

DEVELOPMENT IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION*

by

Dwight Waldo(**)

دراسة الادارة العامة يجب ان تخرج عن دربها الحالي
الذي يذهب الى تدريس طلابها على اساس حل المشاكل القائمة ،
اذ ان الحضارة متطورة ومتغيرة ومتفاوتة ، وعليه يجب علينا ان
نسبق الزمن في استشفاف ما قد يواجهه علم الادارة العامة
خلال الفترة التي تزحف بهذا القرن الى نهايته ، وان نعد لذلك
العمدة قبل وقوعه ، وهذا يجعل المبادرة ، دائما ، في ايدي علماء
الادارة العامة والباحثين فيها وطلابها •

This report on recent and contemporary developments is centrally concerned with self-conscious Public Administration, that is, the academically centered area of inquiry and teaching that knows itself by this name. It is concerned with the institutions and activities of public

*I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Thomas Patka and Elden Steeves with the documentation.

Those unfamiliar with the development of Public Administration and wishing more background information are referred to: Dwight Waldo, *The Administrative State; A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration* (New York: Ronald Press, 1948); Dwight Waldo, *The Study of Public Administration* (New York: Random House, 1955); Dwight Waldo, "The Administrative State Revisited," *Public Administration Review* 25, 1 (March, 1965), Dwight Waldo, "Public Administration," *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* 13 (Macmillan and Free Press, 1968); Dwight Waldo, "Public Administration," *Journal of Politics* 30, 2 (May, 1968)--printed also in Marian D. Irish, ed., *Political Science; Advance of the Discipline* (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1968); Keith M. Henderson, *Emerging Synthesis in American Public Administration* (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1966).

(**) دوايت والدو

ولد الاستاذ دوايت والدو في عام ١٩١٣ ، وحصل على شهادة دكتور في العلوم السياسية في جامعة ييل في عام ١٩٤٢ ، حيث عمل فيها استاذاً

administration chiefly as these relate to Public Administration.

A vexing terminological problem has already presented itself. Economics is little likely to be mistaken for the economy, Political Science for politics, Sociology for society. But "public administration" can mean (1) the institutions and activity of public agencies; (2) self-conscious inquiry and teaching focused upon such public agencies; or (3) both (1) and (2) as a total field of institutions, activities, inquiry, and teaching. In this discussion the style Public Administration will be used in referring to self-conscious inquiry and teaching. The style public administration will refer sometimes to the public institutions and activities, sometimes to the total field of institutions, activities, inquiry, and teaching. The reader will have to do his best to decide, from contextual clues, which of the two is meant.

Public Administration is in a period of stress and change. It is responding to many and often conflicting forces in a complex, sometimes turbulent environment. In the attempt to understand what is happening

للادارة العامة ، ثم في جامعة اوكسفورد وعمل في جامعة كاليفورنيا - بيركلي من عام ١٩٥٨ الى عام ١٩٦٧ مديرا لمعهد الدراسات الحكومية ، عين بعدها استاذاً لكرسي (البيت شوارتزر) في مدرسة ماكسويل المشهورة في الادارة العامة في جامعة سيراكيوز .

اسس الاستاذ والدو دائرة علوم الادارة في جامعة بولون في ايطاليا ، وعمل رئيساً لتحرير مجلة الادارة العامة ، ولف عددا كبيرا من الكتب والبحوث العلمية التي لا تذكر الادارة العامة الا ويشار الى آرائه فيها من حيث تثبيت ركن او اتجاه فكري ضمن مجالاتها . ومن هذه الكتب التي يسمح المكان بذكرها :

دولة الادارة - افكار وقضايا في الادارة العامة - تطورات في الادارة العامة - دراسة الادارة العامة - الادارة العامة والحضارة .
ويعتبر الاستاذ والدو من المبدعين في دراسات التنظيم والادارة المقارنة ، وهو فقيه لمدرسته يتبعه الكثير من طلاب الادارة العامة وعلمائها في جميع انحاء العالم .

يشرف الاستاذ والدو في الوقت الحاضر على مشروع بحث في مستقبل الادارة العامة حتى سنة ١٩٩٩ في جامعة سيراكيوز ، وقد اشترك في هذا البحث الذي اسماه مشروع (دلفي) نخبة من الاساتذة المختصين بالادارة العامة في ارجاء العالم ، ويشرف رئيس تحرير هذه المجلة ان يكون واحداً من هؤلاء الاساتذة .

to and in Public Administration attention is directed first to some aspects of the total field of societal forces to which it is responding. Then, narrowing the scope, I shall discuss interaction with its immediate "external" environment of public administration and with its "internal" environment of academically-centered institutions and ideas. Finally, I shall try to decide what further observations are needed to complete the review, and what speculations appear reasonable.

The Societal Context of Conflict and Turbulence :

Antinomies and Paradoxes

The plethora of problems with which public administration seeks to cope and the extraordinary level of societal conflict and turbulence which presently constitute its environment can hardly be ignored in any attempt to report on recent and contemporary Public Administration. These matters have of course been noted, analyzed, discussed, and debated at great length; and no brief treatment can pretend to add important new information. Perhaps, however, the relevance for public administration of some of the antinomies and paradoxes in the situation can be more clearly delineated. In any event that is the object of what follows.

Public-Private. Conflicting ideas on the proper division between the public and the private realms are hardly new. Neither is a measure of over-lapping and intermixture. But in the present period the conflict between the two principles has not only great intensity but new aspects; and the growth of a "gray" area of public-private admixture, in its size and complexity, is creating a new situation in societal organization and administration.

Reaction against governmental institutions and solutions is massive, varied, and intricate. Manifestations abound: taxpayers' "revolts," antibusing movements, draft evasion, militancy of public employee unions, citizen "vigilante" organizations, withdrawn communal groups, and so forth. As well observed, the liberal consensus that formed about the New Deal has been greatly weakened; no longer is it easily presumed that a national problem can be solved by creating a national program with a matching bureaucracy. Much evidence indicates that belief in the intelligence, the justice, the honesty, and the efficiency of public officials and employees has declined during recent years. The reaction against government spans the social-economic spectrum. Right, Center,

and left, with different motives and for different objectives, speak in concert in this regard.

Yet for all the crying of the "sickness of government" government grows, and it grows because society asks it to grow. It remains by the logic of circumstances society's "chosen instrument" to deal with problems of large scope and great complexity. It could hardly be otherwise short of societal disintegration, or reconstruction in some very different form. The area of *public* problems, that is, the area in which the actions of one or a few affect many, steadily expands; and government, for all its faults, was created to deal with public problems--and there is no obvious and accepted alternative. Except for those whose alienation has led to a "drop out" status there is no other important "game."

The result of conflicting sentiments is conflicting actions: toward government and away from government. Simultaneously there is movement toward the publicization of the private and the privatization ("reprivatization," as some would have it) of the public. The result, when combined with important technological and social changes, is the expansion of an area in which public and private, as these have been conventionally conceived, are intermingled in new and often exceedingly intricate ways.

To be sure, the line of division between public and private was never clear and simple, as even a cursory view of American history indicates (as with respect to such areas as defense, transportation, and banking, but also including farming and--even--general "business"). But with the first measures (even pre-New Deal) to deal with the economic collapse of 1929 an upward curve in the size and intricacy of a "gray" area began. Every important program to raise income, employment and productivity, ameliorate social distress, correct abuses, and protect rights has entailed the creation of new and complex arrangements in which the distinction between public and private has become more blurred.

The curve is upward, the movement accelerates. COMSAT, Amtrak, the U.S. Postal Service, the Public Broadcasting Corporation, are important in themselves and symbolic. The massive and intricate complexes of the public and private presented in urban renewal and housing, defense procurement, space exploration, as well as in other fields, are indicative of the future rather than reflections of the past. It is almost wholly predicable, for example, that when further legislation is passed seeking to improve national health care delivery the prescription will be for a more complete and complex mixing of the public and the

private. Some commentators now speak of the Third Sector, a major new realm on the socio-economic map.

Rising Expectations-Lowering Expectations. In the nineteen-fifties the idea of a world-wide "revolution of rising expectations" was widely publicized. Around the world, we were told, peoples by the hundreds of millions who had accepted poverty as a part of the natural order had now come to realize that poverty is man-made and unnecessary. Now they had come not only to expect a rising standard of living, they looked forward (with varying degrees of confidence and differing time-scales) to a standard of living essentially comparable to that of advanced industrial countries.

It is not necessary to agree with all that was said about the revolution of rising expectations--some of which was exaggerated or in error--to recognize that it concerns something true and important: A new, volatile element has been added to the world and national situations. "Development" has, since World War II, become something of a world-wide ideology and movement; "to develop" is to do something eminently desirable, and while development is susceptible to differing interpretations, its customary meaning is given by such concepts as productivity, industrialization, and standard of living. Undoubtedly, the fervor with which "development" was embraced--having some religious qualities, however secular its core objectives--has affected our domestic politics as well as our international role: We have had our own revolution of rising expectations, among and concerning the poor and disadvantaged generally, but centering upon racial-ethnic minorities.

Meanwhile, a revolution of quite different characteristics has come upon us, one which appears to dictate in many ways and for many people a lowering of expectations. This second revolution is centered in the concept of ecology. It concerns such matters as environmental pollution, exhaustion of non-renewable resources, limiting population, de-emphasizing productivity as a goal, "quality of life" as against "standard of living." Ultimately, it concerns preservation of the biosphere itself.

To picture two monolithic forces in direct conflict would, of course, be oversimplification. But that the two streams of ideas and activities do already conflict and that the potential for much greater conflict exists is beyond cavil. One can, in his optimistic moments, hope for a world in which zero population growth has been achieved, essential human equality in enjoyment of goods is a fact, and a simple life style obtains, one that respects and cooperates with nature. But before

anything of such kind comes to pass--if it ever does--it is wholly predicable that the collision of ideas and desires will bring confusion and conflict. Nothing less is involved than massive change in present living patterns and in expectations for the future, in *both* developed and developing countries--West and East, Non-Communist and Communist.

Industrialism-Post-Industrialism. Closely related is another antinomy. Obviously, industrialization has been so far the heart of development; and a de-emphasis of the production of material goods is viewed by many as essential to adjusting man to a supportable environment. Yet however intertwined, the two antinomies are neither equivalents nor opposites. Many now argue that the development with which disadvantaged peoples are concerned, or *ought* to be concerned, can be conceived in non-industrial terms; and post-industrialism can be conceived as a condition in which production of goods is decreased relatively and perhaps even absolutely.

