

Toward a Public Science : A Paradigm Shift of Public Administration

今里, 滋
九州大学法学部教授

<https://doi.org/10.15017/1980>

出版情報 : 法政研究. 59 (3/4), pp.552-574, 1993-03-26. 九州大学法政学会
バージョン :
権利関係 :

Toward a Public Science: A Paradigm Shift of Public Administration

IMASATO Shigeru

1. Public Administration: A Field in Search of Identity

Much has been said and written in the last few decades on the “identity crisis” of the field of public administration both in Japan and in the United States. Although I realize the large differences of perception, extent, and historical context of the crisis for each country, the basic identity question would be much the same. The crisis can be described, according to Dwight Waldo, as the state of the field or discipline about which people cannot say confidently and with one voice: “This is what public administration *is*, *this* is why you should study it, and *these* are the methods and tools for that purpose.” [Waldo, 1968:6] This “identity problem” has haunted public administration since its early beginnings. It is an eclectic field that lacks a clearly coherent theoretical foundation, thus borrowing theories and analytical approaches from many disciplines. Therefore, we may characterize public administration as a field in search of disciplinary identity.

In this short essay, by primarily focusing upon American Public Administration — hereinafter I use capital letter Public Administration when I refer to public administration as an academic endeavour — I will make the following three points: first I try to challenge the common wisdom in the discipline of public administration, the demise of the politics-administration dichotomy; second, I distinguish three methodological roots of the crisis; and, third, I propose four alternative identities Public Administration might embrace. The reasons I mainly refer to American Public Administration are as follows:

- (1) American Public Administration has continuously struggled with its

identity problem in relation to its mother discipline political science as well as in the fertile and somewhat promiscuous intercourse with other fields of social science.

(2) Japanese Public Administration has been under the strong influence of American Public Administration theory at least theoretical dimension since the end of World War II.

(3) American Public Administration provides a number of suggestions because of its close relationships with public administration education, when we consider the practical or social significance of Public Administration.

2. "Fiction" and "Reality" of the Politics-Administration Dichotomy

There are several widely held views on the historical evolution and lineage of American Public Administration not only in the United States but also in Japan. The three of them are as follows:

(1) Woodrow Wilson was the founder of American Public Administration; therefore his public administration theory heavily influenced subsequent scholars. [See, Brownlow, 1956: 81]

(2) Wilson, in his famous "The Study of Administration," separated "politics" from "administration" and advocated a politics-administration dichotomy saying that administration occurs outside the proper sphere of politics. This dichotomy prompted the development of the so-called "Technical Theory of Public Administration." [See Tsuji, 1966: 37-39]

(3) The orthodox theory of public administration, one of whose tenets is the politics-administration dichotomy, was broken down by the fatal criticism maintaining politics-administration "commonalities." As the result, the contemporary American Public Administration is a sort of

melting pot in which a number of theories and approaches are competing to make their own case.

Against these popular views, however, new and provocative opinions have been proposed. First, against the first view holding "Wilson the originator," Van Riper, who is an eminent scholar of public personnel administration, lodges an objection in his newest book. [Van Riper, 1983 and 1984] Summarized in a nutshell, he argues that Wilson is not the first figure who insisted on the necessity and possibility of a science of public administration. Earlier than Wilson, Dorman B. Eaton, one of the draftsmen of the Pendleton Act and the second chairman of the Civil Service Commission created by the act, had advocated the idea of a science of public administration. Moreover Richard T. Ely, who lectured on public administration at Johns Hopkins University in 1880s, encouraged Wilson to build up his own administrative thought when the young future-president attended the lectures from 1884 to 1885 delivered by the professor just returned from three years' study in Germany. Thus Wilson is just one of the originators of American Public Administration. If we must name the true originator of the American theory and practice of public administration, Van Riper points out, it is none other than Alexander Hamilton.

What supports Van Riper's argument is the fact that the one of the supposedly vital classics and historical cornerstone of American Public Administration, Wilson's "The Study of Administration," is seldom quoted even in the footnotes or indexes when Van Riper looked up the works written by major political and administrative scientists from 1890 to 1925. So why does Wilson still remain on record as the father of American Public Administration? It is, Van Riper explains, not only because Wilson is the only president of the United States known as a public administrationist, but also because the ambiguity of Wilson's argument in "The Study of Administration" exposed it to arbitrary interpretations and consequently made it all the more easy to quote his name. "*Post hoc ergo propter hoc!*" [Van Riper, 1984: 213]

Admittedly Van Riper's argument above is quite persuasive, but what is important to us here is not to trace the true originator of American

Public Administration. What we have to confirm here is the following fact: that an intellectual and disciplinary activity called American Public Administration was borne into the American world with some self-consciousness and identity not so much by a piece of paper written by a scholar named Woodrow Wilson as by a theoretical and practical process started by Founding Fathers such as Hamilton and Madison and continued by Reformists such as Eaton and George W. Curtis.

