

Review

The American New State of Mary Parker Follett

Wasim I. Al-Habil

College of Commerce, The Islamic University, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Gaza.
E-mail: al_habil_wasim@hotmail.com.

Accepted 02 February, 2014

This research tries to answer one of the major questions that has been discussed in the literature of Public Administration (PA) repeatedly. The question is: Has 21st century American government succeeded in achieving a genuinely democratic administration where efficiency and democratic values are reconciled? The main argument of this research is that it has not been possible in spite of the calls of many public administration theories which have encouraged the adoption of Follett's equation based on the partnership between efficient government and active citizen participation. The research argues that Follett's assertion sounds rather optimistic but it has not been implemented seriously on the ground.

Key words: Public administration, efficient government, and active citizen participation.

INTRODUCTION

It seems that the main point Mary Parker Follett tried to assert is one of the basic concepts that have shaped the field of public administration (PA) since Woodrow (1887) established PA as a field of study. Follett believes that the notions of active citizenship and efficient government are not opposed but partners in American political life. She argues that both administrative responsibility and expert service constitute genuine democracy. With her belief of a genuinely democratic administration, Follett was an exception of her time known as the Orthodoxy period (McSwite, 1997: 164). The progressive movement and the founding of a rational, objective, scientific, and value neutral administration mark the Orthodoxy Era. This logical division of value-laden politics and neutral administrative science is referred to as the politics-administration dichotomy (Goodnow, 1900). The foundations of public administration were laid within the politics-administration dichotomy framework for decades.

This research tries to answer one of the major questions that have been discussed in the literature of PA repeatedly. The question is: Has 21st century American government succeeded in achieving a genuinely democratic administration where efficiency and democratic values are reconciled? The main argument of this research is that it has not been possible in spite of the calls of many public administration theories which have

encouraged the adoption of Follett's equation based on the partnership between efficient government and active citizen participation. The research argues that Follett's assertion sounds rather optimistic but it has not been implemented seriously on the ground.

Students of PA can obviously see that PA exists within the tension of efficiency and democracy. This research will start by giving a brief idea about citizen participation and explain Follett's argument and its echoes in the recent literature. Then it will provide a brief history of American public administration with an emphasis on the dichotomy. It will bring the discussion into the context of 21st century American government. The research will conclude by summarizing the ideas and argue that despite the current state of neomanagerialism, there are alternative ideas that help in reconciling bureaucracy (administration) and democracy and achieving genuine democratic administration.

THE OLD IDEA OF CITIZENSHIP

Citizenship, in a general sense, means many things to many different people. The word citizenship is derived from the Latin word "civitas" which means a member, or citizen, of a city. Countries, states, provinces and cities

grant persons rights as citizens and expect certain duties from them.

Generally, in a very topical sense, a country does not exist until people of certain geographic areas organize politically. Once organized country and its citizens are never really separated. Conceptually, they act as one. For the purposes of this effort, it describes elementary considerations of citizenship that are an essential element for understanding the perspective utilized to express an understanding of the question at hand. It is the fourteenth amendment of the U.S. constitution which provides the principle of the foundation of a citizenry and subsequently an administration for it when it states:

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state where they reside.

The idea of citizenship goes back thousands of years. The city states of ancient Greece had citizens, slaves or serfs, and aliens or non-citizens. Greek laws and traditions gave citizens many privileges, but also heavy responsibilities. Citizens were expected to vote, to attend the assembly, to serve on juries and to give military service. Slaves had few rights and aliens had almost none, but they did have personal freedom and protection of the law.

Some philosophers of ancient Greece called Stoics, followers of a school of philosophy founded in Athens about 305 B. C. by Zeno of Citium, a city in Cyprus, regarded all men as brothers (Angeles, 1992: 295). They did much to promote the expansion of citizenship from the few to the many. Christianity with its idea of the equality of man also influenced the growth of the idea of citizenship (World Book Encyclopedia, 1965; A: 44). The idea of citizenship declined with the fall of the Romans and the rise of feudalism.

It is not until the growth of national governments that people changed the notion of serf and vassal to that of citizen and national. The U.S. constitution, in the fourteenth amendment, borrowed such conceptualizations of citizenship from British common law and the U. S. supreme court fully established the legality of citizenship in 1898 (Ibid).

