

## "DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION : THROUGH THE SEVENTIES, AND BEYOND"

Ali Ümit Berkman \*

As Public Administration was originally seen in the United States as the tool for the attainment of the "good society" via "man-made harmony"<sup>1</sup>, within the last decade, in the less developed countries, Development Administration has been regarded as the indispensable tool for the attainment of the "developed society" via "administered society". Some of the "normative" assumptions behind these considerations are : that development is desirable; that development can be planned, directed, or controlled in some way by administrative systems; that improvements in the quality and quantity of societal products is desirable; that obstacles to development can be overcome, and that macroproblems handicapping societal progress can be solved".<sup>2</sup> The implications of these normative assumptions are that (1) **We know what development is;** and (2) **We know how to realize/achieve development.** Now let us look into these two points which are usually taken for granted.<sup>3</sup>

**What is "development"?** Is it a certain "stage" or a "final point" to be reached where certain characteristics are to be realized or approximated? Some scholars, from Marx<sup>4</sup> to Rostow<sup>5</sup> to Riggs<sup>6</sup>, have treated the problem of development in "the stages of development" fashion<sup>7</sup> wherein they have argued that a society has to pass through certain identifiable successive stages finally to become a developed society.

Some other scholars have regarded development as a major **societal change**<sup>8</sup> from one state of national being to another more valued state through a complex of mutually related economic, social and political changes.<sup>9</sup>

For some of the scholars who prefer talking about social change rather than societal change, development denotes change in the

---

(\*) Ali Ümit Berkman is an assistant in the Department of Public Administration at the Middle East Technical University, presently undertaking graduate work at Syracuse University.

direction towards "Westernization", towards becoming **modern**. The process of development is seen as a series of changes approximating towards the types of social, economic, and political systems (structures and behavior) that are heavily associated and are to be found in today's so-called "developed western societies".<sup>10</sup>

Still some other students of the field envision development in more general, or rather in more **systems terms**. For example, Biller defines "development as that process by which the adaptation capacity of any unit is increased".<sup>11</sup> Biller sees development as a process-oriented rather than a content-oriented concept. According to him, increased "problem-solving capacity" (learning how to learn) is the distinguishing mark of development.

The views, ideas, approaches presented so far, obviously, do not exhaust or cover all the studies that deal with the question of "What is development?". And, although the various attempts for a definition and/or explanation of this question have produced congruent elements, like the "idea of goal-directed social behavior"<sup>12</sup>, nevertheless the concept of development is still "vague, slippery, often invidious-and baffling".<sup>13</sup> D. Waldo's example illustrates this dilemma:

"The United States is undoubtedly a developing country. Its gross national product, to take a familiar index, is rising sharply. It is also in many ways an underdeveloped country. It has underused and neglected resources both physical and human. Still, if there were to be a category of 'overdeveloped' countries, the United States would be a prime candidate for inclusion".<sup>14</sup>

Unfortunately (may be fortunately, who knows) we again face our initial question : What is development?, Do we really know what development is? According to D. Waldo the meaning of development may be **unanswerable**.<sup>15</sup> I will not present any further studies that investigate the meaning of development. I will be content with whatever insights the preceding presentation have provided. However, I hope that the reader has been furnished with the feeling that we know less than we think we know about development.

So far one of the implications of the normative assumptions behind the goal of becoming a "developed society via administered society" - "we know what development is" - has been presented and analyzed. The other implication is that "we know how to realize development": Whatever the obstacles to development are, be they basically economic, or political, or social, "administration", adminirtra???, ans and structures" in sum **administrative technology** could be emplo-

yed most profitably in solving development-related problems and in achieving progress towards development. The inner-logic of this argument runs as follows : Since we desire development and we know what development is, and since we regard "administration" as a rational thus preferable means-ends calculus-kit, we will through administrative technology (eg., analysis and planning) determine what should be done, how it can be/should be done, to what extent and at what rate things should be administered. The prescription given to the less-developed systems involves the establishment of administration, the utilization of administrative technology, respect and obedience to the dictas of administration (after all they are neutral); and if any complications arise the prescription calls for administrative change and reform. (\*)

If development does not seem to be near it is generally assumed that the resources and attention devoted to administration are below a critical point and/or administration's dictas not properly followed and obeyed by the fallible human beings.

Some of the questions that immediately come to mind are : Do we know what administrative changes are required? Or stated more clearly, do we know what type of, what quantity and quality of, accompanied with what, if any, and under what circumstances administration and administrative changes are needed? Do we know their full implications/consequences intended or unintended? Are we able to tie in the administrative technology to the whole development process? To what extent can we regard administrative technology "neutral", if at all?

In the preceding pages I have tried to bring into attention the point that cautious and critical attitude are needed in considering the validity of the two statements - (1) We know what development is; and (2) We know how to realize development.

#### DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION, COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

With these points in mind let us now look into some of the definitions of development administration. Again, no claim is made that the following definitions are exhaustive; but, I hope they will be representative of the various approaches to the definition of development administration.

---

(\*) Usually "bureaucratic structures" and further "bureaucratization" are recommended.

