judge; but the matter is arguable. One faces the anomalous fact that America is the center of the attempt to make organization and administration a generalized "science." On the other hand, one reckons with a reputation for pragmatism (and that America is responsible for a philosophic current, Pragmatism). What weight, in this determination, is to be given to Constitutional provisions that insure that government organization and administration will be, at least formally, complicated and "untidy"? (Perhaps the criterion is irrelevant or skewed?)

Regarding the performance of governmental functions through secondary groups or intermediate associations, I believe that the United States ranks high—though again there are troubling problems of interpretation.

How is one to regard the functions traditionally performed by the luxuriant growth of voluntary associations that de Tocqueville noted as characterizing America? While some have served only socio-psychological functions of little or no significance, some—volunteer fire brigades, for example—performed "public" functions. For some, the interpretation is questionable: Is assistance to the unfortunate a public function? However interpreted, voluntary organizations have done much of this. Perhaps it should be added that, by most accounts and interpretations, "volunteerism" is in decline.

At center here is, nowadays, not the voluntary association but the legally chartered corporation. By my interpretation, these are all in an important sense public, no matter the private motives (and perhaps anti-government sentiments). They are public because, at minimum, their purposes have the sanction of public law and because they operate with the guarantees and facilitation of public law and public agencies. So
interpreted, the vast complex of corporate life, from local firms to international giants, becomes (in an old legal phrase of more restricted meaning) "vested with a public interest."

In this area the trend of evolution is forward. In the United States the trend is notably in the direction of the performance of public functions through agencies that are nominally non-public because they are "non-govern­mental" corporations. One aspect of the matter is the invention and elabor­ation of new "hybrid" organizations. There is a growing "gray area" where public and private meet and mingle. As I have elsewhere observed, in this respect we would seem to be returning to the medieval mode—"playing the film backward."

Finally and overall, I judge that American administration rates lower on a Weberian legal-rational scale than Continental Administration. I realize that this judgment is subject to not just empirical challenge but to conceptual challenge. (Is it legitimate to use the ideal-type for more than a single organization, however large, as against the organization of an entire administrative system?) But I enter my judgment for judgment in turn.

More generally, I offer this interpretation of Civic Culture Admin­istration for judgment. Is this a useful category or division of public administration? Assuming it is judged useful, where have I been correct, where incorrect, in its interpretation? 

#
4.2 Classical Continental Administration - G. Timait

Knowledge of Public Administration:
A systematic approach.

Administrative science yesterday, today, tomorrow and the day after tomorrow.

It is through debates and contradictions that the knowledge of public administration became systematic. This was true yesterday, this is still true today and this will remain true tomorrow, as these debates and contradictions are the mark of any science.

YESTERDAY: SCIENCES OR SCIENCE?

It was yesterday. Remember what were the fights about the existence of a single or many different sciences. Researchers wondered about the situation of the administrative science vis a vis its related sciences, specially administrative law. They also asked themselves whether administrative science was multi-pluri-or inter-disciplinary. The scientific community was divided between those who believed in one administrative science and those who favored a plurality of administrative sciences. And this issue was essential.

.../...
I. - An essential issue:

The choice between one or several administrative sciences is the key point because it raises the question of the epistemological autonomy of the discipline. As for us we agree upon the idea that an investigated field obtains its autonomy—and consequently its scientific status—when it gets an object of its own and makes use of specific methods and concepts.

This crucial choice was made through an inversion of the ordinary sequence of scientific process. In the general case, scientists define first the object and then the means by which it could be studied. On the contrary, pragmatically, administrative scientists checked off the disciplines that could be used in studying public administration. These were called administrative sciences. A majority of the scientific community agreed, then, that this diversity could originate a science of public administration. So, during that time, the administrative science was often built up from the various administrative sciences.

It is only later that some scholars began to ask themselves if one administrative science was to be built directly from the characteristics of the object of this new science. The question was also to know if these characteristics were clearly distinct from those of the objects of other administrative sciences.

1) Even in the case of several administrative sciences, the situation was confused because each author draw up his own list of the disciplines that were, more or less, related to public administration. The hope was that from the collection of these disciplines should stream an administrative science.
A) These lists shared a few disciplines in common: law, economy, sociology, and the history of the administration were always present. But one could also find psychology, geography, public budgeting, linguistics, demography, technology and—the last to appear—psychoanalysis. Of course, no one intended to present the complete list. But one question remained unsolved: the situation of political science and management. Political science was finally placed by most authors at the top of these lists, because they thought that, as public administration was under the influence of the political power, all the sciences that had public administration as their object were to be under its domination.

For management, the question was never clearly answered. Founded by Taylor, Fayol and the scientific management movement, this so-called science is closer to technology and engineering than to a real science. Nevertheless, it seems that scientists generally considered that management was to be accepted in these lists, but at a low rank.

B) At this point remained the question of the connexions between these different administrative sciences. The debate was among the tenants of an horizontal coordination link between these administrative sciences, and those who believed in a vertical coordination link. Anyway, there was no integration.

In the early development of a new science, each constituent discipline remains on the same level. This is what we call the horizontal link. It was the situation when appeared the Treaty by Georges Langrod in 1966. In this book, the author wrote that the different social sciences were varied ways of studying the same part of human and social reality. As political science, administrative science is an example of what must result from the streams of modern thinking.

The next step was to consider that there were disparities between the disciplines, one of them being more basic. This is what we call the vertical link. Actually, the idea of a hierarchical or a linear order among the social sciences was questionable. In spite of some theoretical attempts,
nothing allowed to decide that in social sciences there was, as there is in physical sciences, a discipline that would be basic to the others. That is why the definition of administrative science had to be done according to an other method. This new attempt to build the elements of an independent administrative science relied on the characteristics of the object called "public administration".

2) Nowadays, the definition of administrative science concentrates on the specificity of its object and, in this sense, there is only one administrative science. But within this science, there are three types of studies.

The first type has a negative definition: public administration is what remains of the activities of the State once the legislative and the judiciary functions are eliminated. But nothing can guarantee that this remainder makes up an homogeneous object.

The second type tried to find an inherent criteria in the concept of "administrative fact" understood as the ways departments work. The Treaty of administrative science is a well known example of these efforts. Indeed, this conception granted the administrative science with a well defined and an original object, and so gave it a scientific status. But the "administrative fact" as conceived by the authors of the Treaty was common to public and private administration. Administrative science might then become a method to improve the efficiency of the agencies.

The third type intends to show that, as Weber points out, public administration is unique because it has the monopoly of coercion, and this character makes it different from any other social organization. But public administration is nevertheless
connected with social institutions because it is itself a social institution in which appears the organizational model of the social order of which it is a part. Monopoly of coercion and connexion with the social institutions are then used as a definition.

II. - An empty debate:

As people argued. Research went on. As a matter of fact, the debate looks like the old dispute among political scientists: was there a single or several political sciences and, when prevailed the idea of a single political science, was the object of that science State or power? Following the same pattern, scholars discussed whether administrative science was the science of public management or the science of organization. In both cases, the answer to the question was to refuse the choice: political science studies State and power, administrative science studies public management and organization.
As a matter of fact, we are now at the point mentioned by Georges Vedel in his foreword to the Treaty of administrative science: the object of this science is obvious, even if it is not yet adequately defined; then new subjects have to be delineated and a theoretical frame has to be found, where the results of the studies can be included.

But then, we have to ask ourselves whether nowadays administrative science has built these theoretical frames or whether it is relying upon myths.

**TODAY: THEORIES OR MYTHS?**

A science explains the phenomenons that make up its object. In administrative science, the method has been to use "models" that give information but that also draw a slightly biased picture of the administration. That is why I call this state of development of administrative science an infra-science. To know the substance of administrative science today, we have to study these different pictures.

I. - Old pictures:

They have been drawn by the liberals, by Marx and by Weber. Each of them built a model, and many administrative scientists today still make their studies through the picture generated by one or the other—or by more than one—of these models.

If you put the picture one above the others, you can get a clear model with three basic characteristics: first a conception of public administration as a tool of the political power or of a ruling class; second, an unitarian structure, pyramidal, hierarchical and centralized; third, an instrument of coercion.

These three characters contribute to make up the myth of public administration on which administrative science still relies frequently.
But this set of models now reveals some inconsistencies: the weberian model points out the rationality of public administration, whereas Marx shows its irrelevancies as far as centralization if concerned. Some marxists talk about some kind of autonomy in the administration. And last, even the liberals tend to admit that public administration is not only coercive, and has to deal, in a relation of partnership, with the economy.

II. - New Frames.

These founding models have been basic on the past, but the recent empirical studies show that they are far from the actual administrative fact. That is why many scientists tried to renew these models. Unfortunately the method (often) consists in putting together several doctrines, the diversity of which is supposed, once they are blended, to give birth to a new theoretical frame. So are mixed up Marx, Weber, systems analysis, functionalism, etc...

In any case, there is a new picture of public administration. Certainly more acute, but may be as fictitious as the old ones. Actually, there are now a few ideas well spread over the whole community that present a new picture of public administration.

Autonomy first. Public administration is no more conceived as a tool in the hand of the political power or of the ruling class. As Crozier and Friedberg point out, people in the organization hold some freedom towards the formal power. Gramsci, Althusser and Poulantzas talk of quasi-autonomy: for some neo-marxists, it is even plain autonomy.

Segmentation in the second place, is also an important characteristic of this new picture. Described either as segmentation, differentiation, sectoring or cracks in the power of the State, it is always the same idea: public administration is no more unitary.
Some other topics appear, but not so clearly. It is the case for the porosity of organizations; it is also the case for the rationality of the action and of the decisions. This idea has been developed specially by Merton, Crozier and Friedberg, and by Poulantzas. All of them show that there is no rationality in the decision, but conflicts the result of which are evident in the administrative action.

All these ideas are founded on very different theories. They shape a new picture of public administration, which is also a new myth. In the study of public administration theories produced myths - ideas accepted without having carefully thought about them. So administrative science has to go back from myths to theory.

TO MORROW AND THE DAY AFTER: EPistemology AND ARCHAEOLOGY.

Yesterday, Administrative science was a non-science to day it is still an infra-science. Most treaties dealing with the theoretical problems of public administration make use of concepts and classifications out of date.

Of course, taxonomies are essential to describe and to enlight new facts. But the object of a science is more than observation, as Karl Popper points out. The maturity of a science lays at the same time in its capacity to collect and classify facts and in its capacity to build models fitted to explain the facts yet observed and to anticipate new events. On this point, the situation is not satisfactory. We mentioned some models that give hypothesis to understand the facts and the future, but they only present a state, a function or an evolution of public administration. It is much, but not enough. Even when they intend to be universal - as the marxist model does, for example - they never go beyond the empirical reality at the very time they ahematize it.
A) This is the reason why we have to think about the connexions between this infra-science and an ultra-theory. The existing theories only refer, each of them, to some constituent elements of some empirical situations that they describe and schematize.

As it is obviously impossible to refer to each administrative phenomenon, we are in the well known situation of linguistics, situation which is, as said Wilhelm de Humboldt in the 1830's : how to build up grammars that can make infinite use of finite means.

An administrative grammar should provide a system of general rules that would be able to build up any model. As we can see now, the administrative science is larger than the actual models but still, those remain a raw material for future research.

B) The research on public administration has to use these models although they are mainly ideological; that is why these models have to be considered as a land for archaeological research. These models offer the first step on which this ultra-theory we are looking for can be built. Although we do not find in each model the same constituents, some of them will be common, some will not, but the inventory drawn up with all the pieces so discovered will probably form a thorough catalogue of the finite number of elements necessary to make up a public administration.

To test its validity, this ultra-theory should allow to reconstruct each real administration now in existence. But, on account of the infiniteness of the reality itself, this might be difficult; so it could be of importance to examine whether the theory accounts without any loss for the models schematizing the reality.
This research on theoretical models is not an history of ideas. If it is called archaeological it is because it has to bring to light the constituent elements of public administration hidden within the analyzing and schematizing models.

C) How the research makes all its sense, specially on two points.
First, the formalization of public administration. It would allow the discovery and the use of a language. This language will be the tool necessary to translate each picture of public administration and its changing processes into elements permitting the comparison, and giving the connexions, from one picture to the other, even when they are heterogeneous and varied. The second point deals with prospective. Here, the actual problem is not the choice among the futures of public administration: they have, more or less, been drawn already. The question is "how to manage the change", that is to say the selection of ways to go from one state of things to the other. This change relies upon the use of a language allowing the reduction of any possible state of a public administration into common factors.

So the prospective in public administration lies in its formalization. That is where to start.
THE MODEL OF SOCIALIST ADMINISTRATION

1. The general questions

It is of course a matter of discussion what range should adopt of general principles for the socialist administration. The problems of my country makes the analysis especially difficult. I believe that the most important and traditional in socialist state doctrine are the following three principles: democratic centralism, the leading role of socialist /communist/ party and planning.

a. The principle of democratic centralism means that at each level of the organisation of administration there must be preserved the influence of the citizen factor as well as superior state structures - and as consequence the central authority.

In other words democratic centralism means synthesis of elements of democracy and centralism, without any exceptions. In the socialist theory of law this principle was generally accepted, in any rate, it did not constitute an object of general attacks. The new selfgovernmental concepts in Poland will introduce certainly a new picture of the general concept.

Yugoslavia is one exception here - the selfgovernmental concepts remain in contradiction with doctrine of democratic centralism. In its place there has been introduced the concept of decentralisation. I believe that in the recent events in Poland there have appeared certain signs of creating of independent selfgoverning organisations. It does not concern exclusively the trade union movement - it embrace also the great part of state and economic apparatus.
Of course, democratic centralism is an flexible principle and with the framework of which, a number of variant solutions is possible, depending upon the specificity of a given state and character of a given part of administration. The influence of a civic element on the functioning of local government is not the same as influence on the police organisation. There are different proportions between the elements of democracy and centralism.

b. The leading role of socialist /communist/ party is not only a political but also a legal principle. In Poland, as well as in some other socialist countries one article of the Constitution relates to this problem. In most of these countries the leading role of the party in the administration has the following content:

- the party defines the policy lines of action of the administration,
- the party suggests methods of action thus shaping institutional solutions,
- the party influences personnel policy.

These functions are of unstable character and undergo changes especially visible in Poland.

In certain socialist countries we have to do with concerted activities and institutions of the state and party. For example it is characteristic of Bulgaria and the Soviet Union to promulgate common party-government normative acts /issued by the Council of Ministers and the Central Committee of the Party/. In other states this type of activity does not take place, thus, for example, in Poland not a single such act has been promulgated.

Concerted state–party organs are also to be found in, for example, collegiate management of state enterprises in Romania. In other countries, including Poland, mixed groups
of experts are called upon to implement basic changes in the organisation of the administration.

The leading role of the party in the administration is not treated in any socialist country as a means of replacing the administration. In practice, however, as it shown by experience in my country in recent years, the party apparatus often operate using methods taken over from the administration.

The form of political leadership on various levels of administrative activity, constitutes a separate dilemma. While on the upper levels the problem is theoretically simple since is limited to policy formulation, it becomes much more complicated on the lower levels of the administrative apparatus.

The supporters of the strong party leadership are of the opinion that the political character of issues on the level of a county and a district are different from political issues on the central level. On the other hand minute supervision and intervention by the party apparatus into the activity of the administration causes problems from the point of view of their effectiveness. The question arises at the same time how to change, in those circumstances, the range of responsibilities carried by particular administrative organs.

c. The principle of planned administrative activity takes also the form of a legal principle which has been accounted for in the constitution of socialist countries. It is conceived of as a wide principle meaning that the whole activity of the state administration is covered by planning. In this interpretation the principle stressed, until recently, the necessity to use directive planning rather than prognostic planning.

Over the last few years the situation changed dramatically. More and more often opinions are heard that directive planning should be gradually eliminated in favour of prognostic
activities. At the same time planning directives are replaced by parameters which leave to the recipient the decision about the ways of implementation. It concerns mainly the functioning of economic administration.

Planning itself became the object of criticism. It is charged that it gave origin to huge bureaucracy without giving satisfactory forecasting power. It is characteristic of the current tendencies that:

- a growing number of prognostic elements is being introduced;
- non-directive provisions are used to a larger extent;
- efforts are being made to overcome schematism in relations between central plans and lower-levels plans. The most typical example may be provided here by the Hungarian national /governmental/ plan which is binding only the government and the members of the government. It is not binding in the legal sense on numerous other subjects, for instance state enterprises. It is thus the task of the government and of the members of the government to undertake actions which will lead to the implementation of the plan by the whole apparatus. This is not done in the way it used generally previously when each subordinate level was only obliged to break tasks into details in the process of organisation and plan implementation.

The main trend in all socialist states is set in favour of indirect administrative action and against direct administrative action.

2. The central administration

Characteristic features of the central administration of a socialist state are the most difficult to define in comparison with the states of other types.

The system of government is of cabinet type. The number of
administrative departments in the government is relatively high. It is due to the existence of a certain number of economic departments dealing with branches of the economy /for instance department of light industry, department of heavy industry, department of construction industry, department of home trade/. Consequently, the Council of Ministers constitutes a very large body having, in result a limited efficiency. In order to remedy this, the majority of states has set up bodies of "limited" character, for example, in the form of the Presidium of the Government. Those bodies are composed of ministers in charge of economic departments. This group plays a significant role in the management of the national economy. It also plays a very active role in the formulation of investment policy since it is this group which makes decisions concerning the most vital ventures including their location.

Over the last few years a tendency is felt to change the nature of economic departments. The point is that those departments abandon their style of operative activity and tend to assume staff functions for their domain of government activity. In other words, the ministers of economic departments gradually lose their responsibility for directing subordinated organizations /enterprises/ and become responsible for the flow of information reaching the government and for the government participation in the economic policy formulation as well as for indirect action on the organizations from a given department in a given domain.

The number of departments has a tendency to decrease. In Poland it was cut by half during this summer.

It is typical feature of the central administration of a socialist state to have separate organizations dealing with planning. As a rule those organs are collegiate bodies having the form of government commissions for socio-economic development.
Those organs have a special position. From the legal point of view they are organized as separate functional departments with their heads holding the position of deputy head of government. This factor strengthens the position of such departments.

As it seems, one more tendency is manifest in the apparatus of the central administration, namely the growing size of collegiate organs, both civic and consultant, attached to the government or the Prime Minister. In spite of the fact that those organs are advisory, they have a strong leverage potential. I think that they are, in a certain way, linked with civic, professional and scientific "pressure groups". A good example here is provided by: Council for the Protection of the Environment, Council for the Family, Council for the Development of Motor Transport. The number of such organizations is rapidly expanding in all socialist countries. It is linked on the one hand with the widening scope of the state activity and with the need to consult experts and pressure groups on the other.

3. Local administration

Local management is performed by a system of people's councils/local representation as well as by the executive bodies these organizations together with their salaried personnel. If we accept that the separation between self-government and government administration is typical of local administration in Western Europe, we may say that for socialist state the unity of authority on local level is a characteristic feature. In this it is similar formally to the British system of local government.

People's councils should incorporate elements of self-government with features proper to the organs of state. Local representations are elected in general, secret, equal but not proportional ballot. In the preparation of electoral
lists a significant role is played by the Popular Front or Front of National Unity. This organization also plays an
important role in the mechanism of general elections.

People's councils have full authority over their
territory which means that any issue concerning this territory
may be taken up by the council. Due to this fact the councils
are empowered with coordinating functions with respect to
organizations which, from the formal point of view, are not
subordinated to local organs. Thus, for example, stateenter-
prises controlled by the central administration are also subject
to certain coordinative procedures on the local level.

The executive organs are colligate in their majority
and Poland alone is an exception since it has local monocratic
organs.

In the activity of local organs a big role is played
by the commissions of the council. Their authority to supervise
is particularly significant. From the legal standpoint this
authority is very strong although in reality, the disproportion
between legal externals and actual activity has been criticised.

In the majority of states local administration
there is a three-level structure, only in Poland, Bulgaria
and two republics of the Soviet Union a two-level structure
has been adopted. In all socialist states a strong tendency
is felt to reinforce counties as a basic units.

4. Supervision and administrative procedure

In a socialist state the system of supervision over
administration is built around supervision by prosecutors and
civic supervision. The former resembles to a certain extent
the function of the Scandinavian Ombudsman. The prosecutor's
office has the right to question the legality of any administra-
tive act. At the same time the prosecutor has the right to take
part in administrative procedure.

Civic supervision is based on a number of powers wielded
by civic organizations. More specifically, we have to do here with authority to criticize the activity of administrative organs as well as with the possibility to act as a part in the administrative procedure.

Over the last few years we observe increased importance attached to court supervision of administrative acts. Supervision by prosecutors proved to be ineffective as far as the rights of the individual are concerned. Court supervision of administrative acts is known to a larger or smaller extent in most socialist states. What is not so typical of those states is the institution of separate administrative court which was set up in Poland a year ago.

During the last twenty years the majority of socialist states introduced formalized administrative procedure. Usually we have to do here with normative basic of general character. It is significant due to the fact that the initial idea to base legal-administrative relations on the complaint as a popular, accessible and slightly formalized institution did not prove itself to be successful.
From its beginning Yugoslavia has tended to be strongly innovative in government and political organization in accordance with its social and political values.

The ideas shaping the socio-political system in Yugoslavia and its development were well defined from the beginning and evolved in the course of the maturation of what has become known as the self-management system.

The Yugoslav case brings to the fore the question as to the limits of institutional engineering in government, and that is the reason why our attention is focussed more on institutions than on processes.

1. Territorial differentiation - central and local government

a) Owing to Marxian tradition there was an attempt to separate the political stratum from the administration in order to protect political decision-making bodies from undue influence by bureaucrats, disguised as "assistance", "advice" or "service".

The continual increase of functional differentiation in the administration at all levels caused additional problems of coordination. It was believed that better coordination could be achieved by means of certain institutional arrangements - at least this was the explanation given for the constant reorganization of territorial systems during the last few decades. The
executive bodies, as links between the representative bodies and the administration, are charged with the daily coordination of the administration. The composition, i.e. structure, of the executive bodies is one of the institutional arrangements which can facilitate or hamper coordination. In the first period, accepting the Soviet model, the executive was directly in charge of the administration, and individual members of the government (executive committee at local level) were entrusted with various departments of the administration. Under this arrangement, daily coordination could run smoothly, but, at the same time, this led to a fusion of government and administration, since the executive had thus concentrated within itself an influence which predominated over the influence of the representative body. The succeeding stage of development involved a transformation of the system leading to the other extreme. In the endeavour to assert the assembly system a complete separation of government from the administration was effected. Difficulties arose, however, in ensuring daily coordination. This experience led to a compromise between the assembly system (unity of power) and the needs of current coordination - the introduction of an executive council, composed of elected members and certain administrative officials as ex officio members; in this situation, a possible cumulation of influence outside the representative body can be anticipated, and therefore controlled.

b) The radical decentralization of the territorial system has introduced the local government unit - the commune as the basic cell of political society.

The model of commune was built in the sense of the Paris Commune of 1871, units of government through direct democracy based on the supremacy of the working class. It was to be a self-government of producers, and the basic constituent of any other, territorially more inclusive form of government. The realities of local interest relationship and interest conflict, however, sug-
gested the idea of the commune as a platform for the confrontation of interest and the working out of community-wide constructive solutions across organizational boundaries. The commune came to be seen as the central part of a mechanism possibly replacing the traditional interest aggregation and articulation through political parties.

The commune assembly is now organized as a body composed not of directly elected members, but of delegates from local communities, working organizations—factories, shops, and institutions of public administration and political organization—and interest associations, comprising three chambers: the chamber of Associated Labour, the Chamber of Local Communities and the Socio-Political Chamber.

Effective political emancipation from all central political institutions is, it should be remembered, a necessary ideological attribute of the commune. These units were not thought of only as communities of citizens but also as second-order associations of self-managing organizations, as the main mechanism for integrating these organizations for the attainment of more comprehensive social purposes. The trend was toward making local bodies the basis of the whole political system in the republics and the federation by constituting central representative assemblies through delegations from local councils, a distinctive feature of the new Yugoslav Constitution of 1974. Districts—as the regional level of government—have been abolished owing to the 1963 constitutional provision, by which the establishment of districts was left within the discretion of each republic. The main motive was to remove any possible impediment to the full development of the communes as autonomous bodies. Problems of vertical coordination resulted in the "comeback" of districts in 1974. On the other side, within each commune local communities can be organized by the statute of the commune, and have to be organized if requested by a specified number of voters' meetings.
Local communities are conceived as forms of direct associations of the citizens, not as local government; although they have no budget of their own or professional administration, they can, however, elect a council as a representative and executive organ.

c) The relationship between local and central government evolved so that whatever is not reserved by law to central government is considered a local matter. The effect of this sweeping general principle is reduced by almost equally sweeping exceptions: conferring upon central government both exclusive and concurring competencies, not only in traditionally central matters like defence and foreign affairs, but also in the regulation of the economy and the setting of general standards in many other fields. The "generalized" system of self-management introduced by the 1963 Constitution lists the right to self-management in one's place of work among the basic rights of man and citizen. This includes people working in administration.

d) Self-management in government agencies was introduced generally by the General law on the self-management of workers in administrative organs from the year 1964. Self-management in government agencies is limited by law to "internal relationship" including: decisions about the internal organization of the agency, creating the conditions for professional development, improving the working conditions, regulating mutual relationships at work, deciding about personal income. To translate these broad formulas into more concrete responsibilities is left to internal general regulation, also within the jurisdiction of self-management.

There is, however, differentiation in the responsibilities as listed. Some of the decisions can be taken by the employees alone, others jointly with the head of the agency. In case of disagreement the Government as body arbitrates the conflict, subject only to judicial review of the legality of proce-
dures as applied. The first category includes: the allocation of resources for personal income i.e. wages and salaries, the use of funds allocated for "common purposes of the working collective", education and training, the establishment of the Council of Workers Collectivity. Everything else is a matter to be decided jointly by employees and head of department.

Wherever possible self-management prerogatives are exercised by all employees of an agency collectivity, the workers' collectivity. Where this body is too large, a committee is elected, called the Council of the Workers'Collectivity, for a period of two years, with at least five members, of whom no one can be elected for a second term.

2. Functional differentiation

a) With the "generalized" system of self-management, not only the economy—including industry, commerce, transportation, communication, banking, insurance, public utilities - but also services in the fields of education, health, social security and welfare, research, recreation, housing were organized as interlocking networks of self-managed units. Economic enterprises as well as non-economic organizations have developed real autonomy from government. They are managed by workers' councils and other bodies elected by their members. (The idea of workers' self-management was introduced already on June 26, 1950 in all nationalized enterprises. Workers' council were responsible for all the major decision on production, sales, profit distribution, and personnel in the organization). Today their decisions are governed by considerations of maximizing income of other forms of interest satisfaction of the dominant interest coalition within or around them. They elect their own general managers and can dismiss them at any time by majority vote.
b) With the Constitution of 1963 a significant number of what were formerly government agencies became increasingly independent from government and elected organs of self-management, without completely severing their ties with government. This applies to agencies in the fields of planning, statistics, land surveying, geological prospecting, waterworks, meteorology. They are organized separately as a sort of outer zone of the territorial system. The employees in these services elect their own self-management councils. They are bound by the decisions of the assembly of the socio-political communities (Federation, republics, districts and communes) in matters of general policy and policy pertaining to their field of activity, but are not a part of the territorial administration proper. They are called "organizations performing activities of interest to the socio-political community" and they represent a transitional form between governmental administration and fully self-managed institutions.

c) The delegate system established by the new (1974) Constitution is a universal principle of organization and realization of the self-managed socialist system.

The basic meaning and essence of the concept of the delegate system is that the working people, organized in basic self-management organizations and communities, self-managed communities of interest (SMCIs) and socio-political organizations, are enabled to decide about social activity, and especially that the creators of income are guaranteed decision-making authority over the disposal of that income in all the relations of social reproduction.

The main actor of the institutional organism of the delegate system is the delegation. It's task as a constant working body by its planned and organized work contributes to the opportune and qualitative inclusion of working people in the process of decision-making about social activity. The delegation is not a substitute for working people and citizens organized in
basic organizations and communities, but it is a vital link which connects them with the bodies and organs which make decisions in a sturdy and many-sided manner.

The delegation is also a composite part of the assembly of socio-political communities and the assembly of SMCIs whose continual organization and work connects working people and citizens. Delegations elect from among their members delegates to the assemblies of the communes, provinces, republics and the Federation. Delegates are bound to take stands in accordance with what was previously decided by the delegation or the assembly which has elected them.

d) Within the entire delegate system a particularly significant role is played by self-managed communities of interest.

They are established by working people directly or through their self-managed organizations and communities with a view to satisfying their personal and collective needs and interests and adjusting work in the spheres for which such communities are being established to these needs and interests. In order to satisfy their needs and interests in self-managed communities of interest, working people by means of contributions paid to such communities pool resources from their personal incomes and from the income of their basic organizations of associated labour, in line with the purposes or aims for which these resources are to be used.

A self-management agreement on the establishment of a self-managed community of interest and its by-laws regulate affairs of common interest to the community's members, decision-making procedures, the province of work, powers and responsibilities of the community's assembly and other bodies.

The assembly is organized so as to ensure the working people who have established the self-managed community of interest and the workers who perform activities in the field for which the community has been formed, the right to decide, on equal terms,
on mutual rights, obligations and responsibilities. The assembly consists of two chambers: the chamber of service users and a chamber made up of delegates of workers in social activities (services). It decides on the one hand, on the kind, volume and quality or services or other operations, and, on the other, on the criteria for providing resources necessary for the performance of such services.

The assembly may transfer certain of its executive functions to its executive bodies, which are responsible to it for their work.

Self-managed communities of interest may be established in the sphere of production, in social activities, in the sphere of social security, and in the housing sector. In self-management communities of interest working people replace the state in the management and care for the promotion of these activities. This means that schools, theatres, hospitals and other welfare and cultural institutions are no longer state-run, and professors, physicians, actors, etc., are no longer civil servants. Instead, workers in these activities have become self-managers in their organizations.

Since all activities of self-managed communities of interest are of general social concern, the assemblies of socio-political communities may, temporarily, regulate by legislation mutual relations between renderers and users of services pending the conclusion of a self-management agreement by them.

Assemblies of self-managed communities of interest in the spheres of education, science, social welfare, health and culture also act as chambers of commune, provincial and republican assemblies when these decide on matters falling within these spheres, i.e. they take direct part in the exercise of power as independent organs. Without the participation of the assembly of the appropriate self-managed community of interest no legislation may be passed concerning matters falling within its sphere.
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I. Dimensions of Public Administration in Developing Societies

Administration of public affairs in a developing society has at least three analytically distinguishable dimensions: (a) technical, (b) programmatic, and (c) political.

The technical dimension includes the basic housekeeping functions of public authority, such as maintenance of public order and safety, collection of taxes, provision of minimum public facilities like roads and postal networks. This is the traditional dimension of public administration which exist in the public domain of any societies, with different degrees of efficacy and refinement.

The programmatic dimension is related to the purposeful socio-economic developmental requirements more peculiar to developing societies, and includes such positive programmes as public education, agrarian reform and agricultural development, building of social infrastructures, promotion and development of various sectors of industry, family planning, rural and community development, housing and urban development.
The political dimension is related to the changing role of the bureaucracy in the developing societies with increasing initiatives taken by its members in the formulation and implementation of various social and economic development programmes and the consequent political interactions with other emerging elites.

"Development Administration" is primarily concerned with the programmatic dimension with collateral interest in the political dimension. Thus, in terms of knowledges required, it must cover a broader scope than the traditional public administration which has to operate within a more or less established socio-political framework. The scope has to include among others:

(i) the broad agenda of developmental requirements of a particular society,
(ii) the general sequence and synchronisation of the desired agenda,
(iii) a strategy of changes and innovations required at different stages,
(iv) preparation and mobilisation of various resources, particularly human resources, required to undertake requisite tasks at the appropriate time, and
(v) cognizance and cultivation of political and social environment which would enable the requisite changes and innovations to take place.

In terms of intellectual analyses, this implies that development administration must have at least three distinct thrusts:

(a) substantive areas of development policies, plans, programs and projects,
(b) the dynamic process of introduction, implementation and carrying through of change, innovation and institution building,
(c) the role of bureaucrats as change agents, and their recruitment and training.

In the interest of systematising knowledge, concepts and vocabularies related to all the above three aspects have to be considered. In the following sections, each of the above thrusts will receive more detailed treatment.

II. The Substantive Areas of Development Administration

The substantive areas of development administration corresponds to the agenda of development of a particular society.
For a society which is at the very early stage of development, the prime business of government must include the initiation of public education and promotion of agriculture while that for a society in the midstream of development might be the development of higher education system and promotion of industry. But the period of more than a generation since the end of the World War II has seen a panorama of various concrete developmental experiences in many societies, and has now given students of administration adequate materials to draw from in attempts to construct some pattern of developmental agenda. I venture to draw a sample skeleton of developmental agenda based on my personal experiences and observations.

1. Initial social programmes to meet rising social aspirations released by decolonisation and similar political changes, such as
   a) public education,
   b) agrarian reform,
   c) agricultural development.

2. Economic development programmes, such as
   a) development of various sectors of industry,
   b) construction of industrial infrastructures,
   c) establishment of various public corporations,
   d) family planning,
e) manpower and technological development,
f) expansion of secondary, vocational and higher education.

3. follow-up social development programmes, such as
   a) rural and community development,
   b) urban development and redevelopment,
   c) initiation of health insurance,
   d) initial welfare programmes,
   e) spread of higher education and life-long education,
   f) expansion of social and cultural infrastructures.

The question of disciplinary boundaries inevitably arise here. Yet, inasmuch as the substantive areas provide the raw materials, development administration must address itself to these problems.

III. The Operational Leitmotif of Development Administration

Development administration must have some distinct operational thrusts in order to initiate and effect desired changes. As the introduction and management of change is the essence of development, conduct of innovation and reform become the leitmotif of development administration in operational terms. These are the cutting edges.
with which development administration address itself to the substantive areas mentioned above:

a) policy formulation and planning,
b) management of development programmes and projects,
c) conduct of administrative reforms, and
d) institution building.

**Policy formulation and planning**

Policy formulation is the first task of development administrators. This function is inherent in the management of change. Rapid and complex changes in the environment of government constantly call for new policies. A development administrator may either conceive broad policy ideas himself or may digest policy counsel of specialists and outsiders. In any case, his function is to propose and advocate such policy ideas to his political superiors who are responsible for making policy decisions.

Planning is closely related to policy formulation. Planning is the process of preparing a set of decisions for action in the future, directed at achieving desired goals by optimal means. Thus, like policy formulation, planning is a major instrument of managing change.
Management of development programmes and projects

To obtain desired results of development, policies and plans must get translated into concrete programmes and projects. In the final analysis, developments administrators must create changes through programmes and projects and therefore marshall available resources and energize participants and organisations for the implementation of actual programmes and projects.

Conduct of administrative reforms

Administrative reforms are the vehicle through which changes and innovations are introduced into the administrative machinery engaged in development. Administrative reforms may take different forms: reorganization, budgetary reforms, personnel reforms, new methods and procedures. They may also be mounted on different strategies: comprehensive or incremental. Yet the function of development administrators is to select the requisite instruments and strategies and apply them to appropriate substantive programmes and projects and accomplish the desired results.

Institution building

New programmes and reforms must get sustained in order to secure their full developmental effects. This is the task of institution building. When changes are introduced into the administrative processes, the new values and norms involved...
must become protected and diffused over time. This is the way by which innovations become routinized. Various internal and external factors are involved but the element of administrative leadership is of paramount importance.

These are the key functions of development administrators. In contrast to traditional administration, emphases are placed in each of the processes on values and goals, initiative and motivations, resource mobilization and support cultivation.

IV. The Role of Bureaucracy and Its Implications for Training

Inasmuch as development administration involves deliberate attempts at socio-economic development by the government, bureaucrats, especially the senior bureaucrats, play relatively active policy roles.

At the initial stage of development, the bureaucracy usually takes on a relatively passive role under political elites who are typically nationalist-minded ideologues or politicians. Under the legitimizing umbrella of the latter, the bureaucrats, some of whom might have been tainted with the earlier colonial service, carry on the basic operations of government and begin to carry out some initial developmental programmes, often connected with some external assistance programmes. In this process
the bureaucracy gains some measure of competence as well as public exposure and some of the more ambitious members of the senior bureaucracy get oriented toward political careers. It is also at this stage that some young blood joins the bureaucracy.

The second stage is usually more comfortable for the bureaucrats because by this time the power elite has a mixture of original politicians and bureaucrats-turned-politicians. Similarly, the bureaucracy also becomes more mixed with the new blood gaining number and experience. This way, there develops a natural rapport between the politicians and the bureaucracy. This is a crucial stage. In case the power elites are enlightened and responsive to social change, favorable political development can occur. However, should the power elites be repressive, the bureaucracy could easily be bent by their whim, producing regression and systemic decay.

The third stage of bureaucratic metamorphosis comes when various countervailing elites, i.e., political parties, university, press, industry, labor unions and other social organizations, grow in strength and pose effective countervailing forces vis-à-vis the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy feels uneasy about this new situation, being jealous of the quasi-exclusive discretionary
power which it had enjoyed. Particularly irritating are the new industrial elites who are usually more affluent wield increasing resources and powers. It is very difficult for the bureaucracy to swallow this. This is the stage when strong and enlightened political leadership is most necessary whose function is the integration of the various competing new social elements.

This portrait of changing bureaucratic role corresponding to the stage of development casts many implications regarding recruitment, training and control of the bureaucracy.

At the initial stage rudimentary knowledge and skills in the housekeeping functions of government are needed. At the developmental stage, more knowledge and operational skills on developmental subject matters as well as innovational motivations will be required.

At the maturing stage, however, greater sensitivity to the public and a broader perspective on the society as a whole and will be required. At the same time, efficiency would require more upgraded knowledge and skills in managing the day to day operations of the government. At this stage there will have to be less emphasis on innovation and more emphasis on management.

In the area of recruiting, there is hardly any need for making special efforts to groom an elite group because there
is a built-in tendency in almost all developing societies for young people of ambition and ability to aspire for positions in the public bureaucracy. One caveat here is the selection of candidates through a narrowly delimited track like law or public administration. The breadth of substantive areas of development argue for a wide avenue of entry involving all the disciplines taught in the universities and other technical institutions.

The crucial point is the post-entry training. Here the entrants should be oriented toward applying their intellectual and motivational energies to the substantive problems of development. At the senior levels, however, the breadth of view that is necessary for coexistence and productive interactions with elites in other spheres should be emphasized. Lateral recruitments from other sectors should also be encouraged, at this level. How to train senior bureaucrats to look at the counterveiling elites with less sense of threat and with greater equanimity is something which public administration has paid very little attention in the past. Yet a breadth of mind as well as an insight into the increasing needs for genuine service to the society under constant change is the paramount requirement for maturing bureaucracies in developing societies. How to turn an earstwhile task master into a servant for the public is perhaps the greatest challenge facing the disciple of development administration in the coming years.
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5. Group Work

5.1 General Survey and Systematic Order of Administrative Topics from the Viewpoint of Different Approaches

5.1.1 Environment and Tasks of Public Administration

5.1.1.1 Course of Discussion - Report

At the opening of the discussion it was stated that there are 3 papers available which should not be repeated but briefly described by their authors. In the discussion it was suggested to distinguish between administrators and administration as far as tasks of public administration are concerned. The wide range of tasks to be performed from agriculture to development administration in the field - the one paper lists 21 public tasks - requires men with different qualities who in reality are often less concerned with the task itself, but with making politics, government, and bargaining. This leads to the need of combining the task with general functions of the administrator. It was added, that tasks could also be divided into two groups: "proclaimed" and "latent" functions. For instance, decision making takes into consideration the latent goals in the problem solving process (e.g. problems of bussing, but also forcing people to work harder). It was objected that this idea creates problems with socialistic countries like Yugoslavia and Hungaria which are explicitly based on a given concept of proclaimed goals.

Discussing the problem of subdivision of 'environment' another position has been to divide "tasks" into 3 dimensions:
The first one comprising characterizations like static, reactive, dynamic,
as second dimension was suggested complexity, heterogeneity, and homogeneity, and
third, a dimension divided into "intra"- and "extra-system".

From the side of developing countries, then a different distinction has been presented which gives attention to the expectation-environment, religion, role of women, forces of resistance against change, landlords, elite, and trade unions of civil servants as well as on racial or ethnic groupings. In contrast to the latter argument, it was dissuaded to make much use the distinction between proclaimed and latent functions of administration. For one discussant thus seemed of even minor importance, since e.g. he himself served during the last decade under three military and two civilian regimes. But what he felt of being of much more importance are his experiences how civil servants form their own society, elite, clubs etc., regardless of the political head in power. Also, it must be taken into consideration the loss of credibility of public administration that arises if it is not able to meet the expectations of people. Consequently, the proposal has been developed to introduce the label of environment as an independent variable, and administration - that is the system and its organization - should be dealt with separately, as dependent variable, next to human behaviour.

The topic 'environment' was further enlarged by the agreement, that it is relevant to take into consideration that administrative units of a comparable formal position have significant differences in their regular budget as well as the administrators' income vary a lot. Against the latter was argued, that this enlargement of the environment tends to be too broad and would be of no specific significance for public administration.
From the point of view of socialist countries, environment could be described by internal and external factors. External factors are part of the international environment. Of main importance for the understanding of the development of internal factors is the historical progress. There must be consciousness of the existing power relations, because they lead to the formation of the political system. The bureaucrats rely on power, and it is the problem of the central government to equalize that power. As far as conflicts exist, they grow out of internal circumstances. Nevertheless, administrative reforms took place because of the change of environmental factors. Sometimes, these have been quite radical innovations. But one does not observe small groups, special communities or cooperation movements causing this change. In contrast to other political systems it is worthwhile to compare the different forms of handling changes adopted in the family of socialist countries.

Inside some countries like Hungary, it was described as an important problem of the central government to equalize horizontal disparities in the quality of public administration and it seems to be difficult to make sure the treatment of this task which is related to tasks in the environment of public administration.

Summing up, the state of the discussion at this point was an agreement, that the term "tasks" is not an appropriate entry for an encyclopaedia. Practical articles could be e.g. "tasks of management", "latent functions", and especially different kinds of environmental settings. The placement of developing countries as such under this category has still to be discussed. So far there is lack of knowledge and time.
The already mentioned idea, that not tasks (or functions in the terms of some discussants) but environmental settings are the adequate entry to find to all important problems, has been illustrated then in a diagram that was developed spontaneously. Starting with all environmental factors of all existing systems, on one side, it was the idea to find the link leading to public tasks. The diagram was further developed later into the idea of the establishment of a full environmental frame-work which makes visible the relationships until the operational level of public administration. Thus the question, what influences more, environment or task, could be analyzed better. The framework should comprise at least the categories:

1. goals
2. POSDCORB type of paradigms
3. 'stages of development'- arguments (change, speed etc.)
4. welfare-orientation — post industrial consciousness
5. project level
6. regional perspective
7. different policy areas
8. social change aspect.

Finally, the discussion dealt with the strength of influence, or the intensity, environment or task have on administrative action. The question remained unsolved as well as the last one, whether administration is able to or should change the environment.
Environment and task represent two opposing forces in public administration. Task represents the search for activities that are common to all practicing public administrators—the functions that are performed uniformly throughout the executive branch of government. Environment represents the search for factors that make the administrative process different from place to place—dependent upon the situation rather than upon some list of ubiquitous tasks.

Public administration would not exist as a field of study without a list of ubiquitous tasks. The first writers on administration, such as Henri Fayol and Luther Gulick, sought to create such a list, knowing that administration could not be studied and taught without it. To understand the importance of a list of tasks, one needs to recall how administrators were prepared for their jobs prior to the formal study of public administration. Throughout most of history, public administrators prepared for managerial positions by studying the thing to be administered, such as military science or civil engineering.
or by receiving a general education in the liberal arts, as the British did during the administration of the empire.

Fayol, Gulick and other writers revolutionized this situation by suggesting that successful administrators utilized common practices in carrying out similar activities or tasks. Since these were common to all varieties of administration, they could be studied and taught to all persons preparing for managerial responsibilities, regardless of their situation. With this declaration, the opportunity for a science of public administration began.

Despite the efforts of scholars to catalogue the critical tasks of public administration, environment remains a potent force. Scholars generally agree that environment has a separate and distinct impact on the practice of administration, changing the way in which an administrator carries out a task. In some cases, it may even change the administrative tasks that are to be emphasized. Scholars know, for example, that different environments favor different approaches to organization, and may even result in a situation where organizing—one of the primary administrative tasks—is not emphasized at all.

So the elders were not totally incorrect, training administrators in the thing to be administered, and public administrators must constantly contend with centrifugal forces that tend to create a different administrative approach for each separate situation. If such forces triumph, then the study of administration in general would cease to exist.
This paper provides a general survey of the scholarship on task and environment. It reviews the lists of tasks which scholars suggest that public administrators perform and identifies the most important environmental forces that are said to challenge the application of those tasks. The paper is offered as a starting point, and should be used cautiously. Existing scholarship on the subject, while extensive, does not cover all situations to be found throughout the world. In addition, it will be seen that the scholars disagree on the factors to be emphasized. A truly systematic ordering of tasks and environment can only be created through interchange between experts representing different nations, and that discussion has just begun. This paper is offered only to help promote those discussions.

The Tasks of Public Administration

Public administrators perform many different tasks, and scholars representing different schools of thought in public administration do not agree on the tasks that should be emphasized. The disagreement revolves around the different perspectives offered by the "orthodox" and "behavioral" schools of thought, although other perspectives influence the debate as well.

The orthodox perspective arose simultaneously with the beginning of the systematic study of public administration some one hundred years ago, and can be said to have created the
basis for an administrative science by identifying common units for study. European and American writers identified similar elements of administration. An American, Luther Gulick, coined the famous acronym--POSDCORB--that came to represent the formal tasks of administration embraced by orthodox writers.

The major challenge to the orthodox list of tasks came from the behavioral school of thought. In a book titled, appropriately, *The Functions of the Executive*, Chester Barnard tried to replace the list of formal elements of administration such as planning with behavioral processes such as communication. Although popular with scholars in the field, the behavioral perspective has not had the same influence as the orthodox approach in textbook writing and administrative reform.