A long shelf could now be filled with the works discussing the movement of modern man from an industrial period into a post-industrial period. In general they argue: that scientific and technical advances make possible and perhaps inevitable a new socio-economic condition of man; that organized and codified knowledge is becoming increasingly important as against the conventional factors of production, land, labor and capital; that new knowledge and new technologies enable us to produce goods with such efficiency and in such abundance that the archetypical industrial institution, the "factory," is being transformed, evolving into new techno-social patterns; that the new efficiencies in production of goods ("the solution of the ancient problem of scarcity") make it possible--and in some ways necessary--for society to emphasize the rendering of services and the "enjoyment" of leisure as against production of material goods; that these changes, at base technical and economic, have profound implications for total societal organization and style of life, as evidenced by the fact that as the economy of the United States becomes increasingly a service-rendering economy we experience institutional and psycho-social crises.

To the extent such analyses and projections are correct they are of course highly relevant to the several other antinomies here sketched. Can other societies (can parts of *our* society) move directly from pre-industrialism to post-industrialism? Is it realistic or humane to decry "productivity" while hundreds of millions are in dire need? If productivity as goal and measure is inappropriate for a post-industrial,

service-rendering economy, what--if anything--takes its place? What are the implications of the new modes of production and life-styles for the intermixture of public and private, and beyond that for the functions and organization of government?

Nationalism-Post-Nationalism. Nationalism-Post-Nationalism may not be the proper choice of terms. Though some of the phenomena to which attention is called undoubtedly can be so designated, others probably deserve another designation. Be that as it may, the purpose is to note the conflicting forces bearing on the establishment, the "permeability," and the disappearance of political boundaries.

The thesis developed by Hans Kohn and others that nationalism is not a universal phenomenon but one peculiar to the modern period has a corollary, namely, that it may wither and disappear. Reasonable evidence suggests that nationalism has suffered a decline in some of the older nation-states: a growing disinterest in patriotic observances, a neglect of the duties of citizenship, growing estrangement from or hostility toward governmental institutions. Taken by themselves these signs would seem to trend toward the emergence of a--what to call it?--human homogenization or universalism. More, this trend would seem in concert with trends based upon and emerging from various economic, functional, and technical considerations. The growth of trans-national and sometimes world-encircling organizations, associated organizations, and complex systems of associated organizations, clearly is one of the important trends of the century.

But at the same time it seems indisputable that there are contrary trends in the direction of greater group self-consciousness and discreteness. This is manifest in the rise in the number of "new nations," of political entities that are nominally independent in terms of international law; a quadrupling in the fairly recent past. It is evidenced also in the rise of new, or renewed, racial-ethnic "identities," often strident and militant: older nationalisms may become moribund, some "countries" may (from the evidence one may guess *will*) disappear, i.e. lose their present identity, but the result may well be a progressive fractionalization of mankind instead of movement toward a common world culture and order.

Violence-Non-Violence. The mid- and latter-nineteenth century presents a new condition of man with respect to the interaction of violence and non-violence.

As to violence, the Bomb is not only an instrument beyond all past

imaginings, it serves as symbol for a vast array of instruments either created afresh or reshaped and sharpened by modern science and technology. Paradoxically, both our successes and our failures in social organization act, according to circumstances, either to create violence or to enlarge its threat. Actual violence between nations, and within nations, as represented by crime, civil disorder, and repression, is high and probably trending higher; and the possibility of vastly accentuated violence, perhaps even holocaust, seems ever near.

In counteraction, sentiments and movements for non-violence are high and also perhaps trending higher. To be sure, paradoxes and ironies abound. Some movements for peace and brotherhood take violence as a means; Right and Left, conservative, centrist, and radical, find themselves in varying stances, either by their own recognition or in the perception of their opponents; vast confusion, much controversy, concerns means and ends, instruments, and objectives. For violence-non-violence are seldom "pure" issues but come entwined with issues of right and equity. But in any case the fear of dire consequences is high, the longing for *some* state of relative non-violence is strong, across the wide social-ideological spectrum and around the world.

It is a truism to say the present situation is unique: of course it is. But this is also a profoundly important truth. The present moment cannot be understood without appreciation of the strength and the potential on both sides of the complex violence-non-violence equation. The deepest springs of human action are tapped by the issues; in the shaping and reshaping of human culture and institutions this is a crucial period.

Implications for Public Administration. The five fields of contesting forces noted may not have been skillfully delineated; perhaps they were not even well chosen. But they represent an attempt to probe beneath the surface of the rapid change and frequent turbulence of the day-war, social dislocation, civil strife, generational conflict, drug abuse, and so on through a long and somber list--with the object in view of understanding the context of public administration, and thus understanding public administration itself.

Fortunately, the moral that is about to be drawn will stand whether or not the best choice of force-fields has been made or whether their explication has been skillful. The moral is that since public administration, by lack of alternatives if not by enthusiastic choice, is government's central instrument for dealing with general social problems, it is located in or between whatever force-fields exist. It is affected by whatever

forces and turbulence there are; and it attempts also to *act*, to restrain or to increase the direction or the degree of change.

Given that the instruments of public administration must make choices and act--and on this there is no dispute whatever the contrary wishes and hopes--they are confronted by a range of difficult decisions. Within the constraints of the law, and these constraints are often broad, they must decide upon the ends to be sought in the name of a public interest. Again within constraints but characteristically with a considerable range of choice, they must decide upon means to realize the objectives; and then take action based on choices made. They cannot refrain, even if they wish not to, from making decisions that (singly or in combination) involve policy judgements, instrumental judgements, legal judgements, moral judgements.

The External Environment of Public Administration

I now narrow the focus, to note some of the events and developments of the recent past and present which "impact" public administration: to which it responds and with which it interacts. I shall then observe how some central and perdurable aspects of public administration are affected by the larger societal forces noted above and by particular developments.

While for brevity this review of some prominent areas of activity must for the most part proceed as though each area is discrete, this is of course not the case. Typically, one is closely intermingled with another, and all are part of and suffused by the extraordinary social ferment and activism of recent years.

Anti-Poverty. As noted, the revolution of rising expectations has been a domestic as well as a foreign phenomenon. In the sixties poverty was "rediscovered" in the United States. Notable works exposed the depth and breadth of domestic poverty, low-income groups became more politically active, and a "war against poverty" became an official national cause.¹

Much legislation and administration from the beginning of the Republic has been in some sense "anti-poverty," and major programmatic additions, especially dealing with income maintenance for agriculture and labor, were made in the New Deal period. No great changes have been made in historically "given" programs; nor has much debate concerning the establishment of a national income "floor" yet resulted in legislation. The result of the so-called war against poverty has been

rather a variety of special programs designed to improve living conditions, raise incomes, foster employability, and increase employment opportunities. The recently formed Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the newly created Office of Economic Opportunity have been centrally involved. The administrative problems encountered have been often novel and always extremely difficult; by and large only limited successes in reaching objectives and solving the administrative problems can be claimed.³

Racial-Ethnic Equality. The movement of the early sixties to effect the civil rights of blacks in the South of course broadened in many directions. Equality in all respects for blacks quickly became an ardently sought goal. Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Indians, stimulated more or less by the black example, began to assert their "identity" and to press for more equality in education, housing, employment, and income.³ There have been many "reactive" results, including something of a resurgence of ethnic self-identity among European populations that had seemed all but "assimilated." To what extent the equality that is sought by all will, long run, entail separateness of racial-ethnic identity and culture is at this point quite unforeseeable.⁴

Historically, much governmental action in the United States has been not simply discriminatory, but massively and harshly so. Much governmental action has also, however, been directed toward achieving equality; paradoxically, action to secure assimilation and uniformity also has sometimes been insensitive and coercive. This is not the place to analyze a complex national experience. What needs to be noted is that in recent years the goal of equality has been taken with more seriousness, however contentious it remains and however ineffective the results. In large part, the "story" involves legislatures and courts; no large government agencies have been established the *primary* mission of which is achievement of racial-ethnic equality. But the issue of equality of treatment, especially for blacks, is nevertheless centrally and intimately involved in programs in such areas as education, housing, and employment; smaller agencies are created that do have equality of treatment as their central mission; and in the administration of government personnel programs the issue of equal treatment is, as such an increasingly important issue.⁵ Altogether, the matter of racial-ethnic equality is central to the understanding of much of recent and contemporary public administration.

Urban Problems. The shift from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy, with accompanying growth of the city, was reflected

in American public administration well before the end of the nineteenth century, as in the civil service reform movement and the shaping of formula for structural rationalization. After World War I the generations-old migration to the city was accentuated by technological developments and by agricultural policies; rapid population growth helped to increase city size; various policies, particularly with respect to housing, contributed to an expansion of suburban growth at the expense of the central city. For these and for many other reasons, by the sixties the city had become a problem center of a new order of magnitude for public policy and public administration.⁶

In a formal sense one can distinguish between city problems and problems that find their chief location and severest manifestations in the city. The former concern the location and specifications of urban artifacts; they pertain to such matters as physical planning, industrial and commercial location, housing, street lay-out, and public transportation. The latter concern the problems of an industrial society in transition to a new condition designated (negatively, because its defining characteristics are only emergent) as post-industrial—in any event, the worrisome problems of *this* society at this time: racial inequality, increasing crime, drug abuse, and so forth. In some measure these have a city focus simply because our national life now has a city focus. But such a formal distinction has only a limited relevance. In the city problems meet, mingle and meld; physical problems have human dimensions, and human problems are inseparable from physical problems, as of course only a superficial knowledge of any typical urban problem, such as educational inequality or central-city renewal makes clear. The incredibly complex mixture of differing problems and different kinds of problems is the essence of the matter. Few public problems are not now "city" problems.⁷

The implications for public administration are most visible in the creation of a new Federal department, the Department of Housing and Urban Development.⁸ But the implications run far beyond the easily visible, into the problems of the organization and administration of all recent or emerging national programs, and to every level and type of governmental jurisdiction.

Ferment and Change. Space does not permit extended discussion of many other themes and events relevant to recent and contemporary public administration. Brief notice of some of the more important must suffice. Again, it should be understood that separate notice does not imply separate existence. On the contrary, a complex pattern of overlapping and interaction (which would be beyond tracing even in book-length treatment) obtains.

