

Sabatier, Paul A. (ed.). *Theories of the Policy Process*, 1999.

Sayer, Wallace, S. "Bureaucracies : Some Contrasts in Systems", *Indian Journal of Public Administration*, vol. 10, No. 2 (1964) : 219-229.

Sherwood, Frank P. "An Academician's Response : The Thinking, Learning Buseaucracy." *PAR* vol. 56 (March-April 1996) : 154-156.

Theodoulou, Stella Z, and Matthew A. Cahn. *Public Policy : The Essential Readings*, 1998.

Wayne, Stephen, G. Calvin Mackenzie, David M. O'Brien, and Richard L. Cole. *The Politics of American Government : Foundations, Participation, Institutions, and Policy*, 3rd ed., 1999.

Wilson, Woodrom. "The Study of Administration, 1887." (Shafriz and A. Hyde ed.. *Classics of Public Administration*, 2nd ed., 1987 : 10-25.)

### Selected Bibliography

- Almond, Gabriel A. and G. Bingham Powell, Jr. *Comparative Politics Today*, 1984.
- Argyis, Chris. *Intervention Theory and Method*, 1970.
- Ban, Carolyn. *How Do Public Managers Manage*, 1995.
- Carroll, James D. "The Rhetoric of Reform and Political Reality in the National Performance Review." *PAR* vol. 56 (May-June 1996) : 299-304.
- Clinton, Bill. and Al Gore. *Putting People First*, 1992.
- Crozer, Michel. *The Bureaucratic Phenomenon*, 1964.
- Denhardt, Robert B. *The Pursuit of Significance : Strategies for Managerial Success in Public Organization*, 1993.
- Dye, Thomas R. *Understanding Public Policy*, 9th ed., 1999.
- Easton, David. *The Analysis of Political Structure*, 1990.
- Eggers, William D. and John O'Leary. *Revolution at the Roots : Making Our Government Smaller, Better and Closer at Home*, 1995.
- Garvey, Gerald. *Public Administration : The Profession and the Practice A Case Study Approach*, 1997.
- Gerston, Larry N. *Public Policy Making : Process and Principles*, 1997.
- Gore, Al. *Report of the National Performance Review*. 1993.
- Gordon, George J. and Michael E. Milakovich. *Public Administration in America*, 5th ed., 1995.
- Golembiewski, Robert T. *Practical Public Management*, 1995.
- Heady, Ferrel. *Public Administration : A Comparative Perspective*, 5th ed., 1996.
- Henry, Nicholas. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*, 7th ed., 1999.
- Hughes, Owen E. *Public Management and Administration*, 2nd ed., 1998.
- Jones Charler O. *Separate But Equal Branches ; Congress and the Presidency*, 2nd ed., 1999.
- Karl, M. "Civil Service Reforms : Learning From Commonwealth Experiences." *Public Administration and Development* vol. 56. (May 1996) : 123-30.
- McKinney, Jerome B. and Lawrence C. Howard. *Public Administration : Balancing Power And Accountability* 2nd ed., 1998.
- Oliver, Dawin and Gavin Drewry. *Public Service Reforms : Issues of Accountability and Public Law*, 1996.
- Raadschelders, Jos C.N. *Handbook of Administrative History*, 1998.
- Rosenbloom, David H. and Rosemary O'Leary. *Public Administration and Law*, 2nd ed., 1997.

W. Wilson argued as follows (1887 : 10).

“It is the object of administrative study to discover, first, what government can properly and successfully do, and secondly, how it can do these proper things with the utmost possible efficiency and at the least possible cost either of money or of energy.”

The lecture on public administration in the civic culture at our university is intended, first, to provide an introduction to the latest public administration for the student who is striving after a career in public service, and second to foster in other students an appreciation of the nature of public administration and also to let both of them recognize the problematic matter of it. This problematic matter represents the situation to have to move from an industrial government to information government, from a government pre-occupied with sustaining itself to a government clearly focused on serving the people (see A. Gore 1993 : Step 4. G. Garvey 1997 : XIII. F. Heady 1997 : VII VIII VIX).

This situation is explained briefly and to the point by President Bill Clinton and Vice President Al Gore. The following sentence is theirs (A. Gore 1993 : I. B. Clinton and A. Gore 1992 : 23-24).

“We can no longer afford to pay more for—and get less—from our government. The answer for every problem cannot always be another program or more money. It is time to radically change the way the government operates—to shift from top-down bureaucracy to entrepreneurial government that empowers citizens and communities to change our country from the bottom up. We must reward the people and ideas that work and get rid of those that don’t.”

This is an urgent matter of public administration to be solved. Our lecture on public administration revolves around this theme.