At least four other distinct approaches to cataloguing the tasks of administration have appeared. The research of Henry Mintzberg and others on the nature of managerial work has helped the behavioral movement challenge the tendencies toward management control inherent in the orthodox approach. The management science school, based in part on Herbert Simon's emphasis on decision-making as the primary task of management, has tended to strengthen the orthodox tendencies. The tasks identified by persons in the policy analysis school of thought have helped bring scientific analysis to public administration where the pure rationalism of management science has not fit.

Finally, the political approach--an outgrowth of the unique brand of administrative pluralism practiced in the United States--
has added political skills to the list of administrative tasks that grows and grows as each new school of thought identifies the elements associated with its own perspective.

In practice, the stakes in having one's perspective on administrative tasks generally accepted as the ruling formula are quite high. As ubiquitous administrative tasks are recognized, government offices are set up to provide a suitable environment for their completion. The civil service reform movement, for example, with its recognition of the personnel function as critical to good government, prompted the creation of offices of personnel administration at many levels of government. Those offices in turn provided a reason for scholars to continue to train experts in that task, and a basis—often accompanied by financial awards—for scholarly research. In general, the importance of a particular administrative task is reflected in the size of the offices devoted to improving its practice in government at large.

These approaches are developed in more detail below. Although the paper refers to public administration, much of the scholarship upon which it is based comes from the study of business enterprises. There is a reason for this. Scholars who search for ubiquitous administrative tasks tend to believe that the tasks they discover are common to all administrative situations. They see no more distinction between governmental administration and business administration than they do, for example, between police administration and rural development. A ubiquitous administrative
task, by definition, should be found wherever administration occurs—so it should not matter whether the task is discovered in the private or public sector. That belief, although challenged in some sectors, is an article of faith in both the orthodox and behavioral schools of thought.

**The orthodox school:** The first complete definition of managerial tasks was prepared by Henri Fayol. In 1916 Fayol set out his general theory of administration in *Administration industrielle et générale*. The book integrates what Fayol called the elements (or tasks) of management with general principles of administration (such as unity of command).

Fayol identified five major managerial activities: planning, organizing, command, coordination, and control. He defined them as follows:

- **Planning:** Involving both forecasting and planning, this activity provided a means for examining the future and drawing up plans of action.
- **Organizing:** The process of building up both the material and human structure of the undertaking.
- **Command:** Defined as "maintaining activity among personnel," command meant more than giving orders. It incorporated a variety of activities, such as audits and reports, designed to keep the organization functioning.
- **Coordination:** The process of harmonizing the various activities of the organization so as to bind them together and assure the success of the enterprise.
Control: The process of verifying whether everything is occurring in conformity with "the plan adopted, the instructions issued and the principles established." ²

The context in which the managerial tasks were to take place was important in Fayol’s theory because it incorporated other activities which today are also included in general administration. Thus Fayol identified as separate from management the activities of finance (obtaining capital and assuring its optimal use) and accounting (book-keeping, cost analysis, and reports). Technical activities (such as production), commercial activities (exchange of goods and services), and security (protection of property and persons) were also listed as activities of the commercial undertaking, but separate from "management".

Fayol believed that the elements of management, and the principles that guided them, were equally applicable in "commerce, industry, politics, religion, war, or philanthropy, in every concern (where) there is a management function to be performed." ³ He chided managers for relying upon experience acquired on the job, observing that this resulted in a wide range of methods both good and bad, and insisted that the good methods could be identified by careful investigation and then taught in schools of management.

In *Administration industrielle et générale*, Fayol outlined in much detail the precepts necessary to carry out the activities of planning, organizing, command, coordination, and control.
Under organizing, for example, he discussed the selection of personnel. Luther Gulick drew upon Fayol's categories to issue a slightly different definition of administrative tasks. Gulick dropped Fayol's emphasis upon control, and added the functions of staffing and budgeting which were playing such a major influence in administrative reform. In part because Gulick's definition could be stated as an acronym--POSDCORB--and in part because it included personnel and budgeting, Gulick's list of managerial tasks was more widely accepted in public administration than Fayol's. The complete list, with Gulick's definitions, is reproduced below.

Planning, that is working out in broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods for doing them to accomplish the purpose set for the enterprise;

Organizing, that is the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined and co-ordinated for the defined objective;

Staffing, that is the whole personnel function of bringing in and training the staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work;

Directing, that is the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as the leader of the enterprise;
Co-ordinating, that is the all important duty of inter-relating the various parts of the work;

Reporting, that is keeping those to whom the executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus includes keeping himself and his subordinates informed through records, research and inspection;

Budgeting, with all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting and control.¹⁴

At the time when Fayol was developing his theory, Max Weber noted the tendency among modern organizations to make administration more formal—to reduce responsibilities to offices and to define tasks through the rules. While Weber did not elaborate a list of bureaucratic duties, he did predict the consequences of such definitions. The duties would emerge as formal offices in the executive branch and in some cases be made independent of the executive. Gulick recognized both developments and warned against independence. As a result, the orthodox definition of tasks are often said to be formalistic in nature, in respect to the ease by which the tasks were reduced to formal offices (such as budget bureaus) or formal processes (such as audits). The behavioral movement would attempt to return attention to the personal or intellectual qualities that characterize managerial work, although it wanted its offices too.

Despite the strong influence of the behavioral movement, and the advent of new techniques and developments in management,
the orthodox definition of tasks remains a powerful force in the memory of public administration. Fayol’s list of tasks was used by early writers such as Lyndall Urwick and James Mooney to explain the principles by which successful managers led and organized large enterprises. Gulick’s elements of public administration became the standard categories for textbooks on the field, especially those written in the two decades after 1937. Even today, textbook writers who do not devote substantial sections and chapters to organizing, staffing, budgeting and other formal tasks risk editorial displeasure and jeopardize potential sales.

The behavioral movement: Beginning as a reaction to the height of orthodoxy in the 1930’s, the behavioral movement sought to break sharply with the orthodox view of administrative tasks. The most influential book published at that time dealt specifically with the tasks of the executive. Written by a telephone company executive, Chester Barnard, it was widely applied to both public and private organizations.

Barnard began by defining the organization in behavioral terms—as “a system of consciously coordinated activities or forces of two or more people.”

The coordination of efforts essential to a system of cooperation requires...an organization system of communication. Such a system of communication implies centers or points of interconnection and can only operate as these centers are occupied by persons who are called executives.
The resulting functions of the executive were threefold: to provide and maintain the system of communication, to secure essential services from individuals in the system, and to formulate and define the purpose of the organization. Each of these functions were examined in turn.

In Barnard’s view, the system of communication consisted of three elements: the formal organization, the personnel who occupied it, and the informal executive organization. All three were necessary to create and maintain the system of communication. Barnard felt that orthodox theorists placed too much emphasis on the formal organization because, he guessed, “it can apparently be reduced to organization charts, specifications of duties, and descriptions of divisions of labor.” The strategic factor, in Barnard’s view, was not the formal organization, but the recruitment of personnel to occupy the nerve centers in the organizational communication system. The qualities he sought in these personnel were loyalty, responsibility, a willingness to be a member of the organizational team, personal abilities such as poise, and lastly, specialized abilities such as are taught in schools of management. Not content to rely entirely on the formal channels of communication, Barnard added an element of redundancy. He suggested that the executive encourage the development of an informal executive network.

To summarize: the first executive function is to develop and maintain a system of communication. This involves jointly a scheme of organization and an executive personnel. The processes by which the latter is accomplished include chiefly the selection of men and the offering of incentives; techniques
of control permitting effectiveness in promoting, demoting, and dismissing men; and finally the securing of an informal organization in which the essential property is compatibility of personnel.

The second function of the executive, in Barnard's view, involved securing essential services from individuals. In general, this consisted of two general tasks—getting people to join the organization and, once on board, encouraging them to expand their commitment and contribution. This involved a certain amount of routine personnel administration, in which Barnard was not terribly interested. An organization, he said, could not long survive on the minimal contributions produced by the routine activities of recruitment and placement. To encourage a high level of participation, Barnard presented his ideas on the economy of incentives.

Basically, Barnard examined the level of participation in the organization using the logic of economics. The more incentives individuals received, the higher their degree of participation. The type of incentives to be offered, Barnard said, was a very delicate problem. During upon the results of the Hawthorne experiments, Barnard noted that people joined an organization for one reason (to make money, perhaps) and then often found themselves motivated by entirely different factors (friendship, for example). Barnard was among the first to recognize that different work teams in a large, complex organization were likely to be motivated by different factors, depending upon their situation. Building that system of
incentives—one of the central tasks of the executive—was a matter of constant adjustment, persuasion, and negotiation.

The precise combination of incentives...is so delicate and complex that rarely, if ever, is the scheme of incentives determinable in advance of application. It can only evolve; and the questions relating to it become chiefly those of strategic factors from time to time in the course of the life of the organization.10

The third function of the executive was to formulate and define the purpose of the organization. Both orthodox and behavioral theorists have made much out of this task, but Barnard's views represented a radical departure from conventional thinking. In essence, he did for organizations what John Locke did for constitutions—suggesting that the reason for their existence lay in the needs of the members. People came together in an organization to do something that they could not do as individuals, such as operate a telephone company.

The executives, situated as they were at the nerve centers of the organization, were in a good position to define the purpose and communicate it to the various work units. That definition, however, had to be based upon a mutual understanding of the contributions that the units were capable of making and their reasons for joining the organization. Barnard formulated a "bottom up" theory of purpose, radically different from the view held by orthodox theorists such as Gulick who said that the purpose was defined from above (by the Congress, for example) before the work of administration could begin.
In the same way that Fayol and Gulick laid the groundwork for the orthodox definition of tasks, Barnard provided the inspiration for the behavioral point of view. Later theorists, --starting from Barnard's theory of incentives--made much out of the idea of organizational equilibrium. James March and Herbert Simon, writing in *Organizations*, described how changes in the factors affecting employee participation in an organization "endangered its survival."¹¹ Someone (presumably the executive corps) had to create sufficient resources out of the contributions of the members to offer them the necessary incentives to draw forth their contributions--a classic closed loop in the best tradition of systems thinking. Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn, writing nine years later in *The Social Psychology of Organizations*, used the "open systems" model of organizational equilibrium to describe all of the factors that affected institutional survival.¹²

The theory of organizational equilibrium was essentially a theory of transactions, with managers converting inputs into outputs and providing sufficient inducements to members of the organization to encourage their participation. Philip Selznick, writing in *Leadership in Administration*, provided one of the best explanations of these processes.

The job of the executive, Selznick said, consisted of four tasks: defining the mission and role of the organization, implanting this purpose within the social consciousness of the organization, defending the distinctive identity of the organization (so it might survive), and ordering internal
conflict. Selznick recognized that formal powers—recruiting a homogeneous central staff and formalizing policies into rules—were important but not sufficient. The modern organization, so much a collage of special interests, could not be welded together by formal powers alone. Selznick suggested that the executive enjoyed two special advantages which could be used to join the organization to the executive definition of purpose. Both involved transactions.

Open systems theory was primarily concerned with the way in which organizations adjusted to their environment. Selznick recognized that the executive—as the primary ambassador to that environment—could influence the course of the organization by selecting the environment in which it worked. He or she could do this by introducing new technologies, identifying new clients, or building alliances with other institutions. Selznick called this "the selection of a social base." Like Barnard, Selznick believed that the "interest groups" within the organization represented "sources of energy," provided they could be mobilized. This too required transactions with the special interests—or bargaining—to create a situation which Selznick characterized as "cooptation." Through cooptation, the interests would agree to support the mission and values of the organization in exchange for the opportunity to participate in its governance.

The behavioral perspective on executive tasks was reinforced in 1970 by the work of Henry Mintzberg. Mintzberg used a
remarkably simple method to gauge the tasks performed by managers. He asked them how they spent their time, and published the results in *The Nature of Managerial Work*.\(^\text{16}\)

The results were quite a blow to the orthodox belief that managers spent their time planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing and performing other formal administrative tasks. Followers of Mintzberg's perspective characterized these as "programmed" or "control" activities. The managers in Mintzberg's study spent very little time performing programmed activities. They did spend a great deal of time in meetings, in conversations, and in unstructured situations, performing a great quantity of work at an unrelenting pace, usually spending only a brief period of time solving one problem before moving to another.

Mintzberg's managers performed ten different roles. Some involved decisions--initiating change (entrepreneur role), handling disturbances, allocating resources, and negotiating with parties outside the organization. Some involved the handling of information--monitoring, disseminating, and speaking on behalf of the organization. A third set of roles involved interpersonal relations--performing ceremonies, leading, and acting as liaison. The implications behind these different roles seemed clear. Managerial work consisted of an unrelenting stream of unstructured activities for which there was no formal, routine administrative procedure.

**Other contributions:** As each "school of thought" has developed within public administration, it has promoted its
own definition of the tasks of the manager. That definition typically corresponds to the types of practices that persons associated with that particular school are interested in studying. Thus the orthodox movement, which was accompanied by a great deal of interest in civil service reform, saw "staffing" or personnel administration as one of the central functions of the manager.

The orthodox and behavioral schools of thought have made the greatest contributions to the definition of administrative tasks. The contributions from three other schools of thought --the political school, policy analysis, and management science--are also significant.

Along with the behavioral movement, the political school of thought developed as a reaction to the excessive formalism of the orthodox perspective, in this case, as a reaction to the orthodox belief in a politics-administration dichotomy. Impressed by the discovery that administrators engaged in politics and policy-making, the promoters of the political school began to discuss activities related to those tasks. One of the best expressions can be found in Marvin Bernstein's *The Job of the Federal Executive*.

Bernstein's study, as well as the later volume by Hugh Heclo titled *A Government of Strangers*, viewed the job of career executives in terms of their relationships with the political executives under which they served. Said Bernstein:
The most important element common to high career executive jobs is their involvement in policy. 
This element makes it very difficult to separate the work of the career executive from that of the political executive.  

Bernstein's book presented the relationship from the point of view of the bureaucrat, Heclo's from the perspective of the political executive. The list of skills which each side uses (they are quite similar) are not well articulated—certainly not with the clarity of POSDCORB. This is probably due to the fluid nature of politics, which makes the Machiavellian advice contained in these books difficult to summarize. Says Heclo:

> There are no magical management systems or organization changes for "getting control of the bureaucracy." Reorganization plans or techniques like management by objectives and zero-base budgeting are all executive proclama-
tions that presume rather than create changes in subordinate's behavior.  

Heclo discusses the problems of selecting goals and opportunities, the methods of building support and the ways of using people. He views goal selection in terms of timing—the first few months offer the best opportunities. Methods of building support invariably require one side or the other to tap special access it has to officials in Congress, the White House, interest groups and associations of clientele, and other persons strategically located throughout the governmental system. Bargaining, persuasion, communication and consultation are the ways of using people. Heclo warns of the long-run difficulties of relying upon formal authority to deal with internal opposition,
Another school of thought, policy analysis, developed as a reaction to the ambiguity and conservatism of the political approach. Armed with a set of statistical and economic techniques, it proposed that the public administrator apply scientific methods to the planning and implementation of public policy. This created two key tasks for the public administrator. One was policy analysis—the use of economic modeling, social experimentation, or benefit-cost analysis to identify the most effective methods for accomplishing policy objectives. The other was program evaluation, where experimental or quasi-experimental designs would be used to test whether an ongoing program was having a significant impact on the problem it sought to solve. Because of its inherent rationality, emphasis upon science, and impatience with political compromise, policy analysis is often linked to the orthodox school. As such, it is said to have added an "E" to POSDCORB (for evaluation).

The management science school, a counterpart to the policy analysis movement, developed in schools of business administration, drawing initially from techniques in military and science programs. (Policy analysis tends to draw on social programs and is associated with economics and political science.) Management science received much inspiration from the early work of Herbert Simon, who saw decision-making as the central task of the administrator. Initially, Simon was preoccupied with developing an alternative to the "rational man" school of decision making, for which he won the Nobel Prize. Like Mintzberg, Simon initially focused
on the unprogrammed, unsequential nature of executive decisions. This quickly led to a distinction between "programmed" and "unprogrammed" decisions, and the observation that mathematical techniques (such as operations research) and computer programs could be used to manage the former. Later Simon went on to suggest that many types of decisions believed to be unprogrammable could in fact be programmed using sophisticated computer routines.

This division of managerial work between programmed and unprogrammed decisions is best expressed by Robert Anthony in his book Planning and Control Systems. Anthony promoted the view that managerial work could be separated into three general tasks—strategic planning, management control, and operational control.

Strategic planning, a process practiced with enormous energy in the business world, "is the process of deciding on objectives of the organization, on changes in these objectives, on the resources used to attain these objectives, and on the policies that are to govern the acquisition, use, and the disposition of these resources." In public administration, in the military, for example, this consists of making long-range estimates of the nature of the threat to national security, deciding on the defense posture that will be developed to counter the threat, and deciding upon the general types of weapon systems and force deployment that will be utilized.

Strategic planning is followed by the more routine functions of management control. The job of administrators engaged in management control (I prefer the term management planning)
consists of mapping out the specific programs that will be needed to accomplish the missions, developing financial and budgetary plans in order to obtain the necessary resources, setting up the organization and procurement system, and otherwise deciding how the resources will be expended in the most effective manner.

Operational control follows management control, and consists "of assuring that specific tasks are carried out effectively and efficiently." Operational control consists of scheduling and controlling individual jobs, procuring specific items, hiring and deploying specific personnel, and monitoring other activities being performed at the office level.

Throughout Anthony's framework, as throughout all of management science, heavy emphasis is placed on the flow of information. At the highest level, this includes forecasts about changes in the organizational environment to be used for strategic planning. At the lowest level, this includes information for use in management control. Anthony places particular emphasis upon the use of financial information, both for controlling operations within the organization and for reporting the health of the organization to the outside world. Management science in general has supported the development of complex computer programs (management information systems) for processing and filtering information. Clearly, the use and management of information is seen as one of the tasks of the modern administrator.
The multitude of tasks: According to the experts, public administrators perform a wide range of tasks. These tasks range from the orthodox functions of budgeting, personnel, organization, planning and control to the behavioral functions of communication, enlisting participation, managing conflict, and preserving the organization. They include the political skills of bargaining and persuasion, the analytic skills of policy analysis and program evaluation, and the cognitive skills of decision-making. The behavioralists and the political theorists agree that administrators are responsible for formulating and defining the purpose of the organization, while the orthodox theorists believe that this happens outside of the organization by lawmakers or political executives. The management scientists emphasize strategic planning, and so did Fayol.

The list of tasks is long—too long, in fact. It was formulated by experts in administration viewing executives at work in many different settings. Few individual executives perform all of these tasks. Here one will find an administrator engaged in planning, there one will not. The list is accurate in the aggregate, but inexact for the individual case.

The Environment of Public Administration

How does one explain variance in the activities of public administrators? Why, for example, can one find an administrator deeply engaged in politics and then find another manager whose work is strictly administrative? The answer, in general, seems
to be that tasks of administration vary in response to the situation in which they are performed.

For the past two decades, public administrators have struggled to understand the relationship between environment and administrative behavior--including task. The search began in earnest with the comparative administration movement, which sought to understand why western administrative tasks changed so remarkably when exported to non-western nations. The search continued with the policy analysis movement, which suggested an association between different policies and different administrative systems. It was strengthened by the contingency approach, which revealed how different administrative situations required different administrative strategies.

Altogether, these movements point up the importance of four environmental factors that shape the nature of administration in particular situations--the type of political regime, the social setting (called the ecology of public administration), the task (or policy) being performed, and the technology being utilized. This paper will summarize the factors involved and not attempt the complex job of linking environmental factors to specific administrative tasks.

**Political regime analysis:** A number of scholars have noted that public administration differs from country to country, and offered classification schemes. One of the most widely accepted summaries of this work can be found in the book by Ferrel Heady titled *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective.*
Heady begins with the "classic" administrative systems with well established bureaucracies (France and Germany). He then moves through the more pluralistic "civic cultures" of the United States and Great Britain, compares these to the modernizing regimes (such as Japan), and examines administrative power in developed Communist regimes (the U.S.S.R.). The developing countries are dealt with separately. Heady divides them into six categories—traditional-autocratic, bureaucratic elite systems (civil and military), polyarchal competitive systems, dominant-party semicompetitive, dominant-party mobilization, and Communist totalitarian.

The theory is rich in detail—far too rich to present in a paper of this length. The lesson that emerges, however, is clear. Some of the tasks that public administrators are called upon to perform, such as involvement in policy making, vary depending upon the type of political regime in which the administrator serves.

The ecology of public administration: The most complex theory dealing with the relationship between environment and administration has been formulated by Fred Riggs. Ostensibly designed to explain administrative behavior in developing countries, it offers insights into western administrative systems as well.

In essence, Riggs is interested in explaining the phenomenon which he characterized as "formalism"—the existence of extensive administrative forms and procedures that are not
expected to work in practice, such as the degree of discrepancy between a formal merit system and actual hiring and promotion practices. Riggs uses the concepts of differentiation and integration—popular among contingency theorists—to explain the degree of discrepancy. Where the discrepancy is great, administrative agencies will continue to perform economic, social, symbolic, political, and elite management functions. This is the situation in the so-called "prismatic societies." In an intricate theory and elaborate new vocabulary, Riggs works to explain the blending of functions.

Riggs' theory is especially important for understanding the relationship between environment and task. An administrator who formally appears to be performing the staffing task, for example, may in fact be performing economic, social, and political tasks as well. To view the performance of that task strictly in terms of administration, i.e. staffing, causes the observer to miss the full scope of activity underway.

Policy and task: Despite the search for ubiquitous administrative tasks, it is clear that the nature of administration varies according to the policy being administered. Public administration for national security can be quite different than public administration for social welfare. This is frequently revealed by the uneven acceptance of government-wide administrative reforms. Planning-Programming-Budgeting, for example, a sophisticated form of program budgeting, was adopted
with eventual enthusiasm by the U.S. Department of Defense, but was a dismal failure in the Department of Health and Human Services.

The organizational style, political involvement, degree of bureaucratization, possibilities for strategic planning and overall mode of operation vary from policy area to policy area. Theodore Lowi was one of the first to notice differences between distributive policy (grants and contracts), redistributive policy (income transfers such as pensions and social security), and regulatory policy. In the United States, for example, administrators involved in distributive policy are commonly involved in politics and policy-making, while redistributive policy deliberately creates a situation in which administrators are removed from the political arena through the creation of highly bureaucratic systems of rules and procedures.

In some of my own work, I have noted differences in administration in seven policy areas. These include distributive policy, regulatory policy, rural development and land management, research and education, paramilitary operations, redistributive policy, and business-type operations. The science of research and development management, for example, is quite different from the process of managing a paramilitary operation such as a police or fire department. The most obvious difference is the degree to which formal authority can be exercised as the primary means of leadership. This classification scheme also reveals why some government
operations, such as the postal service, can be run like a business while others, such as regulation or rural development, cannot.

**Technology and task:** Differences in organizational technology, like differences in the policy being applied, provide another method for understanding variances among administrative operations. Theorists from the contingency approach have used categories based on task and technology to explain such things as variances in the location of decision making and variances in the allowable span of control.\(^\text{26}\)

By technology, the theorists mean the way in which the work is organized and carried out. James Thompson, an organization theorist, has summarized one of the most widely accepted set of categories.\(^\text{27}\) He distinguishes between organizations that use long-linked technologies (a sewage treatment plant would be an example), mediating technologies (such as a police department, which possesses a number of particular behavior patterns which it uses to categorize and handle different situations), and intensive technologies (a research laboratory, which must create a fresh solution to each new problem).

Other contingency theorists, such as Paul Lawrence and Jay Lorsch, do not use these categories, but focus instead on the degree of differentiation and the resulting methods of integration which must be adopted.\(^\text{28}\) In essence, they suggest that an organization must be as complex (as differentiated) as its environment, and that it must adopt methods of
integration (administrative procedures, for example) that are relevant to the degree of differentiation. They show, for example, how the locus of decision-making and conflict resolution moves lower and lower in highly successful differentiated organizations.

**Conclusion**

The study of public administration began with the identification of common tasks that were to form the basis of a science of administration—planning, organizing, staffing, budgeting, reporting, directing, coordination and control. The list of tasks grew longer as public administrators were found performing other tasks, such as policy making, and other tasks were found for them to perform, such as program evaluation. As the list grew longer, it became apparent that not all public administrators were performing all of these tasks. That encouraged the study of administrative environments, in order to better understand how particular situations gave rise to different types of tasks and behaviors.

The understanding of administrative environments revealed how diverse public administration was, from agency to agency and country to country. The list of administrative tasks presented in this paper, based as it is largely on American scholarship, will never be complete until all of these international and interorganizational differences are explored.
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Introduction: The Identity Crisis of Public Administration

The study of Public Administration has been under attack and is still in a period of stress and change. Is Public Administration part of Political Science? Is it part of the Liberal Arts or Social Science Studies? Can it be considered part of the Schools of Business Administration with courses in economics, business management, management science, behavioural science, etc? There is no doubt that in most universities Public Administration has taken a back seat and has been considered a second class citizen. Institutes of Administration which sprang up in the early years of the 20th century have not made much of a mark - particularly in developing countries. Their problems are many but the most remarkable is that they have not attracted the staff and programmes of enquiry and influence capable of changing the course of events. Their close affinity to the Civil Service in most cases has been a restraining force. Their administration and faculty have been a dumping ground for 'spent force' civil servants.

The New Move

It has been considered in many circles that public administration should move back to the days of Political Economy where political science reacted or interacted with economics. The new approach to public administration favours activist ideas and urges more proactive instead of simply reactive stance. Areas such as concern for social equality and equity, sensitivity to human suffering and social needs are encouraged rather than traditional studies in the separation of powers, local government, etc. The new movement does not rest only with the return to political economy. Other writers are now using terms such as Public Management and Development Administration as a replacement of the traditional "study of men and materials in the accomplishment of the purpose of State". The enthusiastic studies and publications from Business Management have not only dwarfed but made redundant and sometimes irrelevant the study of public administration.
Modern Governments are getting more involved in the ownership and management of national resources. Investment decisions, trade agreements and negotiations, economic plans and strategies, income and wage policy determinations including collective bargaining with equally powerful trade unions or workers' representatives are the order of the day.

Is Public Management the appropriate name?
Development, be it defined in terms of economic, or social criteria including using the basic needs approach is the pre-occupation of all modern states. Development Administration is a household word now. Is this a replacement of Public Administration or is it a new dimension?

The Environment of Public Administration

The environment connotes both human and non-human circumstances which condition the management of public affairs. The major factor in this respect involves the identity crisis of the subject itself. Public administration does not present a clear and simple picture; no discipline with a neat paradigm; no curriculum with agreed boundaries and stable subject matter. Rather it is a loose cluster of research and teaching interests focusing attention primarily - but not exclusively - upon organisations defined by law and conventions as "public", drawing ideas and techniques from a wide range of sources, and interacting with changing, sometimes turbulent environments of several kinds. A casual look at curriculum offered in schools teaching the subject will confirm this fact.

The human circumstances include the personalities who not only influence policies and decisions in public affairs, but also those who are the agents as well as recipients of public administration activities or tasks. The politicians in civilian governments and the soldiers in military regimes can be included in this group. Civil servants and a host of bureaucrats in both central and local administration constitute another group. The citizenry, of course, cannot be ignored.
For the individual public servant, his relationship with his colleagues (superiors, peers and subordinates) offer a formidable environment which conditions his performance.

The organisational unit, be it the ministry, department, or section and indeed, the entire public service - its structure, systems, procedures, rules and regulations - impose non-human conditions on the performance of the task of the public servant.

The national environment consisting of social, political, economic, cultural, linguistic, tribal, religious, age and sex mix cannot be ignored.

The world outside our national borders are becoming so complex and intertwined with our national goals and aspirations that it is taking on greater concern and demanding increasing attention.

Technological achievements and the "information explosion" require attention in the management of public affairs unparalleled in man's history.

Dwight Valdo, in his article in the Indian Administrative and Management Review (July - Sept., 1973) takes on the subject of impatience and conflicts in the post-independence era in developing countries:

1. Public versus private: In most societies there is now a growing reaction against government institutions by taxpayers, unions, the unemployed, farmers, and different protest groups; and yet government business grows because society sees it as its "Chosen Instrument" to deal with problems of large scope and great complexity. Simultaneously there is movement toward the "publicization" of the private and the "privatization" of the public. Hence more confusion, the third sector or "mixed sector" is now fashionable where the private and the public live side by side, although clear definitions of boundaries, purpose, means, etc. are not available.
2. Rising expectations versus non-delivery: Promises of a higher standard of living, the good life, social and economic prosperity preached before the nationalistic movements replaced the colonialists have been an illusion.

3. Industrialism: At whose expense and for whose benefit? The urban rich and elite versus the rural poor and illiterate. What is often referred to as the DUALIST SOCIETIES?

4. Nationalism: There is certainly a growing disinterestedness in public observances including turnout at the polls during election periods; a neglect of the duties of citizenship; a stepping up of individualism; migration and general non-commitment to the State. The new trend for regionalism and economic groupings is virtually a reversal of the movement in the early sixties for national sovereignty.

5. Participation: There is a growing concern about involvement, decentralisation, devolution, deconcentration, etc., all aimed at a serious distrust of bigness and distance.

With all these and more areas of disappointment, and the impatience of the independent third world with traditional theories and practices, it is no wonder that DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION has now become a household word or phrase in the language of both scholars and practitioners. This, in a way, has complicated the task of public administration.

The Task of Public Administration

With all the above stated problems of conflict and disappointment, and the impatience of the independent third world with traditional theories and practices, it is no wonder that the task of public administration has become complicated and does not present itself to a simple method of classification.

A recent workshop of Commonwealth West African Public Administrators held in Nigeria, came out with some suggested tasks of governments some of which are as follows:

* Commonwealth West Africa Workshop on Training for Development Administration held at the Administrative Staff College of Nigeria, May-June 1981.
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- Maintaining law and order, political stability and national security.
- Ensuring the protection of the national interest in all international relations including prevention from external aggression.
- Achieving self-sufficiency in food production and to efficiently market the surplus.
- Providing adequate storage facilities and the minimization of post-harvest losses in addition to the provision and equitable distribution of agricultural inputs and the intensification of extension services to farmers.
- Providing social services including better educational opportunities and primary health care for all; providing transport and communication network, housing, energy and power, water supply, sewerage, national culture; etc.
- Ensuring full employment, balanced economic development in all sections in the country.

In the same workshop a number of constraints to the realization of government goals were identified. Amongst them were:

**Determination of fiscal and monetary policy:**

(a) Inadequate number of trained revenue personnel
(b) Administrative and political corruption
(c) Low sense of responsibility, integrity and discipline.

**Provision of social service:**

(a) Lack of adequate funds
(b) Poor planning
(c) Mismanagement and fraudulent practices
(d) Inadequate information and education of the masses as to the rights to and proper use of service facilities
(e) Administrative and political conflicts as to the best location of service facilities
(f) Lack of adequate trained and skilled manpower locally based to maintain the facilities after they have been provided
(g) Non-involve ment of the people in the identification of their social needs.

Economic Development:

(a) Insufficient local savings and the consequent inadequate investment funds
(b) Poor planning and implementation of development programmes
(c) Poor or lack of evaluation of on-going development projects
(d) Lack of relevant statistical data
(e) Divided loyalty of multi-nationals
(f) Administrative and political conflicts as to the location of development projects.

Tade and Commerce:

(a) Inadequate indigenous managerial and entrepreneurial competence
(b) Lack of Capital funds
(c) Inequitable distribution of infrastructural facilities e.g. roads, power, and water
(d) Dishonesty and lack of integrity of public officers
(e) Unwillingness of multi-nationals to develop indigenous managerial competence and entrepreneurial ability.

To be simplistic, the major task of Public Administration is to identify MEAL needs as well as national resources and to balance the limited resources with unsati able social needs. Establishing priorities and making difficult choice decisions have become an important task since certain needs can only be met at the expense of others. Thus it is imperative for public administrators to establish acceptable or agreed basis on which to make the choice and the criteria for making the choice must of necessity be related somehow to some chosen objective(s).
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INTRODUCTION

Living and working in the developing world, one cannot, perhaps, escape looking at the environment and tasks of public administration from a developing world point of view. Thus this paper seeks to analyse the related issues mainly in the light of the post Second World War experience of the developing Third World countries subsequent to their entry into the world community as independent nation-states in search of modernization and development.

The past three and half decades have witnessed an unprecedented pace of societal change in the developing countries. Both the objectives as well as the content of the process of societal change have, naturally, differed from country to country. In some countries, the process has been geared to the task of building up coherent nation-states from a medley of divergent ethnic and religious groups. In some cases, the process has been linked to a drive towards modernization, in others to a movement for rapid industrial and agricultural growth, in still others to an attempt at improvement of the quality of life of the people, and so on. The pace has not only varied from country to country, but has also varied within each country from period to period. But the common feature has been the relative rapidity of the process of change as compared with previous historical periods.

The approaches through which such societal change has been sought have also varied. In some instances, they have been sought through the implementation of specific development policies, strategies
programmes and projects; in others, through the enactment and implementation of laws and statutes; in still others, through institutional, structural and organizational changes. In several cases, they have been sought through the development of human resources, whilst in others the approach has been characterised by efforts at mobilization of the people.

The process of societal change in the developing countries has been marked by a high incidence of societal tension — of class, ethnic, religious and caste conflict; of political and administrative instability — and by the continued worsening of the relative position of the weaker sections of society. The path has been anything but smooth.

Thus, in the past three decades and more, the over-riding need in the developing world has been perceived as the orderly management of this process of societal change. This has been a key goal of the policy makers who have sought to orchestrate this process of change and public administration has been regarded as one of the critical instruments of such orderly management.

The new role of public administration emerged gradually out of the impact of the experience of the development process as it evolved after the second world war. It was not an overnight change of role, but, in the final analysis, it represents a contrast with the early role. During the colonial or pre-modernization era, public administration was looked upon, in much of the developing third world, as the maintainer of societal stability — as an instrument which would maintain
maintain a stable framework within which the existing patterns of interaction of societal forces could continue. The need for change was not readily seen. In fact, change was perceived as a threat to stability, as something to be contained and only minimally (if not grudgingly) conceded when inescapable. But the situation altered with the coming of an era of pursuit of modernization and development, with the dawn of independence in the case of many of the countries. Societal change became increasingly inescapable and something to be pursued rather than avoided. Thus the role of public administration began to change from that of a maintainer of stability and containing change to one of orderly management of the inevitable and inescapable change to ensure both the avoidance of societal disruption in the process of such change and the possible unanticipated adverse fall-outs from the change process.

The reversal of role was more often unplanned than planned; it was thrust on the scene by circumstances; it was dimly perceived when it took place and continues to be imperfectly understood even three decades later.

2. THE ENVIRONMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

This changed role of public administration occurs not in a vacuum but in a societal environment - an environment which is multi-faceted and multi-dimensional. An understanding of this environment is necessary in order to comprehend the nature and significance of the tasks which public administration is called upon to perform as a contributor to
orderly societal change. The several facets of this environment are discussed below, in terms of the expectation environment, the economic environment, the political environment, the social-cultural environment and forces of resistance. Whilst for convenience of discussion these facets are separately identified, it is obvious that they are closely inter-related both causatively and in their impact on public administration.

Societies or sub-components thereof are no longer cloistered entities but are exposed to developments and changes occurring in the rest of the world and thus have a heightened awareness of what they see as being both desirable and feasible ends of development. Thence has arisen public expectations of rapid economic growth, enhancement of quality of life, greater participation in societal decision making at all levels, equitable participation in the fruits of growth and equity of access to production assets and social services. Increasingly, these expectations are actively articulated with enhanced intensity and an undercurrent of urgency. In addition to these public expectations, are the expectations of the political elites which have relevance to public administration. These are their expectation that the bureaucracy would accept its post-independence instrumental role vis-a-vis the political institutions and also their expectation of continuance in power through satisfaction of public expectations.

Through the past three decades, the economic environment of public administration in developing countries has been characterised by several common features. One such has been the low growth of GNP
and most specifically, together with high rates of population growth, the low rates of growth of GNP per capita. Throughout this period, the developing countries, generally, have faced worsening terms of trade vis-à-vis the developed world, and, with dropping primary commodity prices, have continued to face problems as regards their balance of payments. Scarcity of investment capital has also been a characteristic of the economic environment of these countries. Added to this is the fact that, due to the relative lack of entrepreneurial capabilities both in the private and public sectors of the developing economies, the relative return on the scarce capital which is available has also been low. Another feature of the economic environment of the developing countries is the high level of incidence of poverty and the heavy concentration of the poor in the rural areas. However, with the slow pace of rural development, migration from the rural to the limited urban areas in these countries has continued unabated thus causing a level of urban development problems which these countries can hardly cope with, in order to cater to the burgeoning population of these teeming cities. Within the countries income disparities have continued to grow rather than decrease. The process of economic development and modernisation of production has been accompanied by asset concentration rather than asset distribution. Added to these has been the fast reducing aid flow, in real terms, to these countries from the developing world.

The political environment of public administration in the developing countries has been characterized by an increasing concentration and centralization of decision making. As the process of modernization
got underway, decision making, on the ground of technological requirements, moved increasingly away from the periphery to the Centre and, within the Centre, from lower echelons of representative bodies to higher levels of technocratic executive bodies. Participation in the political process, where it occurred, was limited to periodic elections to the legislatures. Such legislatures have not grown in effectiveness vis-a-vis the decision making process. If anything they have become weaker partners to the political executives in the decision making process.

The social environment has been characterized by racial, ethnic and class conflicts, sometimes made more complex by religious conflicts, thus polarizing society and preventing the emergence of cohesive nation states. In many cases, the relative slow growth of the economic pie in terms of the growth of population, has worsened nascent ethnic and religious differences which lay submerged under the surface at the time these countries gained independence. Women, who constitute one half of the population of these countries, have continued to remain marginal to the process of development. So have the youth, which fact has, over the recent past, contributed to their active disaffection and this disaffection has increasingly been translated into violence.

A final aspect of the environment of public administration in the developing countries are the forces of resistance to change which have continued to operate in these societies. The power elite, both in terms of economic power and social power, have been a significant factor of resistance to change. So have the traditional conservative elements, often buttressed by religious tradition. Thus in instances
where production assets have been traditionally concentrated, such loci of concentration, as land-owners, have been elements of resistance. So have been the new elites who, through the nature of the growth process which contributed to asset concentration, have been in a position to acquire control over production assets. Another important element of the resistance environment have been political and administrative and technocratic elites at the Centre who have shown resistance to changes leading to decentralization of decision making.

This then, in broad canvas, is the environment within which public administration has continued to operate in the developing countries during the last three and a half decades and must seek to play its role of orderly management of the change process in the 1980s and 1990s. As one looks at it, one perceives it as an environment of tension -- a continuing tension between expectations and resistance, calling for massive intervention to generate change but lacking the wherewithal (either in terms of investment capital or of human resources) to make that intervention. It is also an environment in which attempts at resolving tension are bedevilled by factors such as worsening terms of trade and balance of payments and dwindling aid which are beyond the control of the developing societies themselves. This, in a way, is a Catch Twenty-two situation.

3. TASKS OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The tasks of public administration flow naturally from the requirements of the orderly management of societal change. These tasks could, for purposes of convenience, be arranged in five broad groups
The first group of tasks relates to the planning and programming of what may be called the building blocks of change -- including policies and strategies designed to bring about change, programmes and projects (including area development schemes) which constitute the instruments of such policies and strategies, as well as laws and statutes which both enable and validate such change whilst safeguarding the process of change. Public administration at all levels is engaged in these tasks. Those at the Centre of decision making, have the task of anticipating the need for change and the direction of such change. They also have the task of analysing change options, bringing thereinto the comparative experience outside their societies. Those at the periphery have the task of testing reactions to the proposals for change and acting as a feedback conduit both for such reactions as well as an outward conduit for the final strategies programmes etc.

The second group of tasks relate to the implementation of policies, strategies, programmes, projects, laws and statutes. This role of implementor of public policy etc. has been a traditional role of public administration. Nevertheless, in the present context, it takes on a different dimension. What is to be implemented are not stable, time-tested, policies, strategies, programmes etc. but are relatively untested and, therefore, risk-prone change strategies and programmes. This requires an ability on the part of public administration to anticipate both implementation bottlenecks and possible resistance to such strategies, programmes etc. and an ability to avoid these bottlenecks. These tasks also call for an understanding of the implications of such strategies and programmes particularly in the
context of resource constraints in which changes are sought to be
effected.

The third area relates to the monitoring of the implementation
in terms of time-frames and cost-frames and also to a providing feed-
back for evaluation of the impact of such policies, strategies, programmes
etc. This, again, is a task to be carried out at all levels of public
administration with the role of being a feedback conduit falling heavily
on these at the periphery and the role of qualitative monitoring and
evaluation falling more squarely on those at the Centre of decision
making.

The fourth group of tasks relate to the demands of all of the
three earlier groups. It has become increasingly clear that to
maintain a high level of acceptability of change-related strategies
and programmes, to maintain their relevance to the needs of the
public and to reduce the level of burden of implementation on the
bureaucracy as well as to ensure the institutionalization of the
process of change in the society, the participation of the beneficiaries
is a sine qua non, both in planning and programming of change policies/
strategies and programmes etc. as well as in their implementation,
monitoring and evaluation. Thus one of the major tasks which public
administration of today is called upon to perform is that of acting as
an instrument of the mobilization of the participation of beneficiaries.
This perhaps is one of the most difficult and least understood of the
tasks of public administration. The nature of the task of mobilization
calls for an ability to serve as a catalyst whilst, at the same time,
beginning the process of withdrawal from its role from the very commence-
ment itself, thus ensuring that its involvement in the mobilization
of beneficiary participation is a catalytic role which does not create a permanent state of dependency.

The fifth group of tasks relate to the supranational links of the process of change within societies. The post-second-world-war experience has shown that societal change within a country is facilitated by strong enabling links both regional and international. The forging of such links and their nurturing and servicing has become an increasingly important task of public administration, particularly of those groups which are at the Centre. These links take the form of sub-regional co-operation groups, global co-operation groups of developing countries etc.

These thus are the five broad areas in which the tasks of public administration could be grouped. These are not necessarily disparate tasks. There are in many ways inter-related. The performance of these tasks calls for a variety of characteristics and skills in public administration which the following paragraphs seek to analyse.
4. **PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN 1980s AND BEYOND**

For the kind of role which is envisaged here, the developing countries would, above all, require public administrators who are sensitized to the new approach to the dynamic yet orderly management of societal change in terms of its objectives, strategies, constraints, and the measures to overcome such constraints. They would require to possess a comprehension of the nature of the delicate social balance in the society, particularly in the rural areas, which would be intervened in, by the attempts to formulate and implement change strategies. They should also possess the necessary sensitivity which would permit them to serve as effective channels for relevant feedback for decision making, so that they could act as an effective early warning system. Such sensitivity is necessary to avoid the possibility of bureaucratic judgement shaping the perception and the formulation of change-related problems.

The future development administrators would need to be weaned away from their excessive pre-occupation with stability and security. The development scene of the 1980s world call for debate and discussion which would enable participation in, and enhance the quality of, decision making. Debate is possible only if a bureaucracy is open to contradiction and is ready to permit countervailing opinion.

One of the biggest blocks in the development process is the failure of development administrators to recognize that there comes a point in the process at which its momentum cannot be maintained without the active, voluntary participation and initiative of its beneficiaries - an ability to recognize that development cannot, forever, be run from above. Such a recognition calls for a major shift in attitude - a shift from the traditional paternalistic bureaucratic attitude to an emancipatory attitude...
and an ability to develop self-restraint vis-a-vis the organizations of the people so that such organizations can gain momentum and grow on their own.

The changed character and nature of public administration that would be necessary to effectively manage the process of social change in the 1980s poses major challenges to public administration policy makers. There are implications in the new situation in terms of the structures, recruitment practices, training and professionalization and motivation of public administrators.

For example, when one looks at the civil service structure of the future one envisages a type of structure which veers more in the direction of flexibility rather than rigidity. The writer has serious misgivings as to whether the kind of "career service type structures" which have been a character of many of the developing countries since independence and before, would be relevant in the 1980s. The type of role specificity that many of the positions in public administration are likely to demand, point to the need for more specific recruitment for such roles and positions. There is also the possibility that many of the positions in the public administration systems are likely to be time specific, if one is to ensure that beneficiary organizations take over the self-management of their development efforts. The life-time career services which dot the scene today run counter to these needs, and may well become an impediment to the type of public administration structures that would be required in the future.

The public administration structures of the future would also call for an increasing degree of collegiality than hierarchy. The structures would need to emphasize a greater decentralization rather than centralization in decision making. The public administration systems of the 1980s should be characterized more by open structures than closed structures;
and structures which are more interactive than at present - interactive both within the civil services and with the beneficiaries outside.

In terms of recruitment practices, one of the major considerations would be the transitoriness of specific development programmes and projects which would again call for recruitment more for tasks and roles than for career services, thus enabling increased lateral entry for shorter tenures. Emphasis in recruitment to the civil services would have to be increasingly on beneficiary groups, and also more on local recruitment rather than countrywide recruitment. In the recruitment of public administrators, one would place greater emphasis on potentialities for management of social change rather than narrow technical skills.

In the area of training, the 1980s would call for greater emphasis on the deepening of the public administrators' understanding of the social processes inherent in the management of orderly change, rather than on the classical management tools and techniques. The training activities of the 1980s would need to be based more on empirical research within each specific society rather than on ready-made curricula imported from outside. Training would become more and more society specific. The training activities should also be geared to increasing the sensitivity of public administrators to societal aspirations and should encourage risk taking as well as provide the necessary skills for, and confidence in, the management of risk prone interventions for social change. The training should contribute more and more to behavioural changes in the civil service which would generate an openness in administrative organizations - an openness to criticism and countervailing opinion.
5. CONCLUSION

Thus, what one envisages for public administration in the developing countries for the 1980s and beyond is a qualitative change in terms of roles, tasks, capabilities and skills. In the past three and a half decades, the developing countries have sought to come to grips with the problems of orderly management of societal change through marginal reforms and changes to the public administration systems which they inherited at the time of independence. The hard lesson which we have learnt during this long period is that this was an inadequate approach. What was required was unconventional and radical changes in the public administration systems rather than conventional reforms.