--- Participation. A prominent theme and movement of the late sixties and early seventies has been "participation." The participation movement has manifested itself in public administration in two ways: (1) internally, in actions directed both toward greater personnel involvement in decisions affecting the conditions of employment and toward "rank and file" involvement in decisions on agency programs;⁹ and (2) externally, in actions aimed at greater community or clientele participation in both decisions on agency programs and the implementation of these programs.¹⁰

--- Devolution. In some measure related to the participation movement but in some respects quite different has been a movement aimed at bringing public programs more under control of the states and of local governmental jurisdictions. Typically, but not always, "participation" is associated with liberal or even radical sentiments; typically, but not always, devolution is associated with conservative or even reactionary sentiments. Both are responses to a feeling of powerlessness, even alienation, both manifest a distrust of "bigness," and "distance," both represent an attempt to gain control of decisions affecting vital personal concerns. Both movements, alone or in combination, have resulted in various types of action with the avowed objective of "returning power to the people"--or at least keeping it from further concentrating in the Federal government.¹¹

--- New Levels and Jurisdictions. Related both to participation and to devolution, but also to the programs mounted against poverty (and to other matters), has been the creation of more or less experimental "jurisdictions" operating in unconventional ways. These include regional organizations created as a part of a national program to raise the economic and social level of backward or depressed regions of the country;¹² and community action organizations, particularly in the central-city areas, created as a part of the war against poverty.¹³ The "participation" motives as well as those ascribed to devolution have been operative in the creation of new levels and jurisdictions, in addition to administrative and economic consideration.

--- Management Techniques and Instrumentalities. Recent years have witnessed the growth and spread of various more or less new management techniques and instrumentalities in public administration. Characteristically, the techniques and instrumentalities involved are shared with business administration, and in some cases were invented or first developed there. But some of these have been, in the public administration context, refined, adapted, and expanded.

The techniques and instrumentalities involved cannot here be catalogued, explained, and their usage examined. The term Management

Science would comprehend many of the specific techniques, especially those that make use of quantitative methods and have a relation to the newer means of data gathering, storage, and manipulation which center on the computer. The related term, Operations Research, also denotes a perspective and a cluster of techniques of considerable importance. Some techniques, especially perhaps Project Management, have been notably expanded and refined in the public sector.¹⁴

It is characteristic of some of the techniques that they involve a joining or blending of "public" and "private" in the development and effecting of public policy. In this connection "contracting out" or "government by contract" warrants a special word. The legal-administrative device of "contracting out" to achieve public objectives has a long and complicated history. But the use of the contract device has greatly expanded in recent years at all levels of government. It has a new significance as a means of relating public jurisdictions one to another; and it has an especially important role in large-scale public programs in the areas of defense, economic development, and space exploration.¹⁵

--- Unionization and Collective Bargaining. The growth of public employee unionization and collective bargaining, at all levels of government, has been a major development in public administration during the past decade--this at a time in which unionization in some private sectors has been stationary or even declining. Public employee unions are hardly new, but their memberships have been comparatively small and they have not been, characteristically, bargaining units. The growth of public sector unionism has various types of causes. These would include causes related to the national shift from a predominately goods-producing to a predominately service-rendering economy and an accompanying growth in the proportion of the working population in public employment; a relaxation of laws and regulations which have restrained public sector unionization; and the social-ideological ferment and economic recession of recent years.¹⁶

Increasing unionizations, together with a new assertiveness (in some cases, even militancy) poses knotty new problems, and has implications for much of traditional public administration. The traditional area of personnel administration obviously is most immediately affected; but the implications run to all of public organization and management. Indeed, they run to the role of the government in the country's economic and social affairs, and ultimately to the status and nature of government as a "sovereign" power.¹⁷

--- Productivity and Evaluation. An issue that is rapidly coming to the fore is "productivity" in the public sector. Productivity is

always an issue with respect to a modern economy, and the transition to a predominately service-rendering economy has changed and sharpened productivity problems: What is the nature and what are the indices of productivity when there is no tangible product? (Sometimes, even, the object of a program is to *prevent* something from occurring.) With the public sector of the economy steadily enlarging the problems become more complicated and controversial. Various factors will operate to bring contesting forces into controversy and confrontation: the demands of unions not only for greater economic benefits but for shorter hours and control of the conditions of labor (perhaps also some "policy" role); increases in taxes coupled with wide-spread sentiment that the public services are unresponsive, inefficient, unproductive, and wasteful; still further demands on government, such as "subsidization" of corporate enterprises that have become closely government-related ("Lockheed" issues); the rationalization and further public funding of medical care delivery; and programs that make government the "employer of last resort."

A sharpening of controversy over productivity issues will increase the importance of what is already an important problem of current public administration: evaluation. Evaluation is hardly a new problem in public administration. It is, in many respects, but a new term for many of the issues that have been involved in dealing with the perennial and often central issues of economy and efficiency. But now the non-market area grows in absolute and relative terms and the mixture of economic rationality, political rationality, and social equity which must be addressed becomes more intricate and tangled.¹⁸

Two somewhat linked developments in public administration have a close relationship to productivity-evaluation issues and illustrate their importance. One is the attempt to install Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems. Cost-benefit and input-output studies are at the heart of this enterprise; such studies essentially attempt to deal with productivity-evaluation problems; and so intractable are the problems that PPBS has faltered and, often, been turned back.¹⁹ The other is the burgeoning of evaluation studies. (These take many forms: Some are in-house, some are interagency, some are contracted out to consulting firms, "think tanks" and research institutes, universities, and even individuals). The increase in number and complexity of social-economic programs that came with the sixties has greatly intensified problems of judging "effectiveness." Typically, the immediate "outputs" of the programs involved (as in education) are intangible, immeasurable, controversial; and typically the difficulties in trying to assess effectiveness and comparative worth are complicated by the intricate administrative

means: complex interrelations between public organizations and/or public-private organizations.²⁰

--- Environmentalism and Consumerism. The greatly increased concern for pollution of the environment and an increasing, more generalized interest in the "quality of life," have significantly affected public administration and may be expected to affect it more with passing time.²¹ The most obvious results to date have been the establishment of the Environmental Protection Agency, together with programs of action aimed at pollution control directed both externally (e.g. automobile exhaust emissions) and internally (the requirement of the environmental "impact" studies for new Federal programs). But the new currents affect many areas where public administration intersects with an aspect of national life, including resource extraction, public works, transportation, recreation and--even--the arts.

Governmental concern for the consumer, it is often observed, tends to be minuscule or half-hearted in comparison with concern for economic growth and productivity. Nevertheless, a sizable apparatus of regulation and control has been built up during the past several generations, some parts of which have at least significant consumer obligations in their mandates and some parts of which, as the Food and Drug Administration, have as their primary mission the protection of the consumer from fraud and direct harm.

To evoke the name Ralph Nader suffices to indicate that "consumerism" is presently in a period of increased interest and activity. In part the upwelling is an aspect of the social-ideological ferment and reformism of recent years, in part it may stand upon its own base. But it is reinforced by and in a sense is an aspect of the awakened environmentalism: both emphasize the citizen as consumer as against the citizen as producer.

The impact of the heightened interest in citizen-as-consumer on public administration is difficult to estimate. But it already has had various direct effects. It may bring renewed attention to one of Public Administration's perennial (but recently slighted) interests, regulatory administration; it may lead to a new interest in the administration of consumer protection; and it will reinforce--and be reinforced by--environmental concerns.²²

--- Other Vectors. The events, situations, movements, and so forth, with which public administration is presently concerned and to which it is more or less responsive are beyond even brief explication. But some of the other matters of import should at least be noted. One of these is the rising tide of domestic violence, with its implications for such matters as police and correctional administration, social-economic

policies, and judicial administration.²³ Another is the economic-financial difficulties which came to the fore in the late sixties; while no major new "economy management" devices have resulted, still the repercussions in public administration have been far from insignificant. Another is the Women's Liberation movement, which has been taken seriously in personnel administration (how seriously depending on jurisdiction and point of view.)²⁴ Another is continued movement toward specialization and professionalization in American life and the public services;²⁵ and a simultaneous, complicated, recently accentuated counter-movement which attacks "credentialism," seeks to broaden decision-making, to decrease rigidities, to increase lateral communication-generally, to "debureaucratize."²⁶ Still another is President Nixon's proposals with respect to the restructuring of Federal administration, and his proposals concerning, directly or indirectly, the allocation of responsibilities and functions as between the Federal government, the states, and the cities.²⁷

Finally, it may be noted that some of the important currents of recent years have slowed or reversed. It has been widely noted that a mood, if not a movement, of "neo-isolationism" has followed the international experiments and global activism of the post-World War II decades. It is thus not surprising that no report is necessary on new creativity in international organization; nor that aid to developing countries presents recent administrative developments of note. The Planning, Programming, Budgeting System, which may have been the major "event" in public administration in the sixties (and certainly was the central new item in the literature of Public Administration in that decade) has recently suffered a severe decline: given wide publicity for its putative successes in the Department of Defence in the early sixties, ordered broadly applied in Federal agencies in the mid-sixties, it has been recently "non-required" in Federal budgeting. This is not however, to say that PPBS has suddenly disappeared. It continues, as such, in many state and local jurisdictions. It leaves, even where it is formally disestablished, a residue of techniques and altered perspectives; its impact will prove to have been permanent.²⁸ Above all, the problems to which it was addressed remain.

The Internal Environment of Public Administration

A distinction between the external and the internal environments of Public Administration may be more literary convenience than reflection of reality. Certainly the matters I now address are inextricably related to events and trends in the "outside" world. But in any case

Public Administration interacts not only with the world of public affairs but with the shifting currents of ideas and the changing institutional arrangements of academia. Attention is now directed to some of these.

A Change in Mood. Paradoxically, though academia is the fount of much societal change, the university is in many ways remarkably conservative. It yields only slowly to demands for change in its own values, procedures, and organization. "Revolutionary" ideas become tenacious traditions; reforms tend to fade and be supplanted by older ways. So one generalizes at considerable risk.

Nevertheless, it may be noted at the outset that the recent period has been one of extraordinary ferment in the university. Society's turmoil has been reflected in the university; in fact, some of it has centered in the university, as the words Berkeley, Columbia, and Kent State signify. The result has been to weaken the hold of some dominant ideas, to further a search for and heighten receptivity to new ideas, to strengthen forces for change.²⁹ Much of what is relevant for Public Administration is to be understood as an interaction between old and new, inertia and change, tradition and experiment. The interaction is extremely complex, however, and interpretation difficult since one man's progressive perspective is frequently another's philosophical-methodological sterility--or menace.

