

heading of National Security Policy, and by Benjamin Barber of Rutgers University under the heading of Political Thought and Philosophy: Analytical and Critical Theory. These were followed by Mary Lyndon Shanley's section on Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches (29), Jennifer Hochschild's section on Great Issues in Politics (26), and Stephen Krasner's section on Divergent Approaches to Politics and Political Science. Average panel attendance in Chicago was below 1986 levels which ranged from a low of 13 to a high of 39.

The Organized Sections with the highest average attendance were Political Methodology (27), put together by John E. Jackson; Women and Politics Research (20), organized by Sue Tolleson Rinehart and Arlene W. Saxonhouse; Conflict Processes (20), organized by Manus Midlarsky; Law, Courts and Judicial Process (19), organized by Lawrence Baum; and Political Organizations and Parties (19), organized by Alan R. Gitelson.

Individual Panel Attendance

The best attended panel at the annual meeting was The Relationship between Academics and the Policy World of National Security (132), a roundtable including Samuel Huntington, Robert Jervis, Richard Betts, Kenneth Waltz, and chaired by Robert Art. The Claremont Institute's panel on Allen Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind* ranked second in attendance (125). Third was the John Gaus Lecture delivered by C. Dwight Waldo, Professor Emeritus of Syracuse University (113). Now in its second year, the Gaus Lecture remains among the best attended events at the convention. The Gaus Lecture was followed by Democracy and the Self (98), sponsored by the Official Program's section on Political Thought and Philosophy: Historical Approaches.

In addition to the Gaus Lecture, three plenary sessions were held. On Thursday evening Samuel P. Huntington gave his Presidential Address entitled "One Soul at a Time: Political Science and Political Reform." On Friday evening Frank Michelman of Harvard University Law

School, Judge Richard Posner of the United States Court of Appeals (7th Circuit), and Martin Shapiro of the University of California, Berkeley School of Law debated the topic, "The Constitution, Property Rights and the Welfare State." On Saturday evening, Representative Barney Frank, John Norton Moore of the University of Virginia School of Law, and H. Bradford Westerfield of Yale University spoke on "The Constitution and Foreign Affairs." The triennial James Madison Lecture was also held on Friday. The Madison Lecturer, Pendleton Herring, President Emeritus of the Social Science Research Council, spoke on "The Ultimate Asset: A Retrospective View," which is reprinted in this issue of *PS*. □

Editor's note: See accompanying stories on the plenary sessions. Also note that Samuel Huntington's Presidential Address will appear in the March 1988 issue of the APSR.

John Gaus Lecture Delivered by Dwight Waldo

Patricia W. Ingraham
Syracuse University
Chair, APSA Organized Section
in Public Administration

The enormous contributions that Dwight Waldo has made to Public Administration and Political Science were again acknowledged at the Annual Meeting in Chicago, where he received the second annual John Gaus Award. Waldo, Professor Emeritus at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, at Syracuse University, is the author of *The Administrative State, Public Administration in a Time of Turbulence* and numerous other publications. His career has spanned forty-five years. His writings and lectures have been a source of guidance and inspiration to teachers, stu-

¹John Gaus. 1950. Trends in the Theory of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review*, Vol. X, No. 3, pp. 161-168.



Dwight Waldo delivering the John M. Gaus Lecture.

dents, and public servants during that entire period.

In his John Gaus lecture, Professor Waldo drew upon the work of Gaus, both for the lecture's title and for the perspective it provides on contemporary public administration. Utilizing the title of his lecture, "A Theory of Public Administration Means in Our Time a Theory of Politics Also"¹ as his basic premise, Waldo outlined three areas of continuing concern: (1) The troublesome politics-administration dichotomy in politics; (2) the public administration-political science split in academia; and (3) the continued failure to define the proper role of administration in American government.

Many have noted in the past that it is not possible to improve upon Dwight Waldo. I would not presume to try. What follows, therefore, are excerpts from his John Gaus lecture. They cannot fully capture the sophistication of Waldo's arguments; hopefully they convey the flavor of his important reflections.

