

Digital Commons@ Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School

Political Science Faculty Works

Political Science

1-1-1985

Book Review of Problems in Administrative Reform by Robert Miewald & Michael Steinman

Michael A. Genovese Loyola Marymount University, mgenovese@lmu.edu

Repository Citation

Genovese, Michael A., "Book Review of Problems in Administrative Reform by Robert Miewald & Michael Steinman" (1985). *Political Science Faculty Works*. 74. http://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/poli fac/74

Recommended Citation

Genovese, M. (1985). Book Review of Problems in Administrative Reform by Miewold and Steinman. International Social Science Review, 60(1), 35-36.

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Political Science at Digital Commons @ Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. It has been accepted for inclusion in Political Science Faculty Works by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@lmu.edu.

BOOK REVIEWS

University. He has been an activist (in the true sense of the word) by nature. As a sculptor or painter is irrevocably connected to his talent, so Roche cannot change his personality and stop being an outspoken observer and critic of the political world around him.

At the age of 16 he came to the conclusion that "Trotskyists were agents of a non-existing foreign power" and was accused pejoratively by his budding socialist peers of being a "capitalist." He never fell in with the masses who considered Marx a prophet. To him, Marx was from the start "a brilliant political journalist . . . [who] had been left behind like a whale on a sandbar by the development of industrial capitalism."

According to the tenets of socialism, the means of production should be in public rather than private hands. This, to Roche, clearly means inefficiency and ultimately chaos, because responsibilities cannot be pinned down.

Roche is one of the rare Americans who recognize the fact that Czechoslovakia was part of the West and know why that was so.

The author also discusses the Stalin-Hitler Pact of 1939, and its influence on the "faithful" in the United States. The analysis takes us through the postwar era to the demise of Stalin.

Roche is not one to mince words. He has always had the courage to call a fake a fake, a sham a sham, or Marxism-Leninism "an operational code for a new-style Mafia," aiming at power rather than the liberation of "the wretched of the earth." Perpetually watchful, his maxim is: "Don't listen to what they say, watch their hands." Without spelling it out, he admonishes between the lines that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance.

Roche frequently claims that "one has to earn the right to hold an opinion" by familiarizing oneself with the subject under discussion. He certainly lives by what he preaches. He does his homework and offers a sharp view on the golden calf of Marxism-Leninism.

It is hoped that the author will extend the contents of the present slim volume and continue his critical analysis to bring it up to date. He should share his *savoir faire* in his journey through the intricacies of political positioning on the international chessboard of history. Vera Laska

History Department Regis College Weston, Massachusetts 02193, USA

Robert Miewald and Michael Steinman, editors, *Problems in Administrative Reform*, Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1984, pp. v + 265, no price indicated.

Can and does administrative reform work? This is the central concern of a collection of essays derived from a 1978 symposium held at the University of Nebraska. The use of the word "problems" in the title should be "failures," because the tone of this work is very negative regarding past efforts and future prospects for administrative reform.

In the opening chapter, the editors recognize the long tradition of efforts at administrative reform, but these attempts have fallen short of their promise. Yet, we keep trying. Why? One factor, say the editors, is America's tradition of "non-dialectical thought." This, coupled with a legacy of utopian thought and rationalism, leads to heightened expectations and a belief that true administrative reform is indeed within reach.

The result of this search for an administrative panacea has been "a series of dismal failures" (p. 2). Reform was oversold, and the result is that "Public Administration . . . has been a science of wretched excesses" (p. 2). Thus, the hope of this work is to identify why administrative reform has failed, and what, if anything, can be salvaged from the wreckage.

Laurence O'Toole's essay on the "idea of reform" in public administration is especially noteworthy in its effort to trace the history and the character of reform both as an ideal and in practice. O'Toole sees a long tradition of administrative reform, but does not see a monolithic, ideological character to such reform efforts. "Instead of seeming to make up a uniform movement . . . reformers en masse produce a cacophony of voices, all singing the same tune, each in a different key" (p. 238). There has never been a commonly accepted "theory" of reform, and Americans have historically embraced a very nonideological, pragmatic approach to administrative reform in particular, and political reform generally. "The impulse to reform," O'Toole writes, "is to solve problems, not necessarily to understand them" (p. 238).

In another essay, Gerald Caiden identifies the shifting patterns and goals of the administrative reform tradition. He sees the Progressive era (1880-1939) as the first major push for reform. During this period, "the public was concerned with the deficiencies of *laissez-faire* capitalism and monopolistic organizations" (p. 250). In the second period, the New Deal (1930's-1960's), the reform movement "was stimualted by the failure of the market system to maintain economic stability and relieve poverty" (p. 250).

The third wave of reform, which started in the 1960's, began to take on a different tone from earlier administrative reform periods. Now, the administrative state itself was being questioned, as were such time-honored beliefs as the strong executive model, the politicization of social issues, and the role of the bureaucrat as a positive element in promoting good government.

With this new, and less benign, view of the administrative state, Caiden warns, "the 1980s promises to be internally traumatic for American bureaucracy even if outside crises are avoided" (p. 263). However, Caiden feels that today, bureaucratic reformers offer less ambitious, less grand reform proposals and thus may better fit the mood and the needs of the time.

On balance, this book may strike one as being overly pessimistic, even antigovernment in approach and outlook. Certainly it points out the limitations or inability of government to deal with a variety of problems, and it does—especially in the introductory chapter—find more to blame than praise about the performance of the administrative state. But this book also gives pause to reflect on the failures and successes of administrative reform, and as such may serve as a useful guide and warning to those who seek further to advance political reform through the administrative state apparatus.

Michael Genovese

Political Science Department

Loyola Marymount University

Los Angeles, California 90045, USA

Jayantanuja Bandyopadhyaya, Climate and World Order: An Inquiry into the Natural Causes of Underdevelopment, Atlantic Highlands, New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1983, pp. vii + 178, \$17.25.

The economic gap between the North and the South of the globe is the central characteristic of the study of contemporary international relations and has come into existence only during the last two centuries. For in ancient times, as is well known, there were flourishing civilizations in the south, including the Indus, Nile, and Tigris-Euphrates valleys. In the Middle Ages, the Arabs were the torchbearers of civilization. From the economic point of view, there was no significant disparity between the North and the South until the third quarter fo the 18th century when the Industrial Revolution started in England. It was the Industrial Revolution which triggered off the process of accelerated economic development in the North and for two centuries the North became the pacemaker, while the South remained the laggard of history. The result is the wide and widening technoeconomic gap between the North and the South.

While historical imperialism and contemporary neoimperialism of the North are the greatest single factor responsible for the impoverishment of the South and the affluence of