Proposition 13 what is called Jarvis–Gann proposal of 1978 in California and unsuccessful Proposition 2 $\frac{1}{2}$  of 1980 in Massachusetts make a turning point ; public administration can no longer be taught away from ethical and moral concerns. Introducing cutback management and the pursuit of better government for less are the normative rule of today (J. B. McKinney and L. C. Howard 1998 : Preface). As the *Report* expressed rightly, the central issue in our own day is not *what* government does, but *how* it works. People of today needs a government that delivers more for less, treats its taxpayers as if they were customers and treats taxpayer dollars with respect for the sweat and sacrifice that earned them. Too much money for programs that don't work has been spent so far. It is time to make a government work for the people, learn to do more with less, and treat taxpayers like customers (A Gore 1993 : 2). By “customer,” we do not mean “citizen.” A citizen can participate in democratic decision-making ; a customer receives benefits from a specific service. All persons are citizens. Most of them are also customers (Ibid : 7). Consequently we can never anticipate the coming of continuous increase of public budgets (J. B. McKinney and L. C. Howard 1998 : Preface).

The study of public administration is as important for the general citizen as it is for student bound on a career in public service. In a democracy all persons need to know what they may sensibly ask government to do. For power proceeds from the sovereign people and accountability or responsibility returns to them, and besides a system of responsibility and confidence is set between government and them, they also should know what level of performance they have a right to expect from government. As reason is, Woodrow Wilson, more than a century ago, wrote that the most basic aim of administrative study should be to discern what government can properly and successfully do (G. Garvey 1997 : XIII).

lives of people (J. B. McKinney and L. C. Howard 1998 : 62). And also it is generally assumed that administration is synonymous with “bureaucracy” and that public administrators are destined for lives of boring routine without the possibility of parole. It is obvious that most public administrators work in bureaucratic organizations. And it is an admitted fact that elements of routine usually figure in their jobs. But at the core of professional lives, most public administrators are neither “mere bureaucrats” in the derogatory sense nor prisoners of routine and red tape. They are, before anything else, problem solvers. It is about the very special challenges to problem solving that public administrators at every level of government encounter in the public sector (G. Garvey 1997 : XIII).

Nowadays the goal of public administration is to move from red tape or micromanagement to results to create a government that works better and costs less, as noted in the *Report of the National Performance Review* by Vice President Al Gore (A. Gore 1993).

This is a government that works for people, cleared of useless bureaucracy and waste and freed from red tape and senseless rules (Ibid.). In other words, the purpose of public administration, as Nicholas Henry pointed out, is to promote a superior understanding of government and its relationship with the society it governs, as well as to encourage public policies more responsive to social needs and to institute managerial practices attuned to effectiveness, efficiency, and the deeper human requisites of the citizenry (N. Henry 1999 : 1). Hence, growing disillusionment or falling short of their expectations about the behavior of some public administrators and frustration over the ineffective, inefficient, and ever-more expensive programs these days make a new approach to the teaching of public management indispensable. Watergate and subsequent taxpayer backlash, symbolized by

of it is cooperative human effort toward reaching some goal or goals accepted by those engaged in the endeavor. Administration is, therefore, considered as process or action of the accomplishment of purpose through human organized effort. In short administration is an instrumental activity for the achievement of prescribed ends.

Administrative activity in this sense has occurred in a large variety of settings or institutional frameworks. Some of them are enumerated as business firm, labor union, farmers cooperative, church, educational institution, or governmental unit (F. Heady 1996 : 2).

Public administration is that section of administration found in a political setting (Ibid.). In this context politics is about the making of decisions of a certain kind, those that are considered binding by most members of society most of the time. Through them nations set their goals, design their institutions, and seek to cope with their present and future (D. Easton 1990 : Part 1 3). Politics is the means through which who gets what, when, and how is determined, and it is fundamental to the operation of government (S. J. Wayne et al., 1995 : 4-5).

Concerned chiefly with the implementing of public policy decisions made by the authoritative decision-makers in the political system, public administration can be roughly marked off as different from private, or nonpublic, administration. The range of governmental activity may be varied a lot from one political jurisdiction to another. Accordingly the dividing line between public administration and nonpublic one gives itself an ambiguous shape (F. Heady 1996 : 2).

As here-in-above mentioned, public administration comprises activities essential to mobilize organizations and human resources (public and private), translate publicly and authoritatively defined policy statements into programs and projects, permit Middle-and-Lower level managers to translate ideas into actions that ultimately enhance the

In the eighteenth century the *Kameralwissenschaft*, concerned with the systematic management of governmental affairs, became a speciality of German scholars in Western Europe. In the United States the establishment of a field of systematic study of public administration is much more recent. Woodrow Wilson set the tone for the early study of public administration in an essay of "The Study of Administration, 1887." This essay is considered as the starting point of the study of public administration in the United States. (F. Heady 1996 ; 1. N. Henry 1999 : 27).

Since that time on, public administration has become a well-recognized area of specialized interest, either as a subfield of political science or as an academic discipline in its own right (F. Heady 1996 : 1).

