From Levers to Legitimacy: Governance in Transition

A Discussion Paper Prepared for the PSC

Jim Armstrong
James L. Armstrong & Associates, Inc.

September 1997

From Levers to Legitimacy:
Governance in Transition

> Improving capacities to govern is not so much a matter of efficiency, effectiveness, cost-cutting, quality of service delivery and ability to handle current problems. Rather, it is essential for governments to be better equipped to cope with the higher-order tasks that shape the future of individual societies and humanity as a whole.
>
> (Dror, The Capacity to Govern, 1996)

If senior public servants have learned anything during the past decades, it is that change is indeed inevitable, that organizational reaction to change is somewhat predictable, and that preparedness for change is one of the most daunting challenges for senior managers and leaders concerned with governance. Beyond the sea swell of changes related to globalization, information technology, international relations and distribution of power or wealth –changes that have become facts of life and have been examined and reexamined –what we are reflecting on here is the inevitable change in the way political leaders, citizens, and public servants view the task of governance. These collective world views constitute governance paradigms that, like scientific paradigms, go through fundamental changes. The western world is currently in a transition between two governance paradigms: it is undoubtedly beginning to move beyond managerialism, the existing governance paradigm which is proving too limiting, and towards a still unclear new paradigm. Our purpose here is to try and get a better sense of what the emerging governance paradigm might look like, the implications for the public service, and some central issues to be addressed. In doing so, we demonstrate that the emerging paradigm is dramatically different and will force radical changes in governance systems. One author, Y. Dror, stands out as having explorer these changes more thoroughly, and over a longer period of time than others. Therefore, in exploring the nature of the changes required we look to his full body of work culminating in his 1996 report to the Club of Rome, The Capacity to Govern: Designing Governance for Global Transformations, to provide a backdrop for the discussion.

The Road Traveled

Looking back, one realizes that governance paradigms have evolved over time and that our current struggle making the transition from one paradigm to the next is indeed nothing new. Prior to the Middle Ages, there were enlightened or classical governance paradigms–based in Ancient Greece and Rome–as well as the might is right approach typified by Gengis Khan and others. Since the Middle Ages, there have been three major governance paradigms: salvation by God, salvation by society and, most recently, salvation by the market economy. The governance paradigm prevailing in the last decades–salvation by market economy, or the managerial paradigm, also known as new public management–has revolved around the belief that private

sector approached can solve public sector problems. Underpinned by economic theory, this approach has been characterized as market driven. Under the umbrella of the managerial paradigm, we have seen a number of noteworthy trends such as: downsizing, delayering, consolidation, reengineering and alternative service delivery, to name only a few. The general effect of this paradigm has been positive in that a number of problems have been solved and many improvements institutionalized. For example:

- we no longer assume that the state is the necessary provider of public services;
- it is possible, in most areas of government activity, to do more with less, to meaningfully involve citizens and users of services, and to deliver services in non-traditional ways;
- managerial and administrative accountability has improved, as public organizations have become subject to market discipline such as business planning, mandate clarification, public scrutiny and so forth;
- greater demands are being made of public servants as the success or failure of government programs is open to greater exposure and subject to more extensive performance accountability;
- deficit spending has been brought under control by many governments; and
- broad consensus on the limits of what governments can reasonably accomplish has been reached.

Prior to the managerial paradigm, we find the salvation by society paradigm. It lasted 200 years and was premised on the thought that appropriate governance structures, strategies, and policies could lead to a kind of heaven on earth by solving society's ills and rising above the darker side of human nature. This paradigm encompassed many variations of the great society. Ironically, one of the main thrusts of activity under this governance paradigm was the protection of society from the evils of the marketplace that later became the underlying thought of the managerial governance paradigm. What led society away from the salvation by society paradigm was the realization that government had both fiscal and policy limits.

Before the salvation by society paradigm the other-worldly forces of the salvation by God and all that it entailed modeled our institutions and approaches to governance. Just as society became skeptical about salvation by God-the promise of other-world rewards for sacrifices Made in this life, and salvation by society---the promise of an everlasting society that achieves both social and individual perfection, it is now becoming disenchanted with the managerial governance paradigm.