Now let us challenge the second view that Wilson came up with the politics-administration dichotomy. Certainly as far as Wilson stated in "The Study of Administration" that "administration lies outside the proper sphere of *politics*. Administrative questions are not political questions." [Wilson, 1887: 212], he did come up with the dichotomy. Recently, however, both in the United States and in Japan, fewer scholars think that Wilson established an articulate and logically inherent politics-administration dichotomy. Why? One of the reasons would be that his distinction of "politics" and "administration" is ambiguous and even contradictory. For example Wilson makes a sharp distinction between "politics" and "administration" in one part of "The Study of Administration," while he affirms a political function of administration in another part. His "essay thus vacillates between the two poles of thought regarding the separability and inseparability of administration from politics" [Stillman, Jr., 1973: 586] confusing readers. In fact Wilson wrote in his lecture note of February 1888 as follows.

It is customary to speak of Administration as if it were merely the business side of government, - as if the organs of a government were to be tested by the same standards of propriety and efficiency by which we test the organs of a great commercial corporation. But it seems to me that, notwithstanding the very large and important element of truth which this view embodies, little but confusion of thought can result from its adoption as a guiding view. The state is *not a body of* (sic) *corporate*, - *it is a body politic*: and rules of good business are not always rules of good politics. Between money-making and political liberty there are radical differences. [Link, 1968: 689-690 (Italics original)]

Cursory reading of this sentence and the sentence that "[T]he field of administration is a field of business" [Wilson, 1887:212] in "The Study of Administration" would barely lead to the logical conclusion that both were written by the same author. Furthermore, we have to pay attention to the fact that Wilson wrote in his lecture note for Johns Hopkins University in 1891 that "[Administration] *is the continuous and systematic carrying out in practice of all the tasks which devolve upon the State,*" [Link, 1969: 115 (Italics original)]; "[Administration] has been left to deal with everything else not legislative," [Link, 1969: 121]; "*the scope of Administration is, in every case, all the necessary and characteristic functions of the State,*" [Link, 1969: 128-9 (Italics original)]; and "[T]he administrative organs of the Community thus become *organically whole*, vigorous, and full of purpose" [Ibid.: 129 (Italics original)]. From these excerpts we could easily deduce that Wilson recognized and even approved the autonomy and independence of administration as one of the organs of the state. If we think of Wilson's own experience in Germany as having been strongly influenced by State Organicism, his conception of administration shown above would categorize Wilson as a student of the German national law (Staatsrechtslehrer). Consequently we could say that Wilson's dichotomy did not constitute a methodological base of the orthodox Public Administration, but it did constitute "a cartel" issued to the big "evil" of his time, that is, the party politics exemplified by a system of patronage, spoils, or corrupt "congressional government." As a matter of fact, young Wilson was harshly attacking the standing-committee-centered congressional politics in which special interests were rife, public offices were sucked up, and political accountability was far from secured. For him the politics-administration dichotomy was nothing but a "lethal weapon" in the attack. In this sense, Wilson's dichotomy was less a political theory than an ideology representing the slogans of the reformist "mugwumps."

To put it in greater detail, "politics" to Wilson seems to have effectively two meanings in effect. On one hand, "politics" means partisanship leading to a system of spoils and patronage. "Administration" paralleling with "politics" in this sense would be a politically neutral and professionally competent civil service of which selection is free from

influence of the political parties. In this context, therefore, the distinction of “politics” and “administration” is practical and institutional. On the other hand, “politics” means public policy making. In this the distinction of “politics” and “administration” is equivalent to the conceptual distinction of decision and execution. In Wilson’s famous essay these two kinds of “politics” appear in turn, depending on the context they are used and increasing our confusion. The dichotomy, however, could become the methodological core of the orthodoxy by putting the institutional distinction upon the conceptual one. For, as Goodnow does in his *Politics and Administration* [Goodnow, 1900: 9-18], if one confined “politics” to its proper sphere where values were converted and goals were established, we could expect that the study of administration would become a science of means and the practice of administration would become a profession which devoted itself to accomplishing any given goals. It may be needless to say that this orientation was nicely compatible with the American society in the first few decades of twentieth century when scientism, pragmatism, and professionalism had been dominant.