Two related matters deserve brief attention. One is the cry for "relevance." The sentiment that the university is, at best, indifferent toward society's urgent problems has found wide and sometimes ardent expression within the university; and from outside the university has come a variety of pressures (social, political and economic) for altered perspectives and shifts in emphasis in research and instruction. The result is a heightened malleability, a quickening of change. "Public" oriented programs and curricula are of course affected above all.

The other matter concerns changing intellectual-emotional orientations. These are difficult to speak to in brief compass, but several generalizations can be made. While there has been no wholesale abandonment of the view that it is the fundamental objective of the social sciences to achieve a true and thorough scientific status, nevertheless a significant "softening" has occurred. To some extent belief in accepted theories has been shaken by the seeming inadequacies of the theories: thus doubts about Keynesian economic theories created by its putative failures in treating recent economic problems. To a notable extent social scientists (for various reasons from the crassly economic to the moral and ideological) are more inclined toward addressing "applied" problems as against abstract theoretical problems; and since social problems typically ignore disciplinary lines there is a corresponding rise in interdisci-

plinary interaction. Some movement is discernible toward more widespread acceptance of "radical" perspective and ideologies. Philosophical orientations are shifting to some extent; logical positivism is no longer as widely and firmly espoused; neo-Marxism, existentialism, and phenomenology are frequently argued as bases or guides.³⁰

It is within the context of an altered academic-intellectual environment that the following matters are to be construed.

Movement Away from Political Science. It is hardly too much to say that self-conscious Public Administration was the creation of professors of Political Science, so prominent was the role of men such as Woodrow Wilson, L.D. White and W.F. Willoughby. Beginning in the twenties it was customary to regard Public Administration as one of the "fields" or "sub-fields" of Political Science, and in fact probably most persons, both in and out of Political Science, still so regard it. But at the present time it would appear that significant changes are under way. These changes move in different directions and the outcome is far from clear. Some forces in movement suggest the outcome will be a closer, but different, relationship with Political Science; some suggest the achievement of independent status in department and school; some suggest the disappearance of Public Administration as such, its absorption in a general "management" synthesis.

On logical grounds the case for regarding Public Administration as a part of Political Science is a strong one. Political Science concerns the state, government, the public realm. *Public* administration would thus seem by definition a part of the total concern of Political Science. Most professors of Public Administration have regarded themselves as first of all Political Scientists. Many have found departments of Political Science congenial environments, some still do.

But in many, many ways the relation has not been a satisfactory one. Two reasons seem preeminent. One concerns the customary "liberal arts" location and orientation of Political Science. To the extent Public Administration has perceived itself and been perceived as training for a career of government service, and not with scholarship and the values of a "liberal" education, it has been accorded a type of second-class citizenship in its customary academic home. The fact that much of what has constituted its curriculum has been drawn from outside sources, such as Psychology, Business Administration, and Management Science, has accentuated the lack of rapport. The second reason concerns the rise and increasing predominance of behavioralism in the post-World War II period. Public Administration was one of the parts of Political Science that lagged in the behavioral movement. (The reasons for this are varied; probably some of them reflect favorably, some unfavorably,

on Public Administration.) Thus to the disdain of the traditionalists was added the reproach if not contempt of the "new men" of Political Science.

For whatever reasons, Public Administrationists have become increasingly restive with an environment regarded as, at best, merely tolerant. But the problem of an effective remedy is not easy to solve. To muster the resources in money, manpower, and "political" support to achieve the status of an independent program, department, or school is usually difficult to the point of impossibility. To move, individually or collectively, to a school of business or management may or may not be feasible according to circumstances; but regardless, this solution may appear as merely exchanging one type of second-class citizenship for another.

Movements in ideas, the growth and spread of various management-related technologies with little relation to Political Science, and increasing interdisciplinary penetration in Public Administration, accentuate feelings that Political Science is no longer an adequate base. Increasingly, it is felt that Political Science neglects the intellectual-professional needs of public administration. Contrariwise, it is felt that other disciplines and intellectual "clusterings," such as Economics, Sociology, and Management Science, provide the appropriate ideas and techniques. Some feel that Public Administration, while not a profession in a strict sense, represents a focus of interests and occupations not unlike that represented by medicine or the "health services"; and that it deserves, somehow, an organizational status which will enable it to represent the realities and muster and combine the needed resources.³¹

While the wish to escape from Political Science is widespread and growing, nevertheless it needs to be recognized that certain present and potential developments in Political Science might lead to changes which would make Political Science a more congenial and supportive environment. One of these concerns the emergence of a "post-behavioral" Political Science. The ferment of recent years has led, especially among younger Political Scientists, to something of a revolt against the behaviorally oriented "establishment." Political Science, and especially behaviorally oriented Political Science, it is charged, have been too much concerned with technique, too little with goals and values; too much concerned with Science and too little concerned with Society, with urgent public problems. Proper scientific concerns need not be abandoned (it is generally argued), but they need to be put to service in addressing real and urgent problems.³²

It is too early to assess the strength and effect of these new currents. But they at least suggest the possibility of a substantial reordering of

interests and resources in Political Science, making it more "relevant" to public problems, more policy-oriented, and more concerned with "delivery." A Political Science concerned deeply with public policy and not disdainful of the means by which policy is effectuated would be much more attractive to Public Administrationists than that of recent decades.

Movement Toward Political Economy. Another development in Political Science that holds the possibility of making it more attractive is the movement toward Political Economy. Two decades ago Robert A. Dahl and Charles E. Lindblom, in their *Politics, Economics and Welfare* (1953), argued for the establishment of a new Political Economy, a joining of Political Science and Economics in the interest of greater theoretical coherence and better policy guidance. No rush and certainly no concerted effort to establish a new Political Economy followed. But slowly at first, and lately with increasing speed and mass, movement in this direction has taken place. Economists, such as Anthony Downs and Gordon Tullock, crossed the boundary into Political Science, experimenting with the application of economic methods and models to political problems. Political scientists, including (perhaps especially including) those making Public Administration their speciality, have familiarized themselves with Economists seeking theories and techniques applicable to their interests. The movement toward a new Political Economy now has considerable force, its supporters include prominent Political Scientists such as William Mitchell. Economists, for their part, evidence a "have tools, will travel" policy. Their willingness, even eagerness, to help a putatively weaker discipline with its problems has been reinforced by various recent events, including (ironically) the embarrassments arising from the weakness of strictly economic policies in dealing with national economic problems.³³

Public administration, both as a part of Political Science and on its own, so to speak, has moved in the direction of liaison with Economics. Of course the budgeting-fiscal-accounting complex of interests has always been an area of joint interest. But the wave of interest in Program Budgeting in the fifties and especially the enthusiasm for Planning, Programming, Budgeting System in the sixties did much to further interpenetration and foster mutual learning. Two books now in press argue (albeit in very different ways) that the "way forward" for Public Administration is the route of Political Economy.³⁴ At this time perhaps the majority of persons identifying themselves with Public Administration regard Economics as a more relevant and useful discipline than Political Science.³⁵

To the extent that Political Science moves toward Political Economy,

this might, as suggested, increase its attractiveness to a Public Administration moving in a like manner in the same general direction. But the implications with respect to the future are not clear. If Public Administration were to find itself allied with--conceivably a part of--a vigorous Political Economy, this might move it in quite different directions.

"Public" Programs in Schools of Business and Management. Two interrelated developments have great potential importance for the future of Public Administration. One is the growth of programs in Public Administration--designated by such terms as "public sector management"--in schools of business administration. The other is the increase in "schools of management," which characteristically have special curricula designed to prepare some of their graduates for management in the public sector.

Of course it is not new for schools of business to give some attention to public administration. Some have long designated themselves as schools of "Business and Public Administration," even "Government and Business." But even equal treatment in a title has not guaranteed equal status and resources; indeed, gross inequality in resources and emphasis has been the rule. Two factors, however, now bring the business schools to take their "public" programs with increasing seriousness.

One of these is the social ferment of recent years, particularly as reflected in the aims and interests of students. Increasingly it has become evident, many of the students in (or who might be brought into) the business schools hold different values and have other career interests than their fathers. They contemplate a regular business career with indifference or distaste; they wish to "do something" about society's problems, and are seeking knowledge and skills to this end. The other factor has been noted above, namely, the related growth in the public sector of the national economy and the increasing (and increasingly complex) admixture of the traditional "public" and "private." It is now widely recognized in the business schools not only that greater knowledge of governmental affairs is useful in business, but that many business school graduates, whether by accident, choice, or necessity, will be employed in government agencies or mixed enterprises.

The business schools, some of the leading ones vigorously, are responding to these factors. Typically the response is not to "import" faculty or programs identified with Public Administration--or Political Science--though there is a certain amount of this. It is rather to draw upon "indigenous" resources, such as Management Science, augmented by further recruitment from Sociology, Social Psychology and, especially, Economics.³⁶

The idea that administration or management is generic, a function common to all organized enterprise of significant scale, is, to be sure, now generations old. Only comparatively recently, however, did the idea find expression in "schools of management" per se. The number of such schools is still comparatively small. But it is increasing, not so much through the establishment of new schools, but through a renaming of schools of business administration. The renaming, to be sure, is typically accompanied by an attempt to broaden the spectrum of institutional or sectoral concern and to expand and up-date curricula. "Programs" for areas such as public administration, educational administration, and health administration, are frequently established along side the business administration curriculum.

What is evidenced in this development is not simply the abstract appeal of an "idea whose time has come." (The future will instruct us on the degree to which this is true.) Certainly a degree of necessity and opportunism accompany the appeal of the idea--or ideal. Some of the factors involved here have been suggested and others are apparent: a fading lustre for the "business" label, new opportunities and demands, calculations of institutional survival or competitive advantage.

Whatever the reasons or causes, the important fact for present purposes is that the generic schools as well as (perhaps more than) the business schools assert an interest in preparing for careers in public administration. The implications are indeterminate, the results unpredictable. At this point there is no way of knowing the extent to which the various curricula may come to have more of a "public" cast, through the introduction of new influences (whether or not from Public Administration or Political Science); or contrariwise, that public administration may be affected more than it has been to date by "business" concepts and techniques. Nor is there any way of knowing what will be the outcome of competition between varying types of schools seeking to prepare for public service.

Schools, Programs, Institutes, Etc. The current roster of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration, an affiliate of the American Society for Public Administration, lists seventy-seven member institutions. The heterogeneity of titles and styles is arresting: There are schools, institutes, divisions, departments, programs, and centers. While of course Public Administration is often the identifying phrase, Public Affairs, Public Policy, Government, Public Service, Management Science, as well as other labels, appear in the roster. Represented are schools of business, schools of business and public administration, and schools of management. In a number of titles Public Administration or Public Affairs is combined with Interna-

tional Affairs, Urban Affairs, or State and Local Government.