The role of the citizen in public administration is varied. From a positivist frame of reference shaped by a value-free, standard laden goal is that the citizen is client, one to be served by Administration in support of a polity. From a non-positivist perspective, the citizen is participant. They are necessary to composite normative judgments for the delivery of services and allocation of resources. To be clear, these are competing ideologies which grasp for the heart and soul of the field of public administration.

The field of public administration has been discussing the meaning and the role of the citizens for decades through Paul (1997), George (1971), Cherry and Camilla (1998), Denhardt and Denhardt (2000), and many others. However, students of public administration are introduced

to the theme of citizen participation first through Mary Parker Follett in 1940s.

Follett's argument

It is clear from the aforementioned quotation that Follett is mainly calling for a partnership between public administration or professionals and citizens. She argues that experts are needed for purposes of attaining efficiency and that citizens also play an important role in issues pertaining to governance and both roles of professionals and citizens cannot be disputed. She believes that experts and citizens play complementary roles in the society and should not be viewed as working against each other. She wrote that "politics can no longer be an extra-activity of the American people; they must be a means of satisfying our actual wants" (189). Follett (1998) reminds us that citizens do not exist on one side and government on the other. "It must be clearly seen that we can operate as government as well as with government, that the citizen functions through government and the government functions through the citizen" (236). Follett's assertion may be based on her pragmatic vision to harmonize the two different views of modern administration and liberal democracy, according to Stever (1986).

With regard to the relationship between individuals, groups and the state, Follett argues that the group is an expression of the individual will at a higher level while the state is an extension of the group process at a much higher level. Fry (1998) summarizes this view succinctly by stating that:

As the group will is an expression of the individual will at a higher level of purpose, so too is the state an expression of individual and group will at an even higher level of purpose. The true state gives rise to the great group unified by common end with its sovereignty resting on the group process and the principle of integration. As such, the state cannot leave us alone, it cannot regulate us, it can only express us

A worthy political life can be attained only if citizens realize and appreciate the fact that there is no dividing line between them and government. She wrote that "it must be clearly seen that we can operate as government as well as with government, that the citizen functions through government and the government functions through the citizens" (236). She explains that citizens want to be given an opportunity to train in democracy rather than mere opportunities to exercise democracy. Citizens want to be actively involved in the organization and management of their local centers so that they can use their experience to take their localities to a higher level. As Follett argues that "the state must give people every opportunity for building up their own full, varied and healthful life" (237). She goes further that "the question which the state must always be trying to answer is how it

can do more for its members at the same time that it is stimulating them to do more for themselves" (237).

Follett's echo in recent PA literature

King and Stivers (1998) state that American citizens tend to tolerate rather than support the government enthusiastically and the disconnection between citizens and government is attributed to the fact that the US is a large, diverse as well as a "young national with political, social, and geographic boundaries that have been in flux throughout our history". They go further to capture the views of the citizens regarding government by stating that "not only does government exercise too much power and in the wrong ways, not only is it inefficient and wasteful, but it appears to care little about ordinary citizens, their lives, and their problems". Stivers and King add that disconnection between citizens and government "produce apparent apathy that itself reflects a profound lack of knowledge ... Lack of knowledge about government is closely related with feelings of powerlessness".

Hummel and Stivers (1998) hold that people in government institutions do not fully know and understand the citizens. People's representatives do not have any direct linkage with their constituents, hence it is common for them to come up with policies, programs and even laws that are abstract and therefore do not satisfy the needs and aspiration of the citizens. Hummel and Stivers wrote that:

Those in government do not know us directly, only in representation. We appear to them as abstract citizens, as voters, as bearers of certain rights, or as statistics in an opinion poll or policy study, not as complete human beings. Legislators make law for us based on such representations and administrators manage policies over us as if we were these representations.

This is because "government becomes a specialized enterprise increasingly devoted to the exercise of technical rules and procedures, whether or not these take care of real-life problems. Reason, especially instrumental reason, overwhelms care" (Hummel and Stivers, 1998: 29). By the same token, Hummel and Stivers contend that "representative politics negate the original, direct, or immediate experience of ordinary folk" (33). Emphasis on technical aspects has resulted in a top-down approach to governance heavily premised on domination of technocrats in the decision-making process.