Despite several decades of development, public administration is a broad-ranging and amorphous amalgam of theory and practice. Consensus about the scope of public administration is still missing, and the field has been described as making a feature of heterodoxy rather than orthodoxy. But in recent years, the sphere of public administration has been gradually being delineated clearly partly as a result of elaborations in its own core concept and partly as a result of intellectual grafts from other disciplines. Thus public administration has undergone a continuous process of expansion and enrichment (F. Heady 1996 : 1. G. Garvey 1997 : 27).

As F. Heady explained (1996 : 2), public administration in the civic culture, or, modern public administration, (here-in-after abbreviated solely public administration), is probably an aspect of a more general concept of administration. Its essentiality is determined action taken in pursuit of conscious purpose. It is also contained in all human planned efforts. In general the term "administration" adds the element of cooperation among two or more individuals to distinguish human planned effort per se from process or activity of administration. So that, the definition

In Great Britain administrative organizations “maintain their effectiveness by relying on the old patterns of deference that binds inferiors and superiors within the limits of the necessary cohesion”. In the United States organizations “must use many more impersonal rules in order to achieve the same results”.

The differences are also projected upon the choices the two countries have made in arranging for staffing and operating the bureaucracy. As Wallace S. Sayre argued (W. S. Sayre 1964 : 223. F. Heady 1996 : 239), the British responses have produced “a more orderly and symmetrical, a more prudent, a more articulate, a more cohesive and more powerful bureaucracy”. The American choices have produced “a more internally competitive, a more experimental, a noisier and less coherent, a less powerful bureaucracy within its own governmental system, but a more dynamic one”.

With this background the specifics of modern public administration would be now examined.

What is public administration in the civic culture ? According to Ferrel Heady, one of the most famous modern public administration scholars in the United States, it is an aspect of governmental activity (Ibid : 1). This phenomenon has had actual being as long as political systems have been working and trying to achieve program objectives set by the authoritative decision-makers. The relationship between ruler and people as well as observations of advisers to rulers and commentators on the functionings of government has received more attention from time to time as illustrated with examples of Kautilya’s *Artha-sāstra* in ancient India, *the Bible*, Aristotle’s *Politics*, the medieval *Fürstenspiegel* and Machiavelli’s *The Prince*. Therefore, the phenomenon of public administration is of all times (J.C.N. Raadschelders 1998 : Part one I. F. Heady 1996 : 1).

Europe, the United States and Great Britain have civic culture systems. Contrasted strikingly with continental European countries such as France and Germany, the history of political development in both countries is one of relative stability. Circumstances permitted them for the most part to take “incrementalism” to deal with the public problems of political change, and to develop their political institutions without violent breaks and sudden changes of direction (Ibid : 237). “Incrementalism” views public policy as a continuation of past government activities with only incremental modifications. “Incrementalism” emphasizes decision making through a series of limited successive comparisons with a relatively narrow range of alternatives rather than a comprehensive range ; it uses the status quo, not abstract goals, as the key point of reference for decisions. “Incrementalism” focuses primarily on short-term rather than long-term effects, on the most crucial consequences of an action rather than on all conceivable results, and on less formalized methods of measuring costs and benefits (Gordon and Milakovich 1995 : 177. T. R. Dye 1999 : 27-29). The United States and Great Britain have been able to establish stable democratic political systems and to maintain them over considerable periods of time (F. Heady 1996 : 237).

The gradualism of political development in both led to formal political characteristics in marked contrast to each other, with Great Britain retaining a figure-head monarchy linked with a unitary and parliamentary system, and the United States opting for a federal system with an elected president as chief executive (F. Heady 1996 : 237).

The gradualist pattern of political development were also reflected in and consonant with the administrative system or bureaucracy of both countries. Michel Crozier summarized an important difference as follows. (M. Crozier 1964 : 233. F. Heady 1996 : 239).

---

研 究

---

## An Outline of Modern Public Administration

Takashi Takeo

Professor, Kanagawa University

A lecture on modern public administration has been being given ever since the establishment of faculty of law in our university. Modern public administration is, in other words, public administration in the civic culture. Then what does the civic culture mean? It is the political characteristics mostly shared by Great Britain, the United States, and a few other countries formerly British colonies (G. A. Almond and S. Verba 1963 : 8). This political characteristics have been called the civic culture. The civic culture is a political culture that is participant and pluralistic, based on communication and persuasion, a culture of consensus and diversity or disunity in unity, a culture that allowed change but keeping it within proper limits (Ibid.). A political culture, here-in indicated, is a particular distribution of political attitudes, values, feelings, information, belief systems, and skills. People's attitudes affect what they will do, so a nation's political culture affects the conduct of its citizens and leaders throughout the political system (G.A. Almond and G.B. Powell, Jr. 1984 : 37-41). The United States and Great Britain have the civic culture to the greatest degree, with basically similar patterns in each but with somewhat different dimensions, reflecting differences in national histories and social structures, and these differences briefed by labeling the former a deferential and the latter a participant civic culture. (F. Heady 1996 : 237).

Though close relationship to the political systems of continental