What conclusions can be drawn (or at least what speculations can be entertained) from a study of this roster?

First, the heterogeneity of titles and styles must be recongnized as in itself an important datum, indicating a lack of consensus but also reflecting flexibility and a wide range of experimentation. Second, as Public Administration is used as identifying label more in the institutions established earlier, less in those established recently, it may not be regarded as being as strategic or fashionable as some alternatives; at least, recently appearing terms such as "public policy," "management" and "management science" indicate newly desired emphases. Third, obviously the movement of business and generic schools into public administration training is reflected. Fourth, nearly all titles and styles indicate attention primarily if not exclusively to the graduate level, suggesting that training for public administration is regarded as "professional" at least in the sense that it follows a general education. Fifth, in very few cases is a connection indicated with a department or program of Political Science, emphasizing the estrangement noted above.

Other conclusions emerge when the list is studied against a background of history and with some knowledge of recent events back of the titles. One is that there is a movement toward an interdisciplinary emphasis, with Economics, Sociology, Social Psychology, and Management Science playing large roles. Another is an emphasis upon some sort of "research component" and/or special functional-problem focus--Another (related) conclusion is that there is a growing interest in public policy--in all dimensions, so to speak: substantive, analytical, evaluative, etc.

What may be indicated above all is that Public Administration--at least education for public administration--is expanding. Not only has there been a recent increase in the number of educational institutions, student bodies are enlarging, and "markets" are comparatively lively.

The "New" Public Administration. A significant development of recent years has been the emergence of a "New" Public Administration. The term that comes most readily to mind in describing the New Public Administration is "movement." But whether it now is, or indeed ever was, a "movement" is not clear: the appropriateness of the term is denied by some of the participants or exemplars. Also, the extent to which the positions taken and ideas espoused are in fact new is a matter of argument.

But in any case, events and writings usually referred to as "the New Public Administration" have been a part of the recent Public

Administration scene. In general New Public Administration is a reflection within the Public Administration community of the events and ideas of the recent period. Its participants (if this is the proper word) have been mainly the younger Public Administrationists. While none of them, by generally accepted usage of the term, could be called "revolutionary"--after all, as the most ardent point out, they want to change the System, not destroy it--in general they reflect in some degree the "rebellion" of youth, and certain ideas associated with the Counter-Culture and the non-Marxian Left.

In broad brush, the charges made against the "old" public administration are that it lacks a respectable and consistent ideological-philosophical frame and a sophisticated methodology; that in accepting an instrumentalist role it becomes a tool of a System or Establishment that itself is in need of serious reform; that it is inefficient (or efficient in the wrong ways), unresponsive, and unimaginative. On one side the New Public Administration is linked to the forces in Political Science that have been responsible for the emergence of a "Post-Behavioral" mood; the acceptance of the critique of "pluralism" is, for example, prominent. On the other side the New Public Administration is linked, but only weakly, with certain "radical" movements within the public services.

On the positive side, New Public Administration urges a concern for "social equity," a sensitivity to human suffering and social needs. It argues that public administration should be more activist: "proactive" and not simply "reactive." It professes not to be anti-scientific, but wishes advanced methodologies and procedures to be used in a context of concern and reform, not for their own sakes and certainly not as instruments of repression. It professes not to be anti-rational, but wishes the calculations of public administration to be more sensitive, subtle, and humane, the domain of public administration to be enlarged by recognition of the importance of affect. It has a special concern for the problems of the Central City: racial inequality, poverty, violence, physical blight, etc. It has a keen interest in and a receptivity toward Organizational Humanism and advanced techniques of Organizational Development. It reacts against Logical Positivism (it largely ignores Pragmatism), and seeks philosophic guidance from such schools as Existentialism and, especially, Phenomenology.

As a movement--if it ever was one--New Public Administration has, within a few years of its attainment of self-consciousness, lost much of its coherence and identity. But this is not to deny it importance and impact. Its adherents were centrally involved in changes in the American Society for Public Administration designed to democratize

its organization and procedures and to give it a more "forward" stance. The literature it has produced is widely read, its ideas and sentiments circulate in the public administration community, particularly in academia. As its adherents, both original and "converts," are largely on the young side, still to reach positions of maximum influence, it is likely to exert a continuing, if unpredictable, influence. In short, it is unlikely radically to transform Public Administration short run, but long run this is a possibility; and in any case it now is and will continue to be a yeasty addition to the entire complex of theories, techniques, and aspirations.³⁷

Organizational Humanism and Organization Development. Even a brief survey of the academic-intellectual vectors affecting public administration should include some note of the complexes of interests and ideas represented by the terms Organizational Humanism, Organizational Development.

Organizational Humanism--not surprisingly--denotes the continuing movement to "humanize" (and "democratize") organizations. What is sought is more knowledge about and sensitivity toward the human components. The aims are dual: greater organizational productivity or effectiveness and greater human happiness and increased self-realization. In a sense Organizational Humanism is but a continuation of the Human Relations movement rooted in the Hawthorne studies; and the issue of "manipulation" which troubled Human Relations remains. But Organizational Humanism is more subtle and sophisticated, and addresses itself with great seriousness and sympathy to the manipulation issue. The "saint" of Organizational Humanism is Abraham Maslow, and the "needs hierarchy," topped by self-actualization, is a paradigm-ideal for much of what takes place. Prominent and influential writers include Douglas McGregor, Rensis Likert, Warren Bennis, and Chris Argyris.³⁸

More than with any other academic discipline, Organizational Humanism is associated with Social Psychology. Its most influential writers are associated in the main with business or "general" administration rather than public administration. But Organizational Humanism as a complex of ideas and techniques exerts a significant influence on public administration through various channels.

Organization Development--"OD"--refers to conscious attempts to improve organizational output, performance, or "health" through study of and change in the organization, especially change in organizational members. Broadly construed, Organization Development consists of a rather wide spectrum of outlooks and techniques. One author lists seven "currently popular approaches": (1) Direct Consultation, (2) Survey

Feedback, (3) Process Consultation, (4) Team Building, (5) Human Relations Training, (6) Packaged Programs, and (7) Socio-Technical Systems. At one end of a spectrum OD may be mostly concerned with "hardware" and "systems," have no direct concern with interpersonal relations, and not be inclined to concern itself normatively with organization goals. But at the other end of the spectrum the emphasis is strongly on the human components of the organization, inter-personal relations are of central concern, and there is a normative concern for organizational goals.⁹

OD in its later and more popular forms tends toward the second end of such a spectrum. It is closely related to Organizational Humanism, draws upon "humanist" psychologies as well as Social Psychology, takes some variety of the Training Group as its characteristics methodology.

OD has many proponents and practitioners in and out of academia. While the great mass of *all* organizations remains unaffected by the movement, nevertheless its ideas and techniques now reach into many public as well as private organizations; and it appears at this point in time to be an incoming, not an outgoing, wave.¹⁰

Some Summary Observations and Speculations: Two Perspectives

Patently, if the foregoing account is reasonably perceptive and accurate, what is happening to and in Public Administration hardly presents a clear and simple picture. Here is no discipline with a neat paradigm, no curriculum with agreed boundaries and stable subject-matter. Rather, Public Administration appears as a loose cluster of research and teaching interests, focusing primary (but by no means exclusive) attention upon organizations defined (by law and convention) as "public," drawing ideas and techniques from a wide range of sources, and interacting with changing, sometimes turbulent, environments of several kinds.

With the object of better understanding the complex of action and interaction, two perspectives are suggested. The first is the familiar one presented by the original, framing and orienting ideas of Public Administration. The second views Public Administration as matrixed in and interacting with fundamental societal transformations. These are, in fact, related perspectives.

The Framework of Orienting Ideas. In the latter nineteenth century and early twentieth century Public Administration was given definition by a cluster of beliefs. In brief and, to simplify, the main ones were as follows: Politics and administration (to decide and to execute) are

the two basic aspects of the governmental process. In general, these two should be separated; politics should not "meddle" in administration. The objective of administration is to execute decisions, reached in the political process, with economy and efficiency. Free of politics, administration should be, and in important ways can be, scientific. The study of administration, approached in the proper scientific way, will yield "principles" that can be used to guide administration in becoming economical and efficient. In general the science of administration, and the principles it yields, are the same for all governments, democratic or autocratic; the difference between democratic and autocratic governments, that is, pertains chiefly to the way policies are made (decisions are reached) rather than to the way they are executed.

Much of this outlook is expressed in the definition at the opening of the first, and highly influential, textbook (L.D. White's *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration*, 1926): "Public administration is the management of men and materials in the accomplishment of the purposes of the state." This definition indicates at least two other important facts. One is a concept of authority: men, no less than materials, are to be "managed." The other is a concept of *state*: early conceptualizing, rooted in the Political Science of the day (much affected by Continental writings), regarded the state as unquestioned possessor of *sovereignty*. It should be added, however, that there was a firm belief in republican-democratic ideals. The emphasis on efficiency, science, and authority was not--as it was viewed--at the expense of democracy. On the contrary, the problem was seen as how to fulfill democratic ideals by insuring that decisions reached through the means of democratic politics would be effectively realized, not thwarted.

As is well known, these orienting and motivating ideas were seriously eroded in the mid-century decades. Sometimes they were directly challenged and "disproved." Sometimes they were updated and "revised." Sometimes the march of events seemed to "refute" them, or simply made them seem irrelevant. (The "state" all but disappeared in post-World War II Political Science.)

The result has been an indeterminate, even confusing, situation. The original, orienting beliefs remain, not exactly like the smile of the Cheshire cat after the disappearance of the cat, if for no other reason than the fact that some of the "cat" remains. The original, orienting ideas were an intelligent response to a new historical situation: a large polity trying to combine republican-democratic ideals with the situation created by industrialism, urbanism, science, and so forth; and that situation has not disappeared, it only further evolves. The original ideas thus continue to have a certain force and persuasiveness: It is

difficult to be *for* political "meddling" and *against* efficiency and science in public administration. On the other hand, the original ideas are seen by all (or nearly all) as simplistic if not mischievous when addressed to many present realities. The challenge to them on empirical grounds and on moral-ideological grounds has been so thorough and effective, the historical circumstances to which they were addressed has so altered, that they can no longer serve (it is judged) without serious modification.