Macedo et al. (2005) have also observed that the representative system of governance is threatening democracy in the U.S as citizens have turned away from the public sphere in large numbers thus impoverishing civic life. These scholars lament "an erosion of the activities and capacities of citizenship" (Macedo et al., 2005) by stating that "citizens participate in public affairs less frequently, with less knowledge and enthusiasm, in fewer venues, and less equally than is healthy for a

vibrant democratic polity" (Macedo et al., 2005). In the same vein, Macedo and others observe that alienation of citizens from the decision-making process has led to the fact that citizens failed to participate in the co-production of essential goods and services. They are relegated to the position of consumers rather than useful co-producer.

Citizens and efficient government together

It can be noticed that Follett's argument announced 70 years ago has been emphasized and explained more and more in the recent PA literature. Follett (1965) implies a disagreement with the founders' view that pure democracy cannot deal with faction. In addition, the rule of majority to decrease factions or to prevent conflicts, which is based on compromise, does not consist with Follett's beliefs in integration. In fact, she believes that compromises that any majority can reach do not solve the problem of conflict among people. The disability of "majority idea [which] is not the group idea" (Follett, 1965: 27) appears because the majority role does not produce the same stable ends that reflect the interests of everyone. Follett (1965) would argue that the stable ends as the production of her ideal notion of integration are unable to be reached without collective opinion that is not consistent with the Publius' representative democracy.

Regarding the will of the people, Follett (1998) argued that it can only be known and attained through the establishment of neighborhood organizations. She believed that these organizations bring people together to deliberate on their problems, needs and aspirations, which ultimately become the substance of politics. Election of genuine leaders who fully understand the needs and aspirations of the people can also be done through these organizations. As Follett explains, leaders, not bosses and a responsible government can be selected and put in place through neighborhood organizations.

Since Follett argued that the group is an expression of the individual will at a higher level while the state is an extension of the group process at a much higher level, she explained that citizens do not exist on one side and the government on the other. For Follett, a worthy political life can be attained only if citizens realize and appreciate the fact that there is no dividing line between them and the government. As she said "It must be clearly seen that we can operate as government as well as with government, that the citizen functions through government and the government functions through the citizen" (p.236).

Cooper argues that the partnership between public administrators and citizens can be strengthened if the former realize that they are citizens engaged to perform certain duties on behalf of the citizens (nation). According to him, "public administrators are "professional citizens," or "citizen-administrators;" they are fiduciaries who are employed by the citizenry to work on their behalf. In other words public administrators are to be understood as

citizens in lieu of the rest of people. Stivers concurs by stating that public administrators as citizens should “use their authoritative expertise on behalf of their fellow citizens and to see themselves as operating under the sovereignty of citizenry” (590). Cooper (1984) states that it is imperative for administrators to make a concerted effort of establishing and maintaining “horizontal relationships of authority with one’s fellow citizens,” seeking “power with” rather than “power over” the citizenry (266).

Hummel and Stivers (1998) are of the view that the formulation and implementation of abstract policies and programs can be avoided through the use of lived experience of citizens. Their argument is that “to represent fully would require knowing what the people go through: the actual problems they experience and their resulting self-knowledge” (Hummel and Stivers, 1998, 33). This is because “in laws based on represented knowledge, people cannot recognize the fullness of their own experiences. Instead, laws become empty concepts with binding authority of reason rather than lived experience” (Hummel and Stivers, 1998: 36).

Drawing on the underpinnings of the New Public Service, which is explained later, presented by Denhardt and Denhardt (2000), Morse (2006) recommends that public administration should strive for more democracy. “By more democratic, I mean more authentically participatory; “strong” or republican democracy as opposed to “thin” and “procedural” (Morse, 2006, 2). He goes further to explain that being more democratic means “more local self government; more responsible citizenship and more direct participation in the processes of governance (Morse 2006, 2). Boyte (2005) recommends a paradigm shift from a democratic state to a democratic society. As he explains “this shift can be conceived of as a move from seeing citizens as voters, volunteers, clients, or consumers to viewing citizens as problem solvers and co-creators of public goods” Boyte (2005, 537).