One of the most frequently referred definition of development administration is provided by E. Weidner.<sup>16</sup> He writes: "Development administration in government refers to the processes of guiding an organization toward the achievement of progressive political, economic, and social objectives that are authoritatively determined in one manner or another".<sup>17</sup> According to Weidner "If there are no development goals, there is no development administration".<sup>18</sup>

P. Meadows regards development administration as "the public management of economic and social change in terms of deliberate public policy", and the development administrator as concerned with "guiding change".<sup>19</sup> M. Fainsod is not far away from Meadows; "Development administration is a carrier of innovating values".<sup>20</sup> According to Fainsod development administration involves new functions aimed at promoting modernization and industrialization, and new structures to perform these functions. M. Esman identifies "nation-building" and "socio-economic progress" as the key concepts in providing insights to development administration.<sup>21</sup> For J. Montgomery development administration is essentially the carrying out of "planned change" in the economy, and to a lesser extent, in the social services of the state.<sup>22</sup>

Fred W. Riggs, who seems to be the most prominent figure in the enterprise, writes: "development administration refers not only to government's efforts to carry out programs designed to reshape its physical, human, and cultural environment, but also to the struggle to reshape its physical, human, and cultural environment" - and **Development of Administration** (or Administrative Development) - "to enlarge a government's capacity to engage in such programs".

Considering the above definitions and conceptualizations can we make a case for development administration as to distinguish it from Public Administration (PA) and from Comparative Public Administration (CPA)?

Writing a decade ago I. Swerdlow cautioned the scholars: "it (development administration) is in danger of becoming merely a slick expression for 'good public administration' ".<sup>24</sup> Does not "good" PA after all concern itself with the carrying out of government policies and programs and for this purpose searches for promising administrative techniques? It may well be so. Nonetheless many scholars like Swerdlow find it useful to have a concept of development administration as distinct from other kinds of public administration.<sup>25</sup> Swerdlow poses three related questions which he hopes will help us in

assessing the rationale for development administration as a distinguishable concept. His questions are : (1) Is public administration in a high income country different from that in a low income country?; (2) If differences exist, are they significant or merely unimportant variations?; (3) If there are significant variations, can they be related to differences in patterns or systems of administration? <sup>26</sup>

B. Schaffer singles out two elements (conditions) that serve to distinguish development administration from PA and CPA : the coincidence of (a) peculiarly urgent demands for change, (b) with severely inadequate resources in societies expressing exceptionally difficult obstacles.<sup>27</sup> Along similar lines Swerdlow's elements are : the degree of difficulty encountered in executing public administration functions, and the amount of 'pioneering' required in these functions.<sup>28</sup>

With respect to the similarities or differences between development administration and CPA, one group of scholars regards CPA as the scientific or pure dimension and development administration as the operational or applied side of the field. <sup>29</sup> K. Henderson on the other hand seems to view CPA as the broadening of the field of PA, and development administration as mainly engaged in strengthening administrative practices in the underdeveloped countries.<sup>30</sup>

I see CPA as the method of studying public administration in various national settings (developed **and** underdeveloped, capitalist **and** socialist) within a common theoretical framework which, if adequate, provides the analytical scheme for determining and examining similarities and differences among administrative systems. CPA searches for a common framework to study public administration systems comparatively; if it is deemed that one such comparative tool is found, CPA studies, to state the matter crudely, public administration in various national settings. CPA has been generally concerned with "what is". On the other hand development administration has been primarily concerned with the public administration systems in underdeveloped countries with the crux of the emphasis being the ways of overcoming development problems through administration, and the ways of overcoming administrative problems and enhancing administrative techniques for development-oriented purposes. Thus development administration is heavily **normative**, it is full of **prescriptions** for **how to do** things.

## SOME PRESENT AND FUTURE PROBLEMS, ISSUES, CHALLENGES, DILEMMAS : THROUGH THE SEVENTIES, AND BEYOND

In the following pages I will attempt to present and examine some of the selected present and possible future problems, issues, challenges, paradoxes, dilemmas confronting development administration. For purposes of analysis I will examine these as they relate to development, and administration.

I should start with arguing that "there is not visible even on the far horizon a general and agreed 'science of development' ".<sup>31</sup> Indeed there are theories of economic development, social development, and political development; but unfortunately these theories have been strictly developed along the lines of "academic field specialization". ie. A typical, say, economic development theory, considers almost only economic variables, and does not look into the dynamics of the relationships between the economic subsystem and other subsystems (like the political or administrative subsystem) nor between subsystems and the system. Granted that theories, whatever type and kind, cannot embody all the variables one wants to inject into them without losing some of their usefulness. But nonetheless, failure to consider or give proper weight to other variables can have the effect of making a theory unrealistic and thus impractical, however attractive it may be in its inner-logic. W. F. Ichman and R. C. Bhargava have argued this point brilliantly.<sup>32</sup> They try to show that "... the major strategies so far advanced by economists are relevant operationally only in highly specific situations".<sup>33</sup> Ichman and Bhargava present three respected economic development theories/strategies : The Balanced Growth (R. Nurkse, P. Rosenstein-Rodan), The Unbalanced Growth (A. O. Hirschman), and Capital Formation Through Unlimited Supplies of Labor (W. A. Lewis). Ichman and Bhargava convincingly argue and show that these theories or models have basically taken for granted several crucial social and political circumstances or requirements that in order for these theories to work nothing less than a small-scale miracle is needed.