A great deal of Public Administration since World War II has been concerned, one way or another, with attempting to work our way forward from the first firm framework of beliefs to a situation in which there might again be general agreement on a set of guiding beliefs. Up to this point no consensus approaching the original one has developed. What has united the Public Administration community has been, rather, the continuing force of the original ideas even in the presence of altered perspectives and problems; plus the fact that public administration is: its massive institutions are *there*, and the problems to which they are addressed are seen as real and crucial, whatever the differences concerning philosophy and methods.

If one views the attainment of a consensus in Public Administration, similar to the original one, as a desirable state of affairs, a problem to be solved, what conclusion is warranted in view of the above review of the societal-problem context, the external and the internal environments of Public Administration? Again assuming the above review to be reasonably perceptive and accurate, the necessary conclusion would appear to be that no consensus comparable to the old is in view. It seems highly unlikely that there will soon emerge any general agreement on what democracy means for and in administration; on what efficiency "is" and whether, how and to what extent, it is proper goal or criteria in public administration; on what science dictates (or makes possible) in the study or practice of administration. No single school of philosophy, academic discipline, or type of methodology--or combination of these--would appear likely to persuade Public Administration to march under its banner.

This is not, of course, necessarily an unhappy conclusion. An untidy, swiftly changing world may be better addressed by an enterprise which contains many facets, perspectives, interests, and methodologies: one which is eclectic, experimental open-ended.

Public Administration and Societal Transformation. A voluminous interpretative and speculative literature concerns our disturbed and anxious time. One current essay develops the thesis that civilization is undergoing its most fundamental change since cities arose in the fertile

valleys of the Near East, a challenge to and transformation of the basic institutions of family, religion, education, law, and government. Whether this is true we will not know, only our descendants. A now large body of writings deal with our transition from Industrialism to Post-Industrialism. The meaning of this transition, the extent to which it is in fact taking place and its implications, is something we already know something about. Not much, but something. It seems clear that more than public mood and literary-intellectual vogue are involved, that the rate of societal change is accelerating, and that the breadth and depth of change are increasing.

Accepting an increasing rate of change as a fact, and premising that the changes, cumulatively, will greatly transform historically received institutions, what are the implications for public administration? A large book could only begin to draw these out at any length, but this essay can appropriately end with some suggestions. To some extent this involves only restating what has been already said or implied.

First, public administration will be centrally involved in change and transformation. Administration is "the core of modern government" (in Carl Friedrich's oft-quoted phrase), and government itself is one of the basic societal institutions subject to change. But government is not merely acted upon, it acts; and public administration as its chief instrument is and will be a focal area for change and transformation in society generally. Much of the above review of recent and contemporary developments is, of course, commentary on this theme.

Second, what is patently implied is that public administration will itself be an area of stress, ferment, and accelerated change. Negatively, this means it is unlikely that any clear and generally accepted framework of orienting beliefs, comparable to that of the first generations, will soon evolve. The parameters are too indistinct, the variables too many--and too variable. Positively, this means philosophical, disciplinary, and methodological pluralism: continued proliferation of and competition between ideas and "approaches," in a continuing attempt to survive, adapt, and control change. What will hold Public Administration together--assuming it remains "together" as a self-conscious--will not be agreement on some one kit of tools or some one route into the future. Rather, it will be general agreement on the importance of the institutional area of public administration in making a societal transformation, a general interest in organizational phenomena, a comparatively high degree of "public regardness" in outlook, and a wish to address (whether scientifically, professionally, "valuationally," or however) problems seen as problems in public administration.

Third, Public Administration, as represented by its curricula, its

literature, and its organizations, will continue to change rapidly. For example, the old "staples" of Personnel Administration and Budgetary-Fiscal Administration, hardly now recognizable as against their configuration of thirty years ago, will continue to enlarge their boundaries and respond to the many influences playing upon them. "Fads," such as PPBS, will come and go--but in their coming will be important and even in their going will have lasting effects. The writing of general textbooks will become an increasingly arduous, hazardous occupation. (Some argue that it is now an obsolete occupation. I think not: To the extent the textbooks provide perspective and synthesis they are invaluable.)

Fourth, public administration now is and increasingly will be concerned with administrative problems much different from those which it confronted even a generation ago. The "administration" of "an" organization is scarcely the center of the problem in many areas of activity. The continued increase in the demands--particularly with regard to "people" programs--placed upon public administration, the changes wrought by continued transition from a predominately goods-producing to a predominately service-rendering economy, the accelerating "graying" of the area between public and private and between governmental levels and jurisdictions, such phenomena have enlarged and transformed the nature of the "administrative" problem. The task now is the administration of systems (or at least complexes) of organizations, not single organizations; the establishment and monitoring of long, complicated "chains" as against single, bureaucratic pyramids; the creation and coordination of complex networks of subtle, shifting horizontal and/or diagonal interrelations as against neat, vertical command-obedience structures. In the words of the cliché, "It's a whole new ball game" for crucial areas of public administration.

Finally, the implications for public administration of its intimate involvement in societal transformation are beyond knowing, even beyond imagining. Beliefs and institutions that have given Western civilization its defining characteristics are under attack. The "crisis of authority," much discussed is real: traditional sources and loci including family, religion, and law exert diminishing influence. Ideas and institutions of "modern" vintage fare little better: industrialism and technology are under attack. Even Science is now challenged as simply a "school of consciousness," not *the* approach to reality; only one way, and a limited or even dangerous way, of viewing and acting.

For one with an acquaintance with the rise of the modern state out of feudalism, it sometimes appears that the film is now being run

backwards: the Sovereign State is being dissolved, its clear vertical authority structures being replaced by complicated, contractual and informal, horizontal relationships, a new feudalism. Of course, the context is not medieval, and the comparison has but a limited value. It serves to remind us, however, that the modern state system is not necessarily the end of political evolution. In fact, it is now being transformed, and public administration is a part of the transformation process.⁴¹

FOOTNOTES

1. The "poverty" literature of the past decade is voluminous. Early, and highly influential, was Michael Harrington's *The Other America: Poverty in the United States* (New York: Penguin Books, 1963). The following are useful sources for present purposes: Margaret Gordon, ed., *Poverty in America* (San Francisco: Chandler Press, 1965); Oscar Onati, *Poverty Amid Affluence*, (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1966); Thomas Gladwin, *Poverty U.S.A.* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967); Burton Weibrod, *The Economics of Poverty: An American Paradox* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966); Gilbert Y. Steiner, *Social Insecurity; The Politics of Welfare* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966); John C. Donovan, *The Politics of Poverty* (New York: Pegasus, 1967); Warner Bloomberg, Jr., and Henry J. Schmandt, eds., *Power, Poverty and Urban Policy*, (Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications, 1968); Eleanor Burke Leacock, ed., *The Culture of Poverty: A Critique* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971).
2. In addition to the latter works just cited, various aspects of policy development and administrative experience are treated in the following: Sar A. Lovitan, *The Great Society's Poor Law* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1969); Peter Maris and Martin Rein, *Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States* (New York: Atherton, 1967); Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Intergovernmental Relations in the Poverty Program* (Washington, D.C.: 1966); Daniel F. Halloran, "Progress Against Poverty: The Governmental Approach," *Public Administration Review* 28, 3 (May-June, 1968); S.M. Miller and Martin Rein, "Participation, Poverty, and Administration," *Public Administration Review* 29, 1 (January-February, 1969); James L. Sundquist, "Co-ordinating the War on Poverty," *The Annals* 385 (September, 1969). See also citations below on community action and intergovernmental relations.

3. On various aspects of civil rights, race, and related matters, the following are sources: *Report of the National Advisory Committee on Civil Disorders* (New York: Bantam Books, 1968); Carolyn Shaw Bell, *The Economics of the Ghetto* (New York: Pegasus, 1970); Lee Rainwater and William L. Yancey, *The Moynihan Report and the Politics of Controversy* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1967); Martin Kilson, "Black Power: Anatomy of a Paradox," *Harvard Journal of Negro Affairs* 2 (1968).
4. In this connection see: Michael Novak, *The Rise of the Unmeltable Ethnics* (New York: Macmillan, 1971).
5. For an introduction to some of these matters see: Mark A. Haskell, *The New Careers Concept: Potential for Public Employment of the Poor* (New York: Praeger, 1969); Warren I. Cikins, "Graduate Education, Public Service, and the Negro," *Public Administration Review* 26, 3 (September, 1966); Earl J. Reeves, "Making Equality of Employment a Reality in the Federal Service," *Public Administration Review* 30, 1 (January-February, 1970).
6. Consult: James Q. Wilson, ed., *The Metropolitan Enigma: Inquiries in the Nature and Dimension of America's "Urban Crisis"* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968); John C. Bollens and Henry J. Schmandt, *The Metropolis: Its People, Politics, and Economic Life*, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper and Row, 1970); Simon R. Miles, ed., *Metropolitan Problems* (Agincourt, Ont.: Methuen Publications, 1970).
7. Suggested sources on these matters are: Alan K. Campbell, ed., *The States and the Urban Crisis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970); Keith F. Mulrooney, ed., symposium on "The American City Manager: An Urban Administrator in a Complex and Evolving Situation," *Public Administration Review* 31, 1 (January-February, 1971); Henry Reining, Jr., ed., symposium on "Governing Megacentropolis," *Public Administration Review* 30, 4 (September-October, 1970).
8. See: Dwight A. Ink, "Establishing the New Department of Housing and Urban Development," *Public Administration Review* 27, 3 (September, 1967); Robert C. Wood, "Federal Role in the Urban Environment," *Public Administration Review* 27, 3 (September, 1967).
9. Joseph A. Alutto and James A. Belasco, "A Typology for Participation in Organization Decision-Making," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 17, 1 (March, 1972); William G. Scott, "Organization Government: The Prospects for a Truly Participative System," *Public Administration Review* 29, 1 (January-February, 1969):