Stivers reminds us that restoring the trust of citizens in government is not contingent upon efficient and effective delivery of the much-needed services as some people believe. She argues that “enlightening citizens about the complexities of public decision-making or encouraging them to think beyond “getting mine” (598). Mutual trust and cooperation between public administrators and citizens can be enhanced if the latter are given an opportunity to understand and appreciate the intricacies, power relations and limitations of government agencies and consequently they will be able to contribute meaningfully to the decision-making process.

ADMINISTRATION VERSUS POLITICS IN THE HISTORY OF PA

The tension between efficient government and participatory government or the administration-politics dichotomy can be traced back as far as to the founding period and the Federalist- Anti Federalist debate. In fact, this tension can be clearly observed in the debate and

conflict between the Federalists and the Anti- Federalist. The Federalists, who were wealthy educated men lived on the Northeast seaboard believed that the government should be run by the experts with a centralized authority and strong administration. On the other hand, the Anti-Federalists, who were farmers lived in the South supported the notion of having decentralized government which is close to the citizens to reflect and represent their needs. Although the constitution was heavily built on the Federalist perspective, the Anti-Federalist view continued to shape PA in the new nation. An example of how the politics-administration dichotomy appeared in the history of PA can be seen through the merit system and also the spoil system that was acceptable in practical PA during the first half of the nineteenth century.

The progressive reform movement in the US started in the late nineteenth century in response to the problems of the industrialization, urbanization, and immigration. The rapid expansion of cities and public agencies was accompanied with administrative corruption which raised the need for improving the performance of government and a call for the science of PA. In his article the study of Public Administration (1887).

Woodrow Wilson called for the separation of administration from politics marking the beginning of a self-conscious public administration despite some criticism (Van Riper, 1997). Since it was “getting harder to run a constitution than to frame one” (Wilson, 1887: 200) , Wilson called for developing a science of PA as well as detaching administration from the political considerations. At the same time, he was suspicious of mass participation when he states that “the bulk of mankind is rigidly unphilosophical, and nowadays the bulk of mankind votes” (Wilson, 1887: 20). According to Stillman (2000), Wilson believes that administration “serves to carry out the dictates on the populace through efficient procedures relatively free from political meddling” (Stillman, 2000: 5).

The term “politics-administration dichotomy” was not well known in the field until it was carefully and clearly examined by Frank Goodnow in his book “Politics and Administration” which was published in 1900 (Shafritz et al., 2004). He outlines two functions of government – politics and administration. He states that “politics has to do with policies and expressions of the state will. Administration has to do with the execution of these policies” (Ibid, 27). Executing the will of the people could no longer be done by those who were part of the political machine, and loyal to parties and not necessarily to that will of the people. Government is poorly run and corrupt; hence it should be ruled by well-trained and educated experts. Goodnow believed that “modern administration presented a number of dilemmas involving political and administrative functions that had now supplanted the traditional concern with the separation of power among the various branches of government” (Shafritz et al., 2004: 3). Therefore, politics and administration could be distinguished from each other.

At that time, PA was influenced by the scientific management movement which supported the scientific perspective about the field. When Fredrick Taylor published his book "Principles of Scientific Management" in 1911, the impact of his work was very strong on the thinking of how to manage. According to Shafritz et al. (2004), Taylor's ideas were publicly well known when he presented them to a special committee in the House of Representative in 1912. He asserted the use of scientific management and systematic analysis (time-motion analysis) to reach efficient productivity. The scientific approach in management was asserted also by the human relation school and Hawthorne studies. During the considerable effect of scientific management, "universities in the United States were beginning to teach courses in public administration and the first textbooks were being written" (Marini and Pugh, 1983: 25). The most important example for improving government through the application of scientific principles was the Municipal Bureau Movement (Stivers, 2000).

The field was established in an environment which absorbed the scientific administrative principles. Leonard White's "An Introduction to the Study of Public Administration" (1926) was the first textbook that addressed the main concepts of PA. White succeeded in "gluing together various functional specializations as well as disparate ideas of Taylorism, Goodnow's dichotomy, and other innovations" (Stillman, 2000: 20). The main point here is that White continued to present the field based on the scientific interpretation of governance. A decade later, the field of PA was fully influenced by the concepts of the scientific management when Luther Gulick in his book "The Papers on the Science of Administration" (1937) represented a firm notion of the orthodoxy in PA.