This type of sin is not obviously capitalized only and by all of the economic development theories. Psychological and social development theories like Hagen's<sup>34</sup> or McClelland's and at least a dozen of political development theories have operated only in their own backyard to merely become neat mental exercises with minimal chances of becoming realistic or relevant. Indeed I fully agree with Ichman and Bhargava that "the only operational strategies for

development are the products of a **cross-disciplinary social science perspective**"<sup>36</sup> (my underlining).

Development, however defined theoretically by social scientists and scholars, will nonetheless acquire a general common meaning according to whatever empirical conditions exist at a given moment and how people evaluate these conditions. People generally label a society "developed", not because it necessarily fits to some ideal or utopia, but because compared with other existing societies the so-called "developed" one is regarded as having "more desirable" features than the others. Nowadays these desirable features are : industrialization, urbanization, a highly literate and educated population, productive specialization and professionalization, administration by complex organizations often of the bureaucratic type, etc., and the list can be expanded by presenting other features of today's developed societies. (capitalist or socialist). For today's less-developed societies-they are less developed compared to other existing more developed societies-**development denotes what exists in today's developed countries**. The time is now, the conditions are of the present's. This mentality is not absurd, in fact it might even be considered "empirically-oriented". But, the lack of a temporal dimension in this mentality creates several critical issues. First of all, even "if a presently 'underdeveloped' nation succeeds by the end of the century in becoming 'developed' **by current standards** it will nevertheless remain underdeveloped **by certain standards obtained? by the end of the century**"<sup>37</sup> for they would be successful only in recreating what will be a "**vanished civilization**". The reason is simple; today's developed societies are rapidly growing and developing. Thus, the underdeveloped countries, if they are to run, will be running still to stay behind the developed countries. (\*)

Two solutions come to mind : The first is that today's developed societies "stop" developing and "wait" for the other underdeveloped nations to "catch up" with them. Now, even if we assume that such

---

(\*) Assuming that output per capita in Latin America were to rise by 2.4 % per year (a fairly reasonable rate considering the negative effect of population growth) it would take **42 years** for it to equal **one-third** of the **present level** of U.S. output per capita. On the assumption that U.S. output per capita were to rise at the rate of 2% per year while the figure 2.4 continues in Latin America, it would take **252 years** for the level of output per capita in Latin America to reach **one-third** of the **then current U.S.** output per capita. See R.T. Gill, **Economic Development: Past and Present** (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 91.

an impossible phenomenon would in fact take place, and that all societies become more or less equally developed at some future-point, still any further development after that "point" will inevitably be differential, i.e., growth rates will not be the same, and sooner or later we will again have less developed systems compared to other more developed ones. Can a "ceiling" for growth rates be established so that no one country jumps ahead? But then, how about those performing near the ceiling and those not near the ceiling? Would not this lead to significant differences some time later? It seems that our "solution" is inadequate.

The other "solution" is this : today's underdeveloped societies should strive to become not like today's developed societies, but should think and strive to become what today's developed societies will become sometime in the future. D. Waldo's wording of the issue will clarify what I am trying to say : "If these rapidly changing nations are taken as the 'targets' for newer, less-developed nations, then we have a situation in which, if similarity or parity is the objective, the aim must be not **at** the target, but **ahead** of it".<sup>38</sup> If we are to consider the points mentioned above, which I believe we obviously should, a host of new issues emerge. For one thing, many of today's advanced countries are leaving behind the "industrialization" stage, and approaching to, and as United States has entered into, **the post-industrial stage**<sup>39</sup>, where the requirements and circumstances of social and physical existence are of different nature and magnitude.<sup>40</sup> For example, "organized and codified knowledge (becomes) increasingly important as against the conventional factors of production, land, labor, and capital"<sup>41</sup>; "service-rendering economy" emerges as the dominant sector; "ecological considerations" (pollution, limiting population) gain importance in human conduct.<sup>42</sup> Then, we may correctly ask "Should not underdeveloped countries consider and attempt to move from their present pre - or semi - industrial conditions directly to post-industrialism rather than to industrialism?".<sup>43</sup>

If our answer is in the affirmative, we face a host of questions: Can the underdeveloped countries undertake such a task assuming it is possible to do such a leap? To what extent jumping to the post-industrial stage is more difficult in terms of sacrifices, resources, time, etc., than going rather into the industrial stage? Do the underdeveloped countries have the capabilities to realize this jump **and** land where they expect or anticipate? The examples of several less-developed countries who have sought industrialization and modernization and **landed** in "terra incognita" dramatically il-



illustrates the possibility that even if the poorly developed nations somehow obtain necessary resources (do we know what they are?) move ahead (do we know how?), they might reach to a different land than the "expected-promised one".