Finally let us examine the third view: the orthodox theory of public administration based on the politics-administration dichotomy ceased to exist after the thorough attacks from all directions. Then have the orthodoxy and the dichotomy been dead for many years? Has the politics-administration dichotomy been really and totally replaced by the commonality of politics-administration? “No,” the author answers. Because the dichotomy still remains alive in the following two forms or dimensions. The first is the theoretical or methodological one, and the second is the ideological one. It is certain that in the theoretical sense the orthodoxy was so badly damaged that it has not risen again, and it lost the glory of its heyday. But the administrative science, maintaining that administration is administration, did not share this fate. Far from that the administrative science came to prosper as an interdisciplinary field of study by successfully changing itself from traditional to modern administrative science after World War II while the field of study of public administration came to lose its academic liveliness partly because of a lack of a theoretical core. And its influence on Public Administration obviously became greater as Henderson

called American Public Administration after 1958 Organizational Emphasis [See Henderson, 1966: 43-44] and Simon's works typically shows [For example, see Simon, 1956 and 1960]. Even in the field of public administration education a number of schools of management or schools of administration started new programs in public administration. Administrative science is an administrative technology as well and rendering such practical approaches or techniques to the field of public administration as operations research and organizational development. Moreover we could say that implementation analysis, which is in vogue nowadays, and in a sense public policy analysis itself, are implicitly premised on the distinction between policy and its administration. Public administration approaches such as administrative science and implementation analysis may not be the mainstream, but they doubtlessly are quite significant. We may thus conclude that the politics-administration dichotomy still survives with tenacity.

Then how about the ideological dimension? In fact it is in this dimension that the dichotomy retains much stronger influences. Public personnel administration in particular has been affected by it. In the late nineteenth century independence of administration from politics meant primarily political neutrality. And in the early twentieth century to this significance was added the new idea of neutrality that politics as policy should be formulated by such representatives of the people as Congressmen and the President and it should be implemented by the efficient and neutral administrators. But of the later added two significances the former gradually lost its importance as the merit system expanded, and the latter also receded in the face of the formidable fact that the administrators were also policy-makers.

One of the underlying American view of administration, however, has been that a democratic government cannot be compatible with career civil service unless a realistic distinction between politics and administration is possible. Thus, as the second Hoover Commission proposed, the new type of dichotomy emerged which argued that a clear distinction should be set up between political appointees and career bureaucrats and the latter as experts should faithfully implement policies legitimately decided by the former. In the federal context, the focus of the dichotomy in practice is how

to secure responsiveness of the career bureaucrats to the President and political appointees. From the Eisenhower Administration, plans for a Senior Civil Service, including “rank-in-the-person,” were devised again and again, and a Senior Civil Service finally was enacted and instituted by the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978. This seemingly revolutionary reform is predicated upon the traditional politics-administration dichotomy: the reform was carried out under the notion that administration had principles and functions all its own which enabled career bureaucrats to move from one managerial position to another regardless of the change of administration. James Sundquist explains the persistence of the dichotomy in the ideological dimension.

“At least some of the blame for the current low state of the federal civil service may well be laid to the school of theorists who have taught for a generation that the traditional policy/administration dichotomy is obsolete, that no line can be drawn between those functions. That theory no doubt had its uses for professional public administrators; it removed their inhibitions to assume policy as well as administrative leadership, but the theory works both ways. If every managerial job has policy content, then it becomes an easy step to reason that, *ipso facto*, it must be filled by a political loyalist. That has been the prevailing reasoning in Washington. Far more than any old-fashioned hunger for patronage, it has been this line of argument that has supported the steady and continuing politicization of jobs once considered appropriate for career civil servants, with all the destructive consequences for governmental efficiency, responsiveness, and morale. And during all the time that the foundation of professional public administration in the federal civil service has been eroded, the profession itself - immobilized by its own loss of faith in the traditional notion that a neutrally competent civil service can indeed serve diverse policy leaders - hardly resisted the trend.” [Sundquist, 1979:11. Also see *idem*, 1980:183-208]

This persistence of the dichotomy seems to reflect antagonistic

relationship of democracy and bureaucracy in the actual governmental process, and more realistically, that of political appointees and career bureaucrats as Eugene Lewis says "[F]rom an analytical perspective, the problem is that we fail to have a theory of the state that encompasses representative democracy and a highly professionalized bureaucracy." [Lewis, 1977:161] Finally we have to pay attention to the fact that the dichotomy could potentially provide a cover for the career bureaucrats who may exercise extensive discretionary powers in public policy making.