Gulick followed the track of scientific management and created the principles of executives (POSDCORB) to function in public agencies. This period is known in the field as the Orthodoxy era. The Brownlow report of the President's committee on administrative management (1937), which introduced managerial techniques, was the last major contribution of orthodoxy in PA. This report, which was prepared by Brownlow Louis et al (1937) continued to present scientific management which influenced PA during the Orthodoxy era and focused on efficiency and economy as the main goal for public agencies (Stillman, 2000).

The scientific values continued to be the main stream in PA until the end of the 1940s. Mary Parker Follett was one of these quiet voices that rejected the notion of scientific management and thus became an outlier in terms of her ideas. According to Shafritz et al. (2004), her major contribution to the field was what would be called today the participatory management. However, she did not have the influence on the field at that time maybe because she remains one of the 'outsiders' who were only later 'discovered' after the end of World War II by public administration scholarship (Waldo, 1948; McSwite,

1997; Stillman, 2000: 21).

The politics-administration dichotomy was raised again in the early 1940s by Carl Friedrich and Herman Finer in their debate about administrative responsibility (Shafritz et al., 2004). While Fredrick argued that responsible administrators should be connected to professionalism as well as standards and codes, Finer argued that responsible administrators should be connected to the legislative body and popular control. In other words, Finer opposes Friedrich and states that responsible administrators do not "decide on their own course; they are responsible to the elected representatives of the public, and these are to determine the course of action of the public servants to the most minute degree that is technically feasible". Responsible conduct can only be ensured through the courts and hierarchy of administrative departments or sanctions exercised by a representative assembly. Whereas Friedrich relies on the inner checks and professional conduct, Finer has less faith in human beings and argues that they have to be constrained and if necessary punished by an external system. What is important and common in both, is their exclusion of the citizenry from the process of governance and accountability (McSwite, 1997: 51).

A little later, the 1940s witnessed the rejection of the politics-administration dichotomy when it lost its validity. Shafritz et al. (2004) argues that it was believed that it is "not possible to take purportedly value free processes of business and apply them to government". In fact, the considerable influence came later through the works of Simon and Waldo by the end of the 1940s which presented two different logics to criticize orthodoxy and destroy the myth of science of PA.

In his book the Administrative Behavior (1947), Herbert Simon believed in the scientific study of PA, but he considered the POSDCORP only as proverbs not scientific principles. In fact, he had a different meaning for the term "scientific." Certainly, Simon concentrated on human motivation and behavior because he believed that they follow stable "patterns that can be understood and reduced to law-like generalization" (McSwite, 1997: 177). Administrator's decision-making is influenced by "bounded rationality," which is limited by skills and habits, values and conceptions, as well as the limited knowledge of things relevant to job (Simon, 1946).

In his book The Administrative State (1948), Dwight Waldo also criticized the notions of scientific management and orthodoxy and challenged the notion that "positivism" is "the science." According to Stivers (2000), he believed that the PA field is grounded in a fundamental tension among scientific, efficient, business-like management of public sector. Waldo also focused on the political impacts on PA and "despite the field's claim to be 'a science with principles of universal validity,' it operated on the basis of 'political theories'" (Stivers, 2000: 124). According to Stivers (2000), "by emphasizing public administration's political significance, he hoped to

maintain the tension between science and democratic politics" (142). Ultimately, Waldo called for developing a theory of democratic administration. He advocated for focusing on democracy as the main value of PA. He states that the believers of the dichotomy have accepted to reconcile democracy and efficiency. To make this possible democracy had to be re-defined as:

An intelligent and informed citizenry organized into groups, preferable as few as possible, on the basis of issues. To realize this condition the proper institutions, such as the short ballot, a budget system and a reporting system must function...Citizens must realize that there are two essentials in government: politics and administration, deciding and executing. When these two functions are properly separate and institutionalized it will be found that the resulting system is both democratic and efficient (Waldo, 1948: 16).