D. Waldo, possibly thinking beyond post-industrialism, argues that "if we knew where the target were to be at some specified future time"<sup>44</sup>, we could tell to the underdeveloped countries what in the future, today's developed countries<sup>45</sup> will look like and recommend them to act accordingly. According to Waldo "this we do not know"<sup>46</sup>, and "there may be 'no remedy' for this problem, but at least it should be seen as a problem"<sup>47</sup>.

Another set of issues to be taken into consideration involves the growing **post-national** elements in certain advanced countries and in some fields of international relations. Not only transnational, **multinational organizations** are increasingly becoming common<sup>48</sup>, "universalisms", "the citizens of the world" as concepts are emerging and are gaining acceptance rather rapidly. The interdependence among the world societies - the costs of its being absent or the recognition of the benefits it can bring - has contributed to the decline on the emphasis on **nation-state**. On the face of these changing circumstances and views, it seems proper to ask the following questions: "Should development be framed in national terms?"<sup>49</sup>, How about development in international terms in an ever interdependent world? Although at its infancy, the **International Development Approach** has contributed to a new understanding of development both on the part of advanced countries and on the part of less developed countries.<sup>50</sup> But if we are to approach development in international terms to what extent should we, if at all and if possible at all, put national autonomy and independence to a secondary or lesser role? Do we know what are the ideas, methods, tools, structures, institutions, required to realize such an approach? Again, even if we assume that we have such knowledge and information, will we be capable of bringing the desired state of affairs?

And finally, as E.A. Bock brilliantly deals in his essay titled "Governmental Problems Arising from the Use And Abuse of Future - The Last Colonialism?", that the appropriation of the future by the present human beings, with whatever means and for whatever purposes, leaving no unoccupied future should at least be questioned as to its desirability<sup>51</sup>.

Development Administration has to face, cope, and respond to these problems, issues, paradoxes, challenges if it wants to be **realistic and relevant**. Now let us turn to the "administrative" side of development administration.

The concept of "administration", which in development administration has been generally used as and has come to mean "public administration", harbors another set of problems, challenges, dilemmas that development administration has to address itself in the coming years as well as presently. The belief in public administration's capacity to bring development, the prescriptions for the establishment, betterment, and greater utilization of public administrative systems have been the distinguishing characteristics of the thinking and working of the several of the scholars in the development administration circles. Obviously, this attitude towards public administration or this great trust in public administration, if not for anything else, can be deemed desirable for "heuristic" purposes. However what has most plagued the above approach has been what I consider to be the severely incorrect understanding of public administration where it is regarded as "the application of technically certain and ethically neutral means to the attainment of clear and problematic ends"<sup>52</sup>. Taking the second part of this statement-the attainment of clear and unproblematic ends-one can argue that the nature of government policies and programs oriented towards development in underdeveloped countries inevitably is and will be for some time unclear, paradoxical and problematic due to the nature of "development" itself.<sup>53</sup> Coming to the first parts of the statement: "public administration is the application of technically certain and ethically neutral means" has, I believe, constituted the core of the several of the theoretical and practical failures administration and development administration have, without much questioning, accepted the validity of such a statement and have found no harm, in fact, have seen great potential in the application of Western and American administrative technology to a different set of problems existing in different environments. What has further aggravated the invalidity of this view has been the general reluctance of the scholars and practitioners in accepting the fact that Western administrative technology - being a cumulative product of the gradual economic, political, and social growth that has taken a couple of centuries in the Western world, and thus inevitably characterized by certain values and ideologies, could not overnight or overday have possibly worked in an environment

so different with respect to its setting and problems. Rather it seemed more plausible to many scholars that if Western administrative technology did not work the reason had to be the failure of the less-developed countries in not properly obeying the spirit and letter of the principle of administrative technology. The remedy for this failure required accordingly "more" administrative reform.

The "salvation" via Western administrative technology most often recommended and prescribed the establishment and use of the "bureaucratic type organizations" which were believed to be the most value-neutral, rational, and efficient administrative instruments which were thus capable of solving problems of development, and of promoting goals of development. However, as A. Diamant argued persuasively (and showed how Max Weber was misunderstood) that for a bureaucratic model to function as expected the social system had to be governed by a matching type of authority (legal-rational type)<sup>54</sup>. In simple language the public administrative system is a part of a larger system and reflects the values and beliefs of this larger system<sup>55</sup>. An administrative system which is a product of and based on a particular set of social values is bound to fail to operate in an environment which basically has a different set of values.