3. Three Causes of the Crisis

A. Persistence of the Politics-Administration Dichotomy

The dichotomy has been crucial in attempts to speculate on an disciplinary identity for Public Administration. The crisis of identity for American Public Administration started immediately after Woodrow Wilson [1887] and Frank J. Goodnow [1900], the alleged originators of the discipline, conceptually distinguished "politics" and "administration." Wilson especially is responsible for the crisis. His famous essay, "The Study of Administration," was one of the first articles which presented the politics-administration dichotomy, and is seen as the doctrinal origin of American Public Administration. But its distinction of politics and administration is ambiguous, even contradictory, and often leaves its readers confused. Wilson's "The Study of Administration" was an effort to find "an appropriate ideology to justify mugwumps' efforts to strengthen the executive branch, centralize authority, and check congressional irresponsibility" [Stillman II, 1973: 587]. Therefore, we may characterize this article as a *political* "Study," which, in his own words, "philosophically viewed, is closely connected with the study of the proper distribution of constitutional authority." [Wilson, 1887: 213] We must understand that "Wilson's overriding concern in the essay is not the scientific advancement of administrative study but the political advancement of the American polity, and he utilizes the analytical distinction to this end" [Kirwan, 1977: 333-334]. The understanding is critically important to identify the historical origin of the crisis. Why is this so important? There seem to be two major

reasons: One is that the orthodoxy — the discipline of public administration established before World War II — created the dichotomy of “politics” and “administration” to further its own political interests. The other is that, due to the dichotomy, American Public Administration embraced two opposing values, i.e., democratic value and bureaucratic value, and has since then been haunted by their opposition, even after the dichotomy was theoretically terminated. Let me elaborate on this point.

Wilson’s definition that “[P]ublic administration is detailed and systematic execution of public law” [Wilson, 1887:212] seems still effective as a normative definition of administration as an institutional entity. We could easily find out the very American administrative thought that deems political bureaucracy a vital threat against the ideal of liberty and equality in this sort of definition limiting administration to politically neutral law-enforcement organs. This viewpoint claims that “[I]f no real distinction is possible between politics and administration, then a permanent civil-service system is not compatible with a democratic polity.” [Millett, 1956:173] And it persists even now. This opposition of the views on administration is a doctrinal one lying at the core of the dilemma which has been annoying the American politico-administrative theories since the Founding Fathers for what the best way to arrange a political and administrative system should be in an American setting.

Roughly speaking, there are two opposite views. One puts emphasis on representativeness, political responsiveness, and responsibilities of elected officials for their constituency, fears the abuse of uncontrolled authority, and sets a primary value for securing public interest by making plural authorities compete with one another and for protection of the public’s freedom and rights through checking powers. For this view administration is one of the political actors, one of the major public policy makers, and a “leviathan” to be bound up. V. Ostrom’s “paradigm of democratic administration,” [Ostrom, 1987] the public choice school, Representative Bureaucracy, and the incrementalists support this view.

The other view attaches importance to effectiveness, economy, and efficiency of governmental activities. It assumes that since power tends to become irresponsible if divided it should be transferred to experts and

bureaucrats and be centralized to a chief executive elected by the public. This view tries to exclude irrational "politics" from the policymaking process for the reason that the public interest can be more revealed through an objective and scientific analysis by the experts.

I quite agree with Douglas Yates who contends "the particular American understanding of democracy and administrative efficiency causes the two objectives to come sharply into conflict, and this conflict creates deep-seated disagreements about the design of institutions." [1982:9]

B. A Schism in the Concept of Public Administration

The identity crisis of American Public Administration is closely related to a definition of public administration. As stated before American Public Administration gained its disciplinary identity and therefore its independent position against its mother-discipline, political science, in an effort to identify an analytical or functional distinction of politics and administration with their institutional distinction. Later, it allegedly lost its theoretical base of disciplinary identity through a rejection of the identification. However, even if the identification had been rejected, these conceptual distinctions — without clarifying their mutual relationship — remain still effective. In other words, there coexists in Public Administration two different basic approaches: the institutional approach which focuses on the executive branch as a part of the governmental system of process, and the functional approach which sets its research target on functional activities called administration. Compare the following two excerpts.

"IT IS EXCEEDINGLY DIFFICULT clearly to identify the factors which make government different from every other activity in society. Yet this difference is a fact and I believe it to be so big a difference that the dissimilarity between government and all other forms of social action is greater than any dissimilarity among those other forms themselves." [Appleby, 1945:1]

"-----large scale public and private organizations have many more similarities than they have differences ----- In actual administration

there is often a greater difference between small and large organizations than there is between public and private ones." [Simon et al., 1950:8]

We could find a number of similar contrastive definitions in the recurrent controversies over the public-private distinction. It will be clear that this schism in the study of public administration can tear its disciplinary identity apart. In any field of study a number of disjointed but only conveniently united approaches keep on dominating until certain fundamental concepts integrating subjects of the field are established. Simon's famous remarks catch the point well; that is "[P]ublic administration remains a highly schizophrenic field, with relatively little in common between the study of the relation of administration with politics and the study of internal management. The former unites public administration with political science; the latter joins it with administration - both private and institutional - and organization theory." [Simon, 1967:108]