Reading the Signs

Many scholars and thinkers are starting to talk about the post-managerialism era, governments are trying to reintroduce some of the non-economic considerations, the public is telling the public sector that they are missing the point ... Signs abound of the weakening of our society's faith in

the managerial paradigm. In Post-capitalist Society (1993), Peter Drucker explores the transformation from the age of capitalism to the knowledge society, from the nation-state and hierarchical organizations to transnational. political institutions and a pluralistic society of organizations. New Zealand, another example, has perhaps pushed managerial initiatives further than any other nation, only to discover that trust, relationships, and the common good need immediate, renewed attention. Further, citizens are questioning traditional political and institutional arrangements on every front. At no time, it seems, has there been as much cynicism and mistrust toward political and social institutions. The bond of trust and the seal of shared values between citizens and their government is being questioned.

More problem are created than are solved

Paradigms are under pressure and a change becomes likely when the problems they create begin to be greater than those they solve. The limitations of the managerial approach are now coming to light:

- First, there are no institutions and laws to manage the new transnational world economy and its large issues. Traditional economic theory assumes a sovereign national state as the predominant unit but, in reality, there are four such units or dependent variables: national states, regional structures, autononums world money markets, and large scale transnational enterprise.
- Second, the focus of governments on economic development, perhaps the most universally applied policy of managerialism, no longer works: we have shifted from an era when government was an economic activist to one when the emphasis is on government's responsibility for maintaining the right climate.
- Third managerial approaches touch only part of the governance task. In fact, as discussed in more detail elsewhere (Armstrong, Stewardship *and the Public Service, 1997),* there are three, somewhat overlapping, levels of responsibility and activity provided by various parts of the public sector:
  - *higher-order tasks*--providing policy advice, guarding the public interest, building relationships and providing critical assistance in developing grand designs for society and nations.
  - public sector leadership and management--orienting the vast workforce of the public service in meaningful and effective directions, complete with knitting together and passing on core underlying values, providing and nurturing the environment within which the overall public service can best serve citizens-- organization building, learning and organizational memory, and ensuring fairness, equity and due process.
  - delivery of public services–improving services, reducing costs, developing service standards, systems and structures, and ensuring higher levels of personal responsibility for service delivery throughout the public sector.
  A strong argument can be made that, under this market driven governance paradigm, we

dealt with the third level, barely influenced the second, and totally ignored higher-order tasks. In short, the managerial paradigm has focused on technique and strategy without giving attention to the impact on or question of the common good.

- Fourth changes brought about under the managerial paradigm have fractured rather than unified public institutions, resulting in a bewildering array of ever smaller pieces in increasingly isolated units. Every new institution speaks its own language, has its own knowledge, its own career ladder, and, above all, its own values. Few, if any, institutions seem to represent the whole or see themselves as responsible for the community as a whole. This, concludes Peter Drucker, is somebody else's business. But whose?

- Fifth, is the problem raised by transnational networks of information and knowledge transmittal which will become increasingly difficult to control or manage within national boundaries. As information and knowledge become more liberated and accessible, these means of distribution and transmittal will likely be largely self-managed or managed outside existing governance structures.

Fading faith in the public service on the part of politicians

The dawn of a new trend or paradigm is usually marked by a sense, on the part of political leaders, that the public service is holding them back in their efforts to introduce changes. They perceive public institutions as lethargic-What have you been doing all this time?-resistant in the face of change-You are defending the status quo and protecting your own interests-and unable to deal with the challenges of adapting to and implementing new approaches that seem common-sensical to the political leaders of the day-You are dinosaurs from a long gone era. In other words, they find it hard to comprehend that the public service is not already doing the things that seem so self-evident to them and their advisors. Most notable shifts in thinking about governance are initiated by political leaders and later implemented and ultimately embraced by public institutions. Illustrations in recent history include, in addition to reengineering and alternative service delivery that have already been mentioned: militarization of public sector management following the wars, strategic planning, program-based budget systems, zero-based budgeting, centralization, decentralization, management by objectives, democratization through citizen consultation, involvement and participation, and the phenomenon of establishing independent authorities to audit operations.

A disenchanted public

Consultation reports and survey data from several sources demonstrate that citizens expect better service from government. They have expressed discontent with unhelpful, inefficient service and evasive answers. They are concerned about government's ability to deal effectively with major social and economic issues. Furthermore, citizens are expressing impatience with in-fighting,

fragmented services and being caught in the middle. Despite many innovations and heroic efforts inside the public service, citizens are disaffected with government and its institutions. They do not think that public servants are doing a good job, even recognizing resource constraints. Citizens place a premium on cutting through red tape, timeliness, transparency and openness, and getting results. On all of these crucial dimensions of the service transaction, citizen satisfaction levels are depressingly low. The traditional way of organizing public institutions and delivering services continues to frustrate the public.