Today the failure of the bureaucratic model in the less-developed countries is not difficult to see. Paradoxically, if the bureaucratic model had simply failed, these countries would have been better off. More importantly, the building of a bureaucratic structure and its interaction with other sectors and the whole structure has produced a **new synthesis** whereby the bureaucracy in the underdeveloped societies have evolved into a mechanism for everything, including becoming an end in itself. The importation of bureaucracy thus has been an excellent case of the "Trojan Horse". The failure to see and predict that Western administrative technology would not work in underdeveloped countries plus that if applied to such a setting it could lead to several complex unanticipated consequences, undeniably indicates that field, or whatever you might prefer to call it, is not only very far from being near to perfect, but probably also moving in the wrong direction and aiming at the wrong target. The courageous yet obviously premature and unproven claims of "universality" of today's **Organization Theory**<sup>56</sup> make us nothing but more pessimistic. However, still we should not be hopeless. There are some very encouraging attempts to remedy this whole misconceived, misdirected trend. For a start, D. Waldo has

argued all along that public administration is not a neutral instrument, that public administration is shaped by the values and ideologies of the social system it is embedded in. He has tried to show this by analyzing American public administration. He asserts that American public administration "developed functions and ideology appropriate to the historical situation" it was in<sup>57</sup>. Accordingly Waldo writes "American public administration is in many ways ill adapted to help low-income countries with problems of change and development because it has not, paradoxically, dealt consciously and carefully with problems of change and development at home"<sup>58</sup>.

F.W.Riggs' plea for "**ecological-orientation**" is based on similar reasoning; public administration is a subsystem in and greatly affected by the larger political environment. Riggs has also been keen enough to realize the unanticipated consequences of "bureaucratization" in less-developed societies, and considering under this light, he has proposed not only a major conscious deemphasis on administration in these societies so that the political systems would not be dominated by bureaucracies, but moreover he has advised for, if not to the same extent as L. Pye<sup>59</sup>, conscious emphasis and foreign aid to the development and strengthening of "extrabureaucratic institutions" in these countries<sup>60</sup>. Riggs' reasoning is based on his conviction that "premature or too rapid expansion of the bureaucracy when the political system lags behind tends to inhibit the development of effective politics" and effective supervision of the bureaucracy, for this is a must for an efficient bureaucracy<sup>61</sup>.

Some scholars, among them R. Braibanti<sup>62</sup> and M.J.Esman<sup>63</sup> do not agree with Riggs' views about "balanced growth" and find administration and administrative reform as factors that do not necessarily deteriorate political development<sup>64</sup>. Moreover they argue that the public administration systems in underdeveloped countries are practically the only viable apparatus to meet the demands for rapid social and economic progress and that therefore improvements in bureaucratic capability should at no rate be purposely hindered.

Some other scholars have directed their attention and have devoted their resources to finding or **inventing** other **administrative systems** which might be more appropriate to the context in the underdeveloped world. Notable among these scholars is G.Sjöberg, who basing his analysis on the idea of "contradictory functional requirements", has tried to identify or find the features of the soci-

al organization of societies committed to rapid development<sup>65</sup>. Sjoberg regards the Western type bureaucracy inappropriate for development purposes since it is designed basically to serve the status-quo<sup>66</sup>. He offers to the reader his "ideal typical model for the organization of a modernizing society that is committed to a revolutionary type of ideology"<sup>67</sup>. (For him ideology is important for it can be employed as a vehicle to rally the masses as opposed to the alternative of using "force"). Sjoberg's understanding and presentation of the concept of "therapeutic groups" is yet another plus for making his work interesting.

Another notable scholar in this respect is H. S. Kariel who in his essay titled "Goals for Administrative Reform in Developing States: An Open-Ended Design"<sup>68</sup> searches not simply for new and different administrative mechanisms which could work, but searches for those that would "serve" our ideals. He writes "...I do not believe it to be our problem to establish bureaucracies which, when duly functioning, would be capable of bringing about the good society (or the civic culture). Instead, our problem is to make administrative arena itself approximate our ideals"<sup>69</sup>.

Kariel's views somewhat bring us closer into another problem area: today the administrative systems of the advanced countries, facing and at times unable to cope with rapid changes, have been under criticism. Not only the conditions of post-industrial society seem to demand new and novel administrative structures, but additionally changing values are forcing theoreticians and practitioners to search for still further new arrangements. During this process the "revolt against administration, against organizationess" is seen everywhere, and this revolt seems paradoxical with the complexity that characterizes the post-industrial environment. These developments in today's advanced countries should not be overlooked by the less - developed nations. Waldo for example finds "certain parallels" between the problems confronted by the post-industrial American society and by the low-income countries<sup>71</sup>. The attempts in advanced countries, especially in the United States deal with these changing circumstances and values have produced a host of works on "debureaucratizing administrative systems", "nonbureaucratic arrangements", "temporary systems", "adaptive units" and the like. These works might prove not useless for less - developed countries. However, great caution should be expended in adopting these new arrangements; after all even "community development" which once was regarded as "the most" appropriate tool to handle development problems has failed tragically.<sup>72</sup>

Another area that could be explored and that offers new insights and fresh focus for development administration involves the study of **Government - Private Sector Partnership**. Scholars are now searching ways of using public and private resources together in a more meaningful and fruitful combination (The Third Sector?). Development administration has seen much heated and one-sided arguments about development through public route **versus** private route. I believe we should no longer see public and private in a versus context. Development administration has to review its stance and has to actively search for healthy "public private combinations".