Let's take a closer look at this problem. Where we could seek out the more fundamental factors is the equation of what we Japanese call *gyosei* in Japanese with *public administration* in English. Two questions arise. The first: is this equation in effect peculiar to the United States? One historian of American public administration found behind the equation "[T]he history of Anglo-American concern with the administration of popular government [which] contains many efforts to apply scientific method to the execution of popular will, as well as to the determination of it." [Karl, 1976:491] That is to say, in the United States, public administration has the warp and the woof called "*Novus Ordo Seclorum*" which is a governmental system based on the people's sovereignty and the separation of powers, and has been characterized as a way or a function to realize the people's will arising from the order in the radically changing circumstances of American life. [Caldwell, 1976]

The second: the equivocality and the limitation of a concept of "administration" which haunts either approach. Dunsire, who classifies the fifteen meanings of the word "administration," compares "administration" to "weed" saying, "Like 'weed,' 'administration' is a term which gets its

content from its context; very often, it gains its precise meaning from contrast and exclusion more than from positive identification - it is being said to be not something else." [Dunsire, 1973:225] The narrowness stems from the intrinsic incapability of "administration" of containing conceptually functions inherent in public administration as a vital element of the government and essentially different from business administration. Some insists on using the word "public *admagistration*" instead of public administration by dint of the conceptual narrowness. [Mars, 1970:432-433]

C. Increasing Multi-Disciplinarity of Public Administration

Boundlessly increasing the multi-disciplinarity of Public Administration contributes most to deepening the severity of its disciplinary identity crisis. Almost forty years ago Professor Dwight Waldo, a longtime observer of American Public Administration, warned of the danger of increasing the multi-disciplinarity without "a solid center" being concerned that "public administration had grown so broad, and so involved at the periphery with a multitude of other activities and disciplines, that it was in danger of disappearing completely as a recognizable focus of study." [Waldo, 1956:136] Waldo was afraid of the field's eclecticism and parasitism because it uses approaches, concepts, methods, and terminologies made in other disciplines. Also, it opportunistically takes up new research topics that do not lead to a common disciplinary identity. I strongly agree with Ridley in his critical analysis:

"Unfortunately, the adherents of different schools of Public Administration often start with different definitions of their subject matter, different definitions of what, within the system, they consider their special concern. Much of the argument about how the science of Public Administration should develop depends on such definitions ----- In the last resort every scholar can appeal to Humpty Dumpty and make his words mean exactly what he wants to mean." [Ridley, 1975:170-171]

If increasing multi-disciplinarity is destroying the identity of Public

Administration, its status quo seems invincible. For, especially in the United States, more and more scholars deny the disciplinary uniqueness of Public Administration, or even welcome the lack of it on the strength of the unsystematic and inconsistent characteristics of the field in which various disciplines mingle. Frederickson represents the opinion:

“Another way of making the same point is to assert that public administration is *not* a social science or a discipline but is an application of social science (and other science) to public problems. It is a subject matter, a profession, and a field. Public administration bridges the disciplines and, therefore, takes relevant parts of the disciplines and applies them to public problems. This is not to say that public administration is not academically or scientifically creative. In fact, it is the bridging and applying function which gives public administration its most exciting intellectual thrusts. The potential for a subject such as public administration to make a scientific breakthrough is at least as great as the potential of the disciplines.” [Frederickson, 1976:152]

Therefore, if we assume that a self-standing discipline “has its own area of human experience to analyze, its own body of descriptive and factual data to gather, its own conceptual schemes to formulate and test for truth,” [The Committee of Standards, 1962:417] we cannot help but disqualify Public Administration. A public administrationist is likely to be a jack of all trades and a master of none who takes up everything seemingly available to recognize and analyze public administrative phenomena. But is only a public administrationist an omnivorous sponger? Let us turn our eyes upon its neighboring discipline, political science. There we find a circumstance in which political science “is like Poland, open to invasion from every side.” [Waldo, 1975:75] That is to say, it is asserted also in American political science that “[N]o single ‘paradigm,’ however strictly or loosely that much used and abused term is interpreted, can (or should try to) contain or embody [political science]. Political science is multifaceted, and it needs perspectives and theories appropriate to purpose and circumstance.” [Waldo, 1975:123] It may be too arrogant to say that other social sciences

have also been in the similar situation, but, as far as political science and Public Administration concerned, the trends towards “interdisciplinarity,” “multi-paradigms” or “plural theories” seem overwhelming. Accordingly, if Public Administration should have and develop some kind of disciplinary identity, the point will be: what kind of frame of reference can best bring relevant order out of this chaotic state of the discipline?