The Minnowbrook conference in 1967 explored the view about the state and future of the PA field and asserted the importance of democratic conceptions. New Public Administration called for returning to the people by focusing on social equity, citizen participation as well as demonstrating organization responsiveness. In 1982, some PA scholars in Virginia Tech Center for Public Administration and Policy wrote a document calling for refounding PA. Wamsley, Goodsell, Rohr, Wolf, White, and Stivers focused not on "how to reduce whatever role government has, but what form of governmental intervention is most effective in the real world" (Wamsley et al., 1987: 293). Their major concern was about how to legitimate the administration in terms of constitutional principles (Rohr, 1986).

This value-driven school did not continue to have the major influence on the field after the mid 1980s when the concepts of New Public Management (NPM) emerged in the PA field. NPM came with a strong tendency to exchange administration with management and the traditional bureaucracy with market principles. It came with new perspectives that affirmed professionalism, competition, as well as private sector like management. NPM believes that the treatment of problems in PA is to deal with citizens as "customers," which reflects the economic principles, and neglects the traditional values of PA such as fairness, justice, participation and representation (Ventriss, 2000).

However, neomanagerialism had reincarnated as the Reinventing Government movement, inspired by Osborne and Gaebler's book "Reinventing Government" (1992), which was adopted by President Clinton. The Reinventing Government doctrines are very similar to those of New Public Management. Some scholars equate the Reinventing movement and New Public Management (Rosenbloom and Kravtchuck, 2002), others see them similar but on different conceptual levels. This research emphasizes that they have the same underpinnings and doctrines but New Public Management is a broader concept of ideas and Reinventing Government is a

subset of reforms.

The assumptions of this view are derived from market theory and economic decision-making, public choice, principal agent theory and transaction cost economics in particular (Hood, 1991). NPM is based on scientific-analytical and technical-rational modern western thought. It "seeks to predict and control both human behaviour and the behaviour of organizational subunits because of the focus on executive decision making and policy implementation.

" Moreover, "bureaucratic control is essential to this model" and it implies "conscious self interested human behaviour" (Marshall in Ventriss, 2000: 510). Consequently NPM shifts the notion of public service to customer satisfaction. It takes the public out of administration and replaces it with free market principles.

Summary of the history

One can observe that since the early history of the US government, the political concepts of democracy and citizenship have played a considerable role in PA. Even when Wilson called for the science of PA he did not ignore the political side of the field. The Orthodoxy era in PA focused more on scientific management and efficiency, but it did try to maintain the politics-administration dichotomy. In other words, the Orthodoxy of PA tried to reconcile politics with scientific management and efficiency altogether. However, NPM came with a whole new idea that destroyed or influenced negatively the traditional values of PA.

Lynn (2001) argues that there is a gap between the orientations of traditional PA and NPM. He concludes that it is doubtful that NPM is a new paradigm in the context of the consecutive PA paradigms. Even though there are many differences among the traditional scholars' thoughts, Lynn (2001) argues that traditional habits of public administration showed more respect for law, citizens, and values than customer oriented managerialism. Lynn (2001) also confirms that NPM value such as "managerialism, marketization, and reinvention are far from the whole story of public administration discourse". He affirms the importance of returning to democracy to ensure that reform in public sector integrates with the constitution.

This rejection of the ignorance of the political side of administration has encouraged some scholars in the field of PA to return back to the same idea that Follett asserted 70 years ago. Therefore, the importance came again to Follett's argument that "the tendency to transfer power to the American citizenship, and the tendency towards efficient government ... are working side by side in American political life today. These two tendencies are not opposed." The balance that should be maintained between the two tendencies was observed in the New Public Service (NPS).

New public service

An alternative form of governance, New Public Service, defies New Public Management. New Public Service (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000) is rooted in theories of democratic citizenship, models of community and civil society and organizational humanism. With consideration to the work of Dwight Waldo (1948) and Sheldon Wolin (1960), the roots of NPS emerge from three major sources, according to Denhardt and Denhardt (2000):

The theories of democratic citizenship which refer to the active citizens who should engage in governance.

The community and civil society theories which focus on the role of government to create and support community.

The postmodern approach of thinking which believes that "governance must be based on sincere and open discourse among all parties, including citizens and administrators" (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000: 553).