As new interest and focus on "public-private sector partnership" seem full of potential, another combination, that of the marriage of politics and economics may turn out to be rewarding. **The Political Economy Approach** has attracted scholars in Public Administration<sup>73</sup> and in development administration. With respect to development administration W. F. Ichman and N. I. Uphoff have been the most active proponents : they have written a book titled **The Political Economy of Change**<sup>74</sup>, and edited another titled **The Political Economy of Development**<sup>75</sup>. They write : "The Political Economy of which we speak is an integrated social science of public choice. It is political in that its subject matter is the exercise of authority and the competition for authority within a community... It is economic in that it treats with the allocation and exchange of scarce resources, including political, and social resources as well as those generally dubbed economic".<sup>76</sup> Thus Political Economy adapted to a development administration context focuses on public policy choices with respect to development, and examines the exchange of resources (economic, political, social) for this purpose and the consequences thereof.<sup>77</sup> The degree of success and the possible future trend of this approach could not, I believe, be assessed at this time in its development.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Development administration has come a long way, and has shown that it does not lack a promising potential to make valuable contributions to the struggle of the underdeveloped countries for development. However, development administration has not been free of problems, some of which I have presented in this paper. Development administration needs further investigation and research on «development» and on "public administration's role in the development

process". Moreover, there must be conscious efforts to study these questions from new perspectives. Search for new approaches and for newer methods should be encouraged. Meanwhile developments in other social science fields should not be overlooked, and neither the benefits of cross-disciplinary research. In addition, changing circumstances, both in the academic and the social environment, should be closely observed and examined to evaluate their impact on development administration and to assess the possible course development administration could take on the face of these new conditions. If development administration wants to become realistic and relevant, it has to come up with satisfactory responses to its environment and it has to continuously reexamine and renew its stance. And obviously the scholars in the underdeveloped countries must be willing to allocate more of their attentions, talents, and resources to the study of development administration so that development administration can go beyond promise and hope.

## NOTES

1. See Dwight Waldo, **The Administrative State : A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration** (New York : The Ronald Press, 1948), pp. 3 - 5.
2. Gerald E. Caiden, **The Dynamics of Public Administration : Guidelines to Current Transformations in Theory and Practice** (New York : Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971), p. 264.
3. "It has been observed (as by Carl Becker) that each era has certain concepts which are so central and crucial in the definition of meaning and value that **their** meaning and value is taken for granted. Patently in this period **development** is such a concept". Quoted in Dwight Waldo, "Reflections on Public Administration and National Development", **International Social Science Journal** Vol. XXI no. 2 (1969), pp. 294 - 309 (at p. 296).
4. ie. Karl Marx's "dialectical materialism" and "economic determinism", and thus the movement from feudalism to capitalism to socialism and finally to communism.
5. W. W. Rostow's stages are wellknown : The Traditional Society, The Preconditions for Take-off, The Take-Off, The Drive to Maturity, The Age of High Mass Consumption. See his **The Stages of Economic Development : A Non - Communist Manifesto** (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1960), Rostow's recent book focuses on the "politics" aspects of development, **Politics and the Stages of Growth** (Cambridge, Massachusetts : Cambridge University Press, 1971).
6. Fred W. Riggs' stages of growth is based on degrees of "differentiation" within a society. From the least differentiated to the most differentiated society three stages are discerned : the Fused, the Prismatic and the Diffracted. See his **Administration in Developing Countries : The Theory of Prismatic Society** (Boston : Houghton - Mifflin, 1964).
7. Several convincing arguments exist that depreciate the value of the stages approach (like the much criticized presumption of the stages approach that change occurs in a one - way direction, ie., unilinear growth) ; but for a fresh and interesting criticism see Bertram M. Gross, "Space - Time and Post - Industrial Society", in James J. Heaphey (ed.), **Spatial Dimensions of Development Administration** (Durham, North Caroline : Duke University Press, 1971), pp. 216 - 259, the criticism at pp. 222 - 224. Also see I. L. Horowitz, **Three Worlds of Development** (New York : Oxford University Press, 1966), pp. 397 - 401 ; and J. A. Bill and R. L. Hardgrave, Jr., **Comparative Politics : The Quest for Theory** (Columbus, Ohio : Bell and Howell Co., 1973), pp. 61 - 62.
8. Many of these scholars have differentiated **societal change from social change**. They argue that the former involves a **shift** (development) whereas the latter implies a movement **along** an established line (growth). For example see Edward Tiryakian, "A model of Societal Change and Its Lead Indicators", in S. Klausner (ed.), **The Study of Total Societies** (New York : F. A. Praeger, 1967), pp. 67 - 97.