Hence, one must recognize that the public administration systems of the 1980s cannot be mere linear projections of their colonial and immediate post-colonial predecessors.

During the past several years, particularly towards the end of the seventies, we have had a serious questioning of our public administration systems, both by the public of our countries as well as by the political decision makers. There has been increasing disenchantment that the public administration systems are an impeding factor in the management of societal change. Perhaps the only way of countering this disenchantment is to transform the character of public administration so that it becomes a relevant instrument of social change and development.

For this to happen, the developing societies require both open and continued discussion on this subject as well as groups of persons...
within the public administration systems who can detach themselves from the day-to-day management of these systems so that they could undertake objective reappraisals of the functioning of the systems and changes that are required. This calls for more and more policy oriented research by national public administration institutions in their respective public administration systems. Unfortunately, one does not see this to the extent that is required. It is to be hoped that this will be one of the first gaps to be filled in the Eighties.
5.1.2 Organization and Management of State and Administration

5.1.2.1 Course of Discussion

The working group identified its task as to undertake an attempt to design a systematic order of topics or an international and integrative conception on Organisation and Management of State and Administration. The process of work then started with collecting approaches that could be excluded from an intensive analysis in the following. There was soon consent that neither new models nor country reports would be helpful, and also a list of existing organizations and management types of the various policy areas would be desirable. A more positive agreement could be found on some of the necessary elements, which an article should comprise.

This was the need of the:

1. description of the vertical and horizontal structure of public administration
2. management functions and functional fields (finance, personnel, supply)
3. tasks, goals, and problems of administration related to instruments in the sense of standard instruments and standard solutions
4. processes and activities of administration
5. administrative reform and organisational change
6. human behaviour in public administration, including system-environment relations (as examples have been mentioned citizen-participation, accountability, and legitimation)
7. management techniques and technology
8. strategies to improve public administration
9. rational and irrational developments to be observed in public administration.

The group had to cope a lot with the term "state" in its title, and to define clear delimitations of the subject, was regarded as very difficult because
of the broadness of this side of the topic. There had been attempts to concentrate on the search of a core area, then on the formulation of border areas, and finally on the definition of main subjects. Some pairs of notions have been examined for this purpose, especially state and system, institution and organization, administration and bureaucracy, execution and implementation in their combination with management. But it seemed not to be possible to clarify sufficiently the interrelationships e.g. their classifications, to accept these terms as a really significant setting. Another direction of the discussion tried to use a historical view, in order to find the essentials. Generally accepted was the relevance of the history of public administration as well as the history of the theories of state in order to understand the concept and the dualism of the juxtaposition of 'public' and 'private'.

The interest of the discussion focused now on the differences between Public Management and Business Management as well as the transferability of techniques from one area to the other. The same question was applied to find characteristics for the separation of Public Administration and Public Management. In this respect the group did not accept any contribution in the sense of a result of the discussion. An agreement can be reported only about the interest of Organization and Management of State and Administration in the importance of organizational structures on policy program implementation in different policy areas in the sense of "impact". This was discussed also as important to find the borderline to neighboured disciplines and subject areas. At this stage of the discussion it came into the mind of the group, that the range of mentioned subjects covers not only the topic itself, but also the agenda of an Encyclopaedia as a whole and that there was inherent even a tendency to leave the "blurred" boundaries of public administration.

Nevertheless, the vision of labour was emphasized as a basic principle of modern social systems which forces to accept limitations and specializations. The time did not allow to examine, whether the agreement on the need of an internal systematization
requires a theoretical basis, a metatheory or could be done on a pluralistic basis.
In a last view the group looked back on the five papers presented for the discussion which juxtaposed normative, action-oriented systematising and cumulative approaches, and remembered also the agreement on the additional need of historical views for the field, and stated, that there was no integrative process of the whole in the discussion which could be presented as a result.
Neither the points of view of individual users of an encyclopaedia, nor the course of the discussion of the "community of public administration", or even that of an editor appeared to be a substitute to that. It could be stated as one result, that an integrative concept or a systematic order to the given topic is not yet visible.
1. The absence of a conceptual framework for integrating the different topics is not a problem for an encyclopaedia of public administration. There is till now no cohesive and integrative framework.

The contemporary "Public Administration" can be considered as the result of a cumulative process of different trends, situations, schools and disciplines.

An encyclopaedia must contain a variety of approaches and methodologies.

2. An encyclopaedia of public administration in the domain of management and organization must emphasize what is specific in managing government agencies. The field of public management which involves the integration, coordination and direction of all agency activities remain the poor relative of business management. Despite an incredible way of materials on management, the number of works specially oriented to public management is painfully limited (Eleanor Laudicina, Management is management, P.A.R., 1978).

It is important to explain why some management tasks and techniques do not have effect in public organizations and why sophisticated techniques as "operations research" have failed because the reduction of the complex reality into a model.

3. I consider public management and organization as a multi-disciplinary field of study. It has his roots in the scientific management, in political science, in sociology (bureaucratic system), in social psychology, in economics (cost, efficiency, accounting, public choice,...).
1. The jungle of concepts, theories, semantics in "management, organisation, public administration, public management......"

Management, organization, public administration are not only lacking precise definitions but too consensus on the theoretical underpinning of the respectively field of study and practice.

H. Koontz wrote an article on the management theory jungle and Dwight Waldo, Vincent Astrom and others have called the lack of a body of theory that dominates the field of public administration, a crisis of identity.

- Management is the art of getting things done through other people (Dale, 1969).

- Management is the art of getting things done through and with people in formaly organized groups (H. Koontz: The management theory jungle).

- Management is the art of bringing ends and means together. The art of purposeful action. Essentially, it is a process that contains three elements:
  - the selection of a goal;
  - the initiation of planned actions to reach it;
  - the continuous review of the effectiveness of the actions and the value of the goal.
Management deals not only with human and material resources but with morals, ethics, ideals, values.

- Management is the process of directing and facilitating the work of people organized in formal groups to achieve a desired goal. (J.O. Millet: Management in the public service. The quest for effective performance).

In the public service management must successfully function within the limits of purpose and procedure fixed by the political processes of government.

- According to Luther Gulick, administration has to do with getting things done with the accomplishment of defined objectives. (Administration has here the same meaning as management).

- Public administration is that part of the science of administration which has to do with government and thus concerns itself primarily with the executive branch where the work of government is done, though there are advisibly administrative problems also in connection with the legislative and the judicial branches. Public administration is thus a division of political science (Luther Gulick).
Management is the function concerned in the execution of policy, within the limits set up by administration. Administration is the function in industry concerned in the determination of policy, the coordination of finance, production and distribution, the settlement of the compass of the organization and the ultimate control of the executive. (Paul Meyer: Administrative organization, 1957, p. 31)

From the public administration point of view, it is important to know whether goal-setting or goal formulation is part or not of "management". If management is "getting things done", it is only execution of a policy and it does not include goal formulation.

1.1. Management as "execution of a given policy".

One of the pioneers in public administration, Woodrow Wilson, introduced the difference between politics and administration: the field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics.

He tried also to introduce the continental rationalized view of administration. Achieving greater efficiency in the execution of policy was one of the main objectives.

The main question was "How doing the things right. Right in the meaning of rationality and efficiency.

This traditional emphasis on efficiency was supported by the scientific management movement. The main claims of this movement were:
- systematic analysis of the work and the work processes in order to remove inconsistencies, errors, inefficiencies;
- by introducing the right methods of work analysis (as function description, analysis of work processes, time and motion studies) it is possible to discover the best utilization of the available resources, the best one way of doing a job;
- separation of planning from execution and functional specialization;
- use of standard in planning and control of work.

Fayol integrated these elements in a broader framework in a general theory of administration (= management). He worked out a new function: the administrative function. The administrative function (or management) consists of 5 activities:
- planning and forecasting (prévoir);
- organization (organiser);
- command (commander);
- coordination;
- control.
Fayol worked out 14 principles of organization which became later the "basic principles of organization": division of work, authority, discipline, unity of command, centralization, hierarchical chain of command, order, initiative, ....

It was Luther Gulick who later on formulated in the field of public administration the same management activities by the acronym POSDCORB, in which each letter denotes a standard activity of management: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting and budgeting. All this activities should be fulfilled in an organization to make it function effectively.

Luther Gulick developed too a set of principles for grouping or aggregating work units (specialization) in greater work structures as bureaus, divisions, departments: one can aggregate elementary activities on the basis of:

a) the purpose to be served (ministry of defense)
b) the process to be used (planning, execution, control)
c) clientele to be served
d) the place where activities will take place.

It is clear that this classical-mechanistic management movement reduced the organization problem to a problem of organization structure and to an efficient combination of production factors.

Max Weber formulated in this legal-rational organization type namely the bureaucracy, the same organization philosophy as the classical school: functional specialization, delimitation of competence spheres, hierarchical structure, rules and regulations, selection on the competence, promotion on the basis of merit.

Webers' ideal type of bureaucracy leads to the classic model of the merit civil service: the civil servant is a neutral a-political servant.

The characteristics of this first period are:

- If the field of administration is a field of business it is probably possible to apply the management and organization principles and methods of the private business in the execution.

- The primary of politics: goalsetting is normally the responsibility of the elected people.

- Maintaining political accountability during the execution:
  - programs and budgets fixed by law
  - rules and regulations fixed by law
  - an accounting office under the responsibility of the elected institutions
  - a civil service based on professional and technical skills.
1.2. Public administration and decision-making

The intervention of the state in the socio-economic sector puts the accent more and more on the quality of the decisions.

A well-known work on public administration, Sharkanky's *Public Administration: policy-making in government agencies*. This led to the introduction of "rational decision methods or problem-solving methods." The rational decision-making model can be formulated as a process with several phases or steps:

a) A search process to discover the needs;
b) The formulation of goals and objectives;
c) The formulation of alternatives to accomplish the goals;
d) The analysis and evaluation of these alternatives:
   - consequences
   - effectiveness of alternatives
   - efficiency of alternatives
   - cost and benefits
   - degree of risk;
e) Selection or decision rules
   - priority
   - selection criteria;
f) Decision;
g) Implementation;
h) Evaluation;

Critics of the rational decision model underline
   - the difficulty to determine the goals;
   - impossibility to know
     - all possible alternatives
     - all consequences
   - that decision-making is a political process and thus a mixing of bargaining, power and influence.

In spite of the critics the number of policy analysts has grown and all levels of government (federal, state, local) and the number of graduate programs in public policy, policy analysis has grown too. Planning, programming, budgeting seeks a greater rationality by clarifying systematically the choice of means and goals: through a multi-year planning process and through a comprehensive approach by constructing programs across existing organizational units, divisions, departments. This comprehensive approach completed by the analysis of cost and benefits makes an efficient and effective allocation of resources possible.

One of the problem is that planning (as a process of policy formulation) has always been confused with the decision-making process.

The policy formation process as a systematic preparation of decisions is based on other methods and techniques than the decision-making process. Policy formation needs more social and economic research methods as:
- analysis of needs and volves;
- survey research;
- social indicators;
- formulation of goals;
- costs and benefits.

A decision-making process asks questions as:
- centralisation or decentralisation of the decision;
- who is competent during the process for taking decisions;
- who is responsible for the bargaining;
- who must participate in the decision-making.

1.3. Public administration (a management) as organizing

An organization can be analysed as

a) an organization structure;
b) a process of conversion that transforms inputs into outputs;
c) culture or a system of human behaviour;
d) an open system in relation with an environment.

a) organization structure
- formal organization structure
  - line, functional, staff
  - horizontal organization structure
  - matrix-project organization
  - organization of government and government agencies
  - departmentalization
  - advisory committee
  - staff
- theories on national design

b) process or the how of getting things done
- analysis of work processes systems, procedures, methods, standardization of work
- work distribution charts
- flow charts
- work simplification
- work sampling - multi-moment
- search for work-standards
- monitoring and auditing the workprocess
- use of computers and micro-electronics in the office

c) organization as a system of human behaviour
- mechanistic versus organistic thinking
- human relations
- x versus y theory
- motivation of people
  - job rotation
  - job enrichment
  - job enlargement
  - socio-technique
  - small groups
- group structure
  - working with groups
  - group behaviour
  - group theory
- leadership
  - leadership style
  - leadership theories
- organizational change
  - planned change
  - innovation
  - administrative reform

d) organization as an ecological system
  - open versus closed organization
  - organization structure and the environment
    - horizontal-vertical differentiation in function of the environment (stability-homogeneous)
    - the contingency theory

e) bureaucracy
The combination of the organization principles as functional specialization-hierarchy - with expertise and professional skill of the organization members led to an neutral, a political instrument through which a given goal or objective can be reached.

The control of the behaviour of the members of the organization is realised by written rules and regulations.

The weberian bureaucracy reinforced the civil service system based on a career system, on merit and on security of tenure. It is now accepted that the bureaucratic model described by Weber is ineffective in face of the complexity, uncertainty and the rate of change in the environment (see W. Bennis, M. Crozier).

f) organizational change and organization development
Organizational development is a planned systematic process in which applied behavioural science principles and practices are introduced into an ongoing organization toward the goals of effecting organization improvement, greater organizational competence and greater organizational effectiveness.

1.4. Management as an integrated system
2. General survey and systematic order of administrative topics from the viewpoint of organization and management of state and administration

1. General overview of management and organization problems in public organizations

1.1. Differences and similarities between management in public organizations and private enterprises:
   - characteristics of public management integrated in a political system;
   - the question of transferability in management techniques.

1.2. History and growth of the public administration field:
   - relationship between major changes in the society and the application of well determined management systems
     F.ex.:
     - scientific management techniques and separation of politics - administration
     - bureaucracy and the institution of a permanent civil service system

2. Management functions
   (static-description of what managers has to do, classic functions (Fayol-Gulick).
   - planning (forecasting, policy formulation, policy-analysis)
   - organization
   - command
   - coordination
   - control

2.1. Description of these functions (what to do)

2.2. Evolution of these functions.

3. Organization
   See 1.3. organization
   + description of existing administrative structures and the organizational rationale of the organization of the machinery of government.

4. Communication
   - communication in organizations
   - communication networks

5. Functional management fields
   (management of input ressources)

5.1. Financial management
   - the budget system as management tool

5.2. Personnel management
   - manpower planning
   - manpower inventory
   - manpower acquisition: - recruitment
   - selection
- career planning (promotions management)
- development and training
- evaluation and merit-rating
- manpower auditing

5.3. Purchasing and supply management

6. Management methods and techniques

Classified following in the policy-process

1. Problems-
discovering
goals
evaluation
alternatives

- systematic study of public wants and demands (citizen survey,......)
- problem solving
- delphi and cross impact
- creative techniques (brain storming)
- management by objectives
- goalsetting
- cost-benefit analysis
- cost-effectiveness analysis
- planning programming budgeting
- zero budgeting
- investment analysis
- financial analysis
- planning
- gaming
- manpower planning
- decision tree

2. Implementation

- delegation
- follow-up procedures and scheduling
- reporting
- network analysis
- network planning
- critical path method
- organization techniques and organizing (see 1.3. organization)
- operation research (queueing theory - waiting lines, transport problems)
- models and simulation
- PERT, network planning, critical path method
- productivity programs

3. Evaluation
and control

- auditing techniques
- financial auditing
- performance auditing
- evaluation of programs
- before vs. after program comparison
- with and without comparisons
- comparisons planned vs. actual performance
- evaluation of outputs (efficiency) vs. outcomes (effectiveness).
Thirty years ago, a systematic order of administrative topics for the subject Organization and Management of State and Administration might have been fairly easy to specify. Up-to-date thought in 1951 would have understood organization of the state to refer mainly to the way the national territory was divided for governmental purposes: the constitutional form and major tasks of the central or federal executive, and of the provincial or regional organs; the pattern of further sub-division into counties, cities, rural districts and villages, with the distribution of responsibility for major services and regulatory duties. The place of autonomous boards and agencies outside the regular framework would have been somewhat nervously argued, as would the constitutional problems of the spread of state enterprise.

On the more theoretical side, there might have been discussion of the forms of regionalism and regionalization, the advantages and disadvantages of centralization, decentralization, deconcentration, delegation. The theory and justification of local self-government as contrasted with decentralised administration might have appeared prominently.

Under management of the state there would have been subsumed topics on legislative, executive, judicial and financial control by the national political organs over the central administrative organs, and by the central administration over subordinate bodies; description of the taxation system national and local, of internal police and law enforcement, of various types of inspectorate and regulatory procedure; discussion, perhaps, of the 'new' problems of town and country planning, and of the 'intervention' of the state in the economy.

Organization of the administration would have covered topics describing the number of central ministries and the distribution of tasks among them, and the internal structures of typical departments; with similar attention given to the internal structuring of administrative organs at regional and local levels. There would probably have been much space given to theoretical discussion of the purposes and requisites of 'organization' as a task in itself (the usage 'an organization', the generic label for a corporate person, was not then current); and very recent work on the common features of 'large-scale organization' would have been reported. Although avant-garde critique of the approach might also have featured, most discussion of the 'principles of organization' or of departmentalization would be based on Gulick's (1937) schema.

* I am grateful to Christopher Hood for valuable comments. Apologies are necessary for the eurocentrism, indeed anglocentrism, of this paper.
of grouping by function, by process, by clientele or by area. Attention would have been given to the place of committees in administration, and to the problems of locating expertise and professional skills.

The fourth batch of topics, under management of the administration, would have included accounts of the roles of the finance department and central staffing agency, the different types of public official, their recruitment, training, and discipline; the methods of control of the acts of officials, and systems of complaint and appeal by citizens. Discussion of 'bureaucracy' would have been mainly in the nineteenth-century pre-Weberian senses of the word.

In 1961, twenty years ago, an up-to-date Encyclopaedia would still have been concerned under this general heading of Organization and Management of State and Administration with many of the same topics, but less influenced by constitutionalism, and by 'scientific management', than by the rise of comparative administration and of sociology, social psychology and social anthropology; less talk of 'principles', more of history and circumstance; less of 'organization' and more of 'formal organizations'; still 'span of control' and 'staff and lines', but also tall, flat, and parallel hierarchies; still styles of leadership, but also of 'working groups'; still centralization and decentralization, but in terms of 'communication problems', and also of power. Discussion of local government would have been dominated by the 'metropolitan area' problem and boundaries.

Ten years later, by 1971, the emphasis would have been on coordination, reorganization and administrative reform; national and regional planning; large-scale refashioning of central 'machinery of government', revitalising of regional authorities, restructuring of local government, including in some countries reorganization of police, fire, health, welfare, and water services. On the management side, basic rethinking also on budgeting systems, 'value-for-money' accounting, reform of national and local tax systems, fundamental review of civil service groupings and training, rising clamour for 'open government', anguish about control of the mass media, a new group of topics in welfare administration, rights, and 'access'; and concern over the growing political and interest group penetration of civil service procedures. In local government, the recognition of the 'inner city' problem, poverty and minorities, pollution.

Thus any 'systematic order' in this field (and perhaps any other) will be only partly a matter of the logic of the subject, partly a matter of history and fashion.

What of 1981?

From a writing-desk in Britain today, certainly, and also perhaps in the United States, one historical circumstance dominates thought about public administration: fiscal crisis, cuts, retrenchment. With that clue, using hindsight, the period from the early fifties to the late sixties can be seen to have been a period of steady
government growth, the problems those of organizing and managing expansion; multiplication of agencies and programmes, coordination, planning. The later sixties to mid-seventies were a period of relative standstill; and hence, perhaps, of reorganizations, mergers, consolidation, review, improvement. Since the later seventies, an undoubted contraction - not only an "end to growth", but a drastic reduction in real resources available to public administration - has been taking place.

The causes of this cycle are well outside the scope of this paper; and the effects of the current phase (if it is a phase) on thinking about Organization and Management of State and Administration are not yet clear. Let me return to that theme.

Causo, effect, or simple accompaniment of this historical trend, there are perhaps three important movements of thought in the late 1970s to be noted. The first is the spreading critical appraisal of the role of the state; which on the Left speaks of a crisis of legitimation, and on the Right of "getting government off the backs of the people". Both join in the attack on "bureaucracy". The second movement of thought imagines the 'rationality' of earlier orthodoxy in Public Administration writing, rejects its pseudo-technical claims, and politicizes appreciation of public administration generally. The third group of ideas dissolves the clarity of the separation of 'public' and 'private' in earlier thinking, questions the usefulness of the state/non-state distinction, and takes a more holistic view of society and its processes.

I shall devote a few paragraphs to each, and then attempt an appraisal of the impact they should have on a 'systematic order of topics' for the 1980s.

Crisis of legitimation

The phrase is ascribed to Jürgen Habermas, who has been associated with the names of Marcuse, Adorno and others in the 'Frankfurt School' of critical theory. It is neo-Marxist in inspiration and has both a longer history and broader aims than need be alluded to here. But it does not have to be Marxist, or even to have been strongly influenced by critical theory, to recognise that in large parts of the world, whether or not there is a crisis of legitimacy of the state as such, there is something of the sort in respect of the administration of the state. It is not only that civil servants "get a bad press" and have in country after country lost the confidence of the ordinary citizen (that has been a perennial theme throughout history), but that they have lost confidence in themselves; not only that 'bureaucracy' in any of its senses is seen as 'a bad thing' (that, too, is old), but that bureaucrats themselves seem conscious of approaching a threshold when the method will cease to be able to cope, as if rational-legal mechanisms had been found not to be infinitely extensible. So 'alternatives to bureaucracy' are canvassed both from the liberal and radical Left, and also, increasingly, from the liberal and radical Right.
These alternatives take three broad forms: a variant of the 'small is beautiful' thesis, where public provision with a high welfare content has somehow to be reconciled with extreme decentralization, by means of community or peer-group pressures; a 'return to the market', whereby the political organization and management of public services is replaced by consumer choice and price mechanisms, as in 'voucher' schemes for allocation of resources in the public education system, or straight 'privatisation', as in current proposals for denationalization of profitable parts of public enterprises in Britain: and, thirdly, 'the withdrawal of the state', seen in the abandonment of 'food stamps' and other care programs in USA, on the 'demand side', and on the 'supply side', Proposition 13 and similar tax-cut moves by the Reagan Administration and Congress. (The three-fold typology of methods of social control, identifying hierarchical, market, and 'solidarity' or community-pressure types, is in increasing use among administrative theorists.)

In a somewhat subtle intellectualized manifestation, the very title of the paper allotted to me for this Workshop would in the eyes of some critics be 'not legitimate' - deriving from a complacent centralist perspective that distorts reality and inhibits a true perception of the pattern of public administration, by taking it for granted that the state is organized and managed, from the centre, or 'from the top down'.

For is this reaction necessarily inspired by regional or local passions, or by anticapitalist conspiracy theories, or by 'back to the land' hippy romanticism, or the fear of Orwellian 'Big Brother', or by the assertion of the inefficiency of uniformity, or the undesirability and unworkability of any rational central control model - though all of these currents of thought can be found in the decade, and might share the reaction. But the reaction can also be found among perfectly respectable academic researchers, whose criticism of the 'top-down model' as a description of reality stems from a purely intellectual appraisal of the supreme importance in the areas they have studied of the operational or 'coal-face' end of governmental activity; leading to a wish to correct the conventional understanding of a bureaucratic hierarchy energised and given meaning at the summit, authority trickling down to the robot fingers of front-line functionaries.

The alternative understanding (the 'bottom-up' model) stresses that it is at the interface between government and citizen or client, or in yet another metaphor, at 'street level', where alone policy 'bites' and has effect; and that (though here I trespass on another paper's ground) there is much to support the thesis that policy 'mutates' at the street-level to adapt to the environment in which it must survive.

Post-Weberian scholarship on bureaucracy has been a sizeable industry since the 1950s, but one element of the Weberian model gave it its central value: the impartiality of the office holder, acting sine iure as studio, operating objective rules, for no other reward than
an official salary. Regime after regime might be shown not to come up to this ideal, but ideal it remained. Commentators might say that what such countries needed was not less bureaucracy but more - meaning, more civil servants imbued with these Weberian characteristics. Radical critics noted, of course, that this Weberian standard of absolute impartiality was misleading fiction: what actual bureaucrats do is defend the values that are dominant in the society they are administering. In the early 1970s some went beyond this, and in the relatively brief flowering in America of the movement known as the New Public Administration put forward the proposition that public officials should always act so as to defend the rights of the dominated rather than the dominant groups, to redress imbalances in society and not reinforce them: administration should not be impartial, but redistributive.

Another current running counter to the Weberian axioms is 'public service syndicalism' - the growing tendency of public service trades unions not only to impose an 'industrial relations' style of bargaining over wages and conditions, making the whole 'public service ideal' and making public office just another job; but further, to use collective strength to demand consultation over policies that may affect working conditions, to hold up the introduction of new methods, and to protest against 'cuts'. Public servants, like other workers, want more 'control over the job', and are often in a better position than other workers to acquire it, simply because of the nature of bureaucratic work. The civil service and local government service unions in Britain are the largest 'white collar unions', and are all affiliated to the TUC.

The implications for the Encyclopaedia of these 'crisis of legitimation' views - alternatives to bureaucracy, bottom-up perspectives, counter-authority values, and public service syndicalism - will be considered along with those of the other two movements of thought in the fifth section of the paper.

Critique of pseudo-rationality

The 'counter culture' writings of the 1960s attacked science and scientific method itself, as a legitimate way of knowing. Critics within Public Administration had a less virulent project: to expose the presumption of technical rationality, the ground-belong of earlier writers that the organizing of administrative activities is a species of expertise that can be described and discussed in its own terms, as engineers might discuss the requisite structure of a bridge: a set of problems to be solved by the application of professional or craft knowledge and skills to the specific circumstances of a particular case. The contrary assertion, not briefly, is that not only are administrative bridges constantly falling down, as it were, but public administration variables can be shown all to be functions of political, economic, or social variables, and in no real sense autonomous or independent.

There are several routes into the explication of this. The earliest and simplest was the denial of the so-called 'politics/administration
dichotomy'. There is not something called 'policy' or 'politics' which is made by mighty and emotional ephemeral people called politicians, and something distinct called 'administration' or 'execution' which is done by cool, rational permanent people ('in white coats') called officials or administrators: instead, there is a 'seamless web' of policy and administration. This is by now a sterile and futile argument, with the sound of grinding axes on both sides. The politics/administration dichotomy was invented to outflank the specifics system of party appointments to departmental posts in U.S., and successfully used in that struggle. But for serious theoretical discussion the terms have to be more carefully specified, whether for assertion or denial.

A second kind of 'exposure' was popularized by a number of American economists writing about bureaucracy in the late 1960s and early 1970s, drawing attention to the 'producer-interest' within government agencies. Explanations of many aspects of bureaucratic structure and functioning, and also of the policies adopted by ministers and governments, were to be found not in 'rational' techniques of administration and decision-making, but in the self-regarding tactics of individual officials and groups acting as an 'economic man' model would predict: selecting what their superiors should be told, suitably 'interpreting' instructions, and behaving differently if required to 'find their salaries' from user charges than if funded wholly from taxation. The political science parallel to this in Britain, much older than the 1970s (indeed, going back to the root meaning of 'bureaucracy') but fuelled in that decade by a spate of speeches and books by ex-Cabinet Ministers, is the debate about the power of the 'mandarins' over their political chiefs - now eponymised (and to a certain extent defused) by a brilliant television comedy series 'Yes, Minister'.

Another route that can be taken is to examine 'administrative reform', a powerful movement with its modern antecedents in the American 1930s, which has brought forth a great many official reports after such investigation and research, both in the advanced industrial countries and in the developing countries through 'technical assistance' agencies, with a corresponding flood of academic texts, and which still has many practitioners today. One facet of this movement is specifically about administrative organization, and like comparable doctrines in business administration, may be said to rest on 'the structure/performance hypothesis': that is to say, the assumption that the quantity or quality of the output of an organization is affected by the order and arrangement of its parts or processes. In terms of the layout of manufacturing processes, this hypothesis is well enough supported: 'administrative reform' is the search for an application to management and command structures in public administration.

Even in the business administration field, after decades of heavy expenditure on research, quite little in the way of conclusive findings has emerged: organisation theory's cash value is still quite small. In the public administration field, it is smaller. For all the shelves of officially-commissioned reorganisation reports around the world, we still (with one possible exception)
have no definitive evaluation studies showing that a structural change in government administrative machinery produced the effects it was designed to produce. (The possible exception concerns the studies done of city-manager cities in the USA, after the first major administrative reform campaign.)

The burden of academic comment in evaluation of administrative reform exercises leaves a different impression: that in many cases, the reform itself was what was desired, any results being secondary - change was its own goal, being seen to be doing something about present evils the prime objective. Sometimes, chosen directions of administrative change could be expected to generate non-administrative benefits for the managers of change; or the ideological values of the reform (e.g. 'bringing in business method') were all the justification required. It might be assumed that greater economy or effectiveness must follow such reforms: it is usually quite difficult to test whether they do or not, but in any case the attempt is seldom made. Those who pushed through the reforms have lost interest, or may not actually want their prescriptions put to the proof.

The fourth route into the attack on 'rationality' is to consider the apparent assumption that to explain what goes on in public administration generally, or inside a particular unit, what you need to know is the formal system of categories and classifications which lay down the legal powers and responsibilities of the various units or sections, and the formal communication of reports and information and commands that pass between them. The alternative approach is to discard categories, to view each unit of public administration as in principle unique and sui generis, and then look for the de facto influences upon its behaviour, the actual communications it enters into, the bargains it strikes, and so on: then, if appropriate, see what empirical patterns of similarities, frequencies of interaction and the like emerge. This, of course, is not intended as a programme of research, but a statement of viewpoint - sometimes called the 'interorganisational perspective'.

Thus, to take an example, a local government unit is, certainly, on the end of a chain of central-local relationships; but it is also a focus of the 'miniature political system' of that town or district perhaps the most important focus, perhaps not. The town (if we suppose it a town) has its own history and configuration of economic, social, geographic and other parameters, its own set of church, business, cultural, youth and other associations, its own perceptions of its corporate status, etc. It has local parties, it elects members of parliament, it has its degree of political pull - which may feed back into the chain of central-local relations. Town officials have their own power positions, they can form alliances and mobilise connections in other towns, or in professional networks, multinational companies, regional community associations, and so on: they are people with whom central officials have to negotiate, exchange bargains, reach compromises.

It is not wholly different as between headquarters and field offices of a single ministry, or as between the levels of the bureaucratic hierarchy. 'Rational' assumptions about relationships within public administration do not have great predictive power.
State and non-state

The third intellectual challenge to the conceptual framework implicit in my title is a challenge to the assumption of a clear boundary between what is 'state' and what is 'non-state' in organization and management, that one can describe public administration and confine one's interest within that.

There is a sense in which one is and must be able to do this. There are questions of ownership of property, or of employment status, or of rights in litigation and so on, where it cannot be left in doubt whether an item is in the public domain or outside it. But for many contemporary concerns of administrative scholars, the boundary is seen as a distraction and an irrelevance.

In analysing the formulation and working of many sectoral policies of government - for example, economic planning, industrial policy, health, education, and welfare, housing, pollution control, and many others - the significant circumscription turns out to be not around the several public servants concerned, but around 'the policy community'. This comprises all those who may expect to be in regular contact with one another in the development of an initiative or the implementation of a programme. It is not, of course, a formal body, it is an abstract notion; but the officials, businessmen, academics, spokesmen of various interests, who make it up would have little difficulty in delineating it, and in agreeing that it is what matters in explaining policy and its execution.

The policy community is sometimes concretized to some extent by the formation of a consultative committee or advisory council, to 'launder' the activity of lobbies, trade associations, trade unions and so on. Sometimes an association is fostered into life by government, for the purpose of being given state work to do, with or without state funds. Such 'fringe bodies' of central administration have been around in Europe and USA for some time, but research into them is relatively recent. (The category acronym, derived from 'quasi-non-govermental body', is quango in Britain, and 'quango-hunting' has become a Conservative blood-sport, under the illusion that they are nothing but wasteful 'empire-building'.) In more serious vein, the close relationship of officials, employers and labour in the economic planning policy community structures has been given the label 'neo-corporatism', and attacked by bypassing parliamentary procedures. Similarly, it is standard criticism of institutionalised contacts between public servants in regulatory departments and the industries they are supposed to be regulating, that the bureaucrats are 'captured' or 'co-opted' by the clients and hence unable to perform their functions. Institutionalised traffic across the state/non-state boundary is heavy, and this perhaps ought to lead us to redefine 'the organization and management of the state'.

A similar invention to the notion of the policy community is that of the 'delivery system'. Government policy has to be got to the 'front line', and then 'delivered' to the client; scholars are
interested in the 'transmission' of policy, in the choice of policy instrument, and in the conditions for compliance by clients or target population. The study of this process follows where it leads - in and out of organisational boundaries, across the state/non-state frontier and back again if that is the way it is. The study of 'access' to governmental provision is of the same genre as is analysis of 'collection' systems - income tax deducted by the employer, VAT arrangements, the acquisition of data and information of all sorts by government. To investigate the management of the state by such means, one has to focus on the structure of the process, ignoring the structure of the agencies involved. A good deal of contemporary public administration research is of this breed.

A feature of these approaches is that the portrayal of the model on which they rely cannot be done through conventional pyramidal imagery, as with hierarchies of various kinds: they must use 'network' imagery. The interorganisational perspective lends itself to an emphasis on communications and exchanges, negotiating and bargaining; its obscures the command and accountability nexus. The pyramid imagery falsifies political relationships. Neither mode of representation satisfactorily portrays all the aspects of the relationship between one state organ and another, or between a state body and a non-state body.

Analysis

The question is, how are these currents of thought of the 1970s to be understood? Do they invalidate the older ways of thinking about public administration, and replace them by a new, coherent alternative outlook - a successor paradigm? or do they each have a distinct ontology, each providing a vital gloss on older approaches, but not supplanting them?

When contrasting more recent appreciations of some phenomenon with older appreciations, it is always salutary to consider whether the phenomena appreciated are indeed the same. Public administration in 1951, it may be, was well enough understood by the approaches then current, because that was what it was really like; whereas public administration in 1981 is a different animal altogether, and so needs other models for its understanding. Once stated, this is an obvious truth. But altogether different?

Two historical developments of the period 1951-1981 are relevant: the field of public administration has grown, and grown in some sectors more than others; two, not only lawyers and constitutional theorists, but now a large variety of scholars trained in sociology, social psychology, economics, and such also, take an interest in the study of public administration. The two things are connected. There may be a third, independent, development: increase in politicisation as such, connected with the general spread of education, great ease of communication and travel, and consequent recognition of gaps between expectations and experience.
Given overall growth, the pattern of government employment in the post-war period in most Western countries has been one of relative decline in traditional functions of the state (defence, law and order, revenue collection), and enormous expansion in the social services. In Britain, the central government civil service has not increased in total during this period (though there have been some shifts within the total). The great growth in personnel has taken place in local government and in the national health service.

What this means is that there has been a 'quantum jump' in the size of the 'front line', the 'street level', the 'coal face' and other such metaphors for the area of contact between the state and citizen. This has broadened the base of hierarchies, and in the case of the 'social welfare industry' in particular, staffed the base with many workers who, if not quite professionals, often share something of the divided loyalties of the professional in a bureaucracy; both factors tending to institutionalise the gap in comprehension between the 'courtiers' at the policy centre and the delivery-specifiers at the operational end, and also reinforcing anti-hierarchy attitudes and public service syndicalism.

Such a change in the phenomena was bound to trigger a change in the epiphenomena, and several new academic disciplines (social administration, urban studies, policy studies, etc.) with university chairs and research institutes quite distinct from those involved in the training of social workers, health administrators and so on, responded to this rich cornucopia of new material. It is not surprising that many found the existing theoretical models, formulated to explain a rather different set of puzzles, unable to cope with the observations they were making and brought to bear on other models, drawn from the disciplines in which they had been trained.

Hence the emergence of the 'bottom-up perspective', the emphasis on implementation and delivery systems, to some extent the revision of central-local relations theory and the highlighting of the political-system nexus. It has to be said, however, that most of this innovatory research was precisely in these 'modern' sectors; whether a similar volume of research in the 'old-fashioned' policy sectors, like law and order, would find the conventional models equally lacking in explanatory power is not possible to say.

Something similar applies to the notion of 'policy community', and other models which dissolve the state/non-state or public/private boundary. If a researcher sets out to research policy making and implementation in a particular policy field, mapping organisational networks and communications flows, he or she will of course find a 'system', defined by a marked difference between the frequency and volume of interactions among the units of the set and the frequency and volume of interactions between units of the set and units outside it; and this system can then be called the policy community. But any system is 'in the eye of the beholder'; and someone interested in government-wide policy...
(rather than sectoral or policy-field policy) will perform designate a different system which may not cross the public/private line.

Again, the explanatory-value of an interorganizational approach or political-system approach to the phenomena of central coordination and control may be lower under a unitary constitution with an effective Cabinet and powerful Treasury than it is under a federal constitution with a weak executive and powerful regional or local units. Though the application of these newer approaches may well enormously illuminate some features of the relationship even in the former instance, the older models retain a measure of validity. Newer insights are greatly to be welcomed; but they do not necessarily supplant conventional understandings altogether, for the 'animal' being studied has not altogether changed.

What of 'rationality'? Let us distinguish three forms of the attack: one, that the assumptions about bureaucratic form and process that are built into the Weberian ideal-type and the traditional descriptions of public administration are unrealistic - modern purposive organizations do not and cannot work in that way; two, that the presumptions of academic 'experts' who purported to prescribe how organizations or whole governments should be constructed and operated, on the basis of a meretricious spurious sham-science or pseudo-technique, have to be exposed; three, that the pursuit of 'rationality' through organizational process is entirely chimerical.

Leaving aside the possibility that the Weberian and other stereotypes were a closer fit to the reality of their day than they are to the reality of today, surely contributions to the fuller understanding of the kind of thing that goes on (or contingently 'must' go on) in a 'typical' government agency, from economists who highlight the 'producer interest', or psychologists who draw attention to cognitive and communications problems, or from others who concentrate on bureaucratic politics or organizational analysis or whatever, can only be welcomed. There seems less and less need to continue bouncing such ideas off the now-venerable 'Weberian rational model', or indeed against 'rationality' at all. Often, though, the 'rational model' with which some version of reality is being compared is not an earlier explanatory theory (to be superseded), but a normative model of how it is (perhaps subliminally) felt public service agencies ought to be - as if only 'rationality' legitimises bureaucracy, or 'public' administration.

It is, for example, built into the British Constitution that politics or policy making and execution or carrying out of policy are separable entities, institutionalised into two distinct sets of public persons, of which one set is expendable and the other set is not. If this legal and theoretical distinction cannot be validly expressed by a 'politics/administration dichotomy', then some other phrase must be found to express it. The normative force of the words is in this case much stronger than the descriptive force.
Similarly, the dichotomy is designed into the 'hiving-off' during the 1970s of several parts of the former Department of Employment into non-ministerial agencies such as the Manpower Services Commission and the Health and Safety Executive, or into the creation of the Property Services Agency and the Procurement Services Agency out of other Ministries. If the words actually used by those responsible for such changes cannot be made to carry the weight laid on them, some other words must be put into their mouths.

About the pseudo-science, the less said the better. Perhaps, indeed, all claims to organizational 'rationality' are spurious, the objective a chimera. It will depend, of course, on the precise meaning to be given to 'rational': in this discussion, we have been giving it the sense of 'means/end logic', or the consensual information-rich problem-solving mode (as compared with bargaining, coalition-constructing or coercive-violence ways out of difficulties).

Those who equate all talk of 'rational' problem-solving with the maintenance of the status quo power distribution and wish to see that altered, will find a 'rational' bureaucracy the least desirable kind. But they can legitimately be asked what kind of organizational process they would expect to find under a regime of their choosing. Those who see the requisite consensus on objectives, or the requisite cognitive capacities, or the requisite anything else, as simply unattainable in human organization, can legitimately be asked whether the unattainable ideal is nevertheless necessary in order to give a direction to aim in, a standard for comparison, a measuring rod. Perhaps there never was a truly healthy human person, but we would find it inconvenient to do without the concept of health. It may be the same with public administration and 'rationality'. It is a normative concept, and is simply not meant to be a descriptive one.

Conclusion

The end of growth and the arrival of the all-pervading climate of retrenchment has begun to concentrate minds wonderfully on questions of this kind. We have had thirty years of the opposite - an all-pervading climate of growth and expansion - and many of our basic assumptions are rooted in that experience. Articles and books are appearing on cutback management, on cash limits and volume contraction, on sunset legislation and policy termination, on decrementalism versus quantum cuts, on demographic escalators and on whether governments can go bankrupt. It is a new kind of problem for practically everyone currently active in public administration.

It does not appear that the movements of thought discussed in this paper are connected with retrenchment; they are if anything the concomitants of earlier growth. But it is an interesting question whether retrenchment is likely to exacerbate the trends of the 1970s - revealing ever more sharply the nature of public
administration as an arena of power-politics rather than of rational problem-solving, bringing out more clearly the importance of the 'producer interest' in bureaucratic decision-making, highlighting the interrelatedness of public/private or state/non-state bodies; or whether these trends will as it were go into reverse, as financial pressures impose hard-nosed 'rational' management of resources, financial centralization proves the realism of the discredited 'top-down model'. Fiscal stress emboldens government to simply outface civil service union 'syndicalism', 'supply-side' pressures reassert a clear boundary between state and non-state fields of action. So far, there is evidence for either view.

Here we are seeing three perspectives interacting, which superficially we can identify as 'top-down', 'bottom-up', and 'before-after'. But neither 'top-down' nor 'bottom-up' adequately describes the distinctions we have found (certainly, the one is not just the mirror-image of the other). Rather, a primary emphasis on legal and formal administrative structure is complemented by an emphasis on administrative process, and set against the backdrop of environmental change: law and constitutional theory are supported by politics and sociology, and by contemporary history; a habit of thinking in pyramidal imagery is infiltrated by a set of ideas that can better be portrayed on a network or sun-and-planets imagery, and either has to be shown as a longitudinal series through time.

My suggested systematic order of administrative topics for the subject Organisation and Management of State and Administration, which is appended, is based on the recognition of these three necessary dimensions of the subject, which we can call Administrative Order, Administrative Process, and Administrative Trends. Room ought also to be found for comparative studies (cross-national, interorganisational, and other), and for research methodology studies; but possibly not in relation to this subject area alone.

The emphasis among administrative theorists at the moment is shifting very markedly from Order to Process, in these terms. The 1970s saw a growing interest in implementation and evaluation (the 'requisite feedback' influence on rational policy making). The 1980s are seeing a focus on choice of policy instruments - the tools, weapons, bags of tricks which government can employ in translating intention into effects; with growing consensus that these are of four or five broad kinds only - for example, direct labour (government do-it-yourself), regulation-with-coercive-sanction, money-moving, and propaganda (labels differ). Attention is also being paid to the 'surveillance' processes of modern administration; more neutrally, the methods of gathering information, storing it, and utilising it (particularly the consequences of the computer revolution and the micro-chip) - often, here, in the context of 'citizen rights' rather than rational policy making. Attempts to produce taxonomies of instruments and intentions/conditions/concomitants etc. are under way - again under 'rationalist' assumptions.

One of the notable aspects of these studies of Process is the vigour and confidence with which cultural, linguistic and regime differences are laid aside - which echoes the spirit of the theorists of Administrative Order a generation ago. Perhaps the cycle from new simplicity to weary complexity begins again: the necessary condition of life, renewal, discovery, progress, and hope.
The following scheme of topics is not intended as exhaustive, but illustrative only.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ORDER**

**Constitution of the state**

- Central/federal organs
  - "machinery of government"
  - ministries
  - non-ministerial agencies
  - state enterprises
  - quasi-non-state agencies
  - principles
    - centralization/decentralization
    - departmentalization
    - accountability/incentive
    - field-HQ relations
  - types of state officials
  - sociology of public servants

- Regional/provincial organs
  - "machinery"
  - division of functions
  - principles
    - regionalism/regionalization
    - deconcentration
  - centre-region relations

- Local/municipal organs
  - division of functions
  - principles
    - theory of local self-government
  - boundary problems
  - inner city problems

- Central-local relations
  - "machinery" and institutions

**Internal configuration of bureaucratic agencies**

- monocratic versus collegiate forms
- bureaucratic structure
  - type of hierarchy (tall, flat, etc.)
  - span of control
  - specialist/generalist

**Alternatives to bureaucratic organization**

- Hierarchy/market/solidarity models
ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS

Interactions with political organs

Political-system appreciation of Administrative Order
Policy community appreciation of policy formulation
Cabinet and non-Cabinet executives
Minister/civil servant relations
Formal reporting and accountability
Forms of budget and budgetary control
bureaucratic politics

Interactions with clients and target groups

Resource collection and management
Revenue
taxation systems
evaluation and review
charges, fines etc
borrowing, lending
Information
census and registration
surveillance and policing
storage, security
control of computerised records
"open government"

Policy implementation
Direct labour instruments
public enterprise
public works
custodial and 'people-changing'
goods and services delivery programmes

Regulation
prohibitions, performance rules
licenses, permits
inspection, enforcement

Money-moving
cash benefit services
grants, subsidies
financial incentives
money market operations

Propaganda
information, advice, persuasion
media management

Client and target reactions/feedback
Ergonomic and economic compliance systems
Street-level access, queues, and negative queues
Complaints and appeals

Policy Evaluation

Internal processes of bureaucratic agencies

Staffing
Recruitment and training
Superior-subordinate relations
styles of leadership
incentives, motivation
cognitive hierarchy
distribution of knowledge and skills
Programming and coordination
Programming and coordination
  design of performance programmes
  communications
  trouble shooting
Procedural controls
  quality, quantity and tolerances
  financial and budgetary
  legal and contractual
Alternative internal processes
  participation
  collective self-management
  producer-interest models

ADMINISTRATIVE TRENDS

Growth/retrenchment in size of government/public sector
  Differential areas of growth/retrenchment
  Bureaucratization of society

Expansion/contraction in functions of state
  Differential areas of expansion/contraction
  Crisis of legitimacy

Environmental economic growth/recession
  Fiscal abundance/crisis

Politicisation
  penetration of interests
  mobilisation of client groups
  public service syndicalism
Some notes of the starting points

Being familiar with the background and aims of the Encyclopaedia of Public Administration project, I shall not mention again here the difficulties which a project of this size as a whole unavoidably encounters. Therefore I want to go directly to the difficulties of the treatment of my own subject, Organisation and Management of State and Administration, the given task being a general survey and systematic order of administrative topics from the viewpoint of different approaches.