NPS returns to the idea that government should serve citizens as citizens, not as customers. It believes that accountability in public administration should pay attention to "constitutional law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizen interests" (Denhardt and Denhardt, 2000: 555). NPS needs to be put before entrepreneurship, because the boat managers try to steer actually is not theirs. Government belongs to the citizens (King and Stivers, 1998) and therefore has to act in their interest rather than out of entrepreneurial motivations. This means that NPS gives consideration to Follett's equation that asserts the partnership between efficient government and citizen participation.

Assessment review of American government

Our look at the history of American government has shown us that from its earliest days on, a tension between efficient government and participatory government or between administration and politics has existed. Up to the end of the orthodoxy era, democracy and efficiency have been sought to be reconciled, however under a rather narrow definition of democracy. That idea has been challenged ever since through several governmental reforms. The current and most dominant set of ideas known as New Public Management has taken the discussion from business like government to business as government. The threats this movement poses have been articulated by many scholars (Box et al., 2001; Denhardt and deLeon, 2000; Lynn, 2001). However, Denhardt and Denhardt have offered an alternative view of democratic governance represented by the New Public Service which gives hope for achieving a genuine democratic administration.

The 21st century American government clearly shows the signs of its past. Adams (1995) argues that over time 'new' theories in public administration have been

painted over the old, only to continuously 'bleed' through. These images are those of technique and rationality (Adams, 1995). New Public Management has entered new serious changes in 21st century that ignored totally the citizen participation. In previous reforms "preserving democratic values was a key argument used to justify these efforts. Efficiency has always been offered as a way to help achieve democratic accountability" (Box et al., 2001). This can be seen for example in the Brownlow Report:

The efficiency of government rests upon two factors: the consent of the governed and good management. In a democracy consent may be readily achieved, though not without some effort as it is the cornerstone of the constitution (Brownlow Commission, 1937, in Shafritz and Hyde, 91).

The 21st century gospel of New Public Management replaces the struggle to be efficient for democratic values and consent of the governed with 'steering' and treating the governed as customers. Citizenship ends at the ballot box and consumption of competitively supplied goods and services carries the 'customer' through government agencies.

It should be observed that the expectations of citizens from public agencies tend to be higher. This means that citizens of the 21st century expect to get high quality services from public agencies as they get from business sector. At the same time, citizens who are willing to practice democracy and participate in the decision-making process are the same citizens who are willing to be served efficiently. This keeps the dilemma between bureaucracy and democracy as a hot issue in the field of PA. Thus, Follett argument may continue to be valid in the 21st century. Moreover, the questions about the contradictory values in PA will continue to be asked:

Is it a part of political science? Part of business? A separate field? Or what? One can certainly hear the refrains of all these value accents and methodological emphases from earlier eras in the current refounding movement: the business values apparent within the reinventors; Talorite themes within the tools-makers; New Public Administration within the interpretists, or political science within the new bureaucratic analysis. Within each school, new administrative concepts are therefore emerging and then gelling, while old ones are declining or disappearing... the field potential genius may well be that it is continuously "bubbling up" with multiple new perspectives for understanding, defining, and dealing with salient public issues (Stillman, 2000: 29).

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion we can say Follett's assertion might have been realized to some extent in the 20th century; however 21st century American government has taken a turn towards the free market where the citizenship has

become an aggregate of customers. This might be part of hyper-individualism and fragmentation within the post-modern condition. Nevertheless, it is comforting to see that there is commitment to “communal development of a democratic discourse of action” (Fox and Miller, 1998) with alternative theories such as New Public Service.

This research discussed Follett’s argument that the tendency to transfer power to the American citizenship and the tendency towards efficient government are working side by side. The focus was given to the politics-administration dichotomy. This paper argued that the politics-administration dichotomy has continuously existed in the field. Even during the strong influence of the scientific school in management, the political considerations were not totally ignored. Starting from the mid 1980s, NPM came with new concepts that ignored the traditional considered values in the field and introduced complete values of business in public sector. However, NPS was in the 2000s an attempt to maintain the balance again in PA. It seems that the field will never have one best answer for the best way to run government. At the same time, we should always remember that “the government is best which governs least” and “it is equally true that that government is best which provides most”.