9. S. Katz, "Exploring a Systems Approach to Development Administration", in Fred W. Rigg (ed), **Frontiers of Development Administration** (Durham, North Caroline : Duke University Press, 1971), pp. 109 - 138.
10. For example see S.N. Eisenstadt, **Modernization : Protest and Change** (New Jersey : Prentice - Hall, 1966).
11. Robert Biller, "Some Implications of Adaptation Capacity for Organizational and Political Development", in Frank Marini (ed), **Toward A New Public Administration : The Minnowbrook Perspective** (Scranton, California : Chandler, 1971), pp. 93 - 121 (at p. 11).
12. Dwing Waldo, "Public Administration and Change : Terra Paene Incognita", in **Journal of Comparative Administration** Vol. 1 no 1 (May 1969), pp. 94 - 113 (at p. 101).
13. **Ibid.**
14. **Ibid., pp. 101 - 102.**
15. **Ibid., p. 107.**
16. "Development Administration : A New Focul for Research", in F. Heady andr S.L. Stokes (eds), **Papers in Comparative Public Administration** (Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1962), pp. 97 - 115.
17. **Ibid., p.98.**
18. **Ibid.**
19. "Motivation for Change and Development Administration", in Irving Swerdlow (ed), **Development Administration Concepts and Problems** (Syracuse, New York : Syracuse University Press, 1963), pp. 85 - 102 (at p. 86).
20. "The Structure of Development Administration". in I. Swerdlow (ed.), **Development Administration Concepts and Problems**, pp. 1 - 24 (at p.2).
21. "The Politics of Development Administration", in J. Montgomery and W. J. Siffin (eds), **Approaches to Development : Politics Administration and Change** (New York : McGraw - Hill, 1966), pp. 59 - 112.
22. "A Royal Invitation : Variations on Three Classic Themes", in J. Montgomery and W.J. Siffin (eds), **Approaches to Development**, pp. 257 - 294.
23. "The Context of Development Administration", in F. W. Riggs (ed), **Frontiers of Development Administration**, pp. 72 - 108 (at p. 75).
24. "Introduction", in I. Swerdlow (ed), **Development Administration Concepts and Problems**, p. ix
25. **Ibid.**
26. **Ibid., p. x.**
27. Quoted in Richard W. Gable, "The Teaching of Comparative Development Administration : The Report of a Survey", mimeo, p. 21.
28. "Introduction", in I. Swerdlow (ed), **Development Administration : Concepts and Problems**, p.x.

29. See for example N. Raphaeli, "Comparative Public Administration : An Overview", in N. Raphaeli (ed), **Readings in Comparative Public Administration** (Boston : Allyn and Bacon, 1967), pp. 1 - 25.
30. **Emerging Synthesis in American Public Administration** (New York : Asia Publishing House, 1966).
31. D. Waldo, "Reflections on Public Administration and National Development" p. 295.
32. "Balanced Thought and Economic Growth", in F. W. Riggs (ed), **Frontiers of Development Administration**, pp. 247 - 273.
33. *Ibid.*, p. 247.
34. Everett E. Hagen, **On the Theory of Social Change** (Homewood, Illinois : Dorsey Press, 1962).
35. David C. Moelelland, **The Achieving Society** (Princeton, New Jersey : Van Nostrand, 1961).
36. "Balanced Thought and Economic Growth", in F. W. Riggs (ed), **Frontiers of Development Administration**, p. 248. However I do not agree with their contention that a "a strong contribution" from political scientists should characterize this cross-disciplinary perspective if by this the authors mean dominance by political scientists.
37. D. Waldo, "Reflection on Public Administration and National Development", p. 302.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 297.
39. I see "post-industrialism" as a passing stage in human development as all stages will be. Sometime in the future, some of the human societies will enter into another phase. Of course the interesting point in all these is that the modern-man is capable of labeling and consciously analyzing the phases before him, the phases he is in, and the phase he might be in in the near future.
40. See B. M. Gross, "Space - Time and Post - Industrial Society", in J. J. Heaphey (ed), **Spatial Dimensions of Development Administration**, pp 216 - 259. See especially Table 1 (on p. 226) where Gross presents the social structure characteristics of the "preindustrial" societies.
41. D. Waldo, "Developments in Public Administration" (draft of a "field" review for publication in **The Annals**), mimeo, p. 7.
42. Nowadays we do not strive to **control** nature, rather we try to **cooperate** with her.
43. The inspiration for this question has come from D. Waldo, "Developments in Public Administration", p. 7.
44. D. Waldo, "Reflections on Public Administration and National Development", p. 297.
45. With this respect "Futuristic Studies" and "Futurism" have provided not an insignificant amount of work : see for example H. Kahn and A. J. Weiner, **The Year 2000 : A Framework for Speculation on the Next Thirty - Three Years** (New York :

MacMillan, 1967); D. Bell (ed), **Toward the Year 2000 : Work in Progress** (Boston : Beacon Press, 1967) ; B. de Jouvenel, **The Art of Conjecture** (translated by. N. Larry) (New York : Basic Books, 1967).

46. D. Waldo, "Reflection on Public Administration and National Development", p. 298.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 302.

48. See B. M. Gross, "Space - Time and Post - Industrial Society", in J. Heaphey (ed), **Spatial Dimensions of Development Administration**, especially pp. 247 - 256.

49. J. J. Heaphey (ed), «Spatial Aspects of Development Administration», in **Spatial Dimensions of Development Administration**, pp. 3 - 31.

50. For example see **Partners in Development : Report of the Commission on International Development** (London : The Pall Mall Press, 1969); R. N. Gardner and M. F. Millikan (eds), **The Global Partnership : International Agencies and Economic Development** (New York : Frederick A. Praeger, 1968).