4. Disciplinary Identity of Public Administration: Four Alternatives

The consideration of three causes of the identity crisis of Public Administration leads us to the conclusion that the crisis has not been sufficiently resolved yet. We may even claim that Public Administration has *developed* so extensively — particularly in the United States — that it cannot recover its disciplinary identity by searching for and sharing a single paradigm, a future direction, or an image for Public Administration. Then what kind of identity can Public Administration afford for itself? I would like to offer four alternatives we, public administrationists, could select for a viable development of the field.

A. Dissolving Public Administration

The first alternative is, so to speak, for political science to make an adopted child of Public Administration. This option denies an disciplinary identity of Public Administration in its own right. Social *raison d'être* of a scholar majoring in Public Administration do not exist any more. This alternative results from the definition that since both politics and administration as an institution share a political function—policy making and reconciliation of interests—and an administrative function—policy management and implementation—their difference is only derived from the extent of commitment to each function, as well as from the notion that administration is a subsystem of politics and a faithful implementation of public policy.

From the latter definition the center of a study of public administration tends to examine the legitimacy of governmental activities. This is a proper area for administrative law, so Public Administration looks like a minor and

ancillary discipline hanging around such themes as budget, personnel, or organizations which students of constitutional law and administrative law seldom get near. Most of the scholars specializing in public law in Japan more or less enjoy this view of Public Administration and public administrationists.

On the other hand, for the former definition, Public Administration is a subfield of political science which, without its own conceptual target, devotes itself to studying bureaucratic behavior in the executive branch of government. If the name of "Public Administration" were to exist only in this fashion, it would be no more than a general term describing the aggregate activities of those who study what they suppose to be public administration from their own already theoretically and/or institutionally established discipline such as political science, economics, or law. If there were some identity for Public Administration, its content would be either the shared feelings that all of us are studying "public administration" recognizable by common sense, or a sense of solidarity brought by the shared perception that studying public administration is academically and practically significant and relevant no matter what the reasons are.

In this alternative Public Administration should be one of the subjects in the department of political science and could be reasonably placed in among the sections of a political science association for its academic society. Thus, if you take this alternative, please be kind enough to write an obituary for Public Administration as an independent discipline.

B. Maintaining Politics-Administration Dichotomy

The second alternative is to maintain politics-administration dichotomy. This direction assumes that "administration is administration" disregarding the institutional contexts from which administrative phenomena arise. It will enable Public Administration to bring the theories and techniques to improve internal managerial processes of public bureaucracies under the "patronage" of administrative science and technologies.

This alternative can provide Public Administration with at least three advantages. The first one is that it will enable the study of public administration to have a clear focus: administration which is "a type of

cooperative human effort that has a high degree of rationality.” [Waldo, 1955:5] It is widely asserted that the application of scientific methods to the subject of administration to identify regularities in the phenomena under consideration is possible and required. [Thompson, 1956] The assertion become all the more persuasive when we think of Herbert A. Simon who has been long since active in the study of artificial intelligence. [Newell and Simon, 1972; Simon, 1977; Simon, 1979]

The second is that it can set up a viewpoint from which one can recognize and explicate the structure and mechanism of behavior of large scale organizations. Large scale organization is one of the most remarkable characteristics of modern society. About a quarter century ago Caldwell claimed that “[M]ost importantly, it is in the larger aspects of organized human behavior in which complex organizations and multiorganizations interact to constitute national and international affairs that operationally valid theories of public administration are needed to enable men to foresee and, if possible, to control, the consequences of their collective action.” [Caldwell, 1968:208] And a number of studies have explored issues on management and organization in the social context from much the same standpoint as Caldwell’s.

And the third advantage is that it excels in applied theories and technologies. Administrative science is not only theoretical research fields but also is connected to extensive practical research fields which may be called administrative technologies. In those fields such useful theories, techniques, and knowhow have been accumulated to improve internal management of organizations, both public and private.

But we must be careful enough to see that some restrictions are imposed on these advantages by dint of the methodological problems of the second alternative. One of the problems is — and this is probably the most conspicuous one — that the “technical approach” cannot deal with value and ethical issues in public administration. Accordingly it is almost impossible to elucidate the normative meanings of “public.” Also, what is meant by “public”? If, as Caldwell says, “*all* large-scale administration, however organized, had come to be perceived as ‘public,’ thus rendering the term ‘public’ redundant” [Caldwell, 1968:205], then the concept of “public”

would be disconnected from that of law or governance. In turn the NTT company with more than 290 thousand employees might be far more “public” than a local government with a population of five thousand. Consequently this alternative tends always to be haunted by the question of what distinguishes public administration from business administration, and therefore to be exposed to such criticism as “[P]ublic administration must stand on firm foundations as a peculiarly significant branch of political theory because of the nexus which public administration provides for study of the classic problems of man and his claims regarding government, and the nature of the state” [Durham, 1968:225]. Moreover, disciplinary identity of Public Administration as the study of *public* administration will be swallowed up by an “ocean” of general administration, and institutionally, as a number of actual examples show, will be reduced to one of the subjects taught in any business school.