REFERENCES

- Adams GB (1995). Enthralled with Modernity: The Historical context of Knowledge and Theory Development in Public Administration. In J. D. White & G. B. Adams (eds.), *Research in Public Administration: Reflections on Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Angeles PA (1992). *Philosophy*. 2nd ed. New York: HarperCollins. Box, RC & Marshall, GS & Reed, BJ & Reed, CM. (2001). *New Public Management and Substantive Democracy*. *Public Adm. Rev.*, 61(5): 608-618.
- Box RC, Marshall GS, Reed BJ, Reed CM (2001). *New Public Management and Substantive Democracy*. *Public Adm. Rev.*, 61(5): 608-618.
- Brownlow L, Charles M, Luther G (1937). Report of the President’s Committee on Administrative Management. In J. M. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.) *Classics of Public Administration*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers. pp. 90-94.
- Denhardt RB, deLeon L (2000). The Political Theory of Reinvention. *Public Adm. Rev.* 60(2): 89-96.
- Denhardt RB, Denhardt JV (2000). The New Public Service: Serving Rather than Steering. *Public Adm. Rev.*, 60(6): 549-559.
- Finer H (1941). Administrative Responsibility in Democratic Government. In F. C. Mosher (ed.) *Basic Literature of American Public Administration, 1787-1950*. New York: Holms and Meier Publishing. pp. 205-213
- Follett MP (1998). *The New State: Group Organization the Solution of Popular Government*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University.
- Follett MP (1965). *The new state: group organization the solution of popular government*. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith.
- Fox CJ, Miller HT (1998). Postmodern Philosophy, Postmodernity and Public Organization Theory. In T. D. Lynch & T. J. Dicker (Eds.), *Handbook of Organization Theory and Management-The Philosophical Approach*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc. : pp. 415-437
- Friedrich CJ, Finer H (1940). Public Policy and Administrative Responsibility. In F. C. Mosher (Ed.) *Basic Literature of American Public Administration, 1787-1950*: New York: Holms and Meier Publishing. pp. 196-204
- Goodnow FJ (1900). *Politics and Administration- A Study in Government*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hood C (1991). A Public Management for all Seasons? In J.M. Shafritz, A.C. Hyde & S.J. Parkes (Eds.), *Classics of Public Administration*. 5th ed. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers, pp. 503-526
- King C, Stivers C (1998). *Government is us*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Lynn L (2001). Big Questions for Public Administration: The Myth of the Bureaucratic Paradigm: What Traditional Public Administration Really Stood For. *Public Adm. Rev.*, (61)2: 144-160.
- Marini F, Pugh DL (1983). *The Development of Public Administration*. McSwite, OC (1997). *Legitimacy in Public Administration- A discourse Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- McSwite OC (1997). *Legitimacy in Public Administration- A discourse Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Rohr JA (1986). *To run a constitution: the legitimacy of the administrative state*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- Rosenbloom D, Kravtchuck RS (2002). *Public Administration: Understanding Management, Politics and Law in the Public Sector*. 5th ed. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Shafritz JM, Albert C, Parkes, Sandra J (2004). *Classics of public administration*. Belmont, CA: Thomas Learning.
- Simon HA (1946). The proverbs of public administration. *Public Adm. Rev.* Vol. 6, 53-67.
- Stever JA (1986). Mary Parker Follett and the quest for pragmatic administration. *Adm. Soc.*, 18(2): 159-177
- Stillman R (2000). The study of public administration in the United States: The eminently practical science. In R. Stillman (Ed.), *Public Administration: Concepts and Cases*: 17-30. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company
- Stivers C (2000). Bureau men, settlement women: constructing public administration in the progressive era. Kansas: The University Press of Kansas.
- Van Riper P (1997). The American Administrative State: Wilson and the Founders. In R. Chandler (Ed.), *A Centennial History of the American Administrative State*. New York: The Free Press, pp. 3-36
- Ventriss C (2000). New public management: an examination of its influence on contemporary public affairs and its impact on shaping the intellectual agenda of the field. *Adm. Theory Praxis*, 22(3): 500-518.
- Waldo D (1948). *The Administrative State*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers.
- Wamsley G, Bacher RN, Goodsell CT, Kronenberg PS, Rohr JA, Stivers C, White OF, Wolf JF (1987). *Refounding Public Administration*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Wilson W (1887). *The Study of Administration*. In J. Shafritz & A. C. Hyde (Eds.), *Classics of Public Administration*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. pp. 14-26.