- Mauk Mulder, "Power Equalization Through Participation?" *Administrative Science Quarterly* 16, 1 (March 1971); Robert B. Denhardt, "Organizational Citizenship and Personal Freedom," *Public Administration Review* 28, 1 (January-February, 1968); Marvin Mead, "Participative Administration: Emerging Reality or Wishful Thinking" in Dwight Waldo, ed., *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence* (Scranton, Penn.: Chandler Publishing Company, 1971).
10. Jones C. Davies, *Neighborhood Groups and Urban Renewal* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966); C. George Benello and Dimitrios Roussoupoulos, eds., *The Case for Participatory Democracy* (New York: Viking Press, 1971); Hans B. Spiegel, ed., (Volume I) *Citizen Participation in Urban Development: Concepts and Issues* (Washington, D.C.: N.T.L. Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968); Michael P. Smith, "Alienation and Bureaucracy: The Role of Participatory Administration," *Public Administration Review* 31, 6 (November-December, 1971); S. M. Miller and Martin Rein, "Participation, Poverty, and Administration," *Public Administration Review* 29, 1 (January-February, 1969). See also citations below on community control.
11. The "devolution" literature is not as focused as that on participation. Consult: Morton Grodzins, *The American System; A New View of Government in the United States* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966); Joseph Boskin, *Opposition Politics; The Anti-New Deal Tradition* (Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1968); Herbert Kaufman, "Administrative Decentralization and Political Power," *Public Administration Review* 29, 1 (January-February, 1969); James Q. Wilson, "The Bureaucracy Problem," *The Public Interest* 6 (Winter, 1967); Dona'd Haider, "The Political Economy of Decentralization," *American Behavioral Scientist* 15, 1 (September-October, 1971); M. Melrood, ed., *A Bibliography on Decentralization* (Milwaukee: Institute of Governmental Affairs, University of Wisconsin, 1970).
12. Gordon C. Cameron, *Regional Economic Development; The Federal Role* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971); Edward F. R. Hearle, "Regional Commissions: Approach to Economic Development," *Public Administration Review* 28, 1 (January-February, 1968); Randy Hamilton, "The Regional Commissions: A Restrained View," *Public Administration Review* 28, 1 (January-February, 1968); Niles M. Hansen, *Rural Poverty and the Urban Crisis; A Strategy for Regional Development* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1971).
13. Alan A. Altshuler, *Community Control* (New York: Pegasus, 1970);

- Warner Blomberg, Jr., and Henry J. Schmandt, eds., *Powers, Poverty and Urban Policy* (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968); Thomas D. Lynch, ed., symposium on "Neighborhoods and Citizen Involvement," *Public Administration Review* 32, 3 (May-June, 1972); Dale Rogers Marshall, *The Politics of Participation in Poverty* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971); Ralph M. Kramer, *Participation of the Poor; Comparative Community Case Studies in the War Against Poverty* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969).
14. The literature of business administration and general management should be consulted on these matters. For some reflection in public administration see: Ida R. Hoos, "Automation, Systems Engineering, and Public Administration: Observations and Reflections on the California Experience," *Public Administration Review* 26, 4 (December, 1966); Edward F. R. Hearle, ed., symposium on "Computers in Public Administration," *Public Administration Review* 28, 6 (November-December, 1968); Anthony J. Catanese and Alan W. Steiss, "Programming for Governmental Operations: The Critical Path Approach," *Public Administration Review* 28, 2 (March-April, 1968); John P. Crecine, "Computer Simulations in Urban Research," *Public Administration Review* 28, 2 (March-April, 1968); Fremont J. Lyden, "Project Management: Beyond Bureaucracy," *Public Administration Review* 30, 4 (July-August, 1970).
15. Andrew Shonfield, *Modern Capitalism; The Changing Balance of Public and Private Power*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1965; Murray Weidenbaum, *The Modern Public Sector; New Ways of Doing the Government's Business* (New York: Basic Books, 1969). These works are also commentaries on the increasing "gray" area. See also: Walter Adams, "The Military-Industrial Complex and the New Industrial State," *American Economic Review* 58, 2 (May, 1968); C. H. Danhof, *Government Contracting and Technological Change* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1968).
16. On public sector unionism consult: Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, *Labor-Management Policies for State and Local Government* (Washington, D.C.: 1969); Hugh O'Neill, "The Growth of Municipal Employee Unions," *Academy of Political Science Proceedings* 30, 2 (New York: Columbia University, 1970); David T. Stanley, "The Effects of Unions on Local Governments," *Academy of Political Science* 30, 2 (New York: Columbia University, 1970); Robert H. Connery and William V. Farr, eds., *Unionization of Municipal Employees* (New York: Academy of

- Political Science, Columbia University, 1971); Felix A. Nigro, ed., symposium on "Collective Negotiations in the Public Service," *Public Administration Review* 30, 4 (July-August, 1969); Felix Nigro, ed., "Collective Bargaining in the Public Service: A Reappraisal," *Public Administration Review* 32, 1 (March-April, 1972); K. O. Warner and M. L. Henessy, *Public Management at the Bargaining Table* (Chicago: Public Personnel Association, 1967).
17. Here, in addition to the immediately preceding citations, see: Morris Sackman, *The Crisis in Public Employee Relations in the Decade of the Seventies* (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of National Affairs, 1970); David H. Rosenbloom, "Some Political Implications of the Drift Toward a Liberation of Federal Employees," *Public Administration Review* 31, 4 (July-August, 1971); Robert E. Catlin, "Should Public Employees Have the Right to Strike?" *Public Personnel Review* 29, 1 (January, 1968). A work which puts much of unionism, as well as professionalism, in the public sector into perspective is: Frederick C. Mosher, *Democracy and the Public Service* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968).
18. On productivity see: Orville F. Poland, "Why Does Public Administration Ignore Evaluation?" *Public Administration Review* 31, 2 (March-April, 1971); Joseph S. Wholey, John W. Scalon, Hugh G. Duffy, James S. Fukomoto, and Leona M. Vogt, *Federal Evaluation Policy: Analyzing the Effects of Public Programs* (Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute, 1970). Evaluation broadens into economic analysis and technology assessment, and the literature is extensive. The final issue of *Public Administration Review* for 1972 will contain a lengthy symposium on "Productivity in the Public Sector." Charles L. Schultze, *The Politics and Economics of Public Spending* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1968) provides useful "context" for this subject as well as some of the preceding and following.
19. On the PPBS see: Dwight Waldo, ed., symposium on "Planning-Programming-Budgeting System," *Public Administration Review* 27, 4 (December, 1966); Dwight Waldo, ed., symposium on "Planning-Programming-Budgeting System Reexamined," *Public Administration Review* 29, 2 (March-April, 1969); Edwin L. Harper, Fred A. Kramer, Andrew M. Rouse, "Implementation and Use of PPB in Sixteen Federal Agencies," *Public Administration Review* 29, 6 (November-December, 1969); Stanley B. Botner, "Four Years of PPB: An Appraisal," *Public Administration Review* 30, 4 (July-August, 1970); Fremont J. Lyden and Ernest J. Miller, *Planning, Programming, Budgeting* (Chicago: Markham, 1967);

- Guy Block, "Externalities and Structure in PPB," *Public Administration Review* 31, 6 (November-December, 1971); Robert E. Millward, "BBBS: Problems of Implementation," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* (March, 1968); Jesse Burkhead and Jerry Miner, *Public Expenditure* (Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971).
20. Some of the literature already cited bears upon the matters referred to in the latter part of this paragraph. Consult also: Raymond A. Bauer, ed., *Social Indicators* (Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1966); Raymond D. Gastil, "Social Indicators and Quality of Life," *Public Administration Review* 30, 6 (November-December, 1970); Robert S. Weiss and Martin Rein, "The Evaluation of Broad-Aim Programs: Experimental Design, Its Difficulties, and an Alternative," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 15, 1 (March, 1970); Francis E. McGilvery, "Program and Responsibility Cost Accounting" *Public Administration Review* 28, 2 (March-April, 1968); Alice M. Rivlin, *Systematic Thinking for Social Action* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1970).
 21. Lynton K. Caldwell, ed., symposium on "Environmental Policy: New Directions in Federal Action," *Public Administration Review* 28, 4 (July-August, 1968); Daniel H. Henning, "Natural Resource Administration and the Public Interest," *Public Administration Review* 30, 2 (March-April, 1970); Harvey Lieber, "Public Administration and Environmental Quality," *Public Administration Review* 30, 3 (May-June, 1970); Lynton K. Caldwell, "Environment: A Short Course in Semantics," *Public Administration Review* 31, 6 (November-December, 1971); Lynton K. Caldwell, "Environmental Quality as an Administrative Problem," *The Annals* 400 (March 1972).
 22. While there is a vast popular and semi-popular literature on consumerism, and even considerable scholarly writing, as suggested it is still little reflected in the literature of Public Administration. See: Thomas L. Eovaldi and Joan E. Gestrin, "Justice for Consumers: The Mechanism of Redress," *Northwestern University Law Review* 66 (July-August, 1971); Senate Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization on Government Research, *To Establish a Consumer Protection Agency: Hearings*, 92d Congress, First Session, 4 vols. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969). On administrative regulation see: Marver Bernstein, ed., "The Government as Regulator," *The Annals* 400 (March, 1972); Michael Reagan, ed., symposium on "Administrative Regulation," *Public Administration Review* 31, 4 (July-August, 1972).
 23. See: Jameson W. Doig, ed., symposium on "The Police in a Democratic Society," *Public Administration Review* 28, 5 (September-October, 1968); Edward C. Gallas and Nesta M. Gallas, eds., symposium on "Judicial Administration," *Public Administration Review* 31, 2 (March-April 1971); Leslie T. Wilkins, ed., symposium "Five Pieces on Penology," *Public Administration Review* 31, 6 (November-December, 1971).
 24. Helene S. Markoff, "The Federal Women's Program," *Public Administration Review* 32, 2 (March-April, 1972); W. Henry Lambright, "Womanpower: The Next Step in Manpower Policy," *Public Personnel Review* 31 (January, 1970); John J. Corson, "Sex and the Public Service," *Public Personnel Review* 31 (July 1970).
 25. Frederick C. Mosher, *Democracy and the Public Service* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968); Frederick C. Mosher, "The Public Service in the Temporary Society," *Public Administration Review* 31, 1 (January-February, 1971); Emmette S. Redford, *Ideal and Practice in Public Administration* (University, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1958). See also forthcoming special issue of *The Annals* on Public Service Professional Organizations.
 26. Many of the above citations, such as those pertaining to participation, are relevant here. See also: Orion F. White, Jr., "The Dialectical Organization: An Alternative to Bureaucracy," *Public Administration Review* 29, 1 (January-February, 1969); Herbert G. Wilcox, "Hierarchy, Human Nature, and the Participative Panacea," *Public Administration Review* 29, 1 (January-February, 1969).
 27. "Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1970," the Plan with accompanying explanation and Executive Order, *Public Administration Review* 30, 6 (November-December, 1970); William D. Carey, "Reorganization Plan No. 2; Remarks," *Public Administration Review* 30, 6 (November-December, 1970); Selma Mushkin and John F. Cotton, *Sharing Federal Funds for State and Local Needs* (New York: Praeger, 1969); Henry S. Reuss, *Revenue Sharing: Crutch or Catalyst for State and Local Government?* (New York: Praeger, 1970); Congressional Research Service, *Departmental Reorganization, and General and Special Revenue Sharing: Some Issues They Raise* (Library of Congress, June, 1971).
 28. Note 19 introduces the voluminous literature on PPBS. While much of what is cited bears upon the limitations and problems of PPBS, "retrospection" has only begun. In this connection see Allen Schick, "A Death in the Bureaucracy," *Public Administration Review*, forthcoming.