Excerpts from "A Theory of Public Administration Is in Our Time a Theory of Politics Also"

**John Gaus Lecture
Delivered by Dwight Waldo
September 3, 1987**

The word "estrangement" is perhaps too mild to characterize the relationship of Public Administration to other fields of Political Science. Woodrow Wilson's lament in 1887 that administration was "put aside as a 'practical detail' which clerks could arrange after doctors had agreed on principles," seems not greatly to have changed in some quarters in 1987. In the perceptions of most Political Scientists, I judge, Public Administration concerns the "lower things" of government, details for lesser minds. Two decades ago I observed, perhaps with too heavy irony, "[T]he lower things with which Public Administration is now deeply engaged are such matters as the common defense, education, safety and health, economic development and the elimination of poverty, problems of freedom and equality, law enforcement and the administration of justice, the preservation and development of resources, social and physical mobility, population planning, recreation and the amenities, the development of science and the use of technology; and with the interactions of all such matters with governmental theories, institutions and processes, at all levels of government at home and abroad."² So it then seemed to a public administrationist. So it still seems to a public administrationist. . . .

Let me set forth what seem to me the "reasons" for Public Administration's low esteem.³ . . . One factor is the liberal arts ethos. . . . Properly conceived, it holds, education has as objectives the enriching of the mind, the refinement of the sensibilities, the growth of the spirit, the attainment of balance and wisdom, *not* training for employment: *this* is philistine. . . .

Another reason for the low esteem of Public Administration—in some respects the opposite of the liberal arts ethos—was its failure

²From Dwight Waldo. 1968. Public Administration. *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 443-479.

³From Dwight Waldo. 1986. Afterword. In Brack Brown and Richard J. Stillman (eds.), *A Search for Public Administration*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, pp. 165-185.

to participate importantly in the behavioral movement, which became dominant in Political Science in the fifties and sixties. Public administrationists could plead that their behavioral research was being done for them in such areas of social psychology and organization behavior, and that they were fully occupied with the task of preparing persons for administrative careers, no apologies necessary. [These are] relevant considerations, but not fully responsive and strategic. I think that public administrationists *should* have been more sensitive to the issue of empirical research in public organization and administration. Of course the important work that some did deserves note—to illustrate I instance Robert Golembiewski, Herbert Kaufman, Robert Presthus, Harold Seidman, Victor Thompson, and Aaron Wildavsky. And in doing so I acknowledge that classification is difficult and that I paint with a broad brush. . . .

Somewhat related—but also somewhat unrelated—is the failure of Public Administration to address the area of *policy* early and decisively. For something like two decades after it became well recognized that public administrators are inevitably engaged, *substantively* engaged, with policy matters few significant responses were forthcoming. When policy study, policy science, policy analysis, policy evaluation—choose your term—developed rapidly in the late sixties and seventies the attention, energy, ideas and techniques came largely from economic and other sources. In this decade, of course, there has been something of a rapprochement. Typically, instructional programs in public administration include a policy component, and policy programs include an administrative component, although almost certainly under the less contaminated term, “management.”

Public Administration’s problems of definition and image have from the beginning been complicated by something that relates to Political Science but also has a massive outside referent: The Law—the entire complex of laws, courts, lawyers—whatever. What *is* administration as something apart from the Law? . . .

An obvious point now, but it is a useful if not indeed necessary introduction to one not so obvious: The point is that several if not all of the aspects of the enterprise of Public Administration I have identified have a relationship to the architecture and terminology of the Constitution. I refer of course to the creation of the Executive, the Legislative, and the Judicial, and to the absence of the term administration. For reasons that are understandable and forgivable, however regrettable, the Framers left it for history to deter-

mine, with only a few referents, how what we regard as public administration be empowered, organized, operated and controlled . . . with one tremendously important exception, namely the establishment of the Judicial as formally equal to the Executive and Legislative. I argue—I have argued elsewhere—that it is proper to think of the judicial organs and apparatus as constitutionally privileged and functionally specialized instruments of public administration. The task or role of the public administrator is to interpret and apply the laws. The task or role of the judicial organs is to interpret and apply the laws. There are of course modal differences, and at the extremes—say an undercover police officer and a justice of the Supreme Court—differences that are great indeed. But not just logic supports the view that courts are administrative organs; plainly courts historically have been organs of governmental administration, often important and sometimes central to the governmental process. Plainly they now *are* organs of administration, and increasingly are centers of administrative activity. . . .