C. Turning to Public Science

In the third alternative, Public Administration will developed into the upper discipline called “governmental science” or “public science.” It is useless here to employ the word “public administration” except for as a term implying certain governmental organizations. This super-discipline will be so gigantic as to contain highly various subdisciplines and even to be called rather cynically “modern cameralism.” It will include, for example, public law, social law, political science mainly focusing on the governmental system, and other established social sciences such as economics, public finance, business administration, policy sciences, administrative science. Furthermore under its banner come together such individual policy fields with enormous history and experience as tax administration, agricultural administration, road and traffic administration, etc. But we should recognize that this enormous set of subdisciplines and policy areas shall not crowd around the new upper discipline. Instead they will be synthesized by a unifying concept such as “government” or “publicness” and integrated by the orientation toward solution of the public affairs occurring beyond the walls among governmental branches.

This potentially productive direction, however, will confront the

extremely difficult task to creating a unifying concept and terminology which can embrace both "politics" and "administration." Even if that goal can be accomplished, institutional realization of this alternative would not be probable, at least in Japan, for quite some time because of the situation of social sciences and universities there.

D. Transforming Public Administration

The fourth alternative is to seek an identity for Public Administration in a different dimension from the usual disciplinary identity; that is to give up a unifying theoretical paradigm as a core of the identity and then to try to find its foundation in the social *raison d'être* or practical purposes of public administration. The representative effort we immediately remember in this direction is Waldo's "professional approach." [Waldo, 1968:6-7] It "did not mean a search for 'a new paradigm of Public Administration' but, on the contrary, was proposed on the abandonment of it." [Imamura, 1983:114] Moreover, at the base of this approach, there is a practical purpose as Waldo himself says "Public Administration has as its purpose preparation for careers in public administration." [Waldo, 1976:223]

Originally American Public Administration was created by the Reformists passion for "better government" as Ridley pertinently points out that "the study of Public Administration grew in America out of a concern for reform." [Ridley, 1975:231] Nurturing politically neutral and competent civil servants had been one of the crucial objectives of the reform movement. The heritage of this movement is the more than two hundred public administration schools scattered all over the United States.

If we postulate two kind of "spirit" in scholarship, "the study for study" and "the study for social practice," we could say that American Public Administration, above all its "orthodoxy," has always involved the struggle between these two spirits. For example, New Public Administration, which entered with the rallying call "recovering social relevance" during the late 1960s and early 1970s, might be seen as a movement trying to prevent American Public Administration from losing its traditional reformist spirit. In this sense Waldo's professional approach may be an effort to rebuild the identity of Public Administration by returning to the

spirit of the orthodoxy he used to criticize vigorously, and to legitimize the status quo of Public Administration institutionalizing itself in the form of professional education.

This fourth alternative, which may be called the “spirit approach” or the “purpose approach,” when combined with the third one, should make at least two great impacts on Japanese Public Administration. The first might be the introduction of a medicine or engineering type discipline or science, of which the *raisons d’être* is a social need. This approach would use many theories for social purposes, and might require an independent institution. Though such an institution may not necessarily be located in a university, if it is it will not be one of the subjects of the Faculty of Law but a department or school of, for instance, public science which is highly autonomous and independent. It is evident that the new institution will give a destructive shock to the sectionalistic academicism-oriented faculty and graduate school configuration in Japan.

The second is: disappearance of the scholars known as public administrationists, and the birth of a new breed of scholars ready to dare and accept the struggle between the two spirits. They are researchers, educators, and practitioners at the same time. They may be experts in environmental problems, or generalists conversant with the inside bureaucracy, or excellent urban planners. But these “new public administrationists” having various expertise, knowledge, and interests will unite themselves around such purposes as the education of professional administrators, the development of more effective urban renewal programs, and holistically collaborate on the achievement of their purposes.

[References]

- APPLEBY, Paul H. (1945). *Big Democracy*. Knopf, New York.
- BROWNLOW, Louis (1956). Woodrow Wilson and *Public Administration*, *Public Administration Review* 16 (1956):77-81.
- CALDWELL, Lynton K. (1968). Methodology in the Theory of Public Administration, *Theory and Practice of Public Administration* (James C. Charlesworth, ed.). The American Academy of Political and Social Science.