The first decisive important problem is the difficulty of completely different scientific approaches in one general survey. In Europe, the treatment of the subject has traditionally been dominated by the legalistic approach, which is, however in my view, something other than what the Encyclopaedia of Public Administration should aim at. The legal structure of states and administrative organisations is, however on the other hand, an absolutely fundamental element in the systems which are based on certain ideas of the state. Therefore I cannot ignore this completely. It is however difficult to link it with other approaches in a logical way. I regard in fact the linking of different scientific approaches to each other, at least as far as certain elements are concerned, as necessary because for instance, in different socio-economic conditions and in different kinds of cultures the underlying idea of the state inevitably reflects the structures and functional nature of the State and its administration. Consequently nor do I regard the examination of the matter on the level of mere formalistic forms and structures as possible, because it would only lead to almost endless descriptive cataloging of existing systems. While again on the other hand it is clear that the treatment cannot be dominated for example by only one discipline and its concept-systems, still less that the survey could
be informative from the perspective of one theory, for example general system theory. Conscious of these difficulties I am sure that the rough systematisation of the subject presented in this paper is still in many ways imperfect and illogical too.

The second central difficulty is the breadth of the subject. I am not sure how useful it is to link together both state and administration and these then to management, the nature of which, and thus the systematisation in my view forms a very wide field of study depending on which of them is in question. Management of the state leads the survey into political systems, into the relationships between the highest organs of state and into constitutional questions, while management of administration is from the point of view of the systematisation of the functioning of public administration, essentially more clearly administrative. Drawing the boundary between the alternative systems and theories of political science, democratic theory, general theory of state and law, public law, public administration, public management, organisations theory, management sciences, etc. is most difficult in just these questions. Correspondingly the emphasizing of this kind of theoretical approaches varies greatly from one economic system and culture to another. Therefore I say at once that I am myself still very unsatisfied with my systematisation.

The third difficulty is the relationship of the former questions, the question of the relationship of the breadth of the survey and the basis of systematisation. It is easy for anyone who has become at all familiar with public administration to choose a group of concepts, tabulate then and produce on a theoretical basis and by intuitive association a great number of, in principle, quite relevant concepts. The more limited the amount of concepts considered, the easier it is to ensure the logic of classification correspondingly the greater the number of classifications and their sub-classes approved, the further away we get from systematic logic in these fields of the non-exact sciences. The heading organisation and management of state and administration, according to some scientific theories, could almost cover as wide a field as the whole encyclopaedia. Although the authors of the heading have not of course thought in that
way, the situation looks like this when one cannot be sure of the way in which other subjects will be headed and defined and above all what they will include.

**Chosen approaches**

In the treatment of my subject I identify two levels. Firstly I survey briefly different alternatives to approach the subject. I ask myself what were the different ways of writing an article about the subject for the encyclopaedia. The second level is concerned with content; depending on which answer is given to the first question, we can then analyse and systematise the existing approaches and their component theories and concepts.

In order to deal with the subject we can think identify at least the following alternatives.

1. **History of theory** \(^1\) in which the survey could progress in principle chronologically and/or logic-historically so that it would include a review of the most important stages of the development of its main field. In that way the systematics could include for example the following approach:

1. The concept of the state
   - the main historical stages of the idea of the state
   - the most important underlying ideas of the state
   - forms of state
   - types of state etc.

2. The organisation of the state
   - the doctrine of the separation of powers
   - the historical doctrine of legislative power
   - the historical doctrine of judicial power
   - the historical doctrine of executive power etc.

3. The organisation of administration
   - the historical development of thought of the nature of administrative machinery etc.

---

\(^1\) or history of thought
Without describing further here the logic of this alternative, I only confirm that I would regard it as valuable and applicable if the encyclopaedia would be aimed at a purely scientific readership. Then we could assume a given level of understanding from our readers, but when the desired readership of the work is wider, it is not worthwhile relying only on this alternative.

2. Empirical description would be another principal alternative. Obviously in this case, it would be most useful to describe a group of different countries, states and systems of administration "on their own terms" i.e. according to which countries were chosen and to which field the writer chosen represents. The result of the treatment of the subject would in that way be determined by these prechoices and the basic classification systematics would be geographical according to the assumed level of "development" and so on. An example could be the following type of arrangement.

1. Central European organisations
2. Socialist organisations
3. North America
4. Developing countries, etc.

The undoubted advantage of this alternative is its easiness and efficacy because it allows, in addition to the clear division of work, also the avoidance of the difficulties of comparison. From a theoretic and scientific point of view it cannot however be satisfactory.

3. Systematic comparison would be in principle a relatively purely distinctive alternative. Its prerequisite would be however a sufficient amount of sound trustworthy research. However such research does not exist, so that the alternative is only hypothetical. The reason for my mentioning it is simply that systematic comparison at least to some extent has to be included in the treatment of the subject. I regard as successful at least the already presented items: citizen
participation in planning, recruitment of public personnel, and autonomy of local government, of which the latter concerns specifically my own subject. In my classification I shall present still other such themes in which systematic comparison would be necessary for the illustration of the matter.

The method of treatment I have chosen is a combination of the above. I regard it as necessary to include in the systematisation all three alternatives at least on a certain minimal level. For that reason the following catalogue of the subject includes elements from the history of theory, empirical description and systematic comparison. At the same time I would like to point out that the difference of emphasis between these necessarily takes shape in practice according to which mode of thought each writer is committed. So also in this case, at least it has been my intention that the socially defined characteristics of the state and administration are stressed in the classification, and correspondingly less attention is paid to the elements describing the juridical form.
Organization and Management of State and Administration: a rough and preliminary systematisation on the basis of three approaches, history of thought, empirical description and systematic comparison

1. STATE

11 the concept of the state
   111 the state as an idea: history of thought
   112 the state as an institution: characteristics of the modern state

12 the state as an idea
   121 the intellectual tradition of the state
     e.g. 1211 the state as might
     1212 the state as law
     1213 the state as legitimacy
   122 the historical development of theories of the state
   123 present theories of the state
     e.g. 1221 state as an ideal type
     1222 state as a real structure of power in society
     1223 theories of the nature of the state in different political and economic systems

13 the state as an institution
   131 the birth of the state
   132 the early forms of the state
   133 the birth of modern state in continental Europe
   134 the dependence of the nature of the modern states on the political and economic systems
     e.g. 1341 the state in western (capitalistic) countries
     1342 the state in eastern (socialistic) countries
     1343 the state in developing countries: the dependence of the level of the state on the level of development of the economics

2. ORGANIZATION OF STATE

21 the concept of the organization of the state
   211 the state as one center of power
   212 the separation of powers
   213 the basis of the state power: differences in different political and economic systems

22 the legislative power
   221 the historical development of the forms of the legislative power and the forms of the state
   222 the present forms of parliaments and other representative legislative organs
the heads of the states in relation to the legislative power and the system of the government
political parties as representatives of legislative power

e.g.
the electoral systems in different countries: a brief survey
the party system in different countries
the difference of the nature of the constitutions and laws in different political systems
the relationships between the legislative, judicial and executive organs of the state in different countries and constitutions

the judicial power *
the independence of the judicial organs in different political and legal systems
eexamples of court systems in different countries

the executive power
the concept of the government
the head of the state, the government and the cabinet
the forms of government in different constitutions
the heads of the states in different constitutions
the role of the political parties as bearers of the executive power
the prime ministers, ministers and ministries
executive power and administrative power
public administration: its concept and sphere in different governmental systems
the civil service: its concept and sphere in different governmental systems

regional and local self-government
federal and non-federal states
centralization and decentralization as organizing principles of the organization of the executive power
the scope and the nature of the autonomy of local government in different countries
the autonomy of regional self-government in different countries in relation to legislative and judicial powers

* My opinion is that this field of topics could be left out as rega to a detailed survey.
3. MANAGEMENT OF STATE

31 the concept of the management of the state
   311 management vs. control
   312 management vs. direction
   313 management vs. guidance
   314 management vs. steering
   315 management vs. ruling
   316 management vs. government

32 the basis of the management of the state
   321 the types of legitimate domination
   322 the use of state power as domination
   323 the management of society vs. the management of
      the state
   324 autocracy and dictatorship
   325 state as bearer of class power
   326 state as contract
   327 theories of democracy

33 the organization of the management of the state – see
   chapter 2: organization of state

34 the processes of the management of the state – see
   topic Public Policy and Decision Making

35 the judicial control of the use of legislative power
36 the judicial control of the use of executive power
37 the political control of administration
   371 parliamentarism and its forms in different countries
   372 the political control of administration in leading-
      party systems

38 the ombudsman system: state and citizen
39 the public control of the state: the role of press and
   other mass media and their independence on the state and
   political and economic power centers of the society

4. ADMINISTRATION

41 the concept of administration
   411 administration as one organization and administration
      as a group of organizations

+ Although I have already had a lot of difficulties, now they
  really begin. The reason is that "second and". If the heading
  had been of state administration instead of o. and m.
  of state and administration, I could be a little bit more safe.
412 administration as action
413 public administration and private administration
414 semi-public and semi-private administration
412 the change of the nature of administration on different levels of state
42 administration as an object of theory: early stages
421 early ideas of administration
422 Prussian cameralism
423 French rationalism
424 British tradition
425 administrative science and the systematic construction of the absolute state
426 administration as alienated and coercive instrument of class power
427 the beginning of the study of bureaucracy in sociology
428 from Federalists to Wilson and Goodnow: the first stage of American administrative science
43 administrative theory in this century
431 Weber and the theory of bureaucracy
422 administration as organization and management
431 e.g. 4221 the emergence of the scientific management as a result of industrialisation
4222 Taylor's scientific management
4223 Fayol and general principles of administration
4224 the birth of industrial sociology and the human relations movement
4225 classical science of administration reaches its peak: general principles of good administration at the end of thirties
4226 second world war as a boundary line in administrative thinking
423 administration as decision making: Simon and after
424 administration as management
425 administration as steering of complex, multi-objective multilevel system
425 e.g. 4251 the development of the general systems theory
4252 the goal and planning systems in turbulent environment
4253 contingency theory
4254 administration as heuristic problem-solving in complex heterarchial systems in unstable environments
426 administration as power structure
44 the theory of public administration and the development of public administration in different parts of the world
441 the development in socialistic countries
442 the development in continental Europe
443 the development in United States
444 the present stage of the theory of public administration
e.g. 4441 the idea of crisis of identity
4442 paradigm crisis
4443 theorems of rationality and legitimation crisis
4444 the new administrative state and its effects to the theory of public administration

5. ORGANIZATION OF ADMINISTRATION
51 the concept of the organization of administration
511 the concept of public administration
512 the boundary lines between political decision making and public administration in different countries
513 the boundary lines between public administration and semi-public organizations of the "third sector"
514 the growing dependence between public and private organizations
515 the nature of regional and local self-government in relation to the state administration

52 organization of administration on the state/federal level
521 ministries, federal departments, central boards:
the structure of central governmental organizations in different countries
5211 ministry systems
5212 central board systems
5213 mixed systems
5214 the dependence vs. independence of central governmental organizations on political control
522 the task structure on the highest administrative levels
5221 the different nature of the tasks of public administration in different political and economic systems
5222 examples of the task structures of ministries or other highest organizations of administration in different countries
523 the internal structure of the highest organizations of administration
5231 the heads of the organizations
5232 departmentalization
5233 staff and size
5234 decision making structures in highest organizations
5235 formalization and complexity
5236 technology and the structure
524 the civil service in the highest organizations
53 organization of administration on the regional level
531 models of regional administration in different countries: general principles
532 regional administration as state administration
533 regional administration as local-based administration
534 regional administration as self-government
535 the relationships between regional, central and local levels of public administration: the changing patterns illustrated with examples from different countries
536 state governments, provincial governments and other regional level administrative units as organization

54 organization of administration on the local level
541 local administration as part of state administration
542 local administration as part of regional administration
543 local administration as self-government
5431 the scope of autonomy on local level
5432 the electoral systems on local level: a brief comparison
5433 organization of self-governmental local units
544 the participation of citizens in local planning and decision making
545 size as a decisive factor in organizing local administration: metropolitan areas and villages
546 the changing nature of the relationships between central and local administration in different political and economic systems
547 the emerging forms of "sub-local" or neighbourhod democracy and administration in different countries

6. MANAGEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION
61 the concept of the management of administration
611 governing, ruling, directing, steering, guiding, controlling and managing
612 the concept in the context of the relationships between legislative and executive organs
613 the concept in the context of the relationships between political and administrative executive organs
614 the management of public administration and the management of public organizations
615 the history of the theory of management
62 parliamentary control of administration
   621 constitutional law
   622 laws and their changing nature
   623 questions and votes of confidence and other parliamentary means
   624 the steering of administration by long term plans
   625 the budget as tool of governing and controlling
   626 parliamentary investigation committees and auditing
   627 parliamentary ombudsmen
   628 other means of controlling administration: a brief survey from different types of countries

63 governmental management of administration
   631 statutes and decisions in cabinets
   632 the changing role of the head of the state in relation to the management of administration
   633 the role of the prime minister
   634 ministers as members of government and as heads of ministries
     6341 one-party systems
     6342 two-party systems
     6343 multi-party systems and coalition governments
   635 political officials
   636 ministers and civil servants as managers of administration
   637 political planning and the role of the political parties in managing administration
   638 the influence of pressure groups and the concept of corporatism
   639 governmental committees and commissions

64 administrative management of public organizations *
   641 the concepts of management and leadership
   642 historical development of styles of management
   643 planning systems and plans as means of management
   644 patterns of decision making in public organizations: citizen participation vs. political control vs. office democracy
   645 governmental planning systems and management by objectives

* Here, of course, it could be very easy to continue more and more to sub-classes but I have avoided it because they have to be also independent and separate topics.
646 legal sanctions as means of management
647 incentive systems as means of management
648 mechanic and organic structures of public organizations and the influence of technology
649 bureaucracy, organizational climate and the problems of management in the era of education

65 management and the civil service
651 the concept of civil service in different countries
652 the size of civil service in different countries
653 the nature and level of education of civil servants
654 generalists and specialists, technocrats and political officials, professionals and amateurs
655 the new role of the bureaucracy in the administrative state: the bureaucratization of the society and meaning of the bureaucratic self-interest in managing the society and its public administration
656 the responsibility of officials to political masters
657 the responsibility of officials to citizens and the recruitment of civil servants
658 management of administration and the ethics of public officials towards the society

66 management of public economy
661 the concept of public economy in different economic systems
662 the planning, budgeting and accounting systems as tools of management of administration
663 public enterprises and corporations
664 administrative, scientific and commercial organizations of the state and the specific problems in managing them
665 central management of regional and local administration by means of resources
666 the taxation systems in different countries: national regional and local taxation systems and their meaning for the management of administration
667 the private control of public money and the public control of private money
668 the third sector as user of the public money and as the user of public power
669 citizen participation in public planning

After the listing of about 35 sub-themes and about 150 sub-sub-themes I am able to see the nature of the work. See, however, my concluding remarks about the treatment of the subject.
Some concluding remarks

I am aware of the fact that pages I have written surely may give an impression of the list of contents of a text-book in public administration. At the end of the writing I have a fearful feeling that the result is something quite else than what my employers had expected. On the other hand I dare to think that there is a rationale in my approach. Therefore I will here in the end clarify some of my starting points.

I think that the nature of an international encyclopaedia should still be the old idea of collecting and organising all of the existing scientific knowledge - how difficult or even impossible it at last may be. An encyclopaedia therefore is not a handbook, neither a dictionary. My systematisation does not follow the idea of an alphabetical order of head-words but rather a system of themes the three approaches mentioned as a basis of classification. It follows from this line of thought that a great amount of politico-administrative facts has to be left out.

As the reader already has noticed I have emphasized different approaches in different places. Especially the concepts of state and administration require the approach of the history of thought. Correspondingly the surveying of existing administrative structures claims systematic comparison and also simple empirical facts and descriptions already because of the reason of illustration. Of course I have to admit at once that the logic does not stand throughout the listing.

The third point which I have to make is the most obvious. The focus of my thinking has been administration. However, it is not at all clear how far I have succeeded because especially in this point the way of seeing the world of administration varies from one political and cultural system to another.
Herbert König+1)
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1. Preliminary Questions
In an attempt to define the position and functions of organisation and management we cannot just start from any arbitrary point. There are certain questions which need to be considered first. These are:

- the position of the science of administration in the general pattern
- whether the subject "public administration" should also cover the government and the process of governing, and
- what the dominant structural dimensions in a systematic approach to administrative science are.

a) The Position of the Science of Administration
Public administration includes the local authorities and the state, and these in turn appear as subjects for academic study in conjunction with enterprises on the micro and the economy as a whole on

+1) Herbert König: Advisor on Methodology to the Federal Ministry of Economics, Bonn; Professor of Administrative Science at the Federal Armed Forces University, Hamburg
the macro level, and certainly with individuals and society as a whole.

However, in the Federal Republic of Germany we have two local authority levels, the "Gemeinde" (municipal authority) and the "Kreis" (district), although some municipal authorities are so large that they virtually constitute a district in themselves. The state also acts on two levels, that of the "Länder" and that of the Federal Government.

As subjects for academic study these organisations are "covered" not only by the "classical" disciplines, philosophy, law, economics, and so on; they also lend themselves to more general approaches such as the systems theory, the decision-making theory and many others. These more general approaches compete with theories within the "classical" disciplines but they also serve as motors and innovators for them. They also have a direct effect on the subjects for study themselves. And here it is appropriate to ask whether these subjects may not give rise to theoretical impulses - they certainly yield plenty of practical impulses - which not only throw light on the specific features of the "local authority" or "state" as a field for study but are also directed to the development of a theory of the field in question with regard to the "classical" disciplines and the more general approaches. That there has so far been no comprehensive theory need not conflict with this.

The following diagram\(^{1}\) will provide an initial view; it is by no means exhaustive.

---

b) The Government and Administration as a Subject for the Science of Administration

Restricting the doctrine of administration to administration in the narrower sense would mean that in the main only the executive functions of public activity could be included but not the draft phase nor, hence, the policy concept.

Dimensions in the Scientific System

"Classical" Disciplines:
- Philosophy
- Pedagogy
- Psychology
- Law
- Economics
- Engineering
- etc.

Cybernetics
- Systems theory
- Organisation theory
- Decision-making theory
- Action theory
- Information theory
- etc.

General Theories

Objects:
- Individual
- Enterprises
- Local authorities
- State
- Economy
- Society
- etc.
In the Federal Republic of Germany it is now generally accepted - in contrast to Luhmann's views and not least due to strong impulses from experience in practice on ministerial level - that only a comprehensive view of the government and administration will yield a meaningful picture of public activity, since this is the only way in which the reasons for public action can also be included. Without such a comprehensive view one would only be speaking of the activities and their link with resources and would not be able to ask why all this was being undertaken.

++)

(c) Structural Dimensions as an Order Factor

It is not my intention here to develop a theory of structural dimensions, tempting as that would be and however clearly it might appear that this was a general theory which would apply to a football club as well as to an academic documentation system or even a centre of government. What I am concerned with is simply the attempt to think in various dimensions in order to discover how in the science of administration the fields of application of the science on the one hand - we can call them material policy fields - are related to the levels of political activity and what effect the science of administration may have on these two dimensions and, indeed, what it is concerned with generally. What it is concerned with may be called its methodology and we can divide this into various methodological fields. For the details I can refer you to the following diagram.

Now administration theory does not make so bold as to substantiate the policy fields as such. That is a matter for the disciplines concerned, for example economic policy with its preliminary field, economic theory, or foreign policy with its preliminary field, the theory of international relations.

The second dimension - that of the levels of political action - is to show that beyond the local authorities and state activities which are our main concern there are the European Communities.

Dimensions of the Science of Administration

Methodological Fields
- Public Tasks (identification of problems)
- Programmes
- Organisation
- Budget
- Personnel
- Control

Political Action Levels
- International organisations
- European Communities
- Federal Government
- Länder
- Local Authorities (Municipal Authorities and Districts)

Policy Fields
- Foreign policy
- Security policy
- Home policy
- Social policy
- Economic policy
- Transport policy
- Education policy
- Research policy
- Technology policy
- Housing policy
- Agricultural policy

the Atlantic institutions (OECD, NATO) and finally the world-wide international organisations; of course the last two groups could be taken together as "international institutions" as distinct from the supra-national level, although this too could be included in a broad international concept. If we ask what theory applies to this dimension we come back to our initial question whether a theory can be developed at all from the objects of our academic system and we may perhaps find the answer in the third dimension under consideration here, that of the methodological fields. That is, the material assembled by the science of administration may contain the nucleus for a comprehensive theory, or at least the elements of such a theory. The systems theory has already concerned itself with grouping these, i.e. with arranging them end putting them in relation to each other. Certainly we can say that Easton has made a considerable contribution and taken us a good step on the way.

2. Methodological Fields of Government and Administration Activity

If we attempt on the basis of the answers to these preliminary questions to trace the pattern of methodological fields we will produce something like the following diagram.¹)

The diagram is to show that the identification of problems should be the point of departure for public activity and that this in turn may be based on values but at any rate that it is influenced by social indicators which function both as warning lights and as measuring dials. Through a process of differentiation social concerns are arrived at. This in turn enables public programmes to be drawn up and these are dependent on their basic elements, the measures involved. Overall, therefore, a problem landscape may emerge which corresponds with a programme landscape. Certainly - and this is why the neighbouring triangle is crossed out - there should be no question of developing programmes from the top, which generally happens before the problems or goals have been differentiated - how many a programme has arisen solely from a slogan or as of its own accord!

It should also be clear - and we can see this from the information cloud - that there are many thousands of items of information in

¹) See following page
Methodological Fields of Government and Administration Activity
all these fields - and information processes culminate in decisions - so that we cannot construct a system of public activity from this.

The programmes lead to two things, firstly the organisation as a preliminary to the personnel expenditure shown in the budget, and secondly political expenditure, which is a budget item. The budget in turn determines personnel planning, which should contain not only objective but also subjective elements, and all these fields - programmes, budget and personnel - feed control, which in turn affects the evolution of new programmes and - in their preliminary field - the identification of problems.+)

This account of course also contains postulates - for instance, that of the congruence between the structure of the programme on the one hand and that of the institutional organisation on the other; a further postulate would that the budget structure is also oriented to the political programme. But I do not want to go into this in more detail now.

What matters is that such a sequence could at the same time provide the "scarlet thread" for a systematisation of the science of administration.

But regardless of these postulates concerning the congruence between programme and organisation, programme and budget and finally between programme, organisation and budget altogether, a grouping of this nature is naturally also based on a philosophy. This can be seen from the next diagram.++)

On the "classical" level of resources the diagram is divided into "should" and "is", i.e. a time flow between the budget plan and budget accounting. Above this we see a programme level in the field of tension between programme at the beginning of a time period and an accountancy report at its end. Above both again is a problem/purpose level,
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which is intended to provide information on the question for what purposes programmes are "pursued" with what means.

While effectivity can be tested over the course of time, the relations between resources and programme can be seen to be between input and output and hence economic, while - even more important - the relation between the result and the purpose achieved or the problem solved should document the effectiveness of public activity. The degree of economy and effectiveness together may be said to constitute efficiency.\(^{+}\)

So the philosophy is that only in an overall view of the three levels will the essential questions arising from the necessary problematisation of public activity appear at all.

On the other hand this overall view should remain in the background if we are concerned to systematise the science of administration.

3. The Position of Organisation and Management in Particular

A consideration of the methodological fields of government and administration activity has shown that organisation cannot be seen in isolation in the pattern of administration; it is a function of the formation of political programmes and serves the structure, in which resources are ultimately reflected, namely the budget and its medium-term perspective, the finance plan. This proves the obvious contention that organisation is not an end in itself.

In the relation between the levels of resources and programme (last diagram) the organisation gives rise to the identification of resources, in other words it is the point of departure for the question of with what means programmes are pursued. The position of the organisation should be seen as the impulse to the representation of input. Of course a relation could also be established between input on the one hand and the fulfilment of a purpose or the solution of a problem on the other; then we would come to the concept of economy in relation to a particular purpose or problem.

Organisational structure in the broader sense naturally also includes management in the form of processes or procedures or - to use the classical expression - "Ablauforganisation"\(^{+}\)

\(^{+}\) For more details see Eberhard Bohne and Herbert König; Grundfragen politischer Ablaufkontrolle, in: Die Verwaltung 9 (1976), pp. 19 ff.
Hence there is an institutional as well as a procedural component to the concept of structure.

So wide a concept of structure may seem unusual to the members of the administration, since they are actually only accustomed to think in the category of the - institutional - organisation; they understand structure as a snapshot product into which processes could hardly be integrated.

But science has more problems in store for the practical administrator with its concept of structure. For this also includes the structures of the programmes which precede the organisation and in fact those of the identification of problems; it is also and not least concerned with the budget classification which follows the organisation structure, and also with structures in personnel.

But even this is not all: we have learned from what is known as organisation development that the behavioural component belongs on the structural side and that structures on the one hand and behaviour on the other must be kept in balance, indeed that the one side is inconceivable without the other.

4. Functions of Organisation and Management

There can be no doubt of what organisation and management specialists have done in the past for the benefit of the state and the administration. They have in very truth proved the main supports in the public sector pattern. That is still apparent today when, for example, developing countries take the first steps to creating their own methods of government and administration and consult international O & M specialists.

But beyond this the institutional organisation must be linked to the programmatic side as well as towards the budget - one may ask whether the organisation staff member should not take a wider view of his job and see his function as a structural one - there is more than enough to be done here.

Secondly we must naturally also concern ourselves with the link between O and M - which can mean "methods" as well as "management". A considerable amount has been achieved here in recent years.
beyond business directions and regulations - we need only mention the management guidelines which are in general use and have been formulated with particular skill in Switzerland.\footnote{I should like to draw particular attention to the Richtlinien für die Verwaltungsführung im Bunde (RVF) (Guidelines for Federal Administration) issued by the Swiss Bundesrat, Berne, 1974 (available from: Schweizerische Drucksachen- und Materialzentrale, CH 3000 Berne), based on preliminary work mainly by Prof. E. Rühli; see also the guidelines for the canton of Thurgau: Für die Verwaltung des Kantons Thurgau - Grundsätze der Zusammenarbeit, issued by the Regierungsrat on May 27, 1979 (available from: Staatskanzlei des Kantons Thurgau, CH 8500 Frauenfeld).}

Thirdly - and this follows easily from our considerations of management in public administration - the view should be widened to include the socio-psychological component in the relations between the institution and its own personnel, and no less in the examination of the target groups for policy with regard to the question of what has been wrong so far and could be improved. Internally for the institution this involves in addition to management aspects the question of appropriate strategies for the introduction of reforms; as far as the target groups are concerned, we are still virtually at the beginning in our art of government and administration. Perhaps sooner or later marketing attitudes from commercial life will penetrate the public sector - one might call it the "optimisation of policy sales", or even better, "a deliberate orientation of policy to specific target groups"; this would lend a further dimension to administration theory and this should be added to the second diagram.

5. Guidelines

But to what should organisation and management - notwithstanding their link with the formation of programmes and the budget - orient? The answer should be: without doubt to the policy formation and policy optimisation function of government and administration to which they belong. This corresponds to the requirement for economy and effectiveness but only on a different level and after the political aims have become clear. So the drafting of policy should precede the allocation of resources, even if the former cannot be separated from the latter.

For the rest, however, social models such as that of subsidiarity and that of the identification of social concerns in the sense of increasing the sensibility of policy with the help of indicators...
also apply to organisation and management; the demand for the priority of qualitative thinking over a quantitative approach must be seen in the same context: policy does not have to be measurable; on the contrary, it begins to be interesting where it ceases to be quantifiable.

We may leave out of account in how far what organisation sociology has to offer in the way of dimensions may prove helpful to the practice of organisation and management. Recent attempts to structure governments with this have hardly been successful. So let us return to the origins of O & M in the micro-economic sphere. This should be the point from which we can begin to establish micro-economically oriented dimensions, make a political evaluation of their dominant elements and then organise the institutions for which we are responsible according to the models discussed above in such a way as to achieve an optimum of efficiency.
1. Administrative Science and Organization

Since long, organization is one of the topics of the sciences of Public Administration. The questions centered mainly on the internal structures of government and public administration ("machinery of government").

Along with the systems oriented approaches of (public) organization we find the development and combination with decision-making theories.

Also in respect to an encyclopedia of public administration we can distinguish between different complexes of questions and between different lines of scientific development regarding organization and management of Public Administration.
(i) macro-structures

role and function of government and public administration in the political system; border of public and private tasks; organizational reforms (or better: discussions about) on the fundamental structures of Public Administration like centralization/decentralization, federalism etc.

(ii) meso-structures

organization of Public Administration on different levels (Federal, State, cities); horizontal and vertical differentiation; special offices etc.
interorganisational cooperation;
the reform of local government in most European countries during the last 15 years emphasizes the importance of the meso-level;

the issue of (improving) public planning is mainly combined with the meso-structure of Public Administration.

(iii) micro-structure

inside the bureaucracy; structure and processes of offices; new forms of cooperation (like project groups);
hierarchical versus non-hierarchical structures etc.

the issue of (improving) public management is mainly combined with the micro-structure of Public Administration.

Administrative Science is the interdisciplines par excellence ("discipline carrefour"). In respect to the questions of organization and management the cooperation with other disciplines vary in the crucial points, according as on which level of organizational structure you find:

(i) macro-level: political science
(ii) meso-level: sociology of organization
(iii) micro-level: psychology of organization.
2. Program Administration

In comparison with North-American Public Administration the (continental) European Public Administration was (and still is for a certain amount) legal-oriented (the constitution and the laws tell the Public Administration what to do / what is right) and not program-oriented. Along with the general discussions on administrative reforms, with the gradual but steady change to a service-rendering Public Administration the program issue was discovered as a new topic by science and practice (or vice-versa). The program issue is closely combined with the different system approaches in which context organization is playing a not-unimportant role as structure of the system. Organizational structure do matter in the different phases of the decision-making - process of the program and is considered as to be changed in the different approaches.

3. Implementation and Evaluation

The program-approach first brought up questions how to improve the ability of Public Administration to analyse and understand problems to find better answers and solutions. That means: improvement of program design or formulation, improvement of the situation of information or the intelligence of Public Administration.

Later on, the output (sometimes also the outcome or impact) of the programs was investigated, mainly by researchers who emphasized the implementing structures and procedures or the program evaluation. In these contexts we learned - especially from the policy-science-approach - how and why (or why not) programs work, a lot about power and conflict in decision-making, on the influence of the political environment and - important in our aspect - a lot on the structures of the politico-administrative system. Thereby we have to differentiate between programs which are addressed to bodies of Public Administration and programs which are addressed to private de-
cision makers. The first kind of programs has to be differentiated according to the nature of the program (complex, regulating, directing, service-rendering etc.) and the addressees in the different world of Public Administration (see the special question of program implementation in a federal system).

4. Program Formulation and Implementation and Organizational Structure

Although program formulation and implementation should not be distinguished under the aspect of time (one phase following step-by-step the other), the logical differentiation is worthwhile for analytical reasons.

Questions for present research might be the influence of organizational and decision making structures on program implementation as well as on program formulation. The structure of the involved organisation(s) and the networks of information, power, conflict and decision are to be analyzed in respect of their impact on the programs. There will be differences in the different fields of politics (e.g. rural policy, housing policy, social policy) and public programs; these differences can also originate in different organizational structures, different addressees and different decision making processes.

In this context comparative analysis might contribute to understand the phenomena and to theory building. The emphasis will be - national or comparative - mainly on the meso-level, what includes a close team-work with the science of Organizational sociology.
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The following survey only serves as a discussion paper. The author intends to deliver some reflections on a theoretical framework for the goals of effective organization in public administration. The structural dimensions (see now Chr. Hood and A. Dunsire, Bureaucractics, Westwead, 1981, M. Zey - Ferrall, Dimensions of Organizations, Santa Monica, 1979 and D. S. Pugh (ed.), Organization Theory, Harmondsworth (Penguin Books), 1975) and the structural consequences (proposition on structural consequences) are not part of this report. Perhaps this paper could support the discussions on an Encyclopedia of Public Administration.

1. What is Public Administration?

There are many approaches - which can not reported here - to define "Public Administration".

The author thinks that the basic ideas of the "systems approach" by D. Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life, New York 1965, I. Sharkansky, Public Administration Policy-Making in Government Agencies, 4th Ed. 1978, Chicago, and others would be helpful to define "Public Administration" in a systematic way. Under differentiation of those ideas, we can say that the political-administrative system is that system which produces binding decisions (N. Luhmann, Theorie der Verwaltungswissenschaft, Köln/Berlin, 1966) and other services or goods for the public, using certain inputs.
Fig. 1  The Political-administrative System

Task environment: Society and Territory

Inputs (1)
- Demands
- Resources
- Support/legitimation

Political-administrative System

Conversion process (1)

Outputs (1)
- Binding decisions
- Public services
- Public goods

within:
- Structures, procedures, personal capacities etc

feedback

Task environment: Society and Territory

(1) with differentiation in the general shape of the political-administrative System and without changes - from I. Sharkansky. Public Administration, ibid.
Public Administration is part of the political-administrative system and the result of the separation-of-powers-principle. According to this principle the political-administrative system is divided in three parts. The separation-of-powers-principle works as the highest criterion of dividing the political-administrative functions.

The legislative system has the function of policy-making and assuring the legitimation of the political-administrative system. Policy-making means the concretion the nation's ends (goals).

The executive branch (Public Administration) has the functions of

- the execution of legislative policy-making through binding decisions in individual cases and through production of public goods and public services and
- the assistance (support) of the preparation of legislative policy-making


Public Administration is incorporated in the political-administrative system under high legislative control and more or less court jurisdiction without regarding the organizational construction. Therefore the juridical type: Under public law or under private law does not matter. Organizations under private law are public agencies, (see: B. Becker, Typische Eigenschaften der privatrechtlich organisierten Bundesverwaltung, in: Die Verwaltung 1979, pp. 161)

when they

- execute public tasks (see above)
- stand under high legislative or executive control with regard to their production

(process and products)
- depend on the political-administrative system by high financial and personal connections.

A further dimension of Public Administration is the intention to produce public tasks without making profit.

Fig. 2 Public Administration as Part of the Political-administrative System

Task environment: Society and Territory
The rationality of administrative organization and production depends on constitutional or other legal rules.

2. The Concept of Structural Effectiveness

The discussion about the question: "Which organization (structure) is the best for a public agency?" is very important. Before giving an answer it has to be asked however: "Does organization matter?" (F. W. Scharpf, Does Organization Matter? Task Structure and Interaction in the Ministerial Bureaucracy, Berlin 1976, Preprint Series - Ms of the Intern. Institute of Management). Some new evidences which seem to deny the importance of organizational structure (see: J. G. March - J. P. Olsen, Ambiguity and Choice in Organization, Bergen 1976, with their "garbage-can-model-of-decision-making," or G. T. Allison, Essence of Decision, Boston 1971) cast a doubt on a positive answer. But the answer must be positive, although it has to be recognized that other factors than structural effects often have dominant effects on the success or failure of organizations (see for instance the review in: T. R. Dye - V. Gray, eds., The Determinants of Public Policy, Lexington 1980, and R. E. Neustadt, Presidential Power. The Politics of Leadership, New York et al., 1960 about the influence of the personality, or H. Schatz, Auf der Suche nach neuen Problemlösungsstrategien, in: R. Mayntz - F. W. Scharpf, eds., Planungsorganisation, München 1973, pp. 9, about the influence of missing professionalism). In any case, structure has a more or less influence on organizational success.

The principal questions are: "What functions have structures and how can structural success or failure be measured?" The theoretical possibilities of measuring structural success are mainly the following (see also: M. Zey - Ferrell, op. cit. pp. 324):
- to measure whether a structure meets the structural goals

and

- to measure whether a structure supports the attainment of organizational (2) goals

and

- to measure whether an organization carries out its functions with regard to financial inputs and to admeasure indirectly the results to structure.

The first approach is the effectiveness concept (see generally to the concept of effectiveness: A. Etzioni, Modern Organizations, Englewood Cliffs 1965) and the third one is commonly (3) the concept of efficiency. The second approach is the goal-attainment-concept. The second approach is only an indirect attempt to measure structural effects. Here the effectiveness-approach is preferred. The efficiency concept has difficulties in measuring costs and benefits of structural alternatives in monetary terms. The goal-concept includes difficulties to admeasure organizational success or failure to the structure.

3. Structural Functions in Public Administration

N. Luhmann (Zweckbegriff und Systemrationalität, Frankfurt 1973) has revealed detailed but still general structural functions of organizational structures:

- general Simplification of complex environmental stimuli (see also J. G. March – H. A. Simon, Organizations, New York 1958)

---

(2) Organizational goals are for example: cheese production, beer brewing, education and so on.

(3) Ch. I. Barnard and sometimes H. A. Simon use the concept of efficiency in a different sense.
- Institutionalization of organizational simplification through internal programs and procedures
- Differentiation of the task environment through structural steps (as division of work, departmentalization)
- Differentiation of the system itself (departmentalization, coordination etc.)
- Assuring adaptation through structural flexibility.

In Public Administration and its agencies more specific structural functions have to be found out. According to an analysis of literature and empirical research I have collected the following structural functions (selections):

(1) Goal Attainment

The most authors and documents on administrative reform stress the importance of the structural function to enable a (public) organization to produce (public) tasks in an effective way. The terms most frequently used to describe the meaning of "effective" task-production are "quick", "innovative", "to be able coping with new problems", "precise", "proper", "orderly", "productive", "simplified", "correct" and so on. The use of the term always depends on the analysed type of (public) organization. This structural function is quite known and the classical structural function (see J. G. March - H. A. Simon, Organizations, New York 1958, on "Classical Organization Theory", pp.12). It is the task-oriented approach which dominated classical theory.

(2) Coordinative Functions

The function of coordination and integration has greatest importance (for all organizations with division of work, especially in complex public administration (see H. Siedentopf, (ed.), Regierungspolitik und Koordination - Schriftenreihe der Hochschule Speyer, Bd. 57-, Berlin 1976). In

(4) to be published in my forthcoming textbook on "Organization of Public Administration"
some theoretical and practical approaches this function is the basic concept for organizing the organization (see: F. W. Scharpf, Untersuchung zur Reorganisation des Bundesministeriums für Verkehr (Projektgruppe für die Regierungs- und Verwaltungsreform) - unter Mitarbeit von MD H. Hegelau, Bonn 1975 (Ms.)).

(3) Installing Learning Cycles
Many authors (esp. K. W. Deutsch) emphasize the necessity to install complete learning cycles into an organization by structural efforts. We can see by empirical evidences the empirical importance of this structural function (see G. T. Allison, J. G. March - J. P. Olsen, A. Wildavsky, The Politics of the Budgeting Process, 3rd Ed. 1979, Boston).

(4) Assuring Flexibility
Most authors stress the structural function of assuring structural flexibility. This function is theoretically wellknown. In practice the most organizations are highly formalized - and therefore: inflexible and bureaucratized.

(5) Ensuring Motivation
The structural effects on human motivation are known from behavioral theories (see esp. R. Likert, New Patterns of Management, New York et al. 1961)

(6) Ensuring Administrative Legitimacy
A very specific structural function for public agencies is the function to ensure administrative legitimacy. This structural function has special importance in representative democracies (and other systems, too). Administrative legitimacy has many dimensions. In literature and practical manuals/documents the following dimensions can be found:

- administrative legitimacy as process or state of high "external support" (H. A. Simon - D. W. Smithburg - V. A. Thompson, Public Administration,

- administrative legitimacy as "Bürgerfreundlichkeit" ("public as star customer" see D.K. Price, in: F. Morstein Marx (ed.), Elements of Public Administration, 2nd Ed. Prentice Hall),

- administrative legitimacy as administrative transparency (see K. Hesse, F. Schatz and others) and


- administrative legitimacy as impartiality (Unparteilichkeit) correctness and incorruptibility (Unbestechlichkeit) and accountability (see F. Morstein Marx) or as integration function ("Integrationswert" - F. Wagener), pp. 6.

(5) op. cit.
(7) Ensuring Constitutional Standards

The more constitutional needs are given the more the administrative structure must ensure these. In a "Rechtsstaat" (a constitutional system which protects individuals against violations of constitutional rights by executive and legislative arbitrary action through court jurisdiction) the administrative structure has to ensure for example

- the fairplay of administrative procedures, process and action
- the separation-of-power in reality
- the fundamental civic rights before and during administrative action

(8) Ensuring Accountability and Control

A principal function of (public) administrative structure is to ensure accountability and control of public agencies (see Max Weber, Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft, ed. by J. Winckelmann, Köln/Berlin 1956; Th. Ellwein, ibid.; R. Mayntz, Soziologie der öffentlichen Verwaltung, Heidelberg/Karlsruhe 1978, pp. 60, and others). This means especially:

- assuring the political control by legislative branch and by cabinet
- perform continuity
- conformity (J. L. Price, ibid.)
- to ensure uniformity of administrative actions (H. Kaufman, The Forest Ranger, Baltimore 1960)

- absence of organizational strain
  and so on.

The aspects of this function are complex. With regard to legislative control over executive organization and
structure the problems how to ensure this by structure are difficult also from the constitutional and legal point of view (see W. Graf Vitzthum, Parlament und Planung, Zur verfassungsgerechten Zuordnung der Funktionen von Bundesregierung und Bundestag bei der politischen Planung, Wiesbaden 1978). Otherwise, the political control by cabinet or ministers are very problematic, too, and is not often ensured (see D. C. Pitt - B. C. Smith, Government Departments, London et al. 1981); R. Mayntz, Soziologie der öffentlichen Verwaltung, op.cit.).

3. Result

If we compare structural functions of public organizational structures and of private business organizational structures we find essential differences between them. Especially the complex functions in the areas of administrative legitimacy and administrative accountability are different to private business administration. The structural consequences on the planning and developing of adequate structural dimensions (division of work, departmentalization, configuration, shaping organizational units, allocation of decision-making, using staff- and service-units, specialization, stratification, intensity of controls, formalization, communication and so on) effect quite different structures of public agencies.
5.1.3 Public Policy and Decision Making

5.1.3.1 Course of Discussion

At the beginning, the group decided not to repeat the contents of the papers, but to start with an overview of possible approaches or principles on the given issue. Six approaches could be identified and were agreed upon:

1. the goal-tree - as traditional distinction between policy making and decision making
2. policy sciences
3. socialist countries
4. neo-marxist theory
5. public choice
6. public expenditure

It was expected that by discussing these approaches, all relevant topics and items could be identified. On this basis, one contribution was qualified being normative, reflecting traditional policy models, since it builds up on the well-known distinctions of line and staff, politics versus administration, and politicians versus civil servants. These distinctions seem questionable, not only because they are interrelated in reality, but also since they thus exist only for analytical reasons. The policy making process was often considered being very discrete and appears more than an evolution. Especially in developing countries formal distinctions do not explain policy making. It was added, that all countries know policy areas, which are almost secret. Here, the question arose, whether the goal-tree model or policy science can integrate this observation, or whether it remains inexplicable as a "loose end". This led to further questions such as how policies are caused, respectively what policies "produce".
had been settled, that this does not mean output research, whereas the view of the decision maker on what would come out of any decision and the way he deals with that in the decision represents output research. The goal-tree model was appraised as too narrow to compromise all necessary factors. The policy sciences approach was estimated as normative and quite traditional. Different views regarding the qualification "prescriptive" for the policy sciences approach arose. The reason was found in different role conceptions of scientists in public administration or policy sciences.

Another distinction was seen beyond the papers presented to the workshop, i.e. the rational model of decision making as described in the literature by Dror, and the pragmatic model by Wildavsky.

Since at this point a way to make use of these differences could not be found, the discussion turned to the influences of the policy-fields in the administration. It was said, administration could sometimes be the pressure group of subjects in politics, thus producing many influences. This was also expressed as "plan(s)" of the administration or a "policy", if there is acceptance in society for it.

At this point, the group suggested a clear-cut division in two empirical research results about public policy makers and the technical tools and techniques provided by the political system, respectively existing in reality.

The question came up, in how far these ideas correspond to socialist countries. It was said, that there was neither a clear-cut distinction between policy making and decision making, nor between party and government decisions. It was also stated, that policy making is not the privilege of the "top", but takes place on different administrative levels and in different sectors of the public sphere. Western participants inquired for the range of freedom these levels have in decision making. The answer ran, that the latter argument is not the same as self-government in the western sense, because there is no exception from higher level supervision as resulting out of the principle of democratic centralism. But there, the tendency would be, to call for something like "freedom" for the various levels or units. This led to the questions about places of
policy making outside the party which increasingly would exist. At this point the group discovered a convergence to the western development because it was common opinion that the differentiation between public and private diffuses increasingly. A new sector between "big government" and "big business" was seen as evolving in the western hemisphere.

One participant then suggested to come back to think about an ideal normative model of hierarchical decision making and of planning systems, not regarding the implementation at all. The objection was raised that traditional socialist planning with its imperative character and power becomes increasingly weakened under the modern awareness of complexity and conflicts. Thus, there arises interest in western prognostic and forecasting tools. This is accompanied by a shift from direct to indirect methods of control and the more indicator character of the plan itself with a reduced number of quantitative scales in all socialist countries, but with varying distinctiveness. These arguments led to the remark that a comparable shift from mechanistic interrelationships to human relations or open system theories in organisational theory has to be looked at. This was explained as reaction towards the increasing complexity of the environment of any system or political process. The neo-marxist approach was considered as an attempt to generalize this development.

3 main roots were introduced, the
- "poli-t-economy", i.e. the political system in its surrounding economical circumstances, especially the economic system.
- reception of the Marxist literature
- reception and criticism of systems' theories.