All the signs are there: we are in a transition toward a new governance paradigm. The old one is no longer seen as meeting our society's needs. Predictably, there will be a new approach that, like the others, will catch the public service off guard and require difficult institutional adjustments. Adequate attention will need to be given to what the emerging paradigm and its accompanying trends might look like and to what will be needed to prepare the public service for this type of paradigm shift. If this does not happen effectively, the public service will once again be on the wrong side of the wave, vulnerable to serious criticism, and therefore unable to serve their political leaders and the public to the best of their abilities.

The Emerging Paradigm

Regardless of universal acceptance, the managerial paradigm, like its predecessors, will not prove to be the final solution. Society, organizations and institutions will continue to evolve. In spite of the great gains brought by managerialism, chinks are beginning to be seen in its armor. However, unlike what happened in many other shifts in paradigms of governance and trends in public sector management, this time, the old paradigm won't be abandoned with the same degree of absoluteness.

From levers to legitimacy: managerial and institutional change

Much of what has been called managerialism or new public management will simply be assumed by politicians and their constituents to be routine and expected practice for large parts of what we traditionally thought of as public sector activity and service delivery. Public servants at all levels have indeed achieved mastery of private sector practices such as restructuring, business planning, public involvement, enlightened human resource management, succession planning, training and development, performance measurement, information management and so forth. Not surprisingly, considerable mastery already exists or is rapidly emerging. After all, we have been at it for decades now.

It is anticipated that there will be a growing focus on institutional as opposed to managerial matters in the public sector. This emerging approach will be marked by a movement away from large monolithic, centralized, hierarchical public service organizations to more responsive community and citizen-centered delivery mechanisms on the one hand, and more creative, higher

level, but well grounded national and transnational institutions on the other hand. Movement in these seemingly contradictory directions will call for greater emphasis on the legitimacy of institutions and their policies and practices and less on managerial levers. This is perhaps best illustrated by approaches traditionally taken in change management processes. In the past few decades under the managerial governance paradigm these approaches have, not surprisingly, focused on elements of managerial change rather than broader institutional change. However, as experience with major system-wide change and reform of public institutions has demonstrated, institutional reform requires the building up of power concentrations, strong political and organizational commitment and support, special decision supports and the careful nurturing of communications and relationships with other sectors, organizations, communities and constituents. The table below illustrates the contrasting approaches.

From Levers to legitimacy

Managerial approach	Institutional approach
goal: functional improvement(doing things differently)	Goal: transformation (doing different things)
clear, practical purpose	abstract purpose/grand design
short term	long term
procedure-centered	Value-centered
focus on technique (technocrats)	focus on vision (artists)
skill or process change	foundational change
requires access to administrative levers	requires broad based legitimacy
depends on position based hierarchical power	depends on leadership, mobilization, collaboration,
individual/authority-centered	consensus building
can be ad hoc (deals with parts)	Group/organization-centered
predictable outcomes	systematic (details with whole)
needs only localized support	unpredictable outcomes
training of operators is required	must have support from top
requires technical/practical knowledge and experience	organization learning is essential
deterministic	requires high level policy and strategic thinking
routine (simple to understand)	flexible and innovative
often unemotional, impersonal	novel (intellectually challenging)
	emotionally intense, personal

A well-informed public with clear expectations

As demonstrated so clearly in the surveys carried out by the Government of Canada's Task Force on Service Delivery Models, the public has articulate opinions and expectations when it comes to the roles and responsibilities of government and is often thinking along the same lines as many experts (such as Handy, Drucker, Dror, and Hampden-Tumer) when it comes to what government should look like and do. The rising level of public competence was confirmed by a recent United Nations survey on the quality of life in different countries that found Canadians to be among the best informed citizens in the world. Indeed, taking a broad historical view of governance, it could be argued that, in an evolution comparable to that in the status of women over the past hundred years, citizens are no longer seen as chattels whose fate is decided by a supposedly better informed elite. In democratic nations, this shift marks a renewed search for political legitimacy and a need to re-negotiate the relationships between governments and the governed.

The research of the Task Force on Service Delivery Models indicated that Canadians are relatively clear about what they want governments to do. Despite their growing disaffection with government, there is no real desire for federal government withdrawal from Canadian economic and social life. Contrary to what most decision makers believe, 76 percent of citizens would like to see the federal government's involvement in important areas of social and economic life maintained or increased. In addition, citizens would like to see several other fundamental changes in approaches to higher order governance tasks:

- First, they would like to see governments dealing with whole issues, not with parts of issues; whole people, not parts of people. Typically, services to citizens are fragmented between governments and departments within governments and, as alternative service delivery options are created, between and among sectors.
- Second, citizens would like to see and understand what the strategies or visions are for the big issues like safety, stability, health care, food safety, environment, and a healthy ecomonic infrastructure. Because they can't see or envision what the strategies are, they think that these issues are being dealt with in a less than cooperative, coherent, and transparent way.
- Third, citizens would like to see more cooperation among those needed to solve problems, that is, between government departments, governments and sectors.
- Fourth, citizens want greater inclusion in the services that affect them.