51. In D. Waldo (ed), **Temporal Dimensions of Development Administration** (Durham, North Caroline : Duke University Press, 1970), pp. 264 - 296.

52. D. Waldo, "Reflections on Public Administration and National Development", p. 302.

53. Even in advanced countries government policies and programs are to some extent in this nature even though these governments are not trying to "create" development.

54. "The Bureaucratic Model : Max Weber Rejected, Rediscovered, Reformed", in F. Heady and S. L. Stokes (eds), **Papers in Comparative Public Administration**, pp. 59 - 96 (at p. 68). Also see his «The Temporal Dimension in Models of Administration and Organization», in D. Waldo (ed), **Temporal Dimensions of Development Administration**, p. 90 - 134.

55. As early as in 1948 D. Waldo tried to show this in his **The Administrative State**, eg. "...American public administration has evolved political theories unmistakably related to unique economic, social, governmental, and, ideological facts" (p.3). Also see his "Public Administration and Change" Recently Fred W. Riggs has heavily emphasized on this point and has tried direct attention to "ecology of public administration". In several of his writings this theme can be found, see for example **The Ecology of Public Administration** (New York: Asia Publishing House, 1961). or for a more comprehensive treatment see **Administration in Developing Countries**.

56. See A. Diamant, "The Temporal Dimension in Models of Administration and Organization". in D. Waldo (ed), **Temporal Dimension of Development Administration**, pp. 90-134.

57. "Public Administration and Change". p. 98.

58. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

59. Pye has gone as far as recommending foreign aid to the political parties in underdeveloped countries.

60. F. W. Riggs, "Relearning an Old Lesson : The Political Context of Development Administration", in **Public Administration Review** Vol. 25 No. 5 (March 1965), pp. 70 - 79

61. "Bureaucrats and Political Development : A Paradoxical View", in J. La Palombara (ed), **Bureaucracy and Political Development** (Princeton, New Jersey : Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 120 - 168. (at p. 126)
62. "External Inducement of Political-Administrative Development : An Institutional Strategy", in R. Braibanti (ed), **Political and Administrative Development** (Durham, North, Caroline : Duke University Press, 1969), pp 3 - 106; "Administrative Reform in the Context of Political Growth", in F. W. Riggs (ed), **Frontiers of Development Administration**, pp. 227 - 246.
63. "The Politics of Development Administration", in J. D. Montgomery and W. J. Siffin (eds), *Approaches to Development*, pp. 59 - 112; "CAG and the Study of Development Administration", in F. W. Riggs (ed), **Frontiers of Development Administration**, pp. 41 - 71
64. For a presentation of the various viewpoints on this topic see F. Heady, "Bureaucracies in Developing Countries", in F. W. Riggs (ed), **Frontiers of Development Administration**, pp. 459 - 485.
65. "Ideology and Social Organization in Rapidly Developing Societies", in F. W. Riggs (ed), **Frontiers of Development Administration**, pp. 274 - 301.
66. *Ibid.*, p. 289.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 293.
68. In R. Braibanti (ed), **Political and Administrative Development**, pp. 143-165.
69. *Ibid.*, p. 161.
70. D. Waldo, "Reflections on Public Administration and National Development", p. 302.
71. "Public Administration and Change", p. 95.
72. See H. C. Hart, "The Village and Development Administration", in J. J. Heaphey (ed), *Spatial Dimensions of Development Administration*, pp. 32 - 90.
73. Originally in. 1953. R. A. Dahl and C. E. Lindblom provided this framework in their **Politics, Economics, and Welfare : Planning and Politico-Economic Systems Resolved into Basic Social Processes**

## ÖZET

### 'Kalkınma İdaresi : 1970'lerde ve Ötesinde'

'Kalkınma İdaresi' geri kalmış ülkeler tarafından bir ümit kaynağı ve vazgeçilmez bir araç olarak görülmektedir. Kalkınma İdaresinin 'gelişmiş bir toplum' yaratabilme gücüne inanılmış ve 'kalkınma ne demektir?' ve 'kalkınma nasıl olur?' sorunlarına kesin cevap bulunduğu varsayımı ile hareket edilmiştir. Ne var ki bu iki sorun çözülmüş olmaktan uzaktadır ve daha yoğun araştırma gerektirmektedir. 'Kalkınma' ve 'İdarenin Kalkınmadaki Yeri' üzerinde yapılan çalışmalar çeşitli nedenler ile kısıtlı ve verimsiz olmuştur. Yazıda bu konuda daha ayrıntılı bir inceleme takdim edilmektedir. 'Kalkınma' ve 'İdare' kavramları yeni eleştirilere açılmalı, bir takım eski varsayımlar terkedilmeli, yeni gelişmeler gözönünde tutulmalı, ve disiplinlerarası bir yaklaşım takip edilmelidir. Kısacası 'Kalkınma İdaresi' kendini yenilemelidir.

Kalkınma İdaresi geri kalmış milletlerin kalkınma çabalarına katkıda bulunabilecek bir sosyal bilim dalı olmağa hazırdır ve bu potansiyalin verimli bir şekilde gerçekleşmesinde bu ülkelerdeki bilim adamlarına kalmıştır.