It is especially the conception of "active policy making" which is rejected at this point, and the notion of "autonomy" of the political system is regarded as analytically and politically wrong. The argumentation contains strong moral "undertones". In lieu of that, two explanations broadly generalize the topic:
1. class interests are transferred directly and personally into politics and policies in the sense of linear interests (i.e. Stamokap)
2. class interests are transferred by structural devices into the policy-areas. Therefore, in-built mechanisms exist like the
- selectivity of the system (of awarenesses)
- organization as introduction of bias
- non-decisions (Bachrach/Baratz).

The discussion used this contribution to come back to the historical question, 'Why did planning start' and the fundamental question regarding the 'function of the state in modern societies'. Neo-Marxists were criticized, having treated government that way as "black box", which, in reply, was explained with the hesitation to furnish the class-enemy instrumental tools for the management of government.

In the following, the discussion analysed the public choice approach, which was characterized as anti-bureaucratic, anti-rationalistic, trying to transfer the market-model into public decisions, believing in rational choice by everybody and consensus. By its strong believe in community participation and decentralization and its economic basis, the public choice approach was regarded as being ideological and out-dated as an alternative to bureaucracy.

Finally some remarks were made on the public expenditure approach. It was said, scarcity is important and will probably become even more important in future, especially in all developing countries. In the past, mankind thought resources would be unlimited and problems could be solved or at least be limited. It became obvious, that reality is the other way round: resources are limited, but the world problems are unlimited.
5.1.3.2 Special Contributions
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1. **Introduction**

The aim of this paper is to present and assess a theoretical approach to the study of public administration, which is called "public policy and decision-making". As there might be no easy agreement on what this formula designates, I shall start with a reference to policy sciences, which, in my view, provide the paradigm for public policy and decision-making (2).

Following the dual character of policy sciences as a descriptive and a prescriptive approach, I shall go on to elaborate the descriptive vocabulary of this approach covering basically features of decision making systems (3.1), the decision-making process (3.2), and the policy output (3.3).

The prescriptive tools offered by the policy sciences and applied in practice shall be summarized in section 4.

Finally I shall try to assess the applicability of this approach to devising an encyclopaedia of public administration (5).
2. Characteristics of the Approach

Obviously, what is called here "public policy and decision-making" is closely akin to the so-called policy sciences. There is, however, not yet a commonly accepted paradigm of policy sciences; in order to specify what in my view policy sciences means and what, therefore, its bearing upon public administration in general and public policy and decision-making in particular might be, I shall attempt to briefly elaborate its main features.

Policy Sciences is generally regarded as a relatively new approach in political science as well as in the study of public administration (Rhodes 1979), although in practice it was carried out a long time (Heclo 1972), before Harold Lasswell (1951) coined this expression. He already stated the twofold character of policy sciences as an attempt to a) analyze the decision-making process and b) improve the level of information available to the decision-maker by providing him with analyzes and studies of substantive policy problems.

On the one hand, this dual goal mirrors the distinction the English speaking world makes between politics and policy, between process and contents; on the other hand, it might account for some of the confusions and problems later on confronting those regarding themselves as policy scientists:
- the varying degree to which process or contents are to be investigated;
- denomination of the branch in singular (policy science) or in plural (policy sciences);
- its descriptive as well as its prescriptive character.
2.1 Policy Sciences, Policy Analysis, Policy Studies, and Meta-Policy-Making

Although the study of politics should have been expected as the core of political science, this has, for a relatively long period of time, only been partly the case; apart from political philosophy the branch, guided by the model of democracy, rather focused, on the input-dimension, i.e. elections and interest group influence, political elites etc., of the political process than to investigate the conversion process or the outputs of the politico-administrative system. In the USA the shift of attention toward the conversion process and outputs took place only in the 1960s roughly indicated by the works of Braybrooke/Lindblom (1965) and Wildavsky (1964) on the one and Dye (1966) or Sharkansky (1970) on the other hand.

The output-research, although undoubtedly concerned with the contents of public decision-making, does not meet the particularity of Lasswell's second aspect, as it is not prescriptive and related to practical policy problems. Unfortunately, Dye (1976) and others (e.g. Schaefer 1972, Heclo 1972) have labelled research focussing on outputs "policy analysis" and, thereby, somewhat blurred the difference to primarily applied studies of policy issues, which so far were regarded as policy analysis in contrast to the more behavioral, descriptive studies of politics as a decision-making process and outputs as its result.

For clarity's sake I shall furtheron call this branch "policy studies", although from a historical point of view it owns the label "policy analysis".

Although Lasswell's 1951 programmatic statement had to be repeated at the beginning of the 1970s (Lasswell 1971, Dror 1971) to promote prescriptive, applied policy studies, these have been carried out in the 1950s in particular by the RAND Corporation with reference to defense problems and in the 1960s in connection with the "war-against-poverty"
programmes drawing increasingly stronger on social science than on economic analysis, which, however, remained an essential tool in the 1965 institutionalization of PPBS (Ukeles 1977). Prospective studies employing cost-benefit-analysis and other tools were increasingly accompanied at the end of the 1960s by evaluation studies, and later on, by implementation studies, a mark-stone being set by the Pressman/Wildavsky (1973) study. This trend toward evaluation and implementation studies, following an initial emphasis on planning can also be observed in the Federal Republic of Germany (Derlien 1976; Mayntz 1980). It goes without saying that the increased emphasis on substantive policy questions and the concern for practical policy studies has lead to the establishment of several special journals: Policy Sciences, Evaluation Quarterly, Policy Studies Journal, to mention just a few, and several Annual Reviews of the field.

Finally, it should be recollected that Dror (1968) strongly advocated what he called meta-policymaking as a device to improve the decision-making system, i.e. structure and process. He, thus, added a prescriptive aspect to the so far descriptive process-centered aspect of policy sciences stressing the practical need of planning and decision-making techniques. I shall interpret the practical application of these tools as an attempt to rationalize the decision-making process.

To sum up what has been tried to elaborate so far, the various branches of policy science could be sketched as follows:
2.2 Policy Science or Policy Sciences?

There has been some controversy not only about the various aspects of policy sciences, but also about the adequate denomination of the entire approach. This somehow artificial debate is only to be mentioned here, in order to highlight an important trait of the approach under consideration: its interdisciplinary character. The interdisciplinarity was emphasized by Lasswell (1951) as well as by Dror in his article in the first volume of the journal Policy Sciences, when Dror suggested as a compromise to use the plural, but grammatically the singular to indicate the unity of the interdisciplinary approach (Dror 1970, p.137, FN 7). The interdisciplinarity emphasized by using the plural while maintaining the unity and uniqueness of the approach can be traced in empirical process analyses as well as in normative content studies. The former generally draw at least on
organization theory (organizational sociology, administrative science, and business administration), the latter on a variety of disciplines traditionally concerned with specific policies, especially economics and sociology including their research methods and statistical tools.

2.3 Descriptive vs. Prescriptive Character

As mentioned before policy sciences in Lasswell's broad approach has a dual goal, an analytical and a prescriptive one (Dror 1975). Of course, the distinction underlying the picture on p. 5 between analysis and improvement, empirical and normative, descriptive and prescriptive, process and contents, politics and policy is artificial and basically analytical. The decision-making process might affect the contents and output (Nagel, 1980) and should therefore, for instance, be taken into account when, in an attempt of meta-policy-making, a new planning system is designed. On the other hand, decision-making techniques aiming at a rationalization of the process should be scrutinized with respect to the validity of their empirical premises (Tribe 1972, Wildavsky 1969, Schick 1977, Derlien 1978) and their behavioral consequences. The distinction is mentioned here less for methodological reasons (Raynolds 1975) than to indicate the specific role understanding and increasingly professional attitude of those regarding themselves as policy scientists (Lazarsfeld 1975) engaged with meta-policy-making and policy studies. After Dror's (1967) call there has, undoubtedly, been a development towards professionalization indicated not merely by the mushrooming of new journals and books, but, more important, by the establishment of special university training programmes (Engelbert 1977, König 1981) and - in this country - annual conferences of sociologists (Ferber 1977) and political scientists (Ellwein 1980) concerned with substantive policy questions as well as, last not least, the foundation of a professional association.
(Derlien 1981). Similar developments were observed in other countries, too (Dror 1974; Public Administration Review Symposium 1977).

This brief outline of the policy sciences approach containing both, public policy and decision-making as its objects, should have made clear that this approach has a principal bearing on the task of conceptualizing an encyclopaedia:

- the approach can be assumed to have some descriptive power, on which administrative science can draw,
- it, secondly, provides practice with a variety of instruments, which should be covered by an encyclopaedia

- thirdly, the target group of an encyclopaedia to a certain degree might be public administration itself and therefore policy analysts in and around governments, which should find their specific intellectual roots in an encyclopaedia.

However, in order to properly evaluate the merits of this approach it is necessary to display the basic descriptive categories (3.) and important tools proposed by decision-making and policy studies (4.).

3. Descriptive Categories for the Analysis of Decision-Making Systems

In this attempt to give an overview of the contribution the policy sciences approach could possibly make to an effort to map administrative reality I shall restrict myself to elaborating the main points and shall not go into subtleties like, for instance, micro-aspects of individual decision behavior (perception, cognitive dissonance, or risky shift). A further reservation should be made: the categorial system presented here has developed out of research and university teaching and is occasionally a synthesis of various, not only the policy sciences' intellectual influence; this holds in particular for section 3.1.
In order to describe the functioning of administrative macrosystems or individual agencies one should, in my view, distinguish the following aspects:

- properties of the system under scrutiny, the borders of which have to be defined according to the research question; I should like to call this aspect the setting and the structure of the respective decision-making-system (3.1);
- secondly, a phase model of decision-making-processes within that setting and its structure (3.2);
- thirdly, the categorization of outputs of the decision-making-system (3.3).

3.1 The Setting and the Structure of Decision-Making-Systems

A crucial problem is to define the borderline of systems in an abstract way, i.e. without regard to a special problem or question, as defining a decision-system is a matter of theoretical relevance.

In so far, it is much easier to elaborate the institutional approach to public administration and neatly separate local from state government, ministries from agencies a.s.o.; what can be done, however, is to start with

3.1.1 the decision issue, which can be described in terms of a public task or a policy area, and then go on to

3.1.2 the actors inside and outside the institutional system, who are interested, involved in, or affected by the process and its outcome. These actors can be described in terms of their group affiliation or their official position and institutional membership. This leads us to

3.1.3 interests and goals, individual and institutional ones as well as

3.1.4 conflicts, actual and potential, between the actors, and their
3.1.5 power relationships, which can best be analyzed in terms of the power bases (French/Raven 1960) available: expert power (information), reward power (material sanctions, for instance financial resources), referential power (leadership, charisma), legitimate power (authority), last but not least physical power (force) as the ultimate ratio in conflict resolution. The power structure within the system is relatively easily analyzable, for instance within a ministry the relationship between minister and section head in terms of expert power and authority; between federal and state or state and local governments in terms of reward power. This also enables us to judge reversely subsystem autonomy. A crucial point in the power structure is the distribution of legitimate power.

3.1.6 of authority or jurisdiction as it is fixed constitutionally or in another normative way. This not only affects the balance between the various bases of power, but also the distribution of reward power, e.g. by the jurisdiction on organizational, financial, or personnel matters. Most important, however, is the distribution of formal authority in programmatic matters. It should be obvious that this is a point where a lot of juridical knowledge has to be fed into the analysis. From a theoretical point, however, these data enable us to assess

3.1.7 centralization, hierarchy, collegial or monocratic, federal or unitary systems, or participation rights.

3.1.8 Formal roles as defined by institutional membership of the actors (3.1.2) and their jurisdiction (3.1.6) as well as their position within a formal system (3.1.7) could then be regarded almost as a theoretical construct.

3.1.9 Another important category are the existing decision-making-programmes, which more or less conditionally or elastically guide the decision behavior or constitute
restrictions to the advancement of subsystem goals. A typology of programmes can be developed either with respect to policy areas, to output (3.3 below), or to resources (organizational regulations, personnel, budgetary, or programmatic; 3.1.6). In any case, the survey of relevant programmes enables us to judge the degree of formalization and regulation within the respective system.

3.1.11 It can also be helpful to classify programmes according to their hierarchical status as constitutional, federal, state, local and to distinguish between internal administrative programmes, frame legislation, and executive programmes.

3.1.12 Once we have arrived at some measure of centrality/decentrality (3.1.7) or autonomy (3.1.6) we can broaden the frame of reference and analyze interorganizational decision making, networks of relatively autonomous actors, e.g. investigate state-local-relationships or the interrelations between different government branches in the process of implementing a programme. These macrosystems are normally described in the same terminology as individual agencies are; in so far interorganizational analysis is not a new theory, but rather a new question. It might be useful, however, to introduce new descriptions from other disciplines the broader the system under investigation, for instance, measure the degree of politicization and political support, the costs of system maintenance, learning capacity, governability, complexity a.s.o.

3.1.13 In order to set the system into motion and to describe the processes going on in more detail, one should distinguish a few aspects of the decision-making process, a model of which will be outlined in 3.2. As these aspects: control, coordination, conflict resolution, and information processing (Mayntz/Scharpf 1972, 1975) overlap the individual phases of the process model and
often characterize several of the phases, they should be described here. Furthermore, the activities related to these aspects often are assigned to particular institutions as their functions, for instance to coordinating committees or agencies preoccupied with research (information generation). To a certain extent, they are contained in the traditional POSDCORB scheme.

3.1.14 This holds true in particular for control processes involved most universally in hierarchical relations in and between institutions. Two aspects should be separated, which are implied in the English term "control": Directing (Steuerung) and monitoring (Kontrolle) and which can be regarded as connected in cybernetic systems. With respect to directing one could distinguish various means of steering: procedural and substantive programmes vs. ad hoc orders as forms of the exercise of legitimate power (authority, 3.1.7); furthermore means of indirect steering employing other resources (or bases of power, 3.1.6). In any case, the decision premises of other actors are more or less influenced.

3.1.15 Monitoring processes feeding back information about the actual operation of other actors and allowing for analyses of deviations from previously set goals a.s.o. (3.1.14) can be typified, for instance, according to degree of institutionalization, internal vs. external location, criteria (result, legality, economic, individual performance), intervals, and objects (programme, budget, organization, personnel) (Derlien 1980).

3.1.16 Both aspects of control have been subjected to attempts of rationalization by devising management systems, which could be classified in this context.

3.1.17 Coordination as a process of combining the special activities of actors with respect to time, location, and substantive fit should also be described in terms of institutionalization vs. self-coordination, programmed
or latent a.s.o. Of special importance are coordination problems due to "selective perception and departmental identification" (Dearborn/Simon 1958) resulting in suboptimal solutions (Scharpf 1972).

3.1.18 The phenomenon of conflict can be accounted for by referring to type (goal vs. means conflict), mechanisms of resolution (objective analysis, hierarchical (authoritative), persuasion, bargaining, and other "quasi-solutions"); furthermore institutionalization and roles adopted could be distinguished.

3.1.19 Information generation, transformation, and processing most closely of the above mentioned aspects refers to the "genuine" decision-making process (3.2); in addition, most decision-making tools (4.) can be subsumed here as rationalization devices. Information processing is closely linked to organization structure, as the latter determines the communication system and the problems associated with it (for instance filters; lack of feedback).

The categories I have just mentioned are more or less applied in most studies of the policy process; they reveal most obviously the interdisciplinary character of policy sciences, in particular its heritage from organization theory.

3.2 The Policy Process

Easton's (1965) system theoretical approach and Lindblom's (1968) paradigm seem to provide the basis for most phase models of the policy process. Within the Eastonian input-conversion-output model the conversion process has been subdivided into a varying number of phases by those authors who analyse the decision-making process in and around government institutions. This process model much more pronouncedly constitutes a genuine contribution of the policy sciences approach than the vocabulary mentioned in the previous section.
3.2.1 Inputs

Inputs in Easton's terminology are demands for and supports of a policy, originating in a state of the environment perceived as unsatisfactory or problematic compared with the goals (level of aspiration) of an actor. Policy analysis has paid attention particularly to economic variables to explain the final output of the system. It is, however, questionable if the environment of a decision-making system in general and a politico-administrative system in particular can be described in a problem typology, as these problems do not exist per se, but are generated dynamically and perceived in the light of individual or collective references themselves being subjected to change.

A corresponding problem has to be coped with in the related rationalization attempts: the development of social indicators or the specification of impacts in evaluation studies. Operationalizations here ultimately involve value judgements and result in normative problems known from the theory of public choice and public tasks (Staatsaufgaben).

The approach has been more successful in theoretically incorporating input-structures (institutions, norms and attitudes, elections), through which problems are perceived and articulated in order to become a political issue. Insofar, the systems approach in policy sciences, too, proves to be at least a useful heuristic tool.

3.2.2 Conversion Process

The conversion process and its conceptualization is of particular relevance to administrative science, as public administration usually plays an important role in both of the basic stages of this process, in policy formation and in the implementation of a policy. The individual phases distinguished in either of these stages vary from research project to research project,
as they depend on the research problem and on the availability of empirical data.

3.2.2.1 Policy Formation
Most studies distinguish between problem articulation (through input structures), problem perception and definition by those engaged in policy formation, problem analysis, generation of alternatives, assessment of alternatives, and final selection of an alternative to solve the problem.
This phase model of decision-making is strongly influenced by the normative, "closed" model of decision-making; most researchers agree that there are feedback processes between individual phases, the distinction of which often is blurred in practice. As a heuristic model, however, it helps to organize facts and, in particular, to cope with the time dimension of the process. As such, however, it is a relatively empty shell, unless filled with some of the categories describing the setting and the structure of the system (3.1).

3.2.2.2 Policy Implementation
The implementation process has attracted the interest of policy sciences only relatively late. It has grown out of evaluation studies which have demonstrated the importance of the way in which programmes are executed. Difficulties arise in defining the starting point of the implementation process: implementation problems are regularly anticipated in policy formation or programmes are adapted or specified by successive regulations after they have been authorized. After all, it is only recently that implementation research follows theoretical interests and raises these questions (Mayntz 1980): applied, commissioned implementation studies normally take a given point in time as the beginning.
Theoretically implementation studies heavily rely on organizational theory - apparent from their concern with processes of goal displacement and organizational efficiency in general. Occasionally it is argued that implementation research, which regularly analyses a greater number of organizations and their interplay, constitute a new frame of reference in organization theory, as it replaces the traditional focal organization by a network of organizations. Seldomly, however, are these networks analyzed as entities of their own and particular properties elaborated, which would explain implementation problems. In my view, it is rather the focal programme that constitutes the point of reference for analysis thereby running the risk of overlooking the multifunctionality of most agencies involved in the implementation of several programmes.

3.3 Output

The most significant theoretical contribution of the "public policy and decision-making" approach of the descriptive branch of policy sciences, is its attempt to classify policy outputs. Aiming at generalization these attempts, starting with the famous Lowi (1964) typology, had to abstract from every-day-classifications ("housing", "environmental" etc. policies), but are, of course, dependent on the theoretical interests of the researcher. I shall briefly mention some classificatory systems, most of which have been used in one or the other form.

3.3.1 Sectoral Classification

Most common in practice is a system which I should like to call sectoral and which distinguishes in a rather traditional way policy areas, policies, and programmes according to the agency system (Resort-system), for instance separating labour marked policy from urban or foreign or social policy. This system has a close kinship to the system of institutionalized public tasks, and monetary outputs can in most cases be inferred from budget statistics or are even
aggregated (in the FRG in the so-called functional plan of the budget). The problem with this sectoral, as I prefer to call it, classification is that it might vary from country to country and that it is rough and changing over time, therefore allowing for comparative research only very limitedly.

3.3.2 Functional Classification

Another typology, employed basically in organization theory, pays attention to those outputs and decisions referring to the administrative system itself rather than to policies delivered to the public (Luhmann 1970). The latter are contained in the broad category of programme decisions, which, of course, can easily be differentiated according to one of the other typologies. Apart from programme decisions one can separately treat budget, personnel, and organizational decisions, i.e. decisions about resources (3.1.6), which, for instance, might affect the policy process in its formative as well as in its implementation stage and which from a normative point of view should be related to each other (but seldomly are in practice) in the form of a programme budget (4.1.4).

3.3.3 Logical Classification

An alternative way to classify outputs or rather programmes (as means to achieve outputs) is their analysis from a logical or methodological point of view: according to their design as operational or ambiguous in their goal formulation, single or multigoal programme with conflicting or transitive goals a.s.o. Programmes also vary in design between general and experimental; or one could possibly distinguish between law and regulation as alternative juridical forms of programmes.
3.3.4 Welfare Classification

Being at a loss how to label the Lowi typologies and related ones (Jann 1981) I take this expression in order to mention the distinction between
- distributive and redistributive,
- regulative and self-regulative,
- and constituent policies.
Although not mutually exclusive, these categories can easily be theoretically related to the policy process, especially to the level of conflict.

3.3.5 Degree of Intervention

Another typology inspired by the above mentioned welfare classification but basically developed in implementation research takes as its criterion the degree of intervention of the instruments adopted by a programme into the environment of the system by constituting more or less binding decision premises for the individual (Mayntz 1980a):
- imperatives (traffic regulations),
- incentives (tax reductions to induce investment),
- transfer payments (subsidies),
- physical treatment (e.g. in hospitals),
- instructional facilities,
- information (weather forecast) and paedagogical programmes, indicative planning,
- civil law bargaining.
These instruments and their possible mix obviously explain some of the variations in goal achievement of a programme by allowing for behavioral explanations of reactions in the target population.

3.3.6 Efficiency criteria

Occasionally policy output was classified by postulating certain properties derived in an ultimately normative way from some efficiency notion of public policy (for instance Mayntz/Scharpf 1975). Policies are then classified according to legality and legi-
timacy, selectivity of interest representation, comprehensiveness, innovativeness, incrementalism, effectiveness (goal achievement). The validity of this kind of typology is apparently highly questionable, as the criteria are either derived from system goals or personal preferences of the researcher (Derlien 1974, 1980).

Anyway, despite problems of operationalization, these typologies can in principle be combined in order to describe output multidimensionally and, thus, more adequately.

3.4 Feedback

The last phase in the policy cycle, completing formation and implementation, are feedbacks of the results of previous decisions. Since cybernetical models have shaped our thinking, we are more accustomed now to look for this phase. Theoretically, there is a close connection with monitoring processes (3.1.15). Cybernetics, used as a heuristic tool, lead us to investigate, if there are natural or rationally constructed feedbacks, what their criteria are, and how they operate. Rationally constructed feedbacks may stem from management science or could have the form of policy studies (evaluation and implementation research). The question is to which extent the system makes use of the information provided, revises former decisions, and moves goal orientedly. From the point of view of organization theory feedbacks are linked to the problems of organizational learning and programmatic as well as structural change.
4. **Instruments for Rationalizing Public Policy and Decision-Making**

What makes policy sciences a distinctive approach is its engagement in shaping practical policy by devising metapolitics and carrying through policy studies. This professional role understanding is built upon a variety of tools to be applied in the policy-making process, which are interpreted here from a sociological point of view as instruments aiming for rationalization of the decision-making process.

Whereas the descriptive categories and propositions provide us with tools to analyze the process, the prescriptive instruments have been put into practice and, therefore, constitute administrative reality in many countries, a number of policy areas, and some of the phases of the policy cycle. This should be reason enough to pay attention to these techniques in an encyclopaedia.

For the purpose of this paper, however, it may suffice to give a broad overview of the classes of decision-making techniques. These instruments can be grouped roughly along the phases of the policy-process model summarized in 3.2.

4.1 **Planning**

Rationalization of the policy formation stage is at the core of planning, although in a very limited sense; the emphasis is on generation and transformation of information, while the political aspects of public planning are more or less neglected. Whereas the analytically oriented part of the policy scientists are interested in the very politics aspect of the planning process (Braybrooke/Lindblom 1965; Scharpf 1971), the tendency not to take politics into account in the logic of planning tools and on the part of government advisors has in my view two ultimate reasons: the theory of
public decision-making processes has not yet developed far enough and, even if it had, many factors might not be foreseeable on principle grounds; secondly, the professionals more or less follow in their role understanding the classical politics-administration or line-staff dichotomies.

Without intending to be exclusive the techniques available, then, can be classified according to the sub-phases of the policy formation stage:

4.1.1 Instrument of forecasting, as for instance trend extrapolations, scenarios, Delphi-technique, or simulation of future developments, social indicators.

4.1.2 Production of alternatives: brainstorming.

4.1.3 Assessment of alternatives: systems analysis, cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness analysis, simulation of the implementation process (Böhret 1980) and of impacts.

4.1.4 Integrating programming and resources

We have to name, of course, the various instruments or systems which try to integrate programming and budgeting: PPBS, RCB, ZBB. It should be mentioned, however, that there seems to be a lack of instruments which try to relate programming to the other resources: personnel and organization structure. Personnel capacity required for policy implementation is occasionally taken into account, but special organizational arrangements are hardly considered, at least in practice.

4.1.5 Political feasibility

As an exception to the rule analysts seem to be asked for studies of political feasibility on certain occasions; I do, however, not know if there are any tools or patterns of reasoning recommended which go beyond common sense and scientific guesswork.
4.2 Implementation Studies

As I have pointed out above, there is a growing tendency to have the implementation process investigated. In my view, these studies do not require or employ specific techniques going beyond the inventory of organizational analysis and studies in decision-making, although there is a slight shift in perspective: the focal organization is replaced by the focal programme as the point of reference. The findings of these studies gradually lead to the development of a policy typology (3.3.5) which allows to anticipate the suitability of the mix of instruments in the planning process or to stress for de-regulation.

4.3 Evaluation Studies

In principle, implementation studies are just a special brand of evaluation studies. Evaluation studies, however, are predominantly concerned with the impact of policies in the environment and only seldomly take the implementation process into account when trying to explain a lack of goal achievement. I do not want to go into methodological subtleties and the variety of different designs; it should only be recollected that evaluators are increasingly disappointed about the reception of their results in the policy process.

4.4 Meta-Policymaking

What Dror (1968) called meta-policymaking is the proposal to develop a) techniques as the afore mentioned, b) arrange them in systems implying, c) organizational, d) budgetary, and e) personnel factors, in order to ultimately make the politico-administrative system more "intelligent" and self-reflexive. Meta-policymaking is, therefore, an ongoing process the results of which are indicated in the previous sections. Practically important is the existence of organizational units occupied with this job. As a scientific category meta-policymaking yet enables us to hint at two more
problems policy scientists are interested in: (techniques of) direct citizen participation as, for instance, advocacy planning to overcome weaknesses of input-structures; and problems of the relationship between administrative practice and scientific advice.

These tools policy analysts have developed or work with should be contained in an encyclopaedia. Besides their logical construction, though, it should also be conveyed which behavioral consequences their application engenders and what the practical experiences are in general.

5. Assessment of the Approach

In his letter of invitation Klaus König has pointed out several of the criteria which should be met by an approach applied to an encyclopaedia:
- it should descriptively cover as many aspects of public administration as possible,
- it should be general enough to allow for comparisons of the highly differentiated administrative reality,
- it should be interdisciplinary and thereby achieve integration of the various administrative sciences,
- it should be suited to reflect administrative theory and practice.

Like the other approaches to be discussed in this workshop, "public policy and decision-making" surely does not meet all of these standards, but has besides some advantages also a number of shortcomings some of which I shall hint at.

5.1 Bridging the Politics-Administration Dichotomy

Originating in political science the approach clearly helps to bridge the classical gap between politics and administration in the science of public administration. In the same way is can be maintained that, from the point of view of
organization theory, it shares the open system perspective by relating the organization to its environment. However, the conceptualization of the administrative relationships with the political context is accomplished rather from the angle of the political than the administrative system; political scientists have discovered public administration after having been predominantly concerned with inputs.

5.2 One-Dimensionality

Consequently, public administration defined as the conversion system in the policy cycle is analyzed only insofar as it is politically relevant. Other factors and problems, particularly the "technical" aspects of most of the POSDCORB functions are not taken into account or at best interpreted as restricting factors to the decision-making process in programmatic matters.

5.3 Neglect of Resource Dimension

Its roots in political science lead to a relative neglect of the "factors of production", of questions about organization, personnel, and budget. Although the analysis of budgetary processes has been of main interest to policy scientists, only the behavioral aspects or planning systems were investigated or designed, respectively; comparative institutional analyses are lacking, however, and basic budgetary techniques as well as budgetary law are not treated.

Similarly personnel administration is not covered by the approach, nor are behavioral processes in the personnel sector (recruitment, attitudes of civil servants) researched. This critique can be extended to organizational problems, too. In so far, the policy sciences approach really has to be either interdisciplinary or leaves these questions entirely to other disciplines.
5.4 **Capacity as a Meta-Language**

The approach is relatively abstract and commonly not used in administrative practice. It, therefore, could provide the encyclopaedia with a general terminological frame covering a variety of areas of public administration in different countries and cultures. It is rather a meta-language than a theory; a meta-language which enables us to describe similar phenomena under one abstract category, which are probably termed differently in practice (Rose 1976). In my view, the most yielding theoretical contribution could be the conceptualization of process and output.

5.5 **Possibility of Functional Interpretation of Structures**

The terminology sketched in sections 3.2 and 3.3 can also be taken as a reference point for a functional analysis of administrative structures. Either similar structures, for instance local governments or mechanism of citizen participation are described in terms of their functions in the policy process; or specific phases or aspects of the decision process (3.1.13) are taken as point of reference in order to find out in which structures these phenomena/functions take place, are located, or assigned to.

5.6 **Lack of Institutional Description**

On the other hand, it may have become pretty obvious so far that the policy sciences approach suffers - at least for the purpose of compiling an encyclopaedia - from a lack of empirical, institutional, and juridical data. Its capacity as a meta-language and its value for structural-functional analysis are paid for by difficulties to describe or define these data in the every day terminology used in practice. In other words: comparative analysis is eased, but description of singular phenomena in singular contexts is impaired. This deficiency became most obvious in 3.1, when I tried to elaborate categories for the analysis of the setting and structure of decision-making processes.
5.7 Value of Instrumental Techniques

On the other hand, the policy sciences have developed or work with a series of instrumental techniques and decision-making tools in the functional area of programmatic decision-processes, which constitute reality and, therefore, should be contained in an encyclopaedia. These attempts to rationalize processes should, however, be evaluated in the light of practical experience.

5.8 Need for a Truely Interdisciplinary Approach

Nobody considering an approach for the purpose at stake would assume or maintain its exclusiveness. The presumed lack of fit to institutional factors should induce us to deliberate ways of incorporating different approaches into the public policy and decision-making perspective. In particular, organizational theory and organizational law should be candidates for a combination as well as instrumental information about budgeting and personnel administration (Wamsley/Zald 1976).

The criticisms put forward against a specific scientific approach to the analysis of public administration to a certain extent reveal a basic problem of administrative science(s): that we don't have a coherent, interdisciplinary theory yet, which is well corroborated and generally accepted. Building an encyclopaedia on a theory, then, would mean, that we first of all had to develop such a general theory.

An alternative, in my view more promising, procedure would be to base the work not exclusively on a theory or an approach, but on structures and problems of public administration. Of course, at least problems cannot be indentified without reference to theory; but it would be easier to achieve consensus about problems, which in most cases can be described in terms of alternative theoretical approaches, than to reach an agreement about the value of divergent theories. Their capacity would be revealed when theory is applied to the analysis of structures and problems.
References

Böhret, Carl/Werner Hugger,
1980 Praxistext von Gesetzentwürfen — am Beispiel des Referentenentwurfs zum Jugendhilfegesetz, Baden-Baden

Braybrooke, David/Charles E. Lindblom,
1965 A Strategy of Decision, New York

Dearborn, D.C./Herbert Simon,

Derlien, Hans-Ulrich,

Derlien, Hans-Ulrich,

Derlien, Hans-Ulrich,

Derlien, Hans-Ulrich,

Derlien, Hans-Ulrich,

Derlien, Hans-Ulrich (ed.),
1981 Programmforshung in der öffentlichen Verwaltung, München

Dror, Yehezkel,

Dror, Yehezkel,
1968 Public Policymaking Reexamined, San Francisco

Dror, Yehezkel,
1970 Prolegomena to Policy Sciences, in: Policy Science 1, 135-150

Dror, Yehezkel,
1971 Design for Policy Sciences, New York


Easton, David, 1965 A Framework for Political Analysis, New York

Ellwein, Thomas (ed.), 1980 Politikfeld-Analysen 1979, Opladen


v.Ferber, Christian/P.X. Kaufmann (eds.), 1977 Soziologie und Sozialpolitik, Opladen


Jann, Werner, 1981 Kategorien der Policy-Forschung, Speyerer Arbeitshefte 37

König, Klaus, 1981 Die verwaltungswissenschaftliche Ausbildung in Europa, in: Konstanzer Blätter für Hochschulfragen 18


Lasswell, Harold D., 1971 A Pre-View of Policy Sciences, Amsterdam


Lowi, Theodore J.,

Luhmann, Niklas
1970 Reform und Information. Theoretische Überlegungen zur Reform der Verwaltung, in: Die Verwaltung, 15-41

Mayntz, Renate/Fritz W. Scharpf et al.,
1972 Programmentwicklung in der Ministerialverwaltung, Research Report

Mayntz, Renate/Fritz W. Scharpf,
1975 Policy-Making in the German Federal Bureaucracy, Amsterdam

Mayntz, Renate (ed.),
1980 Implementation politischer Programme, Königstein

Mayntz, Renate,
1980a Gesetzgebung und Bürokratisierung, Ms. Bonn, 48-55

Nagel, Stuart S.,

Pressman, Jeffrey L./Aaron Wildavsky,
1973 Implementation, Berkeley

Reynolds, James F.,

Rhodes, R.A.W.,
1979 Public Administration and Policy Analysis, Hampshire

Rose, Richard (ed.),
1976 The Dynamics of Public Policy: A Comparative Analysis, London/Beverly Hills

Scharpf, Fritz W.,
1971 Planung als politischer Prozeß, in: Die Verwaltung, 1-30

Scharpf, Fritz W.,
1972 Komplexität als Schranke der politischen Planung, in: Politische Vierteljahresschrift, Sonderheft, 168-192

Sharkansky, Ira (ed.),
1970 Policy Analysis in Political Science, Chicago

Schaefer, Guenter F.,

Schick, Allen,

Tribe, Laurence H.,
1972 Policy Science: Analysis or Ideology?, in: Philosophy and Public Affairs, 66-113
Ukeles, Jacob B.,

Wamsley, Gary L./Mayer N. Zald,

Wildavsky, Aaron,
1964 The Politics of the Budgetary Process, Boston

Wildavsky, Aaron,
Hellmut Wollmann: Some tentative remarks for discussion in
Group C "Public Policy and Decision Making"
at Hochschule für Verwaltungswissenschaften in Speyer

Group C is obviously meant to deal with the question how policies are made and
which role public administration plays in the policy-making process.

To begin with, reference should be made to the well-known difference which the
English language draws between politics as a conflict about gains and losses
in the "authoritative allocation of value" (or to resume the Lasswellian definition: "who gets what, when, how") and policies as concrete political courses of
action that are decided upon and implemented for tackling certain political,
economic or societal problems.

In order to structure the argumentation it may be useful to construct two models
of an idealtype sort regarding the way policies are made. Typically certain
assumptions and tenets about the mode of decision-making and implementation of
policies seem to configurate. For matter of convenience the two idealtype models
shall be called "rational" and "pragmatic" and shall be juxtaposed under a number
of relevant dimensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical dimension</th>
<th>rational policy making model</th>
<th>pragmatic policy making model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manageability of environment</td>
<td>The scope of action of the political system vis-a-vis economy and society is positively and optimistically claimed and is seen as in principle enlargeable particularly through building up planning and information capacities of government.</td>
<td>The scope of action of the political system is viewed as being limited by considerable restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underlying &quot;planning philosophy&quot;</td>
<td>Public action should be &quot;planned comprehensively&quot;, that is, should be based on a highly informed anticipation of alternative courses of action. Decisions should be made on the basis of &quot;objective&quot; knowledge.</td>
<td>&quot;Bounded&quot; rationality is accepted. Political decision-making is largely regarded as a political process with the necessity of finding consensus and compromises at the price of &quot;incrementalism&quot; (&quot;muddling through&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of information and of scientific research</td>
<td>Information is regarded as a vital resource for political and administrative action. Thus, scientific research is seen in its information and intelligence function.</td>
<td>The relevance of information is matched by the determinant influence of interests. Scientific research is seen and used rather in its partisanship role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locus of political action</td>
<td>In a &quot;central bias&quot; effective political action is expected from central government as agent for planned &quot;social change&quot; within the political system (&quot;systems politics&quot;). Latently, there are elements of the concept of &quot;one&quot; (monolithic) actor.</td>
<td>Vis-a-vis the fragmentation of the decision-making structure in a federal system an open concept in regard to the multiplicity of decision-makers is pursued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frame of action</td>
<td>Public action is meant to be carried out particularly by influencing general parameters (level of public spending, interest rate etc.), &quot;macro-policies&quot; (&quot;Globalsteuerung&quot;).</td>
<td>Public policies should rather be &quot;tailored&quot; to middle-range and low-range variables. (&quot;micro-polices&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of action</td>
<td>The goals and objectives of action should be centrally and operationally spelt out in a &quot;conditional program&quot;-fashion, that is, in a &quot;if... then...&quot;-pattern that precisely instructs the administrative units about what to do under certain conditions.</td>
<td>In order to enable and motivate flexible and innovative administrative action vis-a-vis complex situations, legislation and programs should only state the purpose, leaving the decision on ways and means to reach it to the administrative unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation performance</td>
<td>Adhering (implicitly) to the traditional (normative) concept of Politics and Administration, the administrative function is mainly that of following and enforcing legislative instructions in a hierarchical chain of command. Thus, implementation &quot;goes without saying&quot;.</td>
<td>Conceiving the administrative process as part of a many-staged and fragmented decision-making process, implementation &quot;becomes a problem&quot; in the sense that any legislative rule or program provision, on its way to realization, is on a &quot;long march through the institutions&quot;. Due to the multiplicity of actors &quot;bargaining&quot; and exchange patterns prevail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. The "rational policy making" model in trial (and failure) in the real world of politics and administration

The period of "Reform Policies" ("Politik der inneren Reformen") inaugurated by the Social-Liberal Coalition voted into power in 1969 offers a salient example in which some, if not most of the tenets and implications of the "rational policy making" model can be found, at least at the level of declarative intentions and worded rhetoric. To name only few of these dimensions:

- A widespread belief in the "makability" of sweeping "social change", particularly rooted in the experience that the first serious economic crisis of post-war Germany in 1966/1967 could be overcome by employing neo-Keynsian recipes and conformingly contrived interventionist instruments, and also fostered by a wide popular "reform mood" that became effective in the 1969 elections and appeared to widen the scope of political manoeuvrability in regard to restricting economic and societal interests.

- A mounting readiness to set up institutional and procedural arrangements in order to improve the planning and information capacities in government and administration, be it horizontally on the government level (see the early attempts of the Projektgruppe Regierungs- und Verwaltungsreform at the Federal Government level), be it sectorally in certain policy fields.

- An obvious neglect or underestimation of the hurdles and barriers to the implementation of such reform measures, be it in terms of administrative units that suspect encroachment on their "domain" and thus sabotage change be it in terms of the multiplicity of actors and interests within the layers and sectors of the federal system.

Without going into details at this point: A very telling story of the (passing heyday of the "rational policy making model" can be learnt from the reform mood in which "social experimentation" was expressly introduced into the West German political system in the late sixties as an instrument and vehicle of "systematic political and societal learning", based on the belief that policies should be systematically "tested" in order to produce reliable information for future decisions, whereby it was assumed that scientific research would play a major role in that process of learning and enlightenment and that the policy parties and interest groups involved in that process would be ready to surrender to "the best information available". Perhaps the best-known examples out of the "experimenting" interlude are offered by the "model experiments" within the secondary school system (Gesamtschulen) and also within the Law School Trainings (Einfachenen-Juristenausbildung). (The further course of these "experiments" and the sobering lessons to be learnt from them in regard to the political restrictions to such attempts at "systematic learning" cannot be followed here...
3. The "pragmatic policy-making model" in deployment and action

The honeymoon of that historic "liaison" of reform-minded politicians and bureaucrats as well as of "social reformer" scholars and researchers (comparable to the reform coalition that shaped up in the early sixties in the U.S. in connection with the Social Action Programs of the Johnson Administration), carried on a wave of public support, was relatively short-lived. The following dimensions of the ensuing development seem to be particularly salient:

- The restrictiveness of the economic environment came to the open when after 1973 the dramatically rising petrol prices signalled the end of seemingly car-free "economic growth" of the Western industrial countries, narrowing the financial scope of government action due to the slackening of tax returns and, at the same time, growing public expenditures for anti-unemployment programs and social programs.

- Despite its "hardware" sophistication that the planning and information systems on the various level of government had reached they proved to be of little use due to the fact that the data bases remained relatively poor and basic trends shifted conspicuously, with economic, demographic etc. forecasts often way off the mark.

- Following their logic planning systems and instruments developed a density that, as the elaborate hierarchical planning systems in the realm of spatial and regional planning show, tend to over-determine decentral decision-making and may paralyse local initiative. The same applied to "overregulation" by legal provisions that may be contradicting, if not counteracting. In the discussion which has picked up drive in the last few years this "overregulation" in terms of too many and too detailed instructions for administrative action has been blamed for the "burecratizing process" ("Bürokritisierung") which administrative units undergo and that is seen at work in rigid, routine-like administrative behavior. The high emphasis that was conceptually first placed on the planning stage, that is on the formulation of plans and the setting of goals, turned out to be all the more one-sided as experiences with the implementation processes and problems of federal policies showed that the implementation process and phase is essentially a political process in which battles lost in an earlier stage of the process tend to be reopened in order to be won after all and in which the additional formulation of guidelines on the State and local level may determine or change the contents and substance of a legal provision or program goal considerably.
- The more restrictive and restricted the scope of action externally becomes, the more organisation and procedure of public policy call for attention as internal resource and "bottleneck" for public action. Under these auspices the traditional organisational and procedural setup of public administration proves often to be quite inadequate and insufficient. This is particularly true where the modern welfare state is highly dependent on the active cooperation of the addressee of its policies in order to make such policies effective. The more "targeted" a-policy measure is meant to be (take the example of urban rehabilitation policies that are intended to zero in on certain urban areas or social groups as "target" areas or groups), the less policy-makers can rely on the traditional administrative pattern and behavior to just "sit and wait" for the addressees of such policy to turn to the administrative unit. Instead, in such fields of "targeted" policy the administrative unit is called upon to become active to "reach out" into the field of intended private activities. In order to stimulate and mobilise cooperation and compliance of private actors as precondition for goal-achievement of public policies bargaining and persuasion became a central pattern of administrative behavior even where resorting to hierarchical orders is formally permitted. Organisationally speaking, different variations and strategies for institutional interconnecting and interlocking public actions and private activities are pursued. In many policy fields an arsenal of "intermediary" organisations of different organisational composition can be found, be it, that a legally separate, but in its substance still public organisation is formed, be it that the performance and fulfilment of a certain task is "contracted out". Thus "the fringing out of the state" becomes a vital organisational strategy for public action and activity for getting implementation of public policies achieved.

- Such strategies for implementation become particularly relevant in regard to delivering social services to deprived groups. Public social service organisations proper nor private organisations (which have often turned to become large-scale organizations with bureaucratic patterns themselves) are able to reach with forms of help those we need it most, for instance, drug addicts, juvenile jobless and so forth. In such cases
bypassing the traditional set-up of (public and private) bureaucracies for implementing social policies and, instead, funnelling financial aid and incentives through self-help groups with a claim to autonomy and hardly without any form of traditional financial accountability appear to be perhaps the only way left to reach "problem groups" otherwise outside the reach and range of traditional administrative patterns. Put into a broader perspective building bridges between traditional administrative action and self-help networks should be conceptually tied in with the more general trend to loosening the concept of public action and intervention in its restriction to "state" action (performed through public or at least semi-public units and organizations) and, in order to develop and apply modes of public action more appropriate for coping with more complex societal problems, to regarding (and using) "third sector" networks and activities as a means and resource to mobilize "collective activities" that are not part of the traditional state realm (as channelled through public or semi-public units) nor of the market (as a summation of, in the last resort, individualistic decisions and choices). Seen from the perspective of "the state", a "third sector" strategy appears to have not only considerable motivational assets (similar to "participatory" strategies as entered upon in areas of public planning), but also sizable financial ones, using public money as "seeding money" for prodding private actors into activities and also spending out of private coffers and means, not to speak of the (latent?) function of co-opting potential or actual protest and drop-out groups into the dominant system. Under more general conceptual auspices, this development makes it vital to widen and re-formulate the concept of policy making particularly in its hitherto prevailing concentration on decision making (in a decisionistic sense) and also on implementation (in the sense of being performed through public or at least semi-public actors).