In general, Canadians are dissatisfied with government as an institution. In terms of values, they want to see more integrity, transparency, accountability and openness. As the Canadian statesman Allan Blakeney likes to remind us, in the end, it is the views of citizens that will count. The emerging paradigm, it is argued, will be defined by the need to deal with higher order issues as expressed by concerned and ever better informed citizens.

Issues Defining the New Paradigm

Judging from a broad base of research such as the work of Drucker, Dror, Handy, Hampden-Turner, a number of other scholars, and the report of the Federal Government's Deputy Minister Task Force on Service Delivery Models, there are a number of identifiable emerging issues. When abstracted to their highest level, these issues can be seen to include:

- the public interest and the common good
- complexities of the whole and efficiency of individual aspects of the system
- short term versus long term policies and strategies

The public interest and the common good

In *New Realities* Drucker points out that we have a significant problem between self-interest and the public or common good. Organizations and institutions have a duty to limit their impact to what is actually needed for the discharge of their particular function. Anything that goes beyond this is illegitimate and an usurpation of power. However, institutions and the people in them also have a community responsibility. Further, like Dror and others, Ducker argues that there is a political responsibility for the common good and that it is nonsense to think it emerges from the welter of conflicting interests of market forces.

The notion of common good can provide a sense of purpose or direction beyond ourselves and our institutions and lift us beyond our selfishness. However, as observed by Michael Novak in *Free Persons and The Common Good (1989),* the notion of the common good has been completely overshadowed by economic/managerial theory over the past two decades. The loss of faith in the managerial paradigm is accompanied by a remarkable rebirth in the attention given to the concept of the common good. Not surprisingly, it is an extremely complex concept that has challenged the best minds for millennia. The use of the term is often ambiguous, as the following map of the usages of *common good* illustrates.

A Map of the Usages of Common Good
(Adapted from Novak, 1989)

Common Good	Particular	Private (individual) good	Individual (material) good
			Personal (moral) good
		Common (special) good	Personal (natural) good
	General	Relative general good (no time, place, culture)	Communal (conventional) good
			A Common good (natural)
		"Universal"	The Common Good (supernatural)

Comm
on good and public interest issues are made immensely difficult for two other reasons. The first is the emerging pluralism of society *which seems to render the concept of the common good* quite vacuous and makes it doubtful that any notion of the common good could rally enough consensus to be meaningful. The second major complicating factor is globalization. As Novak argues, eventually, we will have to

> *...speak of a common international order: a common good embracing the entire planet, with full recognition of the rights of the rights persons everywhere ... a universal system of natural liberty. A system. A common good A new order of the ages.*

Indeed, neither a sense of direction beyond ourselves, nor effective leadership can be achieved without approximating some notion of the common good. Further, the common good, as a protection against self-interest and the promotion of what the community desires and requires, calls for institutions suitable to the task. It is these institutions and their institutional settings that will enable government to deal with higher-order issues and thus provide appropriate governance.

Emerging from the common good question is the issue of fairness and uniformity. This issue will become more evident and receive more attention at all levels of institutional and societal life, ranging from work place arrangements and relationships to systems of justice and geographical distribution of populations and peoples to rights and responsibilities at the levels of individuals, communities, nation states, and international global questions of fairness and uniformity.

Complexities of the whole and efficiency of individual aspects of the system

At first sight, the emerging issue of the complexity of the whole versus the efficiency of individual aspects of the system might seem like a reemergence of the age old centralization/decentralization debate. However, in a more complex organizational world with growing numbers of function-specific institutions serving a society with more fragmented and diverse value sets, the issue is metamorphosed into something quite new and different. We have not yet learned to deal effectively with the new complex environment and none of our traditional approaches allows us to quite grasp, manage, or balance the complexity of the whole with the efficiency of individual aspects of the overall integrated system. What is needed is a new model which allows differentiation and integration at the same time.