- (1976). Novus Ordo Seclorum: The Heritage of American Public Administration, *Public Administration Review*, 36 (September/October):476-488.
- COMMITTEE on Standards of Instruction of the American Political Science Association, The (1962). Political Science as a Discipline, *American Political Science Review* 56 (June):417-421.
- DUNSIRE, Andrew (1973). *Administration: The Word and the Science*. Martin Robertson, London.
- DURHAM, G. Homer (1968). Comment on Caldwell's Paper, *Theory and Practice of Public Administration* (James C. Charlesworth, ed.). The American Academy of Political and Social Science:223-227.
- FREDRICKSON, H. George (1976). The Lineage of New Public Administration, *Administration & Society*, 18 (August):149-175.
- GOODNOW, Frank J. (1900) *Politics and Administration: A Study in Government*. Macmillan, New York.
- HENDERSON, Keith M. (1966) *Emerging Synthesis in American Public Administration*. Asia Publishing House.
- IMAMURA, Tsunao (1983). America-gyouseigaku no uketomekata, *Gyouseigaku no genjyo to kadai*. Gyousei, Tokyo:99-118.
- KARL, Barry D. (1976). Public Administration and American History: A Century of Professionalism, *Public Administration Review*, 36 (September /October):489-503.
- KIRWAN, Kent Aiken (1977). The Crisis of Identity in the Study of Public Administration: Woodrow Wilson, *Polity*, 9:321-343.
- LEWIS, Eugene (1977). *American Politics in a Bureaucratic Age: Citizens, Constituents, Clients, and Victims*. Winthrop.
- LINK, Arthur S. (1968). *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Vol.5. Princeton University Press.
- (1969). *The Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, Vol.7. Princeton University Press.
- MARS, David (1970). The Need for Public Admagistration, *Public Administration Review* 35 (July/ August):432-433.
- MILLETT, James D. (1956). A Critical Appraisal of the Study of Public Administration, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 1 (September):

171-188.

- NEWELL, Allen and Simon, Herbert A. (1972). *Human Problem Solving*. Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.
- OSTROM, Vincent (1987). *Political Theory of Compound Republic: Designing the American Experiment*, 2nd ed. University of Nebraska Press.
- RIDLEY, F. F. (1975). *The Study of Government: Political Science and Public Administration*. George Allen & Unwin, London.
- SIMON, Herbert A., Smithburg, Donald W., and Thompson, Victor A. (1950). *Public Administration*. Knopf, New York.
- (1956). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*, 2nd ed. Free Press, New York.
- (1960). *The New Science of Management Decision*. Harper & Row, New York.
- (1967). The Changing Theory and Changing Practice of Public Administration, *Contemporary Political Science: Toward Empirical Theory* (Ithiel de Sola Pool ed.). McGraw-Hill, New York.
- (1977). *Models of Discovery*, D. Riedel, Dordrecht, Holland.
- (1979). *Models of Thought*, Yale University Press, New Jersey.
- SUNDQUIST, James L. (1979). Jimmy Carter as Public Administrator: An Appraisal at Mid-Term, *Public Administration Review*, Vol.39 (Jan./Feb.):3-11.
- (1980). The Crisis of Competence in Our National Government, *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol.95 (Summer):183-208.
- STILLMAN, II, Richard J. (1973). Woodrow Wilson and the Study of Administration: A New Look at an Old Essay, *American Political Science Review*, 67 (June): 582-588.
- THOMPSON, James D. (1956). On Building an Administrative Science, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 1:102-111.
- TSUJI, Kiyooki (1966). *Gyoseigaku Gairon Jyokan*, Tokyo Daigaku Syuppankai.
- VAN RIPER, Paul P. (1983). The American Administrative State: Wilson and the Founders, *Public Administration Review*, 43 (Nov./Dec.): 476-490.

- (1984). The Politics-Administration Dichotomy: Concept or Reality? *Politics and Administration: Woodrow Wilson and American Public Administration* (Jack Rabin and James S. Bowman, eds.). Marcel Dekker:203-214.
- WALDO, Dwight (1955). *The Study of Public Administration*. Random House, New York.
- (1956). *Perspectives on Administration*. University of Alabama Press.
- (1968). Scope on the Theory of Public Administration, *Theory and Practice of Public Administration* (James C. Charlesworth, ed.). The American Academy of Political and Social Science.
- (1975). Political Science: Tradition, Discipline, Profession, Science, Enterprise, *Political Science: Scope and Theory* (Fred I. Greenstein and Nelson Polsby eds.). Addison-Wesley, New York:1-130.
- (1976). Education for Public Administration in the Seventies, *American Public Administration: Past, Present, Future* (Frederick C. Mosher, ed.). The University of Alabama Press:181-232.
- WILSON, Woodrow (1887). The Study of Administration, *Political Science Quarterly*, 2 (June):197-220.
- YATES, Douglas (1982). *Bureaucratic Democracy: The Search for Democracy and Efficiency in American Government*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.