4. Some concluding remarks

a) It would be conceptually misleading, if policy making were exclusively or predominantly seen as decision making proper and if decision making, in turn, were conceived of in terms of a normative decisionist model: Instead, policy making should be regarded as a multi-staged political process which ranges from the formulation of (that is: conflict about) objectives and goals (that is: the distribution of gains and losses between interests and groups) to the implementation process (where the battle about the distribution of gains and losses
is being continued in the various administrative and bureaucratic arenas) as well as to the manifold feedback mechanisms through which the state and result of action are reported back into the process. Although the types of activity can be analytically told apart as goal formulation, implementation and feedback within a cycle model of public action, in the real world of politics and administration they occur in a processual continuum in which the three analytically isolated activities constantly intertwine and interact.

b) The empirical weight and salience of implementation becomes the more conspicuous, the more vital it becomes for the sake of the manoeuvrability of the political system to "decentralize" the decision making and implementation structure in the sense that more discretion and power in terms of concretizing decisions of the intermediary and minor sort and of providing the organizational, personal and financial means tailored to the concrete problems to be solved are granted to hierarchically lower layers and sectors within the political system, also comprising semi-public or quasi-public units and organizations "at the fringes of the state". This development becomes all the more manifest and empirically relevant the more demanding the societal and economic problems become and the more the "governability of the state is at stake. Quite plausibly it can be assumed that these developments applying not only to developed Western industrial countries, but also to countries of state socialism and also to developing countries.

c) In prolongation of this development and line of argument widening and reformulating the concept of policy making is furthermore called for vis-à-vis the functional necessity of the modern welfare state to resort to strategies of "rediscovering" and relating to the "third sector" of collective societal activities (partly of the cooperativist sort which can be historically trace back to working class self help attempts and experiences in the last century) in order to mobilize "private" societal motivations and, for alleviating the mounting "fiscal crisis" of the state, to activate "private" financial means.
d) Differentiating between the analytical-descriptive potentials of a conceptual model on the one hand and its (implicit or explicit) normative premises and possibly (as it is the case in some schools of thinking, such as in the so-called "policy sciences" brand of research on politics and administration) also its strategic, perhaps even recipe-like conclusions and proposals on the other hand, the "normative policy making model", as it was sketched out at the beginning of this paper in an idealtype sort of configuration of dimensions and tenets, proves to be of very limited analytical power in regard to the trends that have been shaping political and administrative behavior and problem-solving strategies of politics and administration. The "normative policy model" turns out to be able to analytically cover and "decipher" only a very narrow segment of the real world of politics and administration; due to its normative premises— it tends to interpret (and to "denounce") real world developments and processes as deviations from what it normatively should be and thus to, as it were, "illegitimiz[e]" it; at any rate, the normative model tends to inhibit the insight into the functionality of such developments in regard to preserve and enhance the manoeuvrability of the political and administrative systems. Compared to these limitations the "pragmatic policy making model", as it was hinted to at the beginning appears to be much opener towards the changes in reality and to have considerably more descriptive power and range.

Yet, as part of the fruitful tension between the normative and analytic dimension of a conceptual model at least two aspects should be borne in mind. First, the normative dimension of a model, even when it "overshoot-reality, often serves as a useful heuristic tool in empirical analysis for constructing and formulating Models as configured hypotheses to be "tested" through empirical research. Second, within a school of thinking in which political and administrative science, beyond its "traditional" task of empirically analyse and theoretically interpret reality as a result of the past (ex post research), has the task of being a consultant to politics and administration as to future decisions, normative models may serve as a guidepost and guideline for the structuring of reality by future political and administrative action.
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A. Two basic assumptions

In my opinion the greatest difficulty the Speyer International Workshop on the preparation of an encyclopedia of Public Administration will meet is to find rationales for a systematic order of administrative topics. This problem has to be resolved in order to continue the proceedings. It is the aim of this paper to contribute to the finding of such rationales in the field of public policy and decision making.

Our starting point are two basic, though often neglected assumptions about the character of the policy process. At a first glance these assumptions may be obvious, nevertheless, a great deal of political and administrative literature does not cope with them in a proper way or does not even mention them. First we mention the idea that the main underlying concept of both policy and decision making in the public sphere is "politics". Though politics is a multi-interpretable concept, in other words, it has different meanings in different contexts, it can and must be clarified. Second, the necessity, for analytical as well as practical reasons, to make a distinction between policy-development processes, especially the phase of policy formation, on the one hand and decision making processes on the other hand.

These assumptions may be fruitful for the development of a rationale for systematic order in our field.

I will give a brief explanation of my two major points. Politics has various, though interrelated or intertwined meanings. We already stated that the exact meaning can only be deduced from the context in which it is used; for instance, in a concrete study, an article or an introductory course in political science or public administration.
There is a lot of disensus among political scientists and public administrationists about the essence of politics. But a closer look reveals that in fact the various ideas about the essence of politics are only different aspects of one and the same political process. Some authors stress elements of power and influence, others stress elements of conflict, decision-making and allocation of values.

Summarizing from what we find in literature on political science, something is called "politics" or "political" if it refers to phenomena which can be indicated by the following key words:

a/ Power and Influence
b/ Conflict

c/ Integration
d/ Decision-making
e/ Allocation of values
f/ Stipulation and realization of common goals.

ad a. It is quite obvious that politics has to do with processes of power formation and application. The effects of the application of power is usually called "influence". Politics regards power phenomena related to the state, especially to processes of state formation and governmental policies. The essence of the state is "zum ersten Macht, zum zweiten Macht und zum dritten nochmals Macht" (Von Treitschke); "When we speak of the science of politics, we mean the science of power" (Lasswell); "Le politique concerne tout ce qui se rapporte au pouvoir" (Burdeau); "Politics is the process by which power and influence are acquired and exercised" (Pfiffner and Sherwood).

ad b. Politics always gives rise to conflicting opinions, interests and principles. There is not only a lack of consensus (disensus) but there is also a "struggle". "Politics is concerned with conflict and disagreement" (Miller); "The basis prerequisite for a political system is disensus" (Spiro); "Politics is conflict" (Mannheim).

ad c. Processes in which, to some degree, conflicting opinions, interests and principles are converted into consensus are also typical for political processes. This is the integration function. Constant failure of this function will lead to the collapse of a political system.
ad d. Also a typical characteristic of politics is making decisions and being responsible for them in a democratic and hierarchical way (representative bodies and political leaders). "The essence of government is the act of choice, the making of decisions" (Matthews); "Politics or political includes the events that happen around the decision-making centers of government" (De Grazia).

ad e. Allocation of material and immaterial goods by a society. As a result of this process some of the members of a society get some "things", whereas others get less or even nothing. "Politics: Who Gets What, When How" (Lasswell); "The authoritative allocation of values as it is influenced by the distribution and use of power" (Easton).

ad f. Stipulation and realization of common goals with deliberately chosen means, at fixed data and along certain ways is nowadays perhaps one of the most important, but also most neglected, aspects of political life. "Politics, d.h. die Lehre von der Erreichung bestimmter staatlichen Zwecke" (Jellinek); "Politics is the process of making governmental policies" (Ranney).

In our opinion this is not a mere compilation of typifications of politics. On the contrary! A clear pattern of relationships can be discovered. The formation of power and its application are a prerequisite to protect conflicting interests and principles. This involves all sorts of struggle, but also decision-making and being responsible for the decisions taken. It must also be clear that one cannot imagine decisions being taken other than on the basis of some desired future state of events or situation (a goal). Subsequently decision-making requires some forms of organisation and management. Each organisation implies power, and more often than not a goal can only be realised to the benefit of some citizens and at the cost of some others. It may be clear now that the five key words, mentioned earlier, stand for different, though interrelated aspects or activities of political life. To a certain degree these key words also reveal the relation between public policy and decision-making. Apparently decision-making is an important aspect of politics, and therefore of the policy process. This obvious conclusion is the starting-point
of our plea to make a distinction between policy development and
decision-making processes. But we will talk about that later. First
we have to clarify the meanings of the concept "policy"; the
disagreement about this concept is less great, though not unimportant.
We can distinguish three meanings:
a. A mode of behaviour, prescribed by higher authorities or accepted
   on a voluntary base;
b. A deliberate search to accomplish certain goals, in a certain way,
   by certain means at more or less fixed data.
c. An approved plan, consisting of goals, ways, means and data, chosen
   by an actor for himself or for others.

The policy process includes all activities that have to do with
the formation, implementation and evaluation of public policy.
A characteristic feature of decision-making in this context is
that it is a feature of phases of the policy process. Therefore we
suggest the following rough classification of this process:

```
  policy process
     \- decision-making processes
        \- policy-making processes:
           a. policy research
           b. policy development or policy design
           c. policy implementation
           d. policy evaluation
```

The decision-making process has two aspects: A political: who decide
what in which way, and a management aspect, taking care that decisions
are made at proper times, by the proper individuals or instances.
In politico-administrative practice it is difficult to separate
policy and decision-making processes. Perhaps here, especially in
the phase of policy formation, lies the reason for the fact that the
distinction is often not made. In our opinion the neglect of the
distinction may have severe consequences or may give rise to misleading
opinions about one's role in the politico-administrative process,
especially with regard to policy formation. The decision-making
process is a part of the policy formation process, often policy formation
processes are misunderstood as being only decision-making processes.
Let me illustrate this by comparing the difference between policy development and decision-making.

The essence of policy development or policy design processes is the creation of (alternative) plans to cope with undesired situations or to prevent them (unemployment, housing-shortage, air pollution etc.). In a more positive sense the starting-point of each policy is a desired future situation or "goals" (e.g. situations or goals). Policy development is an intellectual process. It is rather the work of an individual or small team than the work of groups. Because of this characteristic and the expert knowledge involved, policy development processes are not quite suitable for citizen participation. On the other hand, each ordinary citizen may be a policy developer but not everyone has the power to make decisions. In each political system this is the prerogative of a relatively small group. These statements may seem contradictory, with regard to the role of the ordinary citizen. The proceedings in a policy process may throw light on this. We have to realise that each policy process starts with the explicit or implicit consent of a political powerholder to develop a (policy) plan. In order to reach effective policies there ought to be a clear cut assignment, stipulating the desired future state of events or situation. Such an assignment is a pre-eminently political fact, quite suitable for the start of the decision-making process and (citizen) participation. In contrast, the elaboration of the assignment in one or more concrete plans is an intellectual-creative activity that cannot be handled by group processes which are predominantly directed to consensus-building. The essence of decision-making is terminating debates, and political struggles by taking decisions and being responsible for them in all phases of the policy process. Decision-making processes partly proceed according to fixed rules (procedures). In contrast, policy development is more or less a methodological affair. Administrative scholars and practitioners have elaborated several methods to develop policies in a systematical way (often incorrectly indicated by "Policy analysis"). Whereas decision-making is characterised by debate and the exercise of power and influence, policy development processes are predominated by discussion and attempts to convince one another of the best solution for problems raised by the politicians.
Decision-making and policy development roles rather differ, with respect to possibilities, capabilities and nature. Usually these roles have not been unified in one and the same person. This may be for reasons of constitutional law - an extension of the separation of powers doctrine - but more important because of the complexity of post-industrial society in which policies should intervene. This complexity requires high qualifications in the policy development as well as in the decision-making sphere. Most times these qualifications are not to be found in one person.

The absence of the notion of the distinction to be made between policy development and decision-making has given rise to a lot of confusion and misunderstanding about the character of the policy formation process, especially in the field of civil servants' influence on policy formation and in the field of planning. Once again we have to be aware of the fact that stipulating future situations is the prerogative of political powerholders (Cabinet, ministers, representative bodies). If they neglect or do not fulfill this crucial political role, which is the beginning of each policy process, in a proper way bureaucrats will take their place. According to this view the problem of bureaucratic power and influence on policy formation is not primarily one of the expert knowledge and continued office of civil servants, but rather of the lack of clear defined assignments to develop certain policies from the side of the political powerholders. In principle everybody may be a policy developer in the sense of making more or less elaborated proposals about the things government should do. Because of their education and experience, some people are more able to develop policy proposals than others. In fact a good deal of the civil servants are 'hired' to give expert advice, on the basis of their knowledge and experience. Such advices always take the form of policy plans. But civil servants are never decision-makers in a formal sense. In our opinion their informal decision-making role is enhanced by the absence of the notion that formation processes consists of policy design and decision-making. The difficulty is that in practice both processes are inextricable intertwined. Nevertheless for proper decision-making as well as for sophisticated policy development processes in a post-industrial society with its immense problems, it is more than ever necessary to distinguish these roles, and to take account of the distinction in the institutionalization of policy processes.

The distinction is also a fruitful rationale, I think, for an up to date general survey in the field of public policy and decision-making in an
Encyclopedia of Public Administration, although much theories and concepts - especially in the field of planning - do not even realize the differences between the two processes. In my opinion this is the greatest shortcoming of most planning theories. For instance Dror's concept of 'mega-policy' and Van Gunsteren's idea of 'communicative planning' are ingenious confusions of policy development and decision-making.

The idea to make a distinction between policy-making and decision-making originates from the Dutch political scientist G. Kuypers, who fully elaborated the idea in his book 'Beginselen van beleidsonwikkeling' (Principles of policy development, part I and II) (Muidenberg 1980). Starting-point is the essential difference between 'politics', which can be compared with the work of a 'general' (strategy), and 'planning' which resembles the work of an 'architect'.

B. Suggestions for a rough outline giving a general survey and systematic order of administrative topics from the point of view of public policy and decision-making (to be further elaborated):

I. 1. Politics: a. Power and influence
   b. Conflict (including 'class struggle')
   c. Integration
   d. Decision-making
   e. Authoritative allocation of values
   f. Stipulation and realization of common goals

   b. Deliberate search for the accomplishment of desired future situations
   c. An approved plan, to be furthered by government administration

3. Polity: The whole of rules, procedures, institutions, political culture, in which the policy process takes place. The broader context of the policy process. Also: the political system

4. Policy process: The whole process of decision-making on the one hand, and - policy research (incorrect also: policy analysis)
   - policy development (or: policy design, or incorrect: policy-analysis)
- policy implementation
- policy execution
- policy evaluation (feedback)
on the other hand.

5. policy-making process:
   Collective concept for the processes of decision-making,
policy research and policy development.

6. Policy research:
   all research in the domain of policy development, research
given an assignment to design a certain policy or policies
   (development and application of knowledge)

7. Policy development (policy design):
   part of the policy process. Developing or designing policy
   plans (alternative plans), usually, though not necessarily,
   by public officials

8. Policy implementation:
   Taking care of, to provide for the execution of policies
   (also: management)

9. Policy execution:
   The realization, effectuation of policy plans

10. Policy evaluation:
    Evaluation in the light of
    - their effectiveness
    - their underlying decision-making processes

11. Policy analysis:
    Analyzing different aspects of policies and/or the policy
    process
    - content-analysis
    - decision-making analysis
    - cost-benefit analysis
    - analysis of the nominal output
    - analysis of real output (also: outcome analysis, cost-
      effectiveness analysis)
    - (incorrect) stands also for policy development and policy
      research
12. Planning: More or less scientific development of policy plans

13. Forecasting:
   to foresee the future in order to develop or design policy plans

14. Decision-making process:
   The succession of more or less linked moments in the policy-process, at which times decisions have to be made, starting with the assignment to develop a policy or policies, and ending by the approval or disapproval of the results, sometimes by means of policy evaluation. Each policy process contains numberless moments at which a decision has to be made. Only a few of these decisions are politically relevant enough to be decided upon by politicians.

15. Modes of decision-making (for instance):
   - rational
   - incremental
   - optimal/sub-optimal
   - contextuating
   - mixed scanning
   - satisfying (bounded-rationality)
   - sequential

16. Strategic decision-making:
   decisions made by the top about the goals of future policies

17. Modes of planning:
   1. Adjustment-planning
   2. Comprehensive planning
   3. Communicative planning
   4. Contingency planning
   5. Development planning
   6. Aspect planning
   7. Holistic planning
   8. Indicative planning
   9. Integral planning
  10. Man-power planning
  11. Long-term planning
12. Method planning  
13. New planning  
14. Operational planning  
15. Optimum planning  
16. Orthodox planning  
17. Perspective planning  
18. Policy planning  
19. Preventive planning  
20. Process planning  
21. Sector planning  
22. Strategic planning  
23. Synoptic planning  
24. Tactical planning  
25. Execution planning

18. Domains of planning: (for instance)  
- Economic planning, social planning, fiscal planning,  
- traffic planning, defense planning and so on.

C. Rationale for the classification of planning modes:

A. Planning theories which assume planners are also decision-makers in an informal sense (Nr. 1, 2, 5, 13, 20, 22)

B. Planning theories stressing the importance of phases in the planning process (Nr. 1, 8, 3, 5, 22, 24)

C. Planning theories which assume planners are planning without a planning device (Nr. 1, 2, 9, 7, 3, 6, 11, 12, 15, 18, 19, 20, 22)

D. Planning theories supposing planners are working separated from processes of power and influence (Nr. 2, 8, 10, 12, 17, 19)

E. Planning theories in terms of strategies, operations and tactics (plans to fight) (Nr. 14, 18, 22, 24)

F. Planning theories supposing politicians cannot make decisions before the planners have delivered their calculations (Nr. 15, 18, 22)

G. Planning theories proclaiming what politicians needed most are alternative plans. (Nr. 6, 15, 18, 24)
5.2 Framework and Disposition of Exemplary Administrative Issues

5.2.1 Citizen Participation in Planning

5.2.1.1 Course of Discussion

The group work started with reflections on differences to the tasks of the first series of work with testing topics from the point of view of different perspectives. Some could see only a slight difference to the new tasks finding out, how an exemplary issue would or could be treated as independent item or installment of an encyclopaedia. The interest was then directed to the only paper available and took note of its content by means of a brief report on it. The first part was seen as an attempt to limit or define the topic "participation" in public affairs.

The second part, after page 13, was interpreted as an exemplar of what would be a more critical, empirical and even more prescriptive discussion on what the problems really are, which history and difficulties are linked up with the issue.

The author himself reported about his intention to put in it a couple of approaches to provoke a discussion about the problems of the subject. He also felt that it was not quite clear to everybody, of what nature an entry into an encyclopaedia in this field would be. Therefore, the following was designed as a partial and skeleton entry for an encyclopaedic article on participation.

The papers' internal division express a lack of elaborated approaches in administrative sciences which has to be overcome in the future work-process. It was said, some aspects have rich and long bibliographies, while
others have none, but should nevertheless be part of an article in order to be exhaustive in given issues. To some of these points hints were dropped in the paper, first, that there is a problem in society to be dealt with by participation; second, a problem in the practice of administration which requires or leads to devices or movements that could be called participation.

Also, in everyday life, the difficulties with formal procedures of the constitutions in pluralistic societies in order to give feedback or to exercise political control are understood as a problem of participation. This issue lead to the question of any relationship between people and bureaucratic agencies and was called also "access" to administration in the course of the discussion in the morning. The latter was regarded being an integrative part of another topic as well.

It was then stated, that participation is not quite the same as 'political movements' or organizations, including political parties. It also has to be separated from what is called in market - societies "the consumer movement", an argument, one has devoted much attention in the prepared discussion-paper. On the other hand, there are stressed many similarities to political mobilization and the consumer movements which can be observed in western countries of the civic culture type. A lot of empirical and theoretical work would exist on this.

It was then suggested that the group should differentiate between four types of movement or "response", discovered by empirical research:

1. Interest groups of really partial sort on behalf of the political substance, what comes very close to normal interest groups who defend the whole of interest of their clientele.

2. Movements concerned with improvements and above all simplifications of appeal or intermediary processes in the access-structure of the bureaucratic apparatus or agencies.
3. Self-help movements, do-it-yourself movements, encapsulated communities etc. which exist manifold and in various forms on different levels in developing countries.

4. Improvement strategies to the capacity of individuals and groups to handle the access situations to administration themselves. This is distinct from the various incorporating strategies of institutions themselves.

These analysed participation groups are different from excessive groups which intend to realise goals immediately or wish to change the apparatus concerned with particular affairs.

Thus, public participation movements get very close to political movement itself, which also outlines the point at which most observed participation movements break down. This was described as a problem of the difference between informal and formal cooption. Participation movements emerge as "unfavoured groups" and cannot succeed as outside-groups, because they want to deal with the apparatus. This leads either to co-option into the apparatus or to disintegration which is close to failure. - At this point of the work-shop, the group defined the aim of the discussion as to talk about the right entry on participation. It was stated, that there is written material available about citizen participation and the political process in the sense of politics. In addition, it would be necessary to make a difference between citizen participation and public participation. Therefore, the German background was used to derive two entries. These were that citizen participation would not be necessary, if the government was more sensitive to the citizens' needs or if public servants had a very sense of public interest. In the old days, the neighbourhood played a major role in public life and citizens as such performed many administrative tasks. It would be interesting to compare the development of that
time with the present situation in Germany, socialist countries and perhaps France.

In Germany, participation as well as planning, function at different levels. In Africa, the local level is more important, whereas in Germany a differentiated system of planning seeks to influence real decisions and developments in areas of public administration. In Africa, the citizens elect someone who represents them and hold this for participation.

In Germany, the government is still obliged to hand in plans to people whose property is affected on the local level (i.e. housing, road construction, land use in detail and in general). But there are also new forms like hearings in the public, interest groups with procedural rights in the planning process including the appeal to administrative law courts.

In the U.S.A. and the U.K., the Royal Commission's and Citizen Commission movements represent another kind of participation, which is unique in the world and ought to be included. Yet, it is questionable whether articles on the U.S.A., specifically on Virginia in the 80s or on South Africa's policy in villages should be incorporated.

It was then stated with regard to participation on the whole, everywhere people feel that their systems are not working. The reasons are the enormous problems of the citizens with access, since most of them lack experience. Those citizens take the view that there is an insufficient difference between policy and administration. This would have to be considered in an article.

Another contribution stressed the different levels of participation itself. Joint self-management systems have been described as probably the highest levels of participation (e.g. in schools or districts). But the mentioned precondition for citizen participation remains a problem even there since knowledgeable groups of citizens are very rare, and can be developed
only in long terms. The suggestion was made, to subdivide participation into planning and decision making, into processes and institutionalised systems, in evaluation and implementation and thereby in formal and substantive participation.

A special entry at the end of an article should deal with participation of certain groups of society, e.g. intellectuals and businessmen, but also women. Some village-movements rely utmost on women, as an example from Korea demonstrated.

It was agreed, that the latter movement grew significantly, because administrators learned to make use of it. At this point, one participant proposed to treat participation only as a process, giving around a skeleton of the phenomenon a certain number of joint comments on participation which could be fed with empirical data as far as possible. Such a comment could be for example the warning against mixing up the principle of self-help with participation. This example generated the remark, that there are now various types of participation movements, political analyses of empirical observations and a number of comments in the discussion, which require systematization.

Yet, up to that point, it was not argued that there ought to be participation, though many arguments implied the opinion that participation is good, since it gives people a sense of involvement and makes planning more effective. It was said that the targets of planning could be pursued much more effectively if there existed idealistic engagement on the part of the citizens.

Someone added the institution of "referendum" should also be included and extended by forms such as hearings appeals, enquiries etc. Thus, the question arose, how the boundary between the enormous number of groups that call themselves participation movements in the world (there was seen even a growing wave in this direction) and those, who really
deserve that label, is to be drawn. In response the suggestion ran, to put up as internal work procedure several working groups, which should exchange and discuss their results on participation in form of articles. Since participation movements exist worldwide, this would be fruitful and very international. Against this it was held, that this would be far too complicated because there exist only two possibilities for the fate of such movements, either they grow and are successful and thus become absorbed into the "normal" political process of their country, or they disappear or become irrelevant forces. Thus it would be of general interest to talk about forms and conditions of success.

Another discussant plead for a historical assessment of this phenomenon which at present meets with local power structures in some countries and provokes the state to harsh reactions. If there would be more knowledge of what could come out from participation movements - which would allow to assess what is likely to happen - governments could deal with this current more actively and possibly create even a public section for them. This suggestion was transferred by another participant into the need of a chapter on the dimension of participation in the context of social change. It could not be clarified, if this would lead to a subcategory within another issue (social change) or signify an area of overlapping points to be dealt with by cross-references, or to be repeatedly treated in the context of some general ideas in different articles.

The treatment of the idea of independent participation movements within communist countries could neither be imagined by the discussants. It was then concluded, that citizen participation, if regarded as a process, should be looked at from a logic point of view - that is "process and result".

According to the existing knowledge, two possible results were to be included:
1. The power of knowledge of the internal structure of this institution possibly creates political manipulation.

2. The process of participation might create new members of the decision making process, who dispose of a necessary type of power.

Finally, there seemed to be consensus that there ought to be three main entries, subdivided into many others, and also including many cross-references for the purpose of an encyclopaedia.
5.2.1.2 Special Contribution

PARTICIPATION AND POLITICS

Bernard Schaffer

1. There is a vogue for the discussion of "Participation". On university campuses many contemporary courses in politics, administration, social work and welfare, social and economic geography and sociology have apparently similar discussions of urban, community and political action. This comes, it seems, from concerns about local level politics, opposition and radical political groupings, opposition or alternatives to constitutional and party politics, feelings about the community, the consumer movement and so forth.

2. Evidently these concerns must have some substance. Equally there are problems whether the demand is for participation by this or that actor in this or that process. It is worth looking at the movement more carefully. An observer's model of what the participation movement is about could look like the following.

3. It is associated with or occurs in situations where interests of various types encounter authoritative institutions. In what ways do these encounters happen? A characteristic situation would be mothers of young children becoming aware of specific problems like street safety and more distantly aware that there were urban governmental authorities with whom their relations and communications were somehow frustrating.

4. So the participation movement tends in the first place to express concerns about a present slowness and a desire for a quicker rate of communication. At the same time at a
somewhat deeper level there must be in the participation movement an expression, to a greater or lesser extent, of a felt inadequacy in how the model of representative and responsible, of pluralist and constitutional, politics appears to be working.

5. The flow of relationships between interest-party-election-representative-institution and outcome breaks down. It has dislocations and lacunae. Again, it might be felt in relation to a particular area of concern, the model is not merely not functioning well or indeed negatively. It is not functioning at all. That is to say there has been an extension of the state, the public sector or public activities beyond the area of operation of representative and responsible government, even were that model to be accepted. The model is in some cases inadequate; in other cases it is irrelevant.

5. The movement is associated with profound tendencies in modern life. One is the enlargement of the size of organisations. Another is their hierarchy and centralisation both in authoritative and in spatial terms. The mobility and rootlessness of migration and urbanisation weaken the reliance on kin and the strength of friendship, neighbourliness and other types of network. The extension of the public sector or the rationing and procurement functions of the state has been referred to. There are the problems of periphery in relation to the centre, and of marginal, dependant and excluded groups.

7. These factors tend to weaken the security and familiarity with which people can handle and know about "their"
levels of the representative, responsible or pluralist model, the resources they can employ or the confidence which they can feel. So at least it seems. There are other ways in which the model can be criticised. That particularly applies to one crucial part of the model, namely the ministerial department itself. That is after all a special and contingent institution.

8. The participation movement is an example of a variety of ways in which there is a sense that organisations are slack, and of premises about organisational correction do not function at all or effectively. In political and public life the participation movement expresses dissatisfaction with the devices for correcting organisational slack in that area. Not wholly dissimilarly, in the market, where there is movement away from the small and perfect competition model, other discontents are felt with correctives to organisational slack. This is apparently one cause of the rise of the consumer movement.

9. The participation movement in one context is paralleled by the consumer movement in another. There is something similar between them in personnel terms and from the interpenetration of the imperfect market and extended public sector functions in distribution and allocation. Thus organisational and product loyalties, false consumer choices and distributive and regressive biases of retailing closely associate market behaviour with some problems of access in non-market situations.

10. The participation movement expresses discontents about
the costs, the available corrections, the outcomes and the other actors (the "enemies", so to speak) involved in institutional encounters and public sector situations as the state extends its functions. The costs are matters of time and space. The means are matters of politics and party action. The other actors involved are an amalgam of political and bureaucratic office holders. It is these perceptions of costs, means, outcomes and "others" which define the situations, and the ways in which people at present seem to find the pains and frustrations of institutional encounters, such as the peculiarities of institutional language and the inadequacy or irrelevance of the instruments to hand.

11. The participation movement is about public institutions. What is special about these encounters with public institutions is the feelings of exclusion and outsidership, of inappropriate or unfair priorities and of utterly inappropriate items and packages of service. But what both the consumer in the market or the applicant in the public situation now tend to feel is the possibility of bringing to bear once again felt, potential or actual group interests: a sharing of values, attitudes and opinions, of things known and experienced, of chances or opportunities sought, denied and lost, as against the irrelevance and inadequacy of the present aggregating political institutions, of the models of political integration, and of other institutional means. The participation movement seems to be therefore a seeking for the types of support which had been put under strain by those processes of urbanisation, marginality and mobility which we have referred to above. It is in those directions that people seek for new resources in organisational correction
12. Participation then seems to be about perceived interests in response to institutional encounters where a search for new groupings or a reintegration into lost groupings seems to be actually or potentially available. It is expressed differently from political mobilisation. Participation looks to other directions. There is even a profound difference between participation and political action (or other sorts of political action.) To put it loosely we might say class interests tend to express themselves in political mobilisation. That move is towards crucial political action in relation to institutions, like abolishing institutions, taking them over, changing them dramatically or getting rid of some men in office and replacing them with others.

13. The sort of politics that a participation movement is about (if indeed it is about political action at all) seems to be different from that. It is often aware of this difference, is "not political". It might be in part a mere recreation from a conscious rejection of the political model. It might also be something more than that. It is true either for one reason or the other that orthodox political movements (that is to say, large scale integrating and aggregating movements on class of other widely reaching bases) have a difficulty, evidently so, in handling the movement in general or indeed even in coming to terms with some of the characteristic proposals from the movement, like copartnership and consumer complaint. It is tempting to suggest that there is one type of political action based on class oriented interests and relevant to relationships with the production process. That sort of politics would then be distinguished from the sectional bases of the participation
movement. In this light the closeness of the participation to the consumer movement becomes relevant and vivid.

14. It is also true that the one sort of politics could scarcely be said to be initiated by institutions. On the contrary, political mobilisation is concerned (we have just argued) with crucial changes in institutions, including sometimes their defence one way or another. The fate of the institution is involved. The participation movement is prompted by institutional encounters, sometimes initiated by institutions and concerned with the programs and projects, the outputs of institutions rather than with crucial institutional challenge itself.

15. Clearly there are problems in being too severe about this distinction. There are occasions on which interest based movements have become political parties. Agricultural and trade union movements are the outstanding examples. There are also many political systems in which the bases for aggregating political movements are linguistic, ethnic, religious, regional and constitutional (that is to say, rival attitudes to the constitutional question) or various combinations of these concerns with or without class and production relationships. What is certainly true is that, as against the participation movement, these movements of a political nature are involved in ideological communication, in crucial decisions about institutions, in aggregative and integrating political recruitment. All that is very different from the participation movement at each point. It is not about this sort of political mobilisation. What sort of politics, if any, is it about, then?
16. By definition the opposite of political mobilisation is incorporation. Incorporation means initiatives undertaken by institutions employing interests focused around relations other than those directly in the production process. In practice incorporation will be found to explain and identify much of what goes under the heading of participation particularly when that is described from an institutional point of view. Once again this is suggested by the consumer movement, which so easily moves via consumer research and standards into market research, promotion, public relations and the soft sell: the whole construction of "loyalty", which is, perhaps, the market parallel for incorporation. Can any participation efforts then ever be distinguished from incorporation?

17. As it happens much of what is put forward (at least by institutions) as participation comes squarely under the heading of formal co-option, to use the Selznick formula. Formal co-option is the ways in which the institution creates bodies in its environment which it can consult, to which it can directly or indirectly appoint people, and from which it can select representatives or delegates to sit on the formal structures of consultation, etc., which it might set up: consumer councils, advisory bodies, etc. The costs of formal co-option for "participation groups" (interests that set up organisations around which formal co-option then occurs) include their agenda, the rules which they tend to follow, the substituion of an agency role on behalf of the institution by which they are being co-opted, and an exaggerated tendency to "institutionalisation" (in the specific sense of commitment to organisational continuity rather than following the ends indicated by the interest itself).
Informal co-option is a capture by one interest of elements of the institution itself. The costs are felt by others: whom the institution represents, how its resource allocations occur and how far the institution has been taken over.

18. It is a familiar feature of the life of institutions working in the environment that they will set up more or less informally other group organisations. They can then allow processes of formal or informal co-option in relation to those groups. The ways in which trade associations have been encouraged by departments and public agencies working in relation to those trades is a good example. It is an even more reported example of institutional life to set up bodies for formal co-option by formal processes.

19. The process of informal co-option is related to the distinction drawn about interest groups between favoured and unfavoured groups. An unfavoured group tends to be an organisation representing an "excluded" interest, that is to say the interest of categories of people who are more or less excluded from the current distribution of benefits, etc. It is also seen as tending towards political or mobilisation rather than participant types of strategies. The favoured group is one which is following the right rules, on issues which are on the agenda, is politically "safe", and represents an interest which is not excluded.

20. There is something of a vicious circle here. A group not excluded from the distributed resources is evidently favoured. If it is favoured it is likely to be getting its share
of the resources; if it is unfavoured it will not. There is also something of a metaphysical pathos. An unfavoured group is excluded. If an unfavoured group succeeds in moving into the favoured area it will be distinguished from its former self, by changing its interests, rules, agenda or strategies. It might also then be said to have suffered the costs of having undergone such changes.

21. Participation is a way of dealing with and therefore of response to institutional encounters. Institutions themselves tend to deploy strategies of incorporation. Both participation and incorporation are to be distinguished from political mobilisation. How far participation strategies are themselves to be distinguished case by case from incorporation is a matter of judgement on the record and across the very wide range of strategies and responses which seem to be available.

22. The distinction is not simple. Formal co-option is a matter of incorporation. Informal co-option is more difficult to allocate. Some types of what is asked for by the participation movement come under that sort of heading. Then the distinction between the favoured and the unfavoured group, the implications of being a favoured group with the costs that follow, the characteristics of the unfavoured group and what keeps it such, all bear important implications for judging what participation is about and what might be the implications of one or another participation strategy.

23. In any case there are further ranges of concern in the participation movement and further strategies available. Much
of the experience of access situations and what is involved in them can be regarded as types of incorporation and strategies of depoliticization by institutions. The applicant is not merely separated from his group, he is also alienated from all that is not relevant to bureaucratic process in his application. The style of his application and access experience is highly regulated. The most apparent conflicts that he is involved in are with other applicants rather than with institutions. Insofar as they are with the institution, they are with its most humble rank and file elements. Any grouping which occurs tends to be defined by the institution. The applicant finds himself allocated in effect to a group, like "migrant" or "itinerant", which suffers from the imposition of prejudice. Access situations are more or less dominated by queuing and hence by the formal and informal rules of queuing, by rites and rituals created by the institution and sometimes by merely formalistic or symbolic queues which suit the maintenance of the institution and its political purposes and do not suit the applicant's needs at all.

24. Against all that, a variety of responses can be developed by applicants. These can vary from riot, appeal against access decisions, various ploys and exploitations of the ways in which an applicant can present his data, and escaping or avoiding the access situation altogether. When we think about participation and incorporation, the question is which of these responses (if indeed any of them) can be thought of as participation.

25. In relation to this sort of question the responses can be grouped under four headings. The first is a tendency to political action. The formation of interest groups for example
can express political voice or rallies. We have tried to indicate some sort of distinction between political mobilisation on the one hand and participation movements on the other. The second response is to think of ways in which the access structures can be improved: for example by providing intermediaries; improving grievance procedures, rights and structures; improving supervision and the availability of supervisors, and improving the access decision making system itself in its various elements of eligibility, priority and itemised or packaged allocations. The third is a variety of exit, avoidance or withdrawal responses: self help and do it yourself movements, community development, the return to self sufficient or encapsulated communities and other grass roots movements including a resort to local self government in the hope of escaping bureaucratic encounters (rightly and realistically or not), and the resort to the market.

26. There do seem to be significant distinctions between political mobilisation and participating as far as the first strategy is concerned.

27. The second strategy is more concerned with administrative improvement than with participation.

28. The exit group of strategies has several basic problems. For example, bureaucratic institutional encounters are still for the most part involved, as with local government. Access arrangements themselves are still frequently necessary, as with relations between self help housing groups and government authorities. Then, the movements are regressive. They are all very well for wealthy applicants and groups; all very bad for
poorer or disadvantaged applicants or groups.

29. Meaningful participation in relation to access systems seems to depend on a fourth strategy, namely improving the capacity of individuals and groups to handle the access situations themselves. This is distinct from the incorporating strategies of the institutions, the reform of access systems and the implications of the avoidance or withdrawal responses.

30. It follows that the participation movement might be concerned with measures to assist direct influence on access decisions making at its various levels or with the improvement of access capacity of applicants, whether individual or group. Broad prescriptions seem to follow from thinking about these distinctions in participation strategies.

31. Certainly it is important to draw a distinction between formal co-option, the costs of becoming a favoured group and other processes of incorporation on the one hand, and other types of participation on the other. At the same time the distinction between participation and politics or other sorts of politics is also important. Then what sort of group is involved? Is it in fact a group created by institutions for processes of co-option; or a group which merely reflects institutionally created prejudices? It is also important to see what sort of participation is being sought: for example, the improvement of access procedures, the avoidance of access altogether or the improvement of access capacity.

32. It seems to follow that within the participation
movement a group which is to be assisted had better be assisted by other and rival institutions, and institutions at different authoritative levels from those with which it is seeking participation. Can it then avoid all the costs of formal co-option, incorporation and institutional favour? This may in fact be one of the cases in favour of developing more powerful local government systems so as to supply, support and help the groups seeking participation at other levels of government.

33. Finally, and most crucially, what sort of range from mobilisation to other types of group recruitment and formation can be organised and deployed on the basis of access experience, bearing in mind the characteristics of access experience mentioned above? The essential problem is then to see how an independent improvement of access capacity (as we have called it) can be created. The answer determines our judgement of the participation movement, one way or another.
IV Conclusion: a fourth strategy for participation

We cannot argue for the possibility of a non-institutional world, suppose that processes of distribution and allocation could be avoided or neglect the whole series of experiences which has turned people away from a mere reliance on market forces. In particular there seem to be two traps to be avoided. The first tends to be invoked by managerialism or by economism. For the one point of view, the overarching problem is that of the aggregate supply or budget of resources to be distributed according to a plan. If things go wrong, it is either because the plan happened to encounter "obstacles to implementation" or because the plan should have been altered. For the other point of view, development plans will not be implemented without institutions to achieve them. The problem is then simply to build sufficient and resilient institutions.

For the one view, the answer is planning and budgets and disposing of obstacles, for the other the answer is institution building and institutionality. For neither is institutional process and the experience of allocation in access situations the protagonist.

A second trap is to suppose that somehow or other institutional process, the administrative factor, the access situation, can indeed be avoided. It is in that sort of vision that the strength of the appeal of community development, decentralisation, self-help and do-it-yourself, autarchy and encapsulation still resides as indeed it always has.

The argument that has been put forward here, however, is that while (in fact because) these situations are more or less unavoidable, it becomes central to understand and to alter them: they, we have said, are the protagonists. The requirement then is in the first place for an analytic language for comparing and understanding the nature of institutional experiences which development in general, like rural-urban migration, and specific programmes and projects, like licensing, registration, controls and welfare, necessarily involve.

The language is not easy to construct. It will have to handle relationships between immediate pieces of routine experience and encounter with much larger forces and outcomes; between what is happening at the local level of the government field office and quite other levels; between what brings people into situations from time to time, and their own day by day experiences of living and dwelling, of economic participation; between the special values and perceptions which affect these exchanges and the shaping of their general and wider commitments. It is not a matter of replacing a macro with
a micro focus or vice versa. But nor is it sufficient only to say that large entities like the state become real in the particular: the programme is the allocation. This is true of course. But the point is that the interplay itself has to be understood.

One example is to understand the coincidence of levels, the penetration at work when some massive relocation of power is expressed in a specific procedural formulation, and thus in a permission or refusal. The experience of access itself and the reactions to that, the defences and the explanations and tactics, become crucial revelations and encounters. Another example is the cultures and images of distribution which allow some to submit, some to succeed, some to exploit and some to circumvent. A third category is all that is happening when some routine allocation has invoked reactions which could but do not challenge the large institution itself. There is no way to describe that adequately, either in purely local, or purely programmatic, or purely non-institutional terms. Too many forces are involved. We have made some suggestions to that point, for example about three types of decisional ploy: routine, critical and crucial.

Difficulties also arise because of what we have called the irony of equity: the degree to which the pursuit of substantive justice demands the construction of procedural justice, and in turn the way in which procedural justice, as the ideology of access or institutional distribution, tends to work in the ways we have outlined. Welfarism means institutions, institutions mean procedures. The working of procedures cannot be sustained without types of institutional ideology. The key element in institutional ideology is welfarism. The key outcome is incorporation, specific institutional politics. We need to be able to cut through this sort of circularity.

Yet institutional language is very powerful, as in its descriptions for the most sensitive of institutional phases, the code names for the most dangerous of operations, the honorific promotions for potentially abrasive clients, the apparent strengthening of vulnerable relations, perhaps above all the whole Fabian ideology of "fair shares" through institutional distribution, its characteristic manipulation of a procedural reply to a substantive demand.

This is not mere disguise, else it would not be so powerful. Knowledge does have authority. And incremental changes do indeed occur from time to time and between this place and that, in programmes involving institutional distribution.

Here we have made some proposals, as in the criticism of institution-building approaches, the points of sensitivity which occur in the instrumentation of access situations and the distinction between institutional services and the structures of wants.
The language we have been attempting to construct also suggests certain directions in which actual changes should be pursued. We conclude by indicating briefly what these directions are. The first of these is the need to understand the types of opportunity which could reasonably be created for masses of people to participate in decisions about the programmes which are being operated and about the way in which they are administered and carried out day by day.

The experience of some of the types of programmes we have been looking at shows already the variety of ways in which affected people have tried to cope with their experience of access. There are examples amongst the resettled squatters of the Tondo area around Manila, for example, in the development of their own organisations and aggressive attitudes in handling officials and agencies. This included the formation amongst people on the southern portion of the Tondo foreshore of the Zone 1 Tondo organisation, ZOTO, as it became known.

"They held an impressive record for being able to mobilise large groups of residents to protest some threatening action or demand some concession from a government agency or private organisation through confrontation and conflict tactics followed by negotiation. Violence however did not figure in their approach; militancy did."2 ZOTO was later expanded to cover three areas. In general Hollnsteiner concluded,

"The Tondo case shows what could be accomplished by peoples' groups to gain access to resources if they organise effectively."3

The people's organisations which emerged in this situation went well beyond what is sometimes meant by participation. Substantive projects in their own right were undertaken; formal and informal training or mobilisation for leaders and representatives, to prepare them effectively for handling access situations, "effective use of sympathetic intermediaries".4 As Hollnsteiner appositely said, that case was an extraordinary one which could not necessarily be replicated. Furthermore, as we have implied, a comparison of the sharply different experiences of urban migrants in Latin American cities like Lima or Rio shows a variety of other ways in which individuals or communities of affected people gradually adapt to their access situations. The general problem is what can be

2 Ibid, p. 4.
3 Ibid, p. 9.
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gathered from these wide experiences to suggest lines along which programmes and institutions of participation can be provided to deal with access experience and to confront the allocating institutions. The key to understanding here is that there are three more or less familiar existing blocks of participation, experiments and strategies. The question then is whether a "fourth" strategy, so to speak, could be formulated.

The existing strategies could be grouped together as follows. The first is that very search for alternatives to administrative distribution and allocation itself. We have referred to that in terms of self-help, do-it-yourself, decentralisation, encapsulation, autarchy and so forth, and community development generally. There are serious limitations here.

To an extent these directions could be and are encouraged by some institutions themselves. The difficulty furthermore is that experience does not suggest any particular reason for assuming that the relationships within those emerging organisational experiments, as between leaders and led or the employed and the participant, are necessarily better than those between applicants and other types of institutions. There also remain the difficulties of those who are in fact excluded from these community developments, and then as between these emerging organisations, regarded as clients or applicants themselves, and the larger allocating institutions.

The second type of strategy is the administrative reform of access situations in particular, and distributive institutions in general. The analysis of access situations indicates the directions in which administrative reform might relevantly be pursued. This would include the clarification and simplification of delivery systems and procedures. It would also include however improved systems of supervision and of appeal, especially.

There have been interesting experiments in the institutional provision of representatives and intermediaries for applicants to have resort to in their access experience. The physical location of access and distributive points can also be looked at. Some of the most fashionable of these directions of administrative reform were earlier represented by the many types of Ombudsman experiment. More recently, there have been experiments with co-location, with what in New Guinea was called Maket Raun, and in Australia, the One-Stop-Shop.1

---

1 "The aims which had been argued before the Commission in the November paper (see Commission Document 106) were put succinctly: (a) a wide range of services from all three levels of government and the voluntary agencies; (b) at a single convenient place; (c) in an accessible manner; (d) and in a situation where decisions can be reached, as far as possible, on the spot". 'N.O.W. - The One Stop Shop Experiment', Royal Commission on Australian Government Administration, December 1975.
The third way of looking at programmes of participation is to detect the extent to which they differ from types of political mobilisation initiated by people outside institutional control so as to take over, challenge, alter or affect the responsibility for the institutions themselves, in effect to achieve what we have called crucial changes. As distinct from political mobilisation seeking crucial change, there are initiatives undertaken by institutions themselves. These employ interests focussed around relationships in neighbourhoods and particularly those excited by exchanges with the institutions themselves. These initiatives identify much of what goes on in practice under the heading of participation.

From some points of view this can be compared with what has happened in "the consumer movement": the movements from consumer research and standards to market research, promotion, public relations and the soft sell; the whole construction of "loyalty". That is a requirement in market relations for the interests of oligopolies, parallel to incorporation for public access institutions seeking their own persistence.

From other points of view what is being achieved is seen to be the co-option of active people in the institution's environment, applicants and others, formally or informally, so as to move from unfavoured to favoured positions. Formal co-option is the ways in which the institution creates apparent authorities in that environment which it can consult, to which it can directly or indirectly appoint people, and from which it can select representatives or delegates to sit on the structures of consultation which it sets up: consumer councils, advisory bodies, etc.

---


2 Compare A.O. Hirschman, Exit, Voice and Loyalty, Harvard, 1970. On institutionalisation as the capacity of institutions to build and maintain themselves through these processes of incorporation, see the sympathetic study by S.P. Huntington, Political Order in Changing Societies, Yale, Newhaven, 1968.

There are costs in these formal co-options, as for those interests setting up organisations around which this co-opted occurs so that they become "participation groups". The costs include their agenda, the rules which they follow, the adoption of agency roles on behalf of the agency which is co-opting them, and an exaggerated tendency to institutionalisation. That becomes a commitment to organisational continuity rather than to the initial ends indicated by the concrete interest itself.

Informal co-option on the other hand is the ways in which one interest captures elements of the institution itself. The costs are then felt by others. They cover what the institution comes to represent; how its allocations of its resources occur in access situations; and how far the institution has been taken over.

Similarly, an unfavoured group is the representation of an "excluded" interest, that is the interest of categories of people who are more or less excluded from institutional access situations. It might well tend towards political mobilisation rather than these co-opted or participant type of strategies.