Within our increasingly complex and diverse world, the need for function-specific institutions and organizations will grow, making leadership and policy making ever more important, for two obvious reasons. First, more institutions will tend to increase confusion, particularly in the minds of citizens. The inevitable reaction will be a call for fundamental reform back to the basics, simpler times-a destructive delusion. Second, because the whole system has an intelligence that the parts lack, there will be a recognition of the importance of higher-order thinking and synthesis by well equipped leaders with a perspective on the whole. Hampden-Turner, in Charting the Corporate Mind (1990), thinks this to be one of the corporate world's biggest problems, calling it the triumph of sectional self-interests over the integrity of the organization as a whole. Senior managers and their subordinates are trapped in a perpetual internecine struggle to use the organization for the greater relative enrichment of one faction or the other. It is no less a problem in the complex world of government systems with built-in checks and balances with powers derived from legislation deliberately parceled out to ensure countervailing forces. Inevitably, from time to time, institutions designed to curb the abuse of power seem to work at cross purposes and obscure the need to understand and manage issues at the level of whole systems. In worst case situations, whole system thinking is interpreted as illegitimately operating outside specific mandates and is organizationally sanctioned for merely trying to see the whole picture.

Subsets of the issue of the complexities and integrity of the whole versus the efficiency of individual aspects of the system include notions of federation, departmentalization and central coordination, economies of scale and flexibility, to mention only a few. The skills required to reconcile the tensions between the parts and the whole must be learned and developed. At present, there is little empirical evidence to indicate that we have discovered the approaches needed to lead and manage emerging diversity.

Short term versus long term policies and strategies

Standing at the crossroads of a relatively stable past and an unknown, predictably turbulent future, we are struck by the difficulty of providing some kind of continuity, both forward and backward. Providing this sense of continuity, argues Charles Handy in The Age of Paradox (1994), is one of the most important tasks of leadership. Yet, we most often are driven to find short term, immediate policy and management solutions to problems that are only aggravated by the lack of the art of the long view. Examples abound and touch almost every major societal problem including environmental management, health care, monetary and debt management, education, security and unity. One can rightly be critical of the typically short-sighted approaches taken to solve problems is these areas. Indeed, meaningful solutions demand much longer term thinking than our short election cycles.

Taking a longer term view can be politically and organizationally dangerous in a world of instant fixes. However, as far as we know, none of the miracle solutions have worked. Often, taking a longer view casts one in the light of being non-responsive and inflexible. Because of this danger, the need for an institutionalization of longer term thinking about complex issues from the point of view of societies and humanity is becoming evident. If this type of approach is not taken, this work will become the sole purview of single interest groups with the inherent problem of not having a whole system approach. If left only to single interest groups and their often radical splinter groups, societal fractures and fissures could threaten any stability we have grown to enjoy.

In the face of these issues, the public service is indeed in a difficult situation. Few would argue with the fact that the public service must be apolitical and outside the political process in order to function and perform. In that sense, they, and the institutions they represent, provide the stability and continuity necessary to hold together fragile social institutions and networks of service. However, this same public service must be amenable, flexible and responsive to political direction.

These are some of the issues that will determine the emerging governance paradigm.

They have serious implications for the future public service.

The Emerging Paradigm Demands Bold Thinking

Over the last 25 years, Dror has studied in great detail governance requirements for the emerging realities. In The Capacity to Govern: Designing Governance for Global Transformations, he proposes a series of sweeping changes to our existing governance model including:

- Placing emphasis on the higher-order tasks of governance. Dror observes that governments desperately lack good ideas, as well as a longer term perspective, to cope with increasingly urgent issues.

- Deepening policy reflection and improving central minds of governments. Imaginative new policies are required to raise standards in the civil service, and to encourage people to think in history and understand global transformations and societal dynamics, bringing both scientific literacy and humanistic considerations to policy deliberations. The required improvement in creativity will only come about through constant learning, flexibility and the nurturing of divergent opinions, that is, the avoidance of group think. Further, better links between policy thinkers and citizens are required, and, while policy cannot ignore practical politics and resource constraints, there must be a clear conceptual distinction between the two.
- Empowering people with understanding, encouraging constant societal learning and innovation, and promoting education. Democracy will fail, warns Dror, unless people understand complex public issues and develop a sense of human solidarity. The so-called information society will not create this enlightenment-deliberate efforts must be made.
- Rebuilding trust in governments by countering the prevailing cultural values of consumerism, commercial ethics, permissiveness, and rights without duties which have largely disappeared from politics and developing and adopting a code of ethics for politicians and bureaucrats.
- Replacing state-centered thinking with a more global humanity-centered focus-narrow, confined interests with wider collective ones; and
- Focusing on and restructuring inter-governance relations, as more forms of collective action are required to deal with emerging issues.