I wish now to suggest a perspective, pose a thesis—I am not sure of the proper designation—that I believe helps in understanding such matters as I have introduced: that is, the politics-administration dichotomy, the troubled status of Public Administration in the discipline that gave it birth, and the problem of the identity and role of administration in American government. . . .

“Government in the West is usefully conceived as the rise and mingling of two traditions, the Greek and the Roman.”

Government in the West is usefully conceived as the rise and mingling of two traditions, the Greek and the Roman. The two traditions, which I shall designate the Civic Culture and the Imperial, have been added to and altered by the medieval and the modern experience, and of course by the variety of regional, ethnic, and national histories. But both have been and remain influential. Modern Western states or “countries” combine the Greek and Roman traditions in varying proportions, however much history and circumstances, in particular cases, add ingredients that are neither. . . .

The Roman or Imperial tradition originates in the ancient empires of the Near East and Mediterranean. Imperial Rome was the latest

and greatest of these, and its legacy of centuries-long rule over a large part of three continents has been determinative for much that has followed. For present purposes, this: When the modern state was created by reassembling the "pieces" of government distributed about in the feudal system, the Roman idea and aura provided inspiration and the Roman law a sort of guidebook. The slogan "The king is emperor in his own realm" sums it nicely. Most of the Continent has inclined toward the Imperial tradition. . . .

"Three times I have written about American Political Science 'in the round'—its origins, concepts, interests, methods and so forth. Each time I puzzled over a certain rootlessness."

The Civic Culture tradition arises in the experience and writings of the *polis*. It is added to by such things as the experience of the Roman republic and of early modern city-states. By several means it is infused into English-British constitutional development, mingling with a Roman-Imperial component introduced by the Conquest and the Church, and with indigenous Saxon, feudal and other components. Our Framers created a government very much in the Civic Culture mode. . . .

My argument, at its broadest, is that to understand the *politics-administration* dichotomy and its reflection in intra- and interdisciplinary tensions and diversions it is revealing to see it not simply as a parochial and petty quarrel among American academics. Rather, in significant measures what is involved is a divergence and tension between Grecian and Roman influences. In Greece and Rome the Civic Culture and Imperial modes have their origin, and the two modes are deeply matrixed in subsequent Western history and culture. . . . [My] point, bluntly: Our politics are Greek, but our administration is Roman. I mean this in two senses. One is historical, cultural, causal. The other is symbolic, analogical, heuristic. . . .

An interposition here: That Greece and Rome have been influential, but differently so, in Western development is hardly a new theme. Nor is the thought that the differing influence extends to the political-governmental; this has been the subject of considerable scholarly treatment. To explore that literature is not my

present concern. My present concern is the political-governmental in the United States, and self-aware Political Science and Public Administration in relation thereto. . . .

I begin with etymology. *Politics* and *political* of course derive from *polis*. *Government* derives from the Latin *gubernare*, though it in turn derived from the Greek root that gives us *cybernetics*. *Administration* and *management* of course have Latin roots. We have an American Political Science Association and an American Society for Public Administration. We do not have an American Government Association. . . .

Three times I have written about American Political Science "in the round"—its origins, concepts, interests, methods and so forth. Each time I puzzled over a certain rootlessness. American Political Science, as it gained self-awareness, could be related to various antecedents, such as the history of political theory, college courses in moral philosophy, the yeast of reformism, the rise of science as "idea" and movement. Of course the formal beginning was an offshoot from the American Historical Society. But the history on which it centered its origins was rather parochial; some of it indeed fanciful and ethnically biased. Where was the history of government as a general enterprise, its role in what we call civilization? Shouldn't Political Science have this kind of foundation? Why should there be a *History of Political Thought* journal and not a *History of Government* journal? . . .