On the other hand, over time it is likely either to disintegrate altogether or to move towards the position of a favoured group. That is one following the "right" rules on issues which are on the institution's own agenda, are politically "safe" so that bargains can be made and elements of the interest come to be included. This is precisely the process of incorporation. It will then be distinguished from its former self by having changed its interest, rules, agenda and strategies.

The fundamental challenge for participation thus becomes clear. Is it possible to formulate a fourth strategy, distinct from the escapism of community development, from mere administrative reform, or from the incorporations, the fission and fusion, of formal co-option and the favoured group?

The strength of incorporation and of these institutional strategies of depoliticisation, which develop around the experience of access, has to be faced. It is the significance and nature of these access experiences which demands participation in some sense or another. As we have seen, however, what goes on in those situations makes people behave as mere applicants, separates them from other types of interest and group membership, and alienates the person as an applicant from all that is not relevant to bureaucratic processes.

Let us remind ourselves of the politics of the applicant. The style of his application is highly regulated. The most apparent conflicts that he is involved in are with other applicants rather than with the institution. In so far as they are with the institution, they are with its most humble rank and file members. The groupings which then occur are
institutionally defined. The applicant can find himself allocated in effect to a stereotyped group like "migrant" or "itinerant" which suffers from the imposition of prejudice but which is inescapable to the very extent that application and access are worthwhile. The political calculations in access situations are in any case subjected to the rites and rituals created by the institution: the formalistic symbols of queuing and access which suit institutional maintenance and its political purposes as distinct from the applicant's needs, and the peculiar power and weight of institutional ideology and language.

As against that, the applicants adopt their own strategies. These vary from ploys with data and access procedures themselves to crime, corruption and bribe. They vary also from the exploitation and construction of new systems of intermediary, representatives to deal with some levels of the institution, fixers with others and agents also. The alternative ploys are to escape from or avoid the access situation altogether, as by moving into the market if that is permissible, or by accepting types of degraded access, like squatting.

The question remains whether, as between the strength of incorporation and the possibilities of counter access applicant cultures, what we have called a fourth strategy of participation can be conceived of.

In part that question involves a critical examination of the whole batch of institution-building strategies. This would challenge that way of thinking which has argued that the crucial requirement of development is above all the construction of the possibilities of institutional maintenance: institutionality. The degree to which institution-building is specifically managerialist, even authoritarian, and certainly hostile to participation is clear. This is particularly true in the sense we are seeking to give participation: the capacity of those affected by institutional access to challenge the institutions crucially one way or another. Two reports about participation from the 'I.B.' point of view are instances.

"Feedback also came from the clients of the resettlement program and other public-spirited citizens. The most obvious channel was through the Area Officers of the Resettlement Department itself. Other channels which were more important and more often resorted to were:

---

1 Schaffer and Lamb, op. cit., 'Exit, Voice and Access'.
"(a) Office of the Unofficial Members of the Executive and Legislative Councils. This is the Hong Kong version of an Ombudsman. The Office was first established in 1964. Unofficial members of the two Councils took turn to receive complaints from the public as well as collect public opinion.

(b) Ward Offices of the Urban Council. There were a total of ten ward offices each manned by two ordinary members of the Urban Council. They can be likened to constituencies except that ten of the twenty ordinary members were appointed by the Governor and the remaining ten elected by a very limited franchise not based on electoral districts. The system started in 1965.

(c) City District Offices. There were also ten City District Offices introduced in 1968 under the Secretariat for Home Affairs. They were responsible for conveying and explaining Government policies to members of the public and collecting and forwarding public opinion to relevant Government Departments."

Secondly,

"A systematic way of formally enlisting citizen participation may be achieved through: 1) the city council, 2) the auditing committee, 3) demands for auditing, 4) public hearings, and 5) appeals and petitions to the city council. The systematic and formal involvement of citizens have been established for certain general or specific reasons and they do not pose any major problem. However, the non-systematic and unofficial participation often create many difficult problems." (our italics).

The point then remains whether an alternative approach can be indicated, as a general or fourth strategy. The following keys can be suggested.

In the first place, a fourth strategy, as the Filipino material has suggested, is always likely to involve a combination of two elements. One is certainly effectiveness in influence and control over the authoritative distributing


2 Shigeo Yoshitomi, 'Japan: Osaka South Port Development Plan', ibid., p. 167.
motivate the whole participation problem: the decision to attempt to take up a service being offered; the attempt to deal with the agency at the point of allocation; the attempt to adapt the item of service being offered to the actual needs of the people or family concerned; the effort to sustain and maintain relations which are necessary with the distributing agents.

Secondly, it then becomes necessary to understand the institutional strategies which are also brought into play. These are the phases of administrative planning and institution-building and access instrumentation in particular: eligibility tests, priority systems, itemisation or packaging of services, institutional decision-making, budgetary and programme decision-making and feedback. It is the play between the points of sensitivity and the phases of access instrumentation which provokes the processes of incorporation, formal co-option, the handling of favoured groups. It is these processes, as we have seen, which set up the need for participation and at the very same time make it difficult to get beyond the existing patterns like co-option, or like administrative reform, towards a fourth strategy.

A fourth strategy of participation is not uninterested in improvements of procedures, of supervision and appeal; in providing a wider range of choice and mobility between points of allocation and agencies of distribution; or in improving access penetration in the sense of the number, the location or the coherence of points of allocation. It has to be remembered, however, that the potential applicant's position is what needs to be strengthened, including his opportunity to move between those points and to search for alternatives altogether. The fourth strategy is then likely to be particularly interested in the provision of market surrogates; in improved opportunities of control over institutions; in supplementary and supportive systems of applicant organisation; and in the end an increased capacity of people to handle their access situations by understanding them and by being able to decide about them. That in turn has to be a coincident change in productive participation and opportunity: for example, getting better housing and getting better employment have to coincide. The supposition that there can be policy trade-offs between these areas is a fundamental error.¹

¹ S.P. Huntington and J.M. Nelson, No Easy Choice: Political Participation in Developing Countries, Harvard, 1976, amongst other things shows, in chapter 5 particularly, the problems of what it calls political participation by the poor. Page 184, note 5, is particularly relevant, criticising S. Verba, K. Nie and Jae Kim, The Modes of Democratic Participation, Sage, California, 1971.
The question remains then, whether such a fourth strategy can be distinguished in any worthwhile sense from what is normally meant by political mobilisation and its likely relation to production positions and partisan ideologies. This question, we suggest, remains open. This is partly because of the concrete situation in developing areas, as of urban poverty. It is partly because of the organisational potential in ethnic, nationalist, communal, religious, linguistic factors and agencies. It is partly also, however, because, as we have argued throughout, of the specific significance of these access situations themselves.

We suggest however that the "paths to politics" must include a category of what has been called "mobilised participation": as we have called it here, a fourth strategy. Clearly much about these paths remains uncertain: the politics of urban poverty, for example; the alternative resources and agencies mentioned above, like church or language; the political provocation and responses of access experience itself. At any rate, the questions about access and about participation come, in the end, to demand a political analysis and a political response. At the same time, as the statement of the fourth strategy is formulated, it carries implications for policy criteria, as about some trade-offs, and for institutional changes, as in training and co-location.

Quite different approaches are suggested to much of the existing agenda on participation, specifically about apparent trade-offs between equity and growth; about many of the ways in which, as in urban poverty programmes, apparent participation opportunities have been structured; about past directions of participation, as in community development, self-help and decentralisation; and about many existing intra-institutional attitudes on training, on staffing, on programme evaluation and monitoring and feedback.1 It is a distinctive programme and approach which is being suggested here.

BBS/efr

---

1 Coralie Bryant and others, Participation, Planning and Administrative Development in Urban Development Programmes, USAID, Feb. 1976, provides a useful survey of many of these existing premises, particularly about urban poverty programmes.
5.2.2 Recruitment of Public Personnel

5.2.2.1 Course of Discussion

The working group started reconsidering its task and purpose in relation to the group works on the whole. It should be tried to discuss a disposition of the issue "Recruitment of Public Personnel" in order to test how far acceptance could be gained with any design of framework for the purpose of an International Encyclopaedia of Public Administration. Right from the beginning, it was regretted and defined as the main problem of this highly sensitive issue that reliable data or detailed country reports are lacking that would allow to evaluate national policies in the field.

The group then took notice of the two papers presented to the discussants. None of them includes methods and techniques of recruitment and selection of public personnel. It was estimated that the first understands the issue as too narrow to deal with the selection of individual persons for a given position. This argument concentrated on the general implementation of a "personnel-policy", based on demand as well as on supply of certain qualifications into the apparatus of public administration.

The paper which was characterized as more comprehensive it was said, dealt primarily with basic patterns of building and running a public service under different social conditions. Central factors would be the labour-market, the influence of public opinion on individual behaviour and the possibilities of which disposes the responsible recruitment unit.

The discussion then analysed the situation in developing countries. It was worked out a list of propositions that they have some characteristics in common:
The list was accepted for western industrialized countries as a result, even though the notions used in the different countries vary and may have further meanings.

Proceeding from that list of characteristics, the group continued putting up a list of important problems in order to structure the area of public personnel. It should be understood also as an attempt to gain priorities and to find starting points of discussion in the sense of entries.

This attempt was accompanied by a retrospective view on the two papers, and their discrepancy being signified by most discussants as broad or narrow. The latter discussion provoked a fast change of interest from the intended material search to the main problems of public personnel to more technical and later even principal questions. They have been expressed in the following questions:

- is it possible to coordinate a multitude of authors by guidelines informing them about the content of other articles and directing them in general terms on a pre-defined problem structure?

- is it possible to guarantee the maintenance of a general and equal level of abstraction and sophistication in all subject-matter areas, or are there necessities to differentiate levels according to different topics?
- who needs an encyclopaedia of public administration and what are the consequences of different answers?

- is there a market for an encyclopaedia and what are its conditions and requirements?

- will there be an international effort reflecting the state of the Art of all contributions or will the capable have to do the job for the less advanced?

- are there alternative forms to concentrate, update and promulgate administrative knowledge to the existing ones, which not really help those who need help?

The group itself did not talk about answers but thought of promoting the project by addressing the questions during the final plenary discussion.
5.2.2.2 Special Contributions
Jocelyn Jacques

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

In reading the following paper, one must remember that it's a skeleton of a possible entry in the encyclopedia. The objective here is not to agree on a final text (it would be unthinkable in such a setting) but rather to discuss and to, to a certain extent, experiment the different problems related to this exercise. These problems can (and are) related to culture, philosophical background, language, the use of technical terms etc.

The reader is also invited to look closely at the language used. As the encyclopedia must be used to a great extent by civil servants from different facts of the world as well as students and professors, the language issue is a difficult one. I tried here to produce a text susceptible of meeting these objectives. The discussion that will follow will tell us a lot about the character and the practical feasibility of such an enormous and difficult enterprise.
RECRUITMENT

1. Definition

Broadley defined, recruitment may be used as synonymous of staffing, to include all the steps and activities in filling positions in an organization. But it is generally given a more restrictive definition, where it is considered as the first step in the staffing process, the other step being the selection. In this narrower sense, recruitment is defined as the process of attracting qualified candidates among which selection can be made, according to the needs of the organization.

2. Recruitment policies

There are two major issues in the establishment of recruitment policies:

- Shall vacant positions be filled in priority from inside or from outside (recruitment is necessary only in the latter case).

- Shall recruitment policies reflect "social" or "ideological" values or shall it have for only objective to attract the best qualified people for the jobs to be filled.
a) Filling positions from inside vs from outside

Even though it concerns the entire staffing process, this question affects the recruitment policies because it determines recruitment strategies and clients.

Some organizations may choose to give priority to internal selection (through promotions or horizontal mobility) for vacant positions, thus reserving external recruitment for the cases where nobody in the organization is interested or competent enough to fill those positions. In such organizations, the recruitment has to focus on young persons to fill the lower rank positions of each job category, and on specific problem areas where the organization cannot find adequate resources in its ranks.

Other organizations may prefer to look for the best qualified persons to fill its vacant positions, without considering whether these persons are already in the organization or not. In these organizations, the use of recruitment is much more systematic, thus requiring diversified strategies to reach the different kinds of "clients", depending on the type of positions to be filled.

b) The values of recruitment

Theoretically, the main objective of recruitment may be said to provide the organization with the best qualified applicants for the jobs to fill. In practice, however, two sets of considerations impose certain limits to this objective.
The first limit is an economic one: recruitment and selection are very expensive (in terms of time, money and energy), specially when the recruiting efforts are extensive and the number of applicants important. So it may appear preferable, in some instances, to limit the scope of research for qualified candidates, particularly when a lot of those are available in the labor market.

A second limit to the research of the best qualified candidates result from the inclusion of social or ideological values in the objectives of recruitment. This limitation is not found in the private sector, where efficiency is the only value underlying recruitment. But in the public sector, where public employment is also an instrument of public policy, some ideological considerations may require to concentrate recruitment efforts on specific groups. One of those considerations is the use of public service as an instrument of socio-political integration of minority groups. To facilitate the integration of these groups, or to reverse passed discrimination exerted toward groups under-represented in the public service, it may be required to make special efforts for the recruitment of member of those groups, or even to limit recruitment for certain positions to those groups. This may be contrary to the principle of efficiency, but the social or political benefits of such a practice may be greater than its costs.

Another value which may compete with the concept of efficiency in recruitment is the rule of "equal access for all to the public service". In societies where access to public employment is considered as a fundamental right, systematic advertising of every job vacancy may be the rule, even though it is not always economically advisable.

The point to remember is that, in the public service, efficiency is rarely the only value guiding the recruitment policies and practices.
3. Steps in recruitment

The recruitment process may be divided in four steps:

- recruitment planning
- specification of needs
- identification of sources of supply
- advertising

a) Recruitment planning

Recruitment planning has two main objectives:

1) identify "problems area" where recruitment is difficult in order to adopt specific recruitment strategies to face these problems;

2) anticipate recruitment needs of the organization, so that an organization will be able to satisfy them more rapidly and more efficiently.

Two different problems may complicate the attraction of qualified candidates: the scarcity of certain types of human resources on the labor market, and the attractiveness of government as employer. Manpower planning should be designed to identify the magnitude of those problems and to design programs to solve them.
Long-range recruitment planning requires a knowledge of manpower supply trends in the specific recruiting area of the organization; this area is a geographical one (considering the limited mobility of certain types of resources), but also a professional one. The planners must then identify:

- the extremely difficult chronic shortage area;
- the difficult area, where there is a precarious balance between supply and the jurisdiction's ability to recruit;
- the adequate supply area;
- the generous supply area.

The knowledge of these manpower supply trends will permit to adapt the recruiting efforts to the importance of the shortage, and also, if possible, to improve the labor market itself for certain types of position.

The image of government as employer may also affect the capacity of the public service to attract the best people available in the labor market. This problem may not be very important when the supply of resources is very large; but in areas of manpower shortage, the attractiveness of government employment is a critical element of the efficiency of the recruitment efforts. The attractiveness of public employment is made of two elements: the prestige of such work in the popular mind, and the salaries and working conditions offered by government. If recruitment appear to be difficult because of attitudes prevailing in the general public toward public employment, long terms efforts may have to be done to change
these attitudes. But if the problem is that salaries and working conditions offered by government are inferior to those offered in the private sector, the compensation policies of the public service may have to reconsidered.

Recruitment planning is also a way to reduce delays in filling vacant positions: by systematically anticipating future manpower needs, the recruitment system can be built in such a way or to satisfy them where they actually appear. The anticipation of manpower needs may be based on regular consultations with the executives of the different departments, and on an analysis of new or incoming policies.

b) Specification of needs

The specification of needs has to answer the following question: what kind of candidates does the organization need? The job specifications which should be prepared for recruitment and selection purposes may include five categories:

- level of education
- specialized skills
- extent of prior work experience
- level of intelligence
- essential personality characteristics.
A specific job description must also be given to the recruiting officer so that the applicants know what they are applying for. This job description has ordinarily to be much more precise than the one included in classification plan.

The basic issue in the specification of needs is to decide whether the organization wants to recruit for a career or for a specific job. If the objective of the staffing process is to find the right person for a particular job, the specification of needs shall be based on the specific requirements of that job. But if the public service wants to offer a career plan for its employees, the specification of needs shall be based on the general attitudes and abilities required for the broad category of jobs in which the new employee can make his career.

c) Identification of sources of supply

When information concerning the job has been obtained, the next step is to obtain information on potential supply sources. The search for this information should be conducted with several questions in mind:

- Where can qualified persons be found?

- How many are there?

- Over what geographic area they spread?

- Are they mobile?

- Are they available for employment, or already well employed?
- When are they most available for employment?

- Do they belong to employee, business or professional organizations?

- Is there an organized marketplace for their services?

- What employers compete for their services?

- What recruitment methods do these employers use?

Information should also be gathered about the desires and expectations of potential applicants. Here the basic questions are: What do qualified applicants expect from a job and its environment? What treatment do they expect in the recruitment, selection, and placement processes?

d) Advertising

That part of recruitment process which is concerned with communicating the personnel needs of the organisation and with motivating qualified persons to apply, may, in the broadest sense of the word, be called "advertising". Its purpose is to create a climate which is conducive to selling the job. The closing of the sale - the job acceptance - is a separate transaction.

There are two approaches to advertising for recruitment purposes: the shot-gun approach, where the message is subject to a very large diffusion in the media; and the selective approach, where the advertisement is channeled through specialized media (professional journals, contacts with professional associations, marking lists to specific groups, personal invitation to individuals, contacts with deans or professors in universities, meetings with students in universities).
The shot-gun approach is more often used when the labor market is not too difficult and the selective approach is normally used in addition to the shot-gun approach in the areas of manpower shortage in the labor market.

***

The goal of recruiting activities is the production of an adequate number of qualified applicants. Recruitments ends with an application; then begins the selection process.
If the real constitution of any polity is its administrative system and if the state is as its officials are, then recruitment is the first step toward a good public service. Finding the right people to fill public offices has never been easy. The community should employ in its service people of whom it can be proud, people devoted to advancing the public interest, loyal, competent, hardworking, honest, just. But the power and trappings of public office, the status and prestige that often goes with it, and its advantageous conditions of employment, such as security, attract all kinds from the altruistic to the avaricious, from the most eminent to the least deserving, from the most able to the least competent. Sifting the bad from the good and the weak from the strong has taxed every community, a problem further compounded by the reluctance of qualified, ambitious people to offer themselves because they do not want to live public lives or they cannot face the prospect of constant pressure and strain in exercising public responsibility, or they resent the obligations and restrictions of public service employment, or they consider the conditions of employment unsatisfactory or unsatisfying. The major challenges are attracting and retaining a proper share of the community's talent, sorting the desirable from the undesirable through relevant and adequate tests of competence, and selecting the best qualified in a fair and acceptable manner.

Since the dawn of civilization different societies have met these challenges in different ways. Some have relied on voluntary communal efforts and volunteers to deliver public services; others have preferred filling public offices by compulsory rotation. Some have relied on inheritance, whereby members of the same family, clan or tribe pass on public
offices from one generation to the next; others have selected public servants by lottery. Some have sold public offices to the highest bidders and allowed them to be traded like property; others have treated public office as a sacred public trust reserved only for the most deserving. Some have adopted election by popular vote; others have relied on select committees to decide. Some have restricted public office to a select category of person; others have tried to avoid exclusion by eliminating discriminatory tests of competence. The variations and permutations are many; examples of each of them can be found at most times somewhere around the world. The range is so wide that convenient classification and generalization is defied. Every so often practices change and historical oddities are revived, which adds to the confusion. Much depends on how a society sees itself, what kind of public services it provides, which mechanisms it chooses to deliver public services, and to what extent it relies on a permanent class of public officials to see whether societal objectives are being achieved.

A marked feature of all sophisticated cultures and complex societies is a reliance placed on a permanent class of public officials or public bureaucracy to perform a variety of communal tasks--to enforce general rules by which the community regulates itself, to protect the community from invasion and domestic violence, to provide common amenities and collective services and to help those in distress. Fritz Morstein Marx (F.M. Marx, *The Administrative State*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1957, pp. 54-72.) has distinguished between four major types of public bureaucracy:

(a) guardian--an aloof elite recruited by rigorous tests from the very best to be custodians of social ideals, to live exemplary lives and educate the masses in the ways of righteousness, and to personify in their actions dedication to the common good and advancement of the public interest.
(b) caste--a closed elite recruited from the same restricted social class, usually upper crust, that monopolizes public life, to protect the status quo generally and its own special interests when threatened, thus careful to preserve its status and privileges and tending in its conduct of public affairs to be antiquarian, formalistic, and heavy handed;

(c) patronage--a less restrictive elite drawn from those with the right connections, packed with loyal partisans who can be relied upon to follow orders and to protect the best interests of their patrons but suffering from technical incompetence, indiscipline, rapaciousness, erraticism, and want of spirit; and

(d) merit--an open public service governed by objective standards, competitively recruited on the basis of ability and achievement, regulated by law and politically subordinate.

In short, who public bureaucracies serve largely determines who is allowed to serve in them. Inward looking caste and patronage bureaucracies, viewing public office as a right not a privilege, tend to relish the luxury and majesty of office, use their power and position to serve their own interests and generally conduct public business as personal fiefdoms at public expense. Outward looking guardian and merit bureaucracies, privileged to serve the community, tend to be more administratively virtuous (being frugal, incorruptible, self-denying, dutiful, hardworking, honest, etc.) with a passion for "impartial impersonality" (E. Barker, The Development of Public Services in Western Europe 1660-1930, London, Oxford University Press, 1944, p.18) and professionalism, and more mindful both of the limitations placed on the exercise of public power and the need to be sensitive to public opinion. The one would tend to administrative absolutism, the other to administrative subordination.

This typology does highlight an important clash of views whether a government should be allowed to appoint whom it likes and should take the consequences if it chooses badly or whether vacancies in the public bureaucracy should be filled independent rational recruitment systems
that select the most meritorious about whom the government has little say. Is the public bureaucracy an instrument of the government to do as it pleases, in which case the government should have some say in who serves it? Or is it an instrument of the community which should safeguard itself against possible malpractices, in which case recruitment should be impartial and objective with legal protection of bureaucratic integrity and impartial public service? Perhaps in the modern administrative state, both views are correct and reconcilable. Public servants should enjoy the confidences both of the government and the public. The government should be "confident that it will receive good advice, that its instructions will be carried out promptly and effectively, and that the programs and activities for which it is responsible will be administered efficiently and impartially" and the public should be confident the public bureaucracy is also worthy of the very important functions it executes on the public's behalf (D. Lewis, "The Qualities of Future Civil Servants," Parliamentary Affairs, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1980, p. 422).

Administrative scientists have long maintained that the only public service recruitment system that will satisfy both government and public is some form of merit system which incorporates within government a set of checks and balances that minimizes nepotism and patronage, that recruits public servants on the basis of their qualifications in open competitive examinations rather than "political opinions or the partisan services of applicants for office" (D.B. Eaton, Civil Service in Great Britain, New York, Harper and Bros., 1880, p. 161). For them, the merit principle remains the unrealized ideal in public service recruitment ever since it was enunciated in the Forty-fifth Article of Magna Carta of 1215, and before that in Roman law, and before that in the Code of Hammurabi. The key word
"merit" which has always been subject to different interpretations. For some, it is strictly related to expert and proven ability to perform specific jobs in the public bureaucracy while for others it is the absence of "any distinction, exclusion or preference made on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, political opinion, national extraction or social origin, which has the effect of nullifying or impairing equality of opportunity or treatment in employment or occupation" (Convention No. III on Discrimination in Employment and Occupation of the International Labor Organization, 1957), and they maintain that the principle of equality of rights also includes "the adoption of positive measures . . . to develop the possibilities of effective participation of members of certain groups in public employment" (International Labor Conference, 47th Session, 1963, Report of the Committee of Experts, Part 3, p. 220).

The recent intrusion of international declarations into national considerations of public service recruitment is a typical illustration how different to private employment public sector personnel practices are. Private employers still assume discretionary power to hire and fire at will and strike individual deals as regards conditions of employment, subject to general labor laws, union contracts and self-imposed guidelines. While many independent self-contained statutory authorities claim similar flexibility in personnel administration, public bureaucracies as a whole are subject to much stricter regulation and because of the special circumstances in which government is conducted, they are expected to behave differently from private employers. For a start, some occupations are peculiar to public bureaucracies and have few if any private equivalents; these include the diplomatic corps, the armed services, the police, fire and public safety services, court officers, taxation administrators and various human services administrators.
all of whom constitute a significant portion of public sector employment and have unique personnel problems. Furthermore, public bureaucracies are usually the largest single employers of these and other occupations, and the factor of size presents special problems. The fact that public bureaucracies are subject to political control, mass media attention, and public surveillance means that they really conduct their affairs much in the open and at any time minor details may be subject to public controversy. People have dual standards, one they apply to private business, and another, altogether more principled, more righteous, more demanding, that they apply to public business. Government is expected to be different, to set a higher tone in conducting its affairs, to set an example to others, and, even in some circles, to be a model employer, that is, to be an enlightened leader in terms of employment, industrial relations and fair labor practices. These factors alone would make public service recruitment different but almost universally the public sector labor market is something special.

The Public Sector Labor Market

The private sector labor market is usually highly competitive. Large numbers of employers compete against each other for available labor. If they cannot readily find who they want, they poach employees from other employers, dangle all kinds of inducements (including some that are immoral and illegal), import labor (where permitted), and train people to fill vacancies. Large numbers of employees compete against each other for available jobs. If they cannot readily find what they want, they lower their price, take whatever else might be going until something better turns up, and prepare themselves (where they can) for higher paying jobs. How both sides fare is determined by the general state of the market rather than on
what they as individuals do. They accommodate to the market situation. The public sector market is different. There a few large employers dominate. At political command, they can create jobs to provide employment for those who cannot find employment in the private sector market and they can just as quickly freeze levels of employment and cut back on staff when public finance is scarce. They are often forbidden to compete among themselves or with private employers and they are prohibited from resorting to practices common among private employers. Even when they are actively recruiting and offer competitive terms, they may not be able to attract sufficient qualified persons because of a general prejudice against public service employment.

**Demand.** The modern administrative state is an active state, constantly taking on functions and activities that the private sector is unable or unwilling or incompetent to assume. It is also a welfare state, concerned about improving the quality of life for all and especially the standard of living of the poorest, consequently public sector employment in virtually every country in the world has increased enormously over the past century, particularly since the Great Depression and the adoption of Keynesian economic strategies to keep national economies buoyant. Annual increases of five percent are common and annual increases of over ten percent are not that rare anymore, with defense, social services and public utilities (water, electricity, gas, sewage, transportation, communications) responsible for most of the increase in recent decades. Between them they have generated more employment than the private sector; they are the new growth industries, partly because of the large investments made in them and partly because they remain relatively labor intensive. They absorb more and more of the labor force. Whereas fifty years ago, not more than one quarter of the working population was employed in the public sector in any country.
except the Soviet Union, currently almost no developed country (along with several less developed countries) has a figure below that and Eastern European countries and Scandinavia exceed fifty percent, that is, at least half their working populations is employed in the public sector.

Clearly, governments the world over have assumed more activities as societies have grown more complex and complicated. In several areas private arrangements have been superseded by public administration. Every year, there are more public laws and more public agencies. Several theories, some serious, others less so, have been advanced for this constant increase in public sector employment and the persistent shift from private to public sector employment. It has been suggested that industrialized societies demand more public services, that public service activities are more labor intensive and lag behind in mechanization, that governments have artificially created jobs in the public sector to absorb the unemployed, that public sector productivity is low because management is poor and public servants are workshy, and that public organizations are subject to various multiplier effects caused by patronage, corruption, and various laws of diminishing returns and of the multiplication of work and subordinates. Whatever the reasons, until a recent reaction against the trend, it could be assumed that public sector demands were always increasing and that the public sector required an ever growing list of occupations.

With the growth of the public sector, the labor market has been increasingly fragmented as each special category of public employee has tried to separate itself from others and devise a distinct career service with different employment conditions and different recruitment systems. The first to succeed were the military early in the formation of the modern state and the armed services have since been followed by a host of other public service
professions such as diplomats, judges, postal officers, customs inspectors, police, firefighters, school teachers and revenue agents. To this day the public sector labor market remains fragmented into separate occupational channels and distinct public services. Every so often, attempts are made to broadband public service jobs into general categories to permit greater standardization and internal staff mobility and to ease recruitment administration, but tradition dies hard and distinct occupational channels are not easily upset. Apart from the different nature of jobs, each occupation is subject to different laws of supply and demand. Not all public service occupations increase. Some, like telegraphists, lighthouse keepers and boatmen, are fast disappearing, while others seem to have peaked. In contrast, several private professions are becoming more public—lawyers, doctors, architects, accountants, researchers, and probably no job category is exclusively private anymore. Indeed, new professions in medicine, science and technology, education and human services are becoming increasingly dominated by public sector employers and many other newcomers to the workforce are finding they have no alternative to public sector employment.

Supply. Paradoxically, despite the presence of unemployment, public service vacancies go unfilled for three major reasons, namely, people generally are prejudiced against public sector employment, the conditions of public service employment are unattractive, and the public sector employers are too discriminating or demanding in their selection procedures. The prestige and status of public sector employment vary considerably between countries. In some, it ranks equal to the traditional professions and higher than business pursuits. It attracts the best who make considerable sacrifices to enter public service. In others, it is so poorly regarded and avoided that special inducements have to be offered and resort had to
compulsion or labor direction, particularly in filling unpopular jobs at inconvenient and unpleasant locations. One of the few studies into the image of public service employment suggests that stereotyping dominates occupational attractiveness.

The result is that people usually perceive occupations and employing organizations, not precisely and realistically, but in terms of vaguely generalized cultural prejudices, which not only are undiscriminating in application, uncertain as to origin, and resistant to modification, but also tend to be self-perpetuating and self-enhancing by virtue of their selecting and modifying effect on current experience and perception (F.P. Kilpatrick, et al., The Image of The Federal Service, Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1964, p. 7).

This study also found that not only did stereotypes differ between countries but also between individuals in a country according to their personal goals.

Whether the goals are many or few, immediate or long range, trivial or worthwhile, they are always complex in their pattern of intensity, saliency, and rate of change. Even though the patterns of human striving are rooted in a fairly common biology, their elaboration is a function of learning. They emerge as a compound of the successes and failures and the social prescriptions and expectations to which an individual has been and is exposed as a member of a given family, a given social group, and a given society at a certain time in history (ibid).

It found that in regard to the Federal Civil Service in the United States of America that studies of stereotypes and images could reveal intriguing insights into how different sections of the population felt about public service employment, what motivated people to join and leave the public service, how public servants felt about their employment (and how their views differed from the general public), and what could be done to make public service employment more attractive. As few comparable studies have been made elsewhere, generalization is hazardous and based largely on impressions. Presumably, in less developed countries where any employment,
public or private, is prized and public sector employment denotes closeness to the governing elites, exercise of public authority and a modicum of education. The public service is more attractive than in developed countries where there are more alternative avenues of employment which are equally if not more rewarding, prestigious and authoritative.

Stereotyping of public service employment often highlights security of tenure, income, and retirement benefits as attractions. As public organizations are large and expanding, permanence is fairly reliable especially if it is backed by tenure rights guaranteed in law or custom. Public employers assume an obligation to continue public servants in employment and distinguish between them and other public employees who are given no special privileges. There is an implied contract of good faith on both sides that employment will be continued throughout the whole working life of public servants providing satisfactory service is given and public servants will give loyal service throughout their working lives providing their services are required and their loyalty is rewarded in reasonable income for life. In the early days of the modern state, this reasonable income for life was most advantageous. Public service was well rewarded and pensions were unique. Over the decades, pension schemes have spread to eliminate the public service monopoly while relative rewards have declined as the private sector has caught up and surpassed parsimonious public employers. Some countries still pay above the going rates; others pay well below them and public servants in them complain bitterly about unfair treatment. To prevent both over and under payment, governments have adopted the principle of fair comparability whereby they try to make the package of public service benefits comparable to average or good private employers. In mixed economies, this means that difference in employment conditions between public and private
sectors are minimized except for tenure, although because of the way comparability is measured there is still much room for disagreement. Where either public or private employment dominates, one sector obviously determines prevailing rates.

Problems obviously arise when there is nothing by which to compare public service occupations, where the prevailing rates are solely determined by public employers. This is the most controversial area of public employment. Public service professionals claim they are underpaid, particularly the military, the police, judges, diplomats and the high administrative echelons. Public employers complain that public servants, particularly clerical and middle management and the newer public service professions are overpaid (which they attribute to the absence of a proper pricing structure in producing public goods and services, and unionization). Presumably, if public servants are underpaid, there will be persistent problems in turnover and morale, and in poor countries where public servants are probably underpaid, such problems are endemic and recruitment is a challenge. Conversely where public servants are overpaid, recruitment concerns selection from an overabundance of qualified applicants, providing other factors are constant which they rarely are.

Universally, there does seem to be a problem in attracting and retaining high level public servants who can usually command a higher price outside government inside their own country and in the case of poor countries, abroad. Should they be paid their market worth? How is market worth to be ascertained? Would the public agree to pay market worth? A study of the rewards of top federal officials in the United States of America suggested that the amount paid "should not exceed the level where the public becomes resentful, where doing public service becomes just another job sought for primarily economic rewards or where... conflicts of interest become likely" but it should be "kept above the level where the pool of qualified
talent dries up or where . . . public service is a part-time sideline to some other career" (R.W. Hartman and A.R. Weber (eds.), The Rewards of Public Service, Washington, D.C., The Brookings Institution, 1980, p. 14). It warned about the need to restore "incentives for public service in an era when such service is scorned" which not only made it more politically difficult to raise monetary rewards but also undercut the nonmonetary rewards, thereby discouraging good people and ending up with the kind of public service the public "assumes it has had all along" (Ibid., pp. 21-22).

A further discouragement to public employment is the barriers placed in the way of entry by highly protective recruitment systems that seek to minimize unfit candidates. Guardian, caste and patronage bureaucracies are blatantly guilty of exclusion but merit systems can also be self-defeating where selection criteria are so strict that nobody can qualify at all or too few to fill vacancies or where the processes are so elaborate and time consuming that by the time employment is offered, qualified candidates have found employment elsewhere. And for what reasons? Why do people recruited so laboriously leave and what attempts are made to find out who leaves and why they leave? Is a constant turnover of staff beneficial or detrimental to public sector performance? In any event, no recruitment system works well where demand exceeds supply, which occurs generally in the public sector labor market at times of near general full employment and in specific occupations when the education system has failed to produce sufficient qualified candidates. Further, some newly independent states have found themselves in the unfortunate position of having no qualified residents at all when expatriates have withdrawn their services or qualified residents have preferred employment abroad. In such circumstances, traditional barriers to public service employment have had to be modified if not revised altogether and various expedients employed, such as foreign recruitment and crash
training programs. Nevertheless, many public services have inherited restrictive recruitment practices concerning age, sex, physical fitness, race, color, religion, nationality, residence, physical appearance, character and education unrelated to actual job performance that effectively narrows supply. International efforts are being made to have all unnecessary barriers to employment, private and public, removed. Governments are being urged to lead the way by setting an example within the public sector of equal opportunity and to overhaul public service recruitment systems to prevent inside manipulation of complex laws and procedures to perpetuate unfair discrimination.

Recruitment Systems

The modern administrative state can ill afford haphazard administration, least of all in its staffing function. The sheer size of public sector employment, the multiplication of public service occupations, the large number of vacancies occasioned by natural turnover and annual establishment increases, and social conflicts over who ought to staff public agencies, all push for the systematization of public sector recruitment practices. Over the past century, almost every country has had to devise an elaborate recruitment system to suit its circumstances. While the more developed countries have gone furthest toward sophistication, some newly independent states, underdeveloped and poor, are only just starting to systematize their public personnel administration. They have yet to classify public service positions, group them in related career channels, decide on appropriate conditions of employment, draw up criteria for recruitment and selection, and appoint an authority responsible for recruitment of newcomers to public service. They have yet to design suitable legislation, agree on recruitment guidelines and principles, devise appropriate recruitment procedures, and
designate recruiting agents. They still lack the basic components of a recruitment system. If they look at the developed countries, they will find many different models from which to choose.

Before they do choose, they have to decide on several basic issues. First, should public service be compulsory or voluntary? If voluntary, should it be on the basis of election or selection? If by selection, should selection be made by the employing agency or by a separate and independent recruitment agency? Second, should the career service concept apply to all public employees or only to certain public service occupations? Should public employees be allowed to move between different employing agencies and between different occupations or restricted to the original employing authority and to separate career channels? Should the career service concept veer toward an open or a closed system, that is, toward open recruitment at all levels whereby insiders have to compete with outsiders or open recruitment at a base level only with other levels restricted solely to insiders? How should public service recruitment be related to the education system? Third, should the same criteria for selection apply to all public service occupations? If not, what restrictions should apply generally and what restrictions should apply to specific public service occupations? Who should determine such restrictions? Who should administer them? Who should be responsible for reviewing them? Should the selection criteria be determining or qualifying or suggestive? Fourth, what arrangements should be institutionalized to prevent abuse and breakdown? Who should monitor the system? What rights of appeal and review should be allowed? Who should decide on appeals and reviews? Is any part of the system to be confidential? How are affected parties to be represented in the system and to contribute to it? Fifth, if the system operates in such a way that it discriminates in
favor of particular social groups, should any attempt be made to redress the imbalance? What constitutes an unrepresentative public bureaucracy? What constitutes unacceptable official conduct? What characteristics should the public bureaucracy exhibit? How should government and public confidence in public bureaucracy be guaranteed?

The developed countries have all made their different choices although they do seem to share some common characteristics.

(a) Formalization. Public personnel administration has been strictly regulated, reducing the discretion and flexibility of public employers. Recruitment policies and practices have been increasingly detailed in public law, regulations, policy handbooks, collective bargaining agreements, arbitration awards and explanatory memoranda. Guidebooks are often several volumes thick and they require experienced and well-versed staff to understand and operate them. Less and less is left to chance. Governments set down exactly what should be done to fill any vacancy in the public sector so that there can be no misunderstanding by public employers, personnel administrators, applicants and the public at large. The message is clear—if you want to be a public servant, you need the following qualifications; you need to complete the following application forms and supply the following documents; your application will be reviewed by the following persons who will decide according to the following criteria; the results will be announced in the following manner; if you object to the results, you may appeal in the following manner to these persons; and if you are unsuccessful, you may reapply at such and such a time. Every step is spelled out. Indeed, the process is so bureaucratized that the redtape deters applicants, frustrates public employers and encourages evasion by the impatient. The purpose is to ensure that the government's directions are carried out and that deviations
will be quickly spotted and corrected. This way, everybody knows where they stand.

(b) Democratization. Not only have governments receded from administrative absolutism which once characterized Crown prerogatives in administering public offices, but they have also widened public access to public service employment. Once monopolized by social elites (and still very much influenced by them), public offices have gradually been opened to all qualified persons, irrespective of social origins. Achievement has superseded ascription although some restrictions still apply to do with nationality, moral character, loyalty, and emotional stability and/or maturity. Public services have been a major channel of upward mobility for the socially disadvantaged. Denied advancement elsewhere, they have taken advantage of equal opportunity in the public sector and, for them, the benefits of the higher echelons of the public service. Even so, the socially disadvantaged still do not think enough has been done for them in public sector employment and they would like to make up for lost time by having public employers discriminate in their favor or, failing that, reserve a certain portion of vacancies for them even if they may be less qualified according to pre-selection criteria.

(c) Professionalization. Governments have opted for closed career systems in public service occupations in the attempt to professionalize public sector management and to upgrade public sector performance. They have wanted to make a profession out of government service and to attract to it the same quality of person that other recognized professions recruit. They have modelled public service professionals along the same lines—a demanding apprenticeship, a lengthy journeymanship, and a highly competitive practice governed by eminent peers. By and large, they have succeeded but
at some cost in in-breeding, self-protection and arrogance. As a result, governments have moved more in favor of open career systems to inject new talent with broader experience and a different perspective. They want to avoid isolating the public bureaucracy from the rest of society and the emergence of a self-perpetuating mandarin class, without compromising traditional standards.

(d) Centralization. For a long time, governments preferred to centralize public personnel administration in a separate independent central personnel agency that would eliminate patronage and nepotism, stop cronyism, attract a better class of recruits through positive recruitment methods, spread talent fairly equitably around the public bureaucracy, adjust the recruitment system to changing circumstances, inspect employing agencies to see that they really needed the staff they asked for and that they employed the staff they had properly, and generally take over the personnel function from the government. Thus from small beginnings of merely certifying that new recruits were qualified for the jobs they were to fill, central personnel agencies took over the whole recruitment function and much more. They became too powerful, too self-assertive, too independent. Employing agencies complained about their lack of input into the recruitment system, the red-tape and incompetence of the central personnel agency, and their inability to manage with sufficient flexibility. So governments have moved more in favor of decentralization by reducing the role and activities of the central personnel agencies and restoring more independence to the employing agencies in recruitment and management.

(e) Standardization. Governments have attempted to unify the public bureaucracy and standardize public personnel administration. When employing agencies complained that standardization had been overdone, the policy was
reversed. Great variety has been permitted and the reemergence of fragmented recruitment systems has been tolerated.

(f) Depoliticization. The malpractices of patronage and spoils systems have been so vivid, that governments have sought to remove political considerations from public service recruitment by shifting responsibility to independent personnel agencies. However, partisanship has proved too strong. One party regimes have insisted on party membership or loyalty as a prerequisite for public office. Multi-party regimes have institutionalized the spoils system in sophisticated quota allocations. Other regimes have limited the agency's jurisdiction or circumscribed its powers to allow political considerations to affect selection. Perhaps, the English speaking countries have been the most successful at removing political considerations but even they have been forced to concede to pressure groups such as veteran's organizations, trade unions and professional societies to give their members priority in public service employment. Nevertheless, the aim of depoliticization is still so strongly supported both inside and outside the public bureaucracy that repoliticization is resisted.

(g) Representation. The governance of public recruitment systems has become a partnership between major parties. Each is formally represented and actively consulted when changes are contemplated. Although consensus is not required, alterations are not made against the strong opposition of one or other parties. Consequently, once the system functions smoothly, it tends to remain unchanged even though it could be improved. Confrontation is avoided at the cost of efficiency and efficacy. Reformers are frustrated by the intransigence of vested interests in the status quo. Governments intervene reluctantly, fearful of unnecessarily disturbing things and hesitant to offend any of the parties. Consequently, at any
particular point in time the system is a step behind what is required and outside critics are justified to some extent. On the other hand, when the parties do agree, changes are made quickly and relatively smoothly, often without publicity so that outside critics in turn are a step behind what has taken place.

(h) Classification. Rarely are people recruited for public service and then jobs found for them to do. The jobs in the form of positions in an elaborate establishment model or chart of a public employer are first classified and then people are recruited to fill particular slots. Detailed job descriptions are classified so that similar work is grouped together in the same class and the classes are differentiated by the nature of the work to be done, the qualifications required to do the work, and the assessment of what remuneration is deserved for the work. The classes can be arranged in narrow specialist categories with narrow salary difference or in broad general categories with wide salary differences. In either event the classification work precedes recruitment and is the major determinant who will be recruited and where they will be placed. Newcomers are recruited to specific ranks and to assigned vacancies. The classification determines recruitment needs. But there are exceptions where newcomers are recruited for their general abilities or intellectual prowess or special promise and may be placed in a training category and allocated to whoever can make use of them so that they get varied experience before being placed in a classified position. University graduates being prepared for executive positions are recruited this way as are promising professionals and researchers who are given temporary internships. Otherwise recruits are expected to do the work of a designated position after a brief on the job orientation.
(1) Selection. Since the great majority of jobs in public service are classified in detail together with the requisite specific qualifications required, recruitment concerns itself largely with determining whether prospective applicants possess those specific qualifications and can actually do the work as they claim they can. Vacancies are formally advertised and applications are invited. Not many people may know where to locate the advertisement but it is assumed that anyone who really wants a position will find out on their own initiative where and when formal notices appear and how to make an application in time. The application form, often quite complicated and elaborate, details what qualifications are required, what backing evidence or proof needs to be shown, and how selection will be conducted. The selectors review the application forms to see that they have been correctly answered, check the supporting evidence, and put each applicant through a suitable test of competence. Having satisfied themselves that the applicants are qualified, they may offer a position without further ado, or they may refer qualified applicants in some kind of set order ("first come, first served") to be vetted by the immediate superiors who will be responsible for the newcomer's work, or they may be ranked according to performance at the tests and placed on a merit list from which names are taken in order to fill vacancies. Where demand exceeds supply, the whole process may resemble a ritual because all qualified applicants are guaranteed a position. Where supply exceeds demand, then the process becomes highly competitive and elaborate tests devised to determine fine points of difference between applicants. To ensure that justice is seen to be done as well as done, disappointed applicants may retake the tests or appeal to a separate tribunal. The trend has been toward simplification of the whole selection process, simply because it was just too lengthy, too detailed and
too cost ineffective. Relatively few classes of position required such elaboration. The requirements were designed to keep people out of public service rather than to encourage them to apply. The tests could not be proven to distinguish between applicants with any degree of accuracy or relationship to actual work performance. The high expenses of inhouse tests could not be justified when perfectly suitable outside tests existed. In effect, because of the changed nature of the public sector labor market, selection has gone back to weeding out the worst rather than finding the best.

(i) Probation. As nobody can predict how a recruit will actually perform on the job, recruitment ends only with the completion of a probationary period. Few are appointed without having to serve a probationary period at the end of which the employing agency is suppose to make a determining judgment as to competence. Probation has not lived up to its promise. Newcomers work diligently through their probation (sometimes as short as six months) and then having secured tenure, they slack off. Supervisors are reluctant to complain because they do not wish to challenge the selection process or they find that their own accusations are turned against them, the fault not being in poor recruitment but in poor supervision. Attempts are being made to review the probationary period with a view to extending it or abandoning it altogether in favor of continuous annual or biannual performance assessments.