Concentrating on higher-order tasks will enable the public service to improve advice to decision makers, incorporate a variety of views, anticipate and prepare for future trends and issues, and manage change and transition in our rapidly changing environment. This cannot be achieved in a public service that operates in a rigid, hierarchical, control oriented manner. Creativity and innovation must be fostered and an outward looking and more involving approach needs to be taken. However, we must also continue to ensure that services are delivered and public business administered to acceptable and affordable standards. This will continue to occupy and challenge the talents and energies of the largest part of the public service even though, as Kettle (1996) observes, the government ought to be agnostic about who does its work but care deeply about how well it gets done. More important, however, is the capacity to operationalize new approaches and institutions effectively and quickly enough to address emerging issues and unforeseen problems. The missing link is the equipped resources dedicated to addressing these higher level strategic and policy issues.

Bold thinking in this regard is beginning to emerge as illustrated by Dror's *Delta-type senior civil service for the 21st century* (1997). Dror is concerned with the inability of existing government institutions to deal with any major world issues. Referring to the managerial and economic

paradigm he observes:

> All these are important and often useful and necessary endeavors. However, they suffer from perilous blindness in ignoring the really crucial higher-order functions of government in taking critical decisions and adopting critical policies which will significantly shape the future...

> My prediction is that, unless the core capacities of central government to engage in high-order tasks of setting trajectories into the future are radically upgraded, future historians will add their bitter laments about the future they must live, blaming us for failing to adjust central government to their critical tasks, largely because of a preoccupation with "new public management".

Dror makes it clear that he does not believe that politicians can be expected to take on this super-ordinate perspective. He argues that politicians are not yet knowledgeable enough since the kind of hyper-turbulence we are experiencing renders traditional bases of knowledge (experience-based insights and the knowledge of normal disciplines), increasingly irrelevant and often misleading. Further, Dror points out in *School For Rulers (1993)* that it is exceedingly difficult to immunize against the characteristic diseases of leaders and rulers ... *such as a growing distance from reality, subjugation to mind keepers, and se~self-images which get more and more distorted the longer and the more successful one serves as a Ruler.*

Dror argues that most modem senior administrative services are ill-equipped to deal with emerging issues and that 'managerial skills' have taken the place of other professional requirements. He advocates setting up a senior civil service that concentrates on higher-order issues. This would be a precedent setting endeavor characterized by superprofessionalism, dedication to higher-level rather than operational tasks, innovative and creative, both meritorious and elitist, but linked to and reflecting society, virtuous, autonomous but subordinated and with a strong sense of mission and purpose. Dror calls it a *Delta-type* senior civil service. (Dror's four types of senior civil servants are highlighted below.) He proposes a rigorous ten year education process to prepare people for these elite roles in the senior civil service in order to deal effectively with the higher-order issues.

Dror's four types of senior public servants

Alpha-type: dominant in many historic periods and still found in some countries.

Based on ascribed status, mainly right of birth, or personal nearness to rulers, it fuses political and administrative roles. The alpha-type is most evident in the might is right systems of governance.

Beta-type: based on the purchase of government positions, coming from high-income families.

Gamma-type: based on quasi-professionalism with antecedents found in proto-professional educated slaves in classical Rome and in the Middle Ages, educated priests, and merit-based classical mandarin systems in China which led to their modem version like the British administrative class and the French ENA-trained state elite. The gamma-type senior civil service has been the predominant paradigm bridging type with a foot hold in the ancient and the three modem paradigms.

Delta-type: never been tried, but now needed, it would be characterized by super-professionalism, dedication to higher-level, rather than operational tasks, innovative and creative, both meritorious and elitist, but linked to and reflecting society, virtuous, autonomous but subordinated and with a strong sense of mission and purpose.

Critical Points for Discussion

Before outlining critical issues for discussion, two essential points must be made. The first is that the Delta-type senior public service is but one component of a broader systems-based approach to policy making and governance, and therefore cannot be considered in isolation. Therefore, it would be a mistake to conclude that, in Dror's extensive work and long deliberation on governance matters, he has not carefully considered issues presented here for discussion. For example, he has serious and well founded concerns about the capacities of present citizens, as influenced by mass media, to encourage, support and facilitate long term policies directed at unknown and, in part, inconceivable futures (correspondence, 1997). However, this concern is of the same magnitude as his doubt about the ability of today's politicians and public services to address the current world issues. In addressing this concern, a blueprint for change is required just as one is provided for politicians in Dror's *School for Rulers and Delta-type senior civil services for the 21st century*. To be sure, none of the interrelated initiatives of training and preparing rulers, senior public servants, citizens and their institutions can be easily implemented. Dror himself points out that the Delta-type senior public service is only one component among many in a multi-dimensional approach to improving governance. Other components of Dror's approach to dealing with governing and maintaining democracy in a world of crisis, chaos, hyper-turbulence--a world in which the very survival of humanity is at stake include: a school for rulers, improving citizen knowledge and awareness, approaches to public administration, and state, governance and institutional redesign (correspondence, 1997).