[Similarly] a growth area in social science for now several decades has been organization theory—and it continues to grow. Twice, once in the early sixties and again in the late seventies, I reviewed a cluster of organization theory books. Both times I commented on what struck me as a significant fact: there was no brand of organization theory that could be identified as rising from or supplied by Political Science. Perspectives, theories, "schools" had been contributed—thrust forward if that seems more accurate—by anthropologists, business administrationists, economists, legalists, philosophers, sociologists, sociobiologists, systems theorists, and theologians. But not by political scientists. Why not? . . .

Early on I said I would be seeking to *understand*, not to assign blame for the estrangement of Public Administration; and that it is rather meaningless to argue about which side of the *politics-administration* dichotomy is "right". . . .

When, in my mind, I construct a list of those who have addressed some aspect of the problem creatively or insightfully—to name only

some no longer living: Appleby, Follett, Friedrich, Gaus, Sayre, White—I observe that most were trained as political scientists. Perhaps this is only an accident of timing and career opportunities. But perhaps it is a significant datum, and if so raises the question whether I have been unfair to Political Science. Perhaps so; perhaps it should not be taxed with a failure to solve “insoluble” problems. In any case, the matter is relevant to the future of programs in Public Administration—under whatever name academic fashions and strategies may dictate: *In or Out of Political Science departments*. . . .

During the sixties and seventies, at least, I think the better case was for separation. Lucky the program in Public Administration that suffered no worse than disdain in those times. In the preface to his *The Development of the Modern State*, in 1978, Gianfranco Poggi observed that “As for political science, over the past thirty years or so it seems to me to have gone to incredible lengths to forget the state. . . .” As if reminded, a few years later the American Political Science Association took as the theme of its annual meeting *The State*. While this was rather like the American Medical Association devoting its annual meeting to *The Body*, I welcomed the move. There are other hopeful signs, including notably the size and vitality of the recently recreated Section on Public Administration in the Association. . . .

We shall see; and I shall not predict. But if institutional or programmatic separation is to continue and become decisive, then those in Public Administration programs—again I add: under whatever fashionable names—will have to become their own Political Scientists. They will, that is, if the cleft is not to widen and if they are to discharge successfully their educational function. I can at least hope that those of the other side of the cleft will become increasingly aware of and knowledgeable about administration. Even—here I fantasize—that they give it highly informed and serious attention. □

Constitutional Aspects of Major Policy Controversies

Carol Nechemias

The Pennsylvania State University
at Harrisburg

In honor of the Bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution, the plenary sessions slated

for this year’s American Political Science Association meeting focused on the constitutional aspects of major policy controversies. The panel chaired by APSA President Samuel P. Huntington (Harvard University) explored the struggle for the control of foreign policy between the legislative and executive branches, while the other session, chaired by APSA Program Chair Robert Jervis (Columbia University), examined the question of whether the Constitution does, or should, contain social welfare rights. Although intense debate ranged over a host of contending positions, the participants maintained a high level of amicability and humor as well as intellectual acuteness.

The participants on Huntington’s panel, entitled “The Constitution and Foreign Affairs,” included H. Bradford Westerfield (Yale University), John Norton Moore (University of Virginia School of Law), and Representative Barney Frank (Democrat, Massachusetts). Westerfield reminded the audience that conflict between Congress and the President over issues of American expansionism and foreign involvement have reoccurred throughout American history, from the Jacksonian era to Irangate. For Westerfield, there is a continuity between the debates of the mid-1980s, the 1970s, the 1938-1940 period, and the 1930s. Accordingly, neither partisanship nor an alleged constitutional revolution in foreign affairs account for the current struggle between Congress and the President for authority.

Westerfield pointed out that executive impulses toward greater foreign involvement or intervention sometimes elicit little controversy. In these cases, careful, advance preparation on the part of the executive, coupled with the existence of durable, supportive coalitions in Congress, has meant that the pursuit of “covert actions” like American assistance to rebels in Afghanistan and Angola fail to provoke congressional scrutiny or public outcry. In contrast, where conditions of coalition building and consensus are lacking, as in the Irangate affair, stalemate and the debilitation of the administration are likely to follow.