It can readily be seen that new states can learn much from the experience of old states. They do not have to copy what they did or follow exactly the same steps. They can pick and choose and they can skip a few stages. Independent central personnel agencies are currently out of favor although they may be necessary at an early stage to curb flagrant excesses by employing agencies with or without political support. Broadbanding may simplify the
task of classification where local expertise is scarce although greater differentiation may be required at a later stage as more detailed discrimination may be needed in renumeration. Similarly, expensive, elaborate in-house competitive examinations may be avoided if simpler substitutes can be found. If recruitment guidelines are detailed, employing agencies may be trusted to do their own recruiting without an intermediary central recruiting agency that has no responsibility for their actual work performance. Nonetheless new states could benefit from studying the actual experiences and practices of the older states.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY STUDIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Service Recruitment Agenda

Despite experimentation in public service recruitment for several hundred years, little evaluation of the effectiveness of recruitment systems has been undertaken. It is taken as a matter of faith that merit systems are superior to spoils systems but it has not been proved conclusively that public officials recruited in open competition are superior in quality and competence and perform better in office than those recruited through patronage. The redtape of merit systems may deter good people from applying at all or accepting a position when offered while patronage may be able to induce the self same people to serve. There has been insufficient research into public service recruitment problems and prospects. Many questions still cannot be answered adequately.

1. Images and Stereotyping. Why do different societies view public employment differently? How accurate are popular impressions? How do images and stereotyping affect recruitment? Is self-fulfilling prophecy at work? What could be done to change adverse attitudes?

2. Employment planning. Why does the public sector indulge in so little long range forecasting of its staffing needs? Is recruitment more of an attraction or retention problem? Where do staff shortages persist and for what reasons? Why do people recruited so laboriously leave and what attempts are made to find out who leaves and why they leave? Is a constant turnover of staff beneficial or detrimental to public sector performance?

and fair? Are tests adjusted to advances in social science and to changes in social values?

4. Representativeness. To what extent should public service employment mirror adult society or the working population? Where does unevenness detract from public confidence, official credibility and public sector performance? How does ascription interfere with achievement? Is the right education the determining factor in career advancement? When is an ethnic balance desirable?

5. Efficacy of Recruitment system. How can recruitment processes be streamlined and speeded up? How can potential applicants obtain better information about vacancies? Is the career service concept outmoded? Would complete labor mobility be preferable? Does the classification system impede recruitment? Does aggressive recruiting really work? Would relocating public service jobs ease recruitment shortfalls?

6. Efficacy of Recruits. Do third sector organizations outperform public agencies? How can individual creativity and innovation be fostered? Does contract employment produce better performance? How should an attractive benefits package for the highest echelons of public service be determined? What can public servants do to help themselves? What can be done to turn poor performers around?
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5.2.3 Autonomy of Local Administration

5.2.3.1 Course of Discussion

This working group entered into its discussion with brief presentations and further comments on the prepared papers.

It started with the chairman's paper which was meant to show up a possibility of structuring the issue "Autonomy of Local Administration". The following contribution tried to define an approach or entry that should allow to avoid stratification into different methodologies. The suggestion was therefore introduced to look at local administration as one level of national political activity. Methodologically difficult problems such as tasks, programmes, budgeting etc. should only be examined in connection with the State level. This would correspond to the experience that on this level it could be expected much more sophistication or "niveau". Therefore entries to levels beyond the local ones - including for example the European level - are more adequate for specific methodological reflections. Local Administration - in opposition to that - could be best described as "natural" not designed system emerging somehow out of chaos, respectively out of power play at the very grass-roots of society. This approach might be very vague for the purpose of an international encyclopaedia, but it has the advantage being open to the empirical level and introducing the necessary material and information in public administration as it is familiar to the reader. The question of power networks also arises on the basic level and influences tremendously the sometimes intended implementation of rational innovations into local administration.

The following discussion of the papers concentrated on the advantages, autonomy of local administration has in
comparison with centralized systems. But it was emphasized that these advantages depend enormously on the legal personality of the local entities in the constitutional framework.

Another one plead for a more functional approach, arguing that a general entry to the subject, a 'holistic' approach would be necessary, dealing e.g. with operative aspects and intergovernmental relations. Furthermore, one discussant plead for a political approach forwarding the question concerning the role of local administration as basic entity of political life and their factual bargaining power compared to the legal power of the state. It was objected on this that the accentuation of a legal point of view would again favour the doubtful image of a from-top-to-bottom-structure of states. Also one should not add just another handbook on the mere structure of local administration, because a community power approach would be more fruitful for the understanding of the phenomenon of local autonomy.

There were also doubts, if the choice of only one approach was fitting into the concept of an encyclopaedia and could not become obsolete too soon. Some held, that a combination of both methods would be appropriate.

On the technical side, there was uncertainty to what extent aspects like personnel or budgeting which will undoubtedly have to be treated in separate entries, have to be tackled specifically in connection with "autonomy of local administration" or would be dealt with there. It was generally accepted that a certain degree of redundancy is unavoidable, as all subjects are interrelated.

After a contribution about the rapid changes of policy regarding the autonomy of local administration in socialist countries, it was understood that there is a need to deal with the historical side of the subject, too. Regarding the
other aspects of the subject, it was generally agreed upon not to adopt a national report system. The group discussed two alternative methods:

First, a very general and abstract description of local administration 'as such' with the significant trends of its historical development was taken into consideration. It seemed, however, that this way was not appropriate with regard to the variety of national types of local administration and their different history. It was then stressed the importance, autonomous local administration would have for the integration of all residents and citizens into democratic states.

The interest of one of the papers was interpreted as even primarily directed at the contradiction that would exist between the factual (lack of) power of local self-government and bureaucracy versus their democratic functions and also their legal position. For this reason it would be indispensable to give enough room to the analysis of empirical data and the expression of the view of local practitioners.

The open debate which started from this point, tended to comprehend two points as the fundamental questions in order to design a framework for the topic. The first ran, whether "autonomy" or "local administration" would be more adequate to enter the issue, and which one should thus be regarded as the main point to be stressed. It was said, that one paper favoured clearly "autonomy", declaring that especially valuation and comparisons of different forms of self-government in the various states and administrative cultures would be fruitful and were possible in an encyclopædia.

This position met support as well as critique. The latter argued, that local administration exists everywhere in some way or other, and that the main interest should concentrate on the understanding of the difference between local self-government and the state agencies operating on the local level. Thus, it would be dealt with all non-central agencies and the specific meaning of autonomy could be elaborated out
of their formal and real competences. The discussion went on without an explicit consensus and tried to examine the distinction of local and regional. It was said that in many cases at the same time, fully state-controlled agencies and forms of self-government would coexist. Therefore, it would be necessary to have a special entry into this administrative level, giving a broad overview regarding the different types of state-organization and their structure. Then, the group referred to the second point of main interest, that was intended to be discussed. This point dealt with the problem of the methodological approach. One group of discussants favoured a structural and systematic approach as suggested in one paper, dealing with the elements and aspects of local administration like legal framework, internal structure etc.

The second possibility would be the suggestion to form clusters of states with a common administrative culture, or choosing a limited number of typical states or ideal types. Then, at each point of the disposition, one could refer to these clusters of states. This way was regarded being the more informative one, but the choice of clusters of typical states was estimated as very difficult. Also, the description of the historical developments with this method was questioned, what also led to different opinions, whether the whole historical side of the subject could be presented by one single author.

The group agreed that these problems do not exclusively concern this specific issue, but would presumably occur with other entries of the encyclopaedia as well. Thus, the group expected more discussion within the final plenary discussion.
5.2.3.2 Special Contributions

Encyclopedia of Public Administration

Exemplary Administrative Issues:

Autonomy of Local Administration

by Heinrich Siedentopf

The purpose of this paper is to list in a logical order the different items of the issue "autonomy of local government". The order and the content of the items as well as the way of presenting these items should be discussed.

1. Objectives and functions of local government

1.1. Democratic self-government
- training of public behaviour
- participatory value, co-determination, control

1.2. Decentralization and local development
- centralization of modern government
- self-government in local affairs

1.3. Provider and administrator of basic services
- running services for the benefit of the community
- performing direct governmental services to the people

2. Historical and legal framework of local government

2.1. Inherent or delegated powers of local government
- principle of universality
- delegation of powers, extension of functions

2.2. General local government acts and special purposes legislation
- legislation dealing with local government
- legislation dealing with special services

3. Structure of local government

3.1. Levels of local government
- local level
- regional level

3.2. Local government and state structure
- local government areas
- local government in unitary and federal states
- local government and special purpose authorities

3.3. Internal structure
- organization structure, staff
- political organization, councils, party politics
- management in local government

4. Powers and finances of local government

4.1. Allocation of powers
- size and powers
- allocation of functions

4.2. Local taxation and local expenditure
- local taxation, grants from the state
- local expenditure and central government intervention

5. Central-local government relations

5.1. Centralization - decentralization
- supervision of local government decisions
- power of appointment over local personnel
- integrated development planning

5.2. Local government reforms
- territorial and functional reforms
- evaluation of reforms
Herbert König

Autonomy of Local Administration
- Relationship of General and Local Methodology -
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1. General Methodology

If we attempt to present the sciences of administration as a uniform whole and if we proceed from a general structure we can distinguish between the following main blocks:

- public tasks/problems/purposes of public activity
- programmes as forms of public activity
- organisation: institutional and procedural structures
- budget plan and finance plan
- personnel: requirements and expectations
- control: resources auditing and assessment of impact.

This gives rise to the following questions:

a) An Introduction to the Science of Administration

A brief list of headings:

---

+Herbert König: Advisor on Methodology to the Federal Ministry of Economics, Bonn; Professor of Administrative Science at the Federal Armed Forces University, Hamburg
- the position of the science of administration and its self-image
- relations to politics and law
- levels of political activity
- target groups for public administration
- the science of administration in literature
- the history of the science of administration
- the environment to administration
- theoretical approaches
- terminology
- methods of the science of administration.

The question is whether a separate chapter should be devoted to
the world of information apart from the introduction; all experience
would suggest that this should not be done. In that case we should
extend the list of introductory topics to include:

- information and communication
- data processing in administration
- documentation
- information systems
- social indicators.

b) Tasks versus Problems/Purposes versus Goals

A basic problem in the systematisation of a science of public
activity is the concept of the task. However, it is something
we can easily forget, for it is in fact the answer to a wide
range of preliminary considerations which are rarely included.
A task is something one wants to do and it does not provide an
answer to the question of why one wants to. Hence in a prelim-
inary stage public purposes must be clarified or problems identi-
fied which give rise to public activity and hence to tasks. But
once we know that we do not need public tasks, we must formulate
programmes.

With experience gained in management techniques and planning in
private enterprise we then immediately ask where the public objective
are. Well, they too are an answer to the identification of prob-
lems and the establishment of purposes, for they act as a kind
of starter's gun for public activity, for which they could provide
a heading. Insofar they are not in fact very far removed from
the concept of the task. But that does not mean that we cannot use them at all: of course one could imagine work objectives graded down to the individual job and offering people something like a direction in which the concrete work has to go. But national goals have little in common with this; they are rather the transposition of value concepts into prospects for action, hence they are in a "sky" far above the level of the identification of problems and purposes. But problems and purposes can be identified if we ask what in the concrete political situation of a country contradicts the general concept of national goals.

c) Programme Typology

In the German science of administration we draw a distinction between
- Purpose and routine programme according to Niklas Luhmann, and
- Conditional and final programme according to Klaus König.

The first distinction would appear to be meaningful with regard to the fact that the formulation and implementation of programmes give rise to different forms of action and perhaps even a different type of protagonist. But administration can be adjusted to this. Klaus König's distinction, on the other hand, enables a differentiation between the implementation of norms and budget execution. The first moves in an "if so, then" relation, the other in the relation between the establishment of purpose and the provision of means.

The question is simply how the two fit together; the answer I propose is that the distinctions cross each other, giving four fields:
- a conditional purpose programme (draft legislation)
- a final purpose programme (draft budget)
- a conditional routine programme (implementation of legislation) and
- a conditional final programme (budget implementation).

---

d) Planning and Decision-making

We have already said that a science of administration can hardly be constructed on decision-making; there is far too great a range of decision-making and the decisions go into far too much detail. But that does not mean that we do not need to concern ourselves with decision-making techniques and these in turn are accompanied by very much more demanding methods which range up to planning concepts such as the subsidiaries of the PPBS.

All this in turn needs to be incorporated into a science of administration. Here we must differentiate between comprehensive systems and simple approaches. Certainly an integrated planning and budgeting system will include virtually all the methodological fields (diagram p. 5); there would be no point in including it among these, we should deal with it under "integrated systems" at the end of the presentation of a science of administration, in other words after "control" as a separate chapter.

But we still have to place the other - "smaller" techniques and methods. They should come between problems/purposes on the one hand and programme formulation on the other, for they serve the formulation of programmes when it is known what the programme is to serve. So here - subsequently to the account of programmes - we should include:

- methods of gaining information (brain-storming, Delphi and scenario)
- deterministic methods (morphology and linear optimization)
- stochastic methods (critical path analysis and queue methods)
- heuristic methods (the relevance tree, cost-benefit analyses, use-value analyses and cost-effectiveness analyses).

e) Management Concepts and Organisation Development

The question here is again that of position. Should management concepts be discussed in connection with organisation or not until motivation has been discussed - in connection with personnel? The same applies to the strategies of organisation development, for these too were actually only evolved after the behaviour side was accorded equal weight with the structural component in public organisations. But this is in itself an answer to the question.
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König
If both were considered together with organisation the most important component would be lacking. Hence we should deal with management concepts and the strategies of organisation development towards the end of the personnel section.

2. Local Methodology

As can be seen from the following diagram local administration can be placed neither in the methodological nor in the substantially political dimension, its legitimate place is among the levels of political activity. So there is no point in discussing this in the primary context of methodology. On the other hand we do not need to repeat what has already been said on general methodology. It would be best if the discussion on methodology could consider both state and local authority activity, and this would be possible. Otherwise the only possibility would be to discuss the particular features of local authority level after the discussion on general methodology. The particular features of the local authority level could be seen as:

- the basis function of area planning, infrastructure and citizens' participation and hence the application of the subsidiarity principle;
- possibilities for cooperation in development planning, regional components, political specialised planning and the use of resources, which the state does not necessarily have, and
- their suitability as a basis for innovation in the public apparatus.

On the other hand there is certainly a gap between the local authorities and the state where methodology is concerned; we need only mention a few points:

- an absolutely under-developed programme and reporting system,
- the dominance of organisation and budget in politics,
- an ominous orientation in tasks,
- uncertainties in determining the level of activity,
- an inadequate typology of measures,
- an only indeterminate programme steering and
- very little assessment of impact.
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In fact on local authority level in the Federal Republic of Germany political programming is totally under-developed. But it increases both in quantity and in quality as one moves from local authority to state level and here again from the Länder to the Federal Government. But it has so far scarcely penetrated the consciousness of the protagonists what political programmes are, what purposes they serve and how they are to be differentiated from other activities. So there are no reports on the conclusion of the programme periods; but these would form the necessary basis for political accounting, for the budget itself only includes financial components and merely shows what is to be put into the system (while the accounting would show what has been put in). But as things now are we have neither a demonstration of results nor any meaningful statement on their effects.

And so organisation and budget dominate in policy because their preliminary field, the identification of problem and programme (see diagram 1), is totally unclear.

As it is not known from what public activity should derive, the orientation is to a task concept which in turn has no theoretical basis. So permanent tasks are quickly evolved but these again block the way to a flexible policy in response to rapidly changing problem situations.

A major point in this connection is the determination of the level of local authority activity, i.e. the allocation of responsibility for public activity. On state level this is done by placing the responsibility in the head of section ("Referatsleiter"); this largely lacking for the local authorities with the result that responsibility can easily be pushed on to the higher or lower level and something really drastic results no guilty man can be found to hang or they hang the wrong man.

A further problem in this connection is the lack of adequate classification of public activity. If one assumes that this should be manifest exhaustively in the programme design, one must embark on a search for the basic unity of the programme - let us say "measures". These will include, for instance:

- the creation of infrastructure facilities,
- the transfer of impulses to industry (subsidies),
- insurance against risk (guarantees) and
- the maintenance of law and order through the establishment of norms.

This is the effect of what we said above on the crossing of final or conditional types of action on the one side and concepts of purpose and routine programmes on the other. But once such a typology has been created one can work with it as with building blocks; it is reminiscent of the building blocks of the PPBS and of the decision packages of the ZBB.

What we still lack is a deliberate programme steering in the political field and that presupposes everything that has just been outlined. But year for year above budget level we should ask what we intend to do and how the resources can be used - if not optimally then at least sub-optimally. Precisely here the local authorities, in their development planning, have possibilities open to them which the state has only conditionally at its disposal.

But if all this is created we should also ask whether in addition to the "classical" finance control we should introduce assessment of impact, i.e. the effects of the results of action on the purposes the activities were to fulfil or the problems they were to solve. A recent study on this question carried out in the Federal Republic of Germany\(^1\) showed that the step has scarcely been taken so far.

---

Wassilios Skouris

The Autonomy of Local Administration

The autonomy of local administration is one of the fundamental questions of administrative law and it has literally a universal character. The problem attracts the attention of the theory and the praxis of the west and the east, of the federal and non-federal, of the developed and developing states. Certainly, the trends of local administration appear with different intensity and are differently successful in the various countries. However, the effort and the procedure to detach powers of the central government and to confide them in the units of local administration are common.

1. The Guaranty of Local Administration

The legal protection of the local government is mainly performed by the Parliament. The Parliament establishes the local authorities, protects them by institutional guarantees, defines their functions and provides for their relationship to the central administration.

It is worth mentioning here that the guaranty of local administration in many countries, is provided by constitutional dispositions. E.g., according to the Article 28 of the German Basic Law, 1949, "the right to regulate on their own responsibility all the affairs of the local community within the limits set by law". The Article 72 of the French Constitution, 1958, defines the "collectivités territoriales" of the Republic as "les communes, les départements et les territoires d'outre-mer". Those entities are governed independently by elected councils and under certain conditions specified by law. Further, the Article 102 of the new
Greek Constitution contains an analytical adjustment of the matter providing that "the administration of local affairs shall be exercised by local government agencies, the first level of which comprises municipalities and communities". Those agencies enjoy administrative independence, and their authorities are elected by universal and secret ballot. The State supervises the local government agencies, "without infringing upon their initiative and freedom of action". Additionally, the State provides for funds and other resources necessary to perform the purposes of local administration.

In other countries, as, e.g., in the United Kingdom, the issues of local administration are regulated by basic laws, like the Local Government Act, 1972.

2. The Characteristics of Local Administration

a) The principal characteristic of local administration is the exercise of a certain number of governmental functions by special units not integrated in the central agencies (mainly the ministries) and organized as separate persons in law. It is difficult to imagine a local government in its proper sense without legally incorporated agencies. The legal personality enables the units of local administration to enjoy powers and rights, to have obligations, to manage their own property, to own their own budget and to appoint and to occupy employees under their particular responsibility. A further consequence of the legal personality is the administrative autonomy of the units of local government.

Administrative autonomy does not actually mean complete independence. Thus, as a rule, local authorities are subject to the supervision of central agencies. The supervision is restricted to the control of the legality of the local government activities. That means, central agencies are not allowed to control whether the mentioned activities are opportune. Otherwise such a form of extensive control would violate the autonomy of local administration.
b) The second characteristic is the election of the authorities of local administration by universal ballot. Normally, the agencies are governed by councils the members of which are elected for a certain period of time. The elections are fundamentally important, not only because they grant democratic legitimation to the local councils, but, principally, because the units of local administration form the smallest cells of organized power, and thus they approach the spirit of direct democracy. Certainly, we also find much of a representative democracy here, since the authorities of local administration are appointed by elections. However, the smaller the agencies of local government become, the more intensive the elements of direct democracy appear (for example parish meetings in England).

The local government franchise arises from the quality of the residence in the area of the local authority and not necessarily from the quality of the citizenship. For this reason, it is well discussed at the present time, whether permanently living in the country should obtain the right to vote on the occasion of local elections.

c) The third characteristic concerns the functions of local authorities. In this respect, it is the local element which dominates, because the agencies of local administration are created and exist, in particular, to regulate the local affairs and to satisfy the local needs. The "local affairs", therefore are closely related to the local government and define as well as limit its powers. Normally, it does not cause many problems to specify the matters of local character and to conclude whether they have to be treated by the local authorities. Very often, however, the same matter appears comprising local as well as general interest. In these cases the problem of subordinating the issue local or State affairs becomes difficult.

For this reason, the Parliament often tries to determine the local affairs in order to facilitate the distribution of the functions between central and local agencies. In spite of the fact that the
local functions do not appear identical from country to country, the following issues are usually considered as local affairs: the construction of roads, streets, public utility areas, cemeteries etc., the town and country planning, the building control and the clearance of slums, the prevention of pollution, the collection and disposal of refuse, the transport planning, some social and personal services, the registration of births, marriages and deaths etc.

3. The Advantages of Local Administration

The local administration owes its existence and its development to historical, political and economic reasons. It is worth mentioning that the necessity of local government is not being questioned even in the smaller countries, although the rapid technological progress and the possibility of direct contact to the central administration could lead to opposite results. While supporting the idea that centralization facilitates the coordination of public tasks and secures the uniformity of standards, one should not overlook that the leaping increase of the State affairs makes the distribution of functions imperative.

a) Firstly, local administration corresponds to the ties people have with the place of their residence as well as with the other people who share the same problems of a geographically connected area. These close ties allow the authorities of local government to obtain the solution of the local problems with the assistance of the knowledge and with the participation of the directly interested.

b) On the other side, local disposition of affairs permits variation in government according to differences in local needs and circumstances. Each area has its own special difficulties. For example, town and country planning cannot be uniformly applied. The needs of a rural area, as far as the roads and streets are concerned, are different from those of a large and densely-populated city. In such a case the knowledge of local representatives can be very
helpful. If central administration were to substitute the local responsibility, "individuality of approach would give way to uniformity and adaptability would be superseded by rigidity. (Harvey and Bather, The British Constitution, 1977, p. 440).

c) Local administration enforces the democratic institutions and offers the chance to the citizen to participate more intensively in the public affairs. Local councils are elected by the residents and are directly accountable to them. The public gets the sense of a more intimate contact to its local authorities and is aware of the possibilities to exercise effective influence on the local policy.

d) Moreover, it is useful to have a division of powers between the central government and local authorities. While the local functions are normally derived from the Parliament, there is a great difference between the real system of local government and the one which only de-centralizes functions through regional agencies. Local government means that the residents of a certain area elect their own authorities which are responsible for their political activities only towards the local electorate. Furthermore, the more the central powers and the local independence are balanced, the smaller the danger becomes that the interests of remote areas will not be taken into consideration by the central administration.

4. The Crisis of Local Administration

Although neither the advantages of local administration are seriously to be questioned, nor the confidence in the necessity of its existence is decreasing, it is often noticed that local government is passing through a serious crisis. The main reasons are the following:

a) The first problem concerns the efficiency of local government, because the States face demographical changes, which are the result of population mobility and rapid urbanisation. Several countries have been forced to introduce models for the rational use of
geographical space and for the reform of local administration. Yet, they have not always succeeded in creating durable units of local administration.

b) Another major problem is the erosion of autonomy of local administration. There are many facts which lead to a centralist direction, as for example the continually growing State interventionism, the further establishment of national planning agencies and the trend to secure the best possible living conditions by costly programmes. These phenomena cause the shift of functions from the local authorities to the central government, without noticable reaction of the affected persons.

c) A third question concerns the sense of "local affairs". Because the central administration overtakes coordinating functions and general planning tasks, it is difficult to characterize issues as exclusive local affairs, like, for example, the construction of a street, the creation of new residential areas or the modification of town planning. The State participates actively in the above mentioned procedures which, anyway, need some coordination. Thus, the original division of powers between the central and local agencies is replaced, today, by a cooperation. Many problems are solved by the central government with the participation of the local authorities. These, however, often only have the right to express their point of view, without resolutely influencing the final decisions.

d) The autonomy of local administration is also threatened by another factor. Local authorities are really independent only to the extent that they can manage their own finances. The guaranty of administrative autonomy must be completed by the largest financial independence possible. Otherwise, the influence of the central administration upon the authorities - by collecting and distributing the taxes or duties among them - violates their autonomy and prevents the planning of their activities.

e) A final major problem which has come up recently has a political dimension. It is often observed that local elections lose their local character and become sensitive to national political trends. In the towns and cities most candidates represent the national
parties. Only in the rural areas many candidates stand as independent or as the representatives of local groups. The political parties use the local elections either to find out the public opinion or - mainly the parties in opposition - to express dissatisfaction with the governing party. In some countries we even have a real opposition between central government and local authorities, which reduces the efficiency of local administration and removes its authorities from their original destination.
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The following article intends to contribute some theoretical and empirical aspects to the discussions on "Autonomy of Local Administration". My contribution is an abridged result of a case study about a real communal decision-process.

The goal of this report is to demonstrate that real administrative action differs from legal and even constitutional needs and standards. It will be shown that the problem of "Autonomy of Local Government" has quite curious aspects.

1. Local Government in the Federal Republic of Germany

The autonomy of towns and boroughs (Gemeinden) is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution (Grundgesetz vom 23. Mai 1949 - GG -) in Article 28 Sec. 2. Hereby the communes have the right to regulate on their own responsibilities all the affairs of the Local Community within the limits set by law (1). In the communes the people must be represented by a body chosen in (general, direct free equal and secret) elections. Communal self government is government for and through the people - represented by chosen bodies (commonly: Gemeinderat or Stadtrat). The communal self government is a principal democratic element and a democratic right of the local community and its people. The constitutions of the Länder (States of the Federal Republic of Germany) and special laws ("Gemeindeordnungen") prescribe further details of the inner organization of the communes. The commune (town) which is here regarded, is a Bavarian town. The Bavarian Constitution (Bay. Verfassung vom 2. Dezember 1946) repeats in Article 11 Sec. 2 the communal right to regulate the local affairs (local self government) and

---

the importance of local self government for the structure of the state (Article 11, Sec. 4) In Art. 83 the Bavarian Constitution gives examples for "local affairs".

The organization of (Bavarian) communes is ruled by law (bay. Gemeindeordnung i.d.F. vom 31. Mai 1978). In accordance to the Federal constitution the people are represented by an elected body (Stadtrat). The Stadtrat is the principal communal authority - comparable (2) with the legislative branch of state government. It "administers" principally if the mayor is not competent; a competence of the mayor is the exception in affairs of the local community (Article 29 Bav. Law on communes).

The Stadtrat administers the commune for the citizens (Art. 30). The notion "administer" contains

- the policy-making for the commune in the area of local affairs
- the executing of binding policies
- the control over the conduct of local affairs through the local administration.

The last functions show that the Stadtrat "has" an administration to execute the communal policy through binding decisions in individual cases and production of communal goods and services. This (local) administration is headed by the mayor. The mayor is chairman of the Stadtrat and directly elected by the people. The mayor executes the decisions of the Stadtrat through the (local) administration.

(2) but not equal with the legislative branch
Fig. 1: Communal Organization (Bavarian Type)
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The local administration is legally seen the realizing part of local government. Like every administrative system it has also functions in the assistance of the elected body (Stadtrat) for the preparation the communal policy making.

Legally seen the following hierarchy of power and autonomy can be shown:

1. The people
2. The elected body (Stadtrat) and
3. The mayor

The following case study will show a different power order.

2. The Case Study (The Facts)

In the big city which is analyzed we had in 1970 till 1973 a great political movement in favor of "Bürgerhäuser" (civic centers). A civic center ("Bürgerhaus") is a building in which several communal services are integrated, for instance

- meeting rooms for young people, for old people, for mothers and children and so on
- small restaurants
- rooms for theatre, folksongs, classic music and so on
- workshops for the "do-it-yourself-people"
- rooms for sports
- medical aid, mother care and so on.

The end (goal) of an civic centre is to give facilities for meetings, talks and for general communication. The essence of a civic center is the combination (aggregation, programming) of many communal services in one building.
Civic centers are well-known in Germany, The Netherlands and in Scandinavia. In Germany civic centers are installed mainly in the state of Hessen. Political aim of civic centers is to bring people together and to improve community.

In the analyzed city the political discussion to realize such centers had been brought in the Stadtrat by elected delegates in 1973. The Stadtrat decided then to commission the planning department to work out a paper which copes with the costs and benefits of an implementation of (several) civic centers.

This was the first and last substantial action of the elected body in this matter - though the political stimulus was intensive and the Stadtrat had been unanimously interested in it.

The planning department started after some organizational and personal arrangements with its work in 1975 - two years after that decision. The works were properly made: questionnaires, interviews, paper writing and so on. But it was quite clear, that the department-head disliked the civic-center-approach. He tried obviously to hinder the works.

In 1977 - four years later - a final paper of the planning staff had been completed and sent to various administrative departments. Meanwhile there had been a discussion among department chiefs about the type of organization in which a civic center could be vested in. After that a report of the planning staff was sent to the delegates of the Stadtrat and to the mayor and discussed in a new commission on multiple use of communal infrastructure. This commission researched and made excursions to the Netherlands, Sweden and selected towns in Germany to study implemented civic centers.
Also in 1977 a new law of the state of Bavaria implemented new funds and grants to the communes to build sports-halls which can be used for several purposes ("Mehrzweckhallen" = "multiple-purpose-halls"). The condition to obtain these grants was (and is) the proof of a real demand. The planning staff worked out demand and supply figures for all communal services related with "multiple-purpose-halls" and civic centers. With regard to civic centers each single service in it had been calculated separately. The aggregated supply was not recognized as a specific effect (see above). Therefore no demand could be found out for civic centers.

In 1978 and 1979 a "multiple-purpose-hall" plan had been developed with an outspoken emphasis on sports-halls with one or two rooms for meetings of the sportclubs. This plan of the administrative commission (see above) and the planning staff has been decided by a commission of the elected body (Ausschuß des Stadtrats). After this (May 1979 - six years after the first charging decision -) the new opposition of the Stadtrat the former "governing" party applied for a discussion in the elected body (Stadtrat). The Stadtrat buried the "Bürgerhaus" (civic center) in a short discussion - with the new majority. The plan to build multiple-purpose-sports-halls has been chosen.

3. Analysis

Firstly, it has to be expressed: The final step in the Stadtrat had no substantial political significance. The mentioned discussion had been brief. The civic-center-concept had not been recognized as a specific approach. The desire to obtain state grants for "multiple-purpose-

(4) The election in 1978 changed the majority relations: The Social democrats had lost their majority
sports-halls" dominated real political instinct for communal policy-making.

Secondly, the general election in the analyzed city (in 1978) had no real influence on the decision process. Perhaps there has been an influence by the fact that civic centers are mainly installed in so-called progressive countries (though there is a well established civic center in Nürnberg) and that the new opposition (the Social democrats) has applied to the Stadtrat.

Principally, the administrative process combined by random with some odd circumstances caused the result

(1) that "x" (civic centers) was intended in 1973 and "y" (multiple-purpose-sports-halls) has been chosen in 1980

(2) that the decision-making-process and after all the policy-making-process has been controlled exclusively by the administration.

The first effect has been caused primarily through
- a distinct dislike of the department chief (of the planning department) for civic centers
- a distinct contra-productive behavior of a section head (of the planning staff) and
- the incidental connection between the new state law on grants for "multiple-purpose-sports-halls" and the civic-center-planning in one commission - with the focus on the first aspect.

The first process recalls intensively to the "garbage-can-model-of-decision-making" (J. G. March - J. P. Olsen, Ambiguity and Choice in Organizations, Bergen 1976) and other random processes in organizations.
The secondly mentioned process affects the allocation of autonomy and power in Local Government. In the analyzed case it is evident that the autonomy and power is transferred to the administration - without legitimated and controlled transitions and effects. The empirical hierarchy of power and autonomy has been changed - in this case - the constitutional and legal order of priorities.

Fig. 2 Legal and empirical hierarchy of power and autonomy in Local Government (case study)

Constitutional and legal hierarchy

1. The People
2. The Elected Body (Stadtrat)
3. The (elected) Mayor
4. The Administration (Local bureaucracy)

Empirical hierarchy

1. The Administration (Local bureaucracy)
2. The Mayor
3. The Stadtrat
4. The People

4. Conclusion

An analysis of the "Autonomy of Local Government" has to take into account that bureaucratic politics and bureaucratic policy-making in local communes differ sometimes from legal and even constitutional standards. The numerous literature on this should be analyzed thoroughly.
6. Plenary
6.1 Discussion

The idea of the discussion was not to discuss reports as such, but to integrate discussions of reports in the general conclusions. The group work results should be utilized as material constituting a present basis for further reflections.

As experience of the work about the topic "Environment and Tasks of Public Administration", which led to more than two dozens of separate tasks (e.g. formalistic tasks, planning and budgeting, behavioural tasks, building political support), this group reflected the problem of discovering a structure and decided that an encyclopedia should begin with environment rather than tasks.

Environmental factors include micro-factors as the type of policy being administered, as well as macro-factors as the type of political system, in which the administrators are working. It seemed clear enough from literature that the tasks which political administrators perform, vary according to the situation created by the particular environment with those two dozen factors on each side, and this clearly creates too many situations to be incorporated, even in a multi-volume Encyclopaedia of Public Administration. The discussion of that group laboured with the problem discovering a method that could be used to organize a presentation of task and environmental factors, useful for practitioners and teachers.

There was an agreement that the emphasis on beginning with task would be more appropriate for a handbook of management than for an Encyclopedia of Public Administration. So it was decided to focus on environment by describing the major types of situations, generally speaking, that exist in practice and examine the types of tasks that public administrators perform in response to them; this means in particular to focus on the agenda of government that rises from the environmental setting and in turn seeks to influence the environmental setting.

So the final product would be a discussion of tasks, but arising from particular environmental conditions.
The paper by H.S. Wanasinghe was considered as a good example of this type of approach. He discusses the task public administrators must perform in a country at a particular stage of development, characterized by a few factors that he discusses, i.e. rising expectations, increasing centralization, class conflict, resistance to change and other factors, and within the environmental setting he discusses five general tasks in detail, which public administrators must perform. Three are fairly conventional, two are fairly unique. The first three are planning and programming, implementation tasks, monetary tasks and the two that are particularly unique are mobilization of participation of beneficiaries and building supranational linkages. Consequently, the interest of the discussion turned to the major problem, to identify the environmental factors that have to be taken into account, in dividing up the situations to be analysed.

Two environmental factors came up. These are the various stages of development of different regimes which means a small number of broad historic types of political systems, probably more than the four the group discussed, but less than ten, which is a number that is used in one leading textbook.

For the purpose of outlining articles the group discussed a number of special factors which they felt to be particularly important. One was the way of handling the environmental impact at the rate of change, taking into account the characteristics of the population being served. The group developed a matrix of situations, involving genious populations as opposed to homogenous populations in administrative action.

Another factor was involving tasks in administering small local programs in very small states, what suits more to the situation in which administrators find themselves, than large national programs conventionally treated in literature.
Furthermore, the discussion took into consideration the problem of administering programs which possess strong latent objectives, which are not part of the proclaimed objectives of the administration, but, nevertheless, strongly pursued by the administrator carrying out those programs.

Besides these positive results, there had been discovered three items dealing with things that could not be incorporated under any mentioned structure, but deserve attention in separate articles. The first one is the problem of administering micro-level programs (project management and local management). The second item is that, in the opinion of one group, an article which takes care of POSDCORB, should discuss the problem of systematization in a settled, stable environment as sort of an engineering problem. A final piece should be included which, from an intellectual or theoretical perspective, treats in general the relationship between environmental factors and administrative tasks.

It was reported, that Dr. Lee drew up a chart displaying how this might be conceptualized, if one could simply put that up with use of knowledge of a variety of representatives of the classified environments.

It was concluded that both sides of such a chart represent the environment of public administration. Micro-factors, such as the type of policy being administered, national security policy versus world development have an influence on facts to be observed in macro-factors, such as the type of political regime and political system also has an influence on the type of tasks being performed. So three dimensions of representation would be useful to express in some sort of a theoretical piece, what structures the link from environment to tasks.

Utilizing the group work experience it was argued that the morning task was mainly interpreted as the task to check
different approaches, and many interpreted it as theoretical approaches, with their relevance for designing an instalment on the given topics like public policy and decision making.

After the struggle with terminology and semantic problems the group worked out classifications of main headings. The group C1, for example, suggested as reported concrete sections: The first chapter in the instalment should be on the historical and societal context of public planning.

The second chapter should be on the political administrative process, constituting public policy and decision making and the model was provided from policy sciences, a model which can best be characterized as the political cycle, starting with input, going on to conversions and then to the output. The third chapter should not be descriptive and not behavioural as the first two chapters, but of instrumental nature. It should contain the various planning instruments being available these days and being applied in practice.

That group thought it would be useful to have a chapter on the historical context of societal planning, since in particular in the Neomarxist approach towards public policy and planning, reflections on the historical and societal preconditions of public policy are of main importance. This approach would lead to the interesting point of determination of societal functions of planning. These functions would obviously vary in capitalist societies, socialist countries and in developing nations. Comparable is the problem of comprehensiveness of planning systems, since in socialist and probably in developing countries they are more comprehensive, because the regimes involve more societal functions than capitalist systems, where many decisions are left to market mechanisms.

In such a first chapter, there should also be reflections on the societal conditions of planning in terms of scarcity or
affluence of resources. Obviously the societal functions of planning systems vary according to the availability of resources and, last not least, one should include in this chapter also the public choice approach towards public policy making in a normative sense. Thus it would become possible to derive arguments from the scientific discussion about deregulation, debureaucratization etc.

The second chapter in this instalment should deal with the decision making process, conceptualized as a cycle following the theoretical approach. Of main importance for this policy cycle for the purpose of an encyclopaedia, would be the conversion process in which inputs are transformed into outputs. In a descriptive way the conversion process could be subdivided into the stage of policy formation followed by the implementation, and finished by the evaluation. The task of one paragraph could be to find out, which institutions exist in different countries to deal with these "phases", and which were the specific problems. The emphasis should be on descriptive and analytical treatment. Finally, this chapter could also contain reflections on the outputs of policy systems. There are various classifications available and used by researchers, and one of them was reported to be particularly useful, that is the classification distinguishing policy output according to the degree of interference in the environment. Applying this sort of classification in characterizing the various planning systems, it is possible to point out significant differences.

As it was said, the East German system heavily relies on the imperatival system, whereas the Hungarian or the Yugoslav system is more flexible, and this again coincides with the degree of decentralization of the planning system. The most interesting result of the discussion, with regard to the policy cycle, is that it applies to the socialist, as well as to capitalist and developing countries. The result of the group discussion was that it can be used in all these contexts as descriptive category.
This was seen as particularly true for the public, respectively private economy, which is an essential point of the distinction between capitalism and socialism.

As last section, the group on "Public Policy and Decision Making" would deal with decision making or planning instruments developed during the last thirty or forty years and utilized in practice, e.g. in planning systems like PPBS. This instrument again can roughly be arranged along the policy cycle. Planning instruments, for example, would be of course equivalent to the policy formation stage and studies, focusing on implementation or evaluation and obviously are interrelated with the two other phases of the policy cycle.

A final section in this instrumental chapter should deal with planning and organization in structural terms. Here it could be included different budgeting systems, as well as the problem centralization and decentralization in planning systems. It was considered being a problem in socialist countries to which degree public planning is centralized. There seem to be some functional requirements for decentralization, as the Hungarian case proves and the Polish problems indicate presently.

It was agreed that the organization of planning allows the description of all basic problems of planning systems. This was seen as an analogy to the observation that planning works better in practical life if its system has not rationally been constructed, but has organically grown. Then the relation to the unavoidable bargaining processes could be brought to the knowledge of the reader.

In the experience of the group "Citizen Participation in Planning" certain points were made very clear.

One paper was written from the point of view of looking at people outside administration and experiencing administration. It was therefore distinguished from another sort of paper, a paper, describing the actual institutional opportunities, rules and structures, that are provided for participation in various
types of formal planning processes, such as physical planning, airport construction etc. (which are common in almost all systems, but vary in detail). That led to an important conclusion for the Encyclopaedia, what means that the administrative performance must be devoted attention to, in the sense that improving the administration means building up non-bureaucratic relationships. In other words, all entries of the encyclopaedia must include cross-references and linkages for all other systems.

Then the question was raised very briefly, where and how the boundary for the Encyclopaedia of Public Administration should be drawn - in general and each particular instance - and how it could be managed to say this belongs to the substant inside the encyclopaedia and that does not. Here, the speaker for the group promised to give examples on that point, yet it was said that all of them failed to do so. On the other hand it was regarded as rather obvious that it could not be expected to get one single non-controversial, universally acceptable authoritative author for an exhaustive and totally correct entry for the encyclopaedia. It was therefore proposed to work out rather a skeleton than to put up a written draft for the entry.

In the following, the experiences of the work processes have been used to examine how entries to topics could be found.

This discussion started with the group on "Autonomy of Local Administration" and brought up three main points:
1. What does the term "Autonomy of Local Administration" comprehend and include?
2. Which is the appropriate approach to the subject?
3. How can the subject be split up?

The group thought that the subject could relate first to the autonomized local administration in the sense of self-government (in German 'Kommunale Selbstverwaltung'), second to any administration on the local level, underlining the part Local Government, including the local level of state agencies in the
sense of the term "Local Administrations". It was discussed whether or not regions should be included, either in federal States or in centralized states; especially on this level autonomous and state-controlled agencies coexist at the same time and have to be coordinated.

The second question concerns the approach to the subject; two different approaches have been discussed. The first approach is of a systematic structure and deals with the elements of local administration, its legal framework, its internal structure, like different levels of local government, the budget system etc. The group discussed if, on the one hand, there would come out just another international handbook on local government or, on the other hand, a more functionalistic approach would lead to new insights. This approach would stress points like the original, political and bargaining power of local government as opposed to legal power, deriving from the state level. It would discuss e.g. the importance of local autonomy for the integration of the citizens.

The third question focused on the technical possibilities of the preparation of any approach within an encyclopaedia. Doubts were expressed, if all the aspects mentioned could be dealt within one article or one entry or could be dealt within even one volume. It was not clear to what extent aspects like personnel or the methodological questions should be treated in the context of local government, in a different context or as such. It was accepted generally that a certain degree of redundancy is unavoidable, as all subjects are linked to all other subjects. Finally that group agreed, neither to recommend a system, nor an addition of national reports.

Then possible alternatives were discussed.

The first alternative was a very general one, an abstract description of local administration as such. It was said that this way seemed not very appropriate with regard to the different national forms of administration. Instead it was agreed that such an Encyclopaedia should be divided into local government in "Western" countries, in socialist countries, and in local
administration in developing countries. The possibility of forming clusters of states with related administrative cultures and tradition or choosing a limited number of typical states or ideal types of local administration was seen as being very informative, but the grouping of clusters of different states would be too difficult, as far as the description of the historical development is concerned. So the realizability of the last method was denied.

After that, it was discussed that, regarding the Encyclopaedia, much more intellectual work should be done still. The following three aspects should be treated separately:

1. The worthwhileness of such an undertaking
2. The intellectual feasibility of such an Encyclopaedia and
3. the economic, financial and institutional viabilities of such an enterprise as the basic condition for going on.

The question whether it is intellectually desirable and the issue of intellectual feasibility is of primary interest, and there are many problems still to be solved.

The group A2, for example, has come to the conclusion that it will not be possible to present the actual situation in all countries of the world, but it could be started with a certain grouping of countries. That group came to a certain basis of analysis of a particular problem or a particular elementary problem demonstration, breaking it up in major aspects or properties. One could also describe it and try to build on informations from the various countries on the basis of variations of the variables. This might also be a possibility.

Another question is either to deal with normative or with descriptive situations. A normative situation would be much easier to do than a descriptive one, but how to get the material for description?

Another issue was the interrelationship between the various entries. There was a typical example in the group "Policy and Management". Everyone would like to incorporate planning in the entry, but where should one put the total aspects of public
administration in relationship among their different entries? Another problem which was raised was, how to make the total of all structures of such an encyclopaedia.

After having thought primarily in terms of broad domains or particular entries, another aspect of great importance, the aspect of interrelationship of major domains which would all be the major entries in such an encyclopaedia, was considered as a very serious problem. As reaction it was stated that one could learn from the conclusions of encyclopaedias in the past that it is obvious and clear, that any choice being made would be an arbitrary one, and no choice would be absolutely eternal.

Responding and comparing, it was argued that this project of an encyclopaedia cannot be compared with other encyclopaedias, because it is a very open project. A very flexible type of organization would have to be constructed, as this encyclopaedia is going to be a continuous revision, adding, accumulating and perceiving process, and the combination of different institutional resources will be necessary for this purpose.
All the issues should be treated in a dynamic sense which is not the way many encyclopaedias are prepared. It was suggested to start without a metatheory and to combine or adapt different theoretical tools to different facets of the encyclopaedia.

The discussion turned then to practical steps and final statements. The opinion was expressed that it would now be urgent to go forward. Therefore one should concentrate on one point, the funding of means, the means which are the vehicle to go ahead.
Another opinion was that, regarding the project, there were still different problems open. One point is, whether writing an encyclopaedia could become worthwhile and another point is that, with regard to the encyclopaedia, the target groups should be taken into account, what means, whether the practitioners should be included or not. As to the objectives of the under-
taking, these could be information and education. As to the market chances it has to be considered that the German market is fed up with lexicas for the next five years, even on administration.

Approaching the end of the given time it was concluded that the project as a whole has high potential and could be intellectually feasible within certain limits and under certain conditions. The conditions include an adequate resource base and an organizational centre. Such a project should gain perfect support from the intellectual and international community as a whole. It would be desirable to start with a short-term course, such as planning, in order to get interest in this encyclopaedia and also to get clientele. At the same time it would be advisable to think in long-term perspectives by giving references to items related to important target groups, i.e. the needs of the developing countries and particularly to those of practitioners.

The Plenary then worked out and agreed on the following resolution:
Resolution - Résumé

This workshop recognizes that a wide range of issues faces the project for an international Encyclopaedia in Public Administration. The meeting feels nevertheless, that the project as a whole has high potential and could be intellectually feasible within certain limits and under certain conditions.

The conditions include an adequate resource base and organizational centre. In the expectation that these conditions can be met, the meeting feels that the project deserves and should gain appropriate support from professional and intellectual and international community as a whole.

The meeting accordingly invites and encourages a working group to continue and move towards a resolution of remaining questions so that an international Encyclopaedia can be developed in what appears in due course as the most feasible form.
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