Second, it would be chicanery to consider Dror's ideas as naive or unrealistic.

While calling for radical change, he recognizes that many of his recommendations will be slow and difficult to implement and, when looking in the rear view mirror, are subject to the criticism of being unrealistic. However, when we

> *... look forward into the labyrinths into which we are moving ... neglect of the possibilities to upgrade navigational abilities ... realized in phases ... is an act of gross negligence and perhaps of self-destruct, and not of realism in any true sense of that term* (Dror, 1993).

Further, areas of deep theoretical concern such as the problem of elitism are addressed head on by Dror. He openly chooses his form of elitism as preferable to egalitarian conceptions such as selecting rulers by lottery. *The real question,* he maintains, is *not whether policymaking will be elitist or not, but what are the qualifications and compositions of the elites and how are they selected, rotated and legitimized* (Dror, 1993).

Nevertheless, arising from Dror's recommendations to make governance systems more suitable for current reality, at least four concerns demand thorough discussion and examination:

- We know that education does not necessarily lead to deep thinking, therefore we require much more precision about the nature of the education we are talking about and the standards that will be used to signal accomplishment;
- Dror's approach seems dependent on strong political leadership and a sense of urgency if only to get over what he refers to as insidious institutional inertia *which prevents serious consideration of innovative ideas;*
- Overall, the establishment of a Delta-type senior public service has the potential of throwing the public service back to another type of elitism, just as it is thankfully moving away from earlier forms of elitism. Further, the formal relationships and accountability of such a Delta-type senior public service to legislating bodies and the body politic need to be explored in more detail in order to resolve some of the problems associated with being both subordinated to democratic majorities and being, of necessity, relatively autonomous (correspondence, 1997). What frameworks, procedures and mechanisms are required to ensure this subordination and autonomy?
- The proposal that supreme wisdom residing in an elite public service legitimizes governance must be tested-no one really knows if citizens in democratic nations will accept or recognize it as legitimate. For example, existing public services, particularly in Westminster systems, can be characterized as invisible and anonymous. Unlike Dror's Gamma-type public service, the Delta-type cannot enjoy the same degree of anonymity.

Summary Conclusions

Extraordinary circumstances and extraordinary issues call for serious discussion of unprecedented approaches to dealing with the way we work toward preparing ourselves as servants of the public,

for the emerging governance paradigm. As mentioned earlier, the new paradigm will not cast off managerial approaches, but will move beyond them. Many elements of the market model will continue to be powerful aids in our management tool box. However, a movement beyond levers to legitimacy or away from managerial techniques (dealing mechanistically with pieces and parts) to broader, foundational institutional considerations (dealing with the organic whole) is evident.

It is likely that the new governance paradigm will reflect a renewed respect for what only governments can do, including defense and maintaining law, order and justice. In addition, there will be renewed citizen support for government's paramount role in maintaining a *level playing field,* setting ground rules that are equally binding on everybody and which balances everybody's interest, such as having clear rules which enable honest buying and selling. Government institutions will be valued for their role in maintaining an infrastructure that will promote economic health. Government's compassionate function-protection of the poor and oppressed; and its stewardship role-protecting the Earth and it's environment-will be legitimized as the provision of an infrastructure conducive to environmental, social, economic, and individual health and well being will be seen as the purview of governments working together with communities at local, national and international levels. This more clearly understood role of government will require heightened management and policy skills in the face of turbulence and rapid change. To govern in this growing complexity is, as Handy describes, to navigate through, rather than solve, paradox. To manage public institutions effectively, a new governance paradigm will be required. This new paradigm must at once be citizen and community-centered and transnational-able to cope with individual diversity and the common good.

References

Armstrong, J. (1997), *"Stewardship and Public Service",* Public Service Commission of Canada

Armstrong, J. (1997), *"Reason and Passion in Public Sector Reform "*, Public Service Commission of Canada

Armstrong, J. (1997), *"Fading Boundaries: Thoughts About Alternative Service Delivery"*, Institute of Public Administration of Canada

Bruce, D. (1980), *"The Common Good and the Public Interest*", Political Theory

Cassinelli, C. (195 8), *"Some Reflections on the Concept of the Public Interest"*, Ethics

Deputy Ministers, Task Force on Service Delivery Models (1996), *Report of the Task Force, Volumes 1-4,* Canadian Center for Management Development.