29. The literature of "ferment" in American education is voluminous and of course outside the scope of this review. Chiefly with foreign readers in mind, I cite the following as an introduction: Nevitt Sanford, ed., *The American College* (New York: Wiley, 1967); Christopher Jencks and David Riesman, *The Academic Revolution* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1968); Jacques Barzun, *The American University; How It Runs, Where It Is Going* (New York: Harper and Row, 1968); George B. Leonard, *Education and Ecstasy* (New York: Dell, 1968); Carl Rogers, *Freedom to Learn* (Columbus, O.: Merrill, 1969); Charles E. Silberman, *Crisis in the Classroom* (New York: Random House, 1970). More focused for present purposes is: Clyde J. Wingfield, ed., symposium on "The American University: A Public Administration Perspective," *Public Administration Review* 30, 2 (March-April, 1970).
30. Again, a large, "unfocused" literature on these matters. But see: Robert Brown, *Explanation in Social Science* (Chicago: Aldine, 1963); Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckman, *The Social Construction of Reality; A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967); Maurice Mandelbaum, *Phenomenology of Moral Experience* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969); Eugene S. Meehan, *Value Judgment and Social Science* (Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1969); S. M. Lyman and M. B. Scott, *A Sociology of the Absurd* (New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1970); Charles Hampden-Turner, *Radical Man* (New York: Doubleday, 1971); William J. Filstead, *Qualitative Methodology* (Chicago: Markham, 1971).
31. A discussion of these matters will be found in: James C. Charlesworth, ed., *Theory and Practice of Public Administration: Scope, Objectives, and Methods*, Monograph 8 in a series sponsored by The American Academy of Political and Social Science; Cosponsor for this volume: The American Society of Public Administration (Philadelphia: 1968). This is, generally, a very useful source on the recent period in Public Administration.
32. The "new currents" in Political Science have been evident mainly in journals, but are manifested also in some books. Consult: Henry S. Kariel, *The Promise of Politics* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966); Peter Bachrach, "The Theory of Democratic Elitism," *The Theory of Democratic Elitism; A Critique* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967); Charles McCoy and John Playford, eds., *A Political Politics; A Critique of Behavioralism* (New York: Crowell, 1967); Marvin Surkin and Alan Wolfe, eds., *An End to Political Science* (New York: Basic Books, 1970).
33. See: Anthony Downs, *An Economic Theory of Democracy* (New York: Harper, 1957); Anthony Downs, *Inside Bureaucracy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1967); Gordon Tullock, ed., *Public Choice* (Blacksburg, Va.: Center for Studies in Public Choice, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1968); Gordon Tullock, *Private Wants, Public Means; An Economic Analysis of the Desirable Scope of Government* (New York: Basic Books, 1970); Gordon Tullock and James M. Buchanan, *The Calculus of Consent* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press, 1967); Gordon Tullock, *The Politics of Bureaucracy* (Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1965); Walter W. Heller, *New Dimensions of Political Economy* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966); William A. Niskanen, Jr., *Bureaucracy and Representative Government* (Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971); William C. Mitchell, "The Shape of Political Theory to Come: From Political Sociology to Political Economy," *American Behavioral Scientist* 11, 2 (November-December, 1967); William C. Mitchell, *Public Choice in America* (Chicago: Markham, 1971); L. L. Wade, "Political Science and Public Policy: A Review Essay," *Policy Sciences* 2, 3 (Summer, 1971); Marver H. Bernstein, "Understanding the Political Economy of Public Regulation," *Polity* 4, 4 (Summer, 1972).
34. The reference is to a book by Vincent Ostrom; and a book co-authored by Gary Wamsley (Political Scientist) and Mayer Zald (Economist). See also: Vincent and Elinor Ostrom, "Public Choice: A Different Approach to the Study of Public Administration," *Public Administration Review* 31, 2 (March-April, 1971).
35. This is certainly indicated by a Delphi exercise conducted at the Maxwell School, Syracuse University (by Emanuel Wald). A Delphi exercise conducted by the National Academy of Public Administration suggests this conclusion; but the data do not bear directly on the point.
36. For a discussion of these developments see: "Training MBAs for the Public Sector," *Business Week*, 2232 (June 10, 1972), pp. 82-84.
37. The central document of the New Public Administration is: Frank Marini, ed., *Toward a New Public Administration; The Minnowbrook Perspective* (Scranton, Penna.: Chandler, 1971). A collection of pieces concerning the "movement" and "responses" from administrators may be found in: *Public Management* 53, 11 (November, 1971). Several essays in the following are relevant: Dwight Waldo, ed., *Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence* (Scranton, Penna.: Chandler, 1971). See also: Richard S. Page,

- "A New Public Administration?" *Public Administration Review* 29, 3 (May-June, 1969); Wesley E. Bjur, "The 'New' Public Administration," *Public Administration Review* 30, 2 (March-April, 1970); Lyle J. Sumek and Franklin D. Reinow, "New Public Administration: For a Time of Crisis--In a Time of Change" *Midwest Review of Public Administration* 4, 2 (August, 1970), Robert R. Wilcox, "The New P.A.: Have Things Really Changed That Much?" *Public Management* 54 (March, 1971).
38. See: Abraham Maslow, *Eupsychian Management* (Homewood, Ill.: Irwin Dorsey, 1965); Abraham Maslow, *Toward a Psychology of Being* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1968); Douglas McGregor, *The Human Side of Enterprise* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960); Douglas McGregor (edited--posthumously--by Warren G. Bennis and Caroline McGregor), *The Professional Manager* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967); Rensis Likert, *New Patterns of Management* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961); Rensis Likert, *The Human Organization* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967); Warren G. Bennis, *Changing Organizations* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966); Warren G. Bennis and Philip E. Slater, *The Temporary Society* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969); Warren G. Bennis, Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin, *The Planning of Change*, 2nd ed. (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969); Chris Argyris, *Integrating the Individual and the Organization* (New York: Wiley, 1964); Chris Argyris, *Intervention Theory and Method* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970). The reflection of Organizational Humanism is prominent in New Public Administration, but it is more extensive: see, for example, the writings of Robert T. Golembiewski, e.g., his *Men, Management, and Morality; Toward a New Organizational Morality* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965).
39. This paragraph represents a point of view reflected in an unpublished paper (dated March, 1972) by M. E. McGill, "Discarding the Monolithic Myth: Assumptions About Personal and Interpersonal Relationships Underlying Approaches to OD." Some proponents and practitioners, as the following paragraph suggests, would reject McGill's "broad spectrum" definition; they would identify the earlier techniques not with OD, but with Management Science.
40. As indicated, there is much overlapping between Organizational Humanism and OD, and some of the preceding citations are relevant here as well. See also: J. K. Fordyce and Arthur Weil, *Managing With People* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1971); Harvey A. Hornstein et al., *Social Intervention; A Behavioral Science Approach* (New York: Free Press, 1971); Richard Walton, *Interpersonal Peacemaking; Confrontations and Third Party Consultation* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969); Robert T. Golembiewski and Arthur Blumberg, eds., *Sensitivity Training and the Laboratory Approach* (Itaska, Ill.: Peacock, 1970); Edgar Schein and Warren G. Bennis, eds., *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods* (New York: Wiley, 1965); Leland Bradford, Jack R. Gibb, and Kenneth D. Benne, eds., *T-Group Theory and the Laboratory Method* (New York: Wiley, 1964). *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* is the central journal of OD and should be consulted for further information. The *Administrative Science Quarterly* is also a useful source on OD, as well as various other matters, such as Management Science. On impact in public administration, see, for example: Robert T. Golembiewski, "The 'Laboratory Approach' to Organizational Change: Scheme of a Method." *Public Administration Review* 27, 3 (September, 1967); Robert T. Golembiewski, "Organizational Development in Public Agencies: Perspectives on Theory and Practice," *Public Administration Review* 29, 4 (July-August, 1969); William B. Eddy and Robert J. Saunders, "Applied Behavioral Science in Urban Administrative/Political Systems," *Public Administration Review* 32, 1 (January-February, 1972); William B. Eddy, "Beyond Behaviorism? Organization Development in Public Management," *Public Personnel Review* 31 (July, 1970). See also: George E. Berkley, *The Administrative Revolution; Notes on the Passing of Organization Man* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971).
41. The documentation for this review has presented unusual difficulties: of "target," level of assumed knowledge, etc. With this in view, the following suggestions for further exploration and explanation are made; some may find them useful: Claude E. Hawley and Ruth G. Weintraub, eds., *Administrative Questions and Political Answers* (New York: Van Nostrand, 1966); Alan A. Altshuler, ed., *The Politics of the Federal Bureaucracy* (New York: Dodd, Mead, 1968); Francis E. Rourke, *Bureaucratic Power in National Politics*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Little, Brown, 1972). All three of these are useful collections--and all are broader in scope than their titles suggest. Gerald E. Caiden, *The Dynamics of Public Administration; Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971) is recent, intelligent and provocative. Finally--recent editions of textbooks should not be overlooked, both because they review what is presently "happening" and because they attempt to project emerging perspectives. See: John M. Pfiffner and Robert V. Presthus, *Public-*

Administration (Ronald); Herbert A. Simon, Donald W. Smithburg, and Victor A. Thompson, *Public Administration* (Knopf); Felix A. Nigro, *Modern Public Administration* (Harper and Row); Marshall E. and Gladys O. Dimock, *Public Administration* (Holt, Rinehart and Winston); Ira Sharkansky, *Public Administration; Policy-Making in Government Agencies* (Chicago: Markham); Robert T. Golembiewski, Frank Gibson, and Geoffrey Y. Cornog, eds., *Public Administration; Readings in Institutions, Processes, and Behavior* (Rand McNally). Purposely, I have omitted dates. My information is that all but two of these books are being revised: consult the latest edition.