Douglas, B. (1980), *"The Common good and the Public Interest", Political Theory*

Dror, Y. (1968), *Public Policy Making Re-examined,* Chandler

Dror, Y. (197 1), *Design for Policy Sciences,* Elsevier

Dror, Y. (197 1), *Ventures in Policy Sciences*, Elsevier

Dror, Y. (1980), *Crazy States: A Counter conventional Strategic Issue,* Health Lexington Books (1971), 1980 revision, Kraus Reprint

Dror, Y. (1984), "Required breakthroughs in think tanks", *Policy Sciences*

Dror, Y. (1986), *Policy Making Under Adversity,* Transaction Books

Dror, Y. (1987), "Advising the ruler", William Plowden, ed., *Advising the Ruler*

Dror, Y. (1988), "Improving Critical Choices", *Futures*

Dror, Y. (1988), "World Politics Towards the 21st Century", *Futures*

Dror, Y. (1988), "Visionary political leadership: on improving a risky requisite", *International Political Science Review*

Dror, Y. (1988), "World Politics Towards the 21st Century", Futures

Dror, Y. (1988), "Improving Critical Choices", *Futures*

Dror, Y. (1988), "Uncertainty: Coping with It and with Political Feasibility", Miser and Quade eds. *Handbook of Systems Analysis: Craft Issues and Procedural Choices*

Dror, Y. (1989), "Memo for system-reforming rulers", *Futures*

Dror, Y. (1989), "Fateful Decisions as Fuzzy Gambles with History", *The Jerusalem Journal of International Relations*

Dror, Y. (1993), "School for Rulers", from Kenyon and De Greene, ed., *A Systems-Based Approach to Policymaking*, Kluwer Academic Publishers

Dror, Y. (1993), "Policy professionalism as a vocational calling", *Policy Studies Journal*

Dror, Y. (1994), "Basic Concepts in Advanced Policy Sciences", Nagel, ed., *Encyclopedia of Policy Studies*

Dror, Y. (1995), "Strengthening Government Capacity for Policy Development", United Nations

Dror, Y. (1996), "The International Context of Public Administration: A History of Ideas Perspective", outline of presentation at CLAD Conference, Rio de Janeiro

Dror, Y. (1996), "Democracy facing globalization", Demokratic am Wendepunkt: Die Demokratische Frage als Project des 21 Jahrhunderts

Dror, Y. (1996), "The Capacity to Govern: Designing Governance for Global Transformations", The Club of Rome

Dror, Y. (1997), "Delta-type senior civil service for the 21st century", *International Review of administrative Sciences*

Dror, Y. (1997), "Workshop in Policy Planning and Strategic Choice For Senior Decision Makers and Policy Advisors", author's workshop outline

Dror, Y. (1997), "Strengthening Government Capacity for Policy Development", *International Journal of Technical Cooperation*

Dror, Y. (books in preparation), The Superior Ruler: *Mirrors for Political Leaders; Remaking the World: Memorials to a Global Potentate;* and *Advanced Policy Planning*.

Drucker, P. (1989), *The New Realities,* Harper Row

Drucker, P. (1993), *Post-Capitalist Society,* Harper Business

Drucker, P. (Feb. 1995), "Really Reinventing Government", *The Atlantic Monthly*

Drucker, P. (1995), *Managing in a Time of Great Change,* New York

Hampton-Turner, C., (1990), *Charting the Corporate Mind,* The Free Press

Handy, C. (1994), *The Age of Paradox,* Harvard Business School Press.

Handy, C. (1989), *The Age of Unreason,* Harvard Business School Press.

Handy, C. (1995), *Beyond Certainty: The Changing Worlds of Organizations,* Random House.

Kettle, D. (1996), "From Program to Contract Management: The New Skills Set", IPAC Round Table on Alternative Service Delivery

Novak, M. (1989), *free Persons and the Common Good*, Madison Books

Senge, P. (1990), "The Leader's New Work: Building Learning Organizations", *Sloan Management Review*

Senge, P. (1994), *The Fifth Discipline-The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization,* Doubleday

Senge, P. (1997), "Rethinking Leadership in the Learning Organization", *The Systems Thinker*

Shapiro, E. (1995), *Managing in the Age of instant Answers: Fad Surfing in the Boardroom,* Addison-Wesley