

Conceptual framework of CPA : elements

- ✓ 1. Cross-cultural Comparability : allowing broad comparisons b/m west & non west.
- ✓ 2. Development dimensions
- ✓ 3. Ecological Perspective
- ✓ 4. Goal Orientation : stressing unique goals of particular cultures in relation to their admin systems.

All these elements have to be tied together in CPA analysis.

Riggs : four purposes of CPA

- (i) distinctive features of particular system / cluster of systems
- (ii) explain cross cult. / cross national diff / similarity
- (iii) causes of success / failure of particular admin features in particular ecological settings.
- (iv) understand strategies of Admin. reform.

Approaches to models in CPA

- ✓ (1) Bureaucratic : legal rational
 - ↓
dominant form of civt service subsystems.
 - ↓
legitimate authority
 - ↓
controlled on basis of knowledge.

(2) General Systems approach

(3) Ecological Approach (used by Riggs)

(4) Structural Functional Approach (Prismatic Society model)

(5) Development Approach (Edward Weimer → goal oriented model)

Riggsian Models : (covered in Prasad)

- By 1980 : Revival movt. of CPA initiated by scholars like Heady & Goodsell. Goodsell → New' CPA. → now includes supra national, subnational analysis & cross national comparison.

Ecology of Pub Adl.

- ✓ Ecology in biology: science concerned with inter-relationships b/m organisms & its environment.
- ✓ All subsystems of the wider social system interact with ~~the~~ it and are influenced by it & influence it.
- ✓ Riggs: "The significance of each administrative system lies in its setting."
- ✓ All political & admin systems are influenced by society's background environment and culture.
- ✓ ecological approach to PA: John M. Gaus: key ecological factors for an understanding of contemporary American PA.
- ✓ 1961: Riggs: "The Ecology of PA."
- ✓ Riggs: interaction b/m the admin subsystem on one hand and political, social, cultural & economic subsystems on the other. $\Rightarrow$ interaction b/m admin & its environment
- ✓ 1957: Agraria-Industria; 1959: fused-prismatic - diffracted $\rightarrow$ how environ affects PA system on basis of studies in Thailand & Philippines.
- ✓ Prismatic Sala Model of admin sub system
- ✓ Robert Dahl also advocated ecological approach
Why?
 - (i) experience of one can't be universally applied
 - (ii) imp to test validity in all settings before formulating theories
 - (iii) make PA more scientific & widen its horizon
- ✓ PA as a human activity has a social, political, economic & ~~so~~ cultural context. Any PA system is product of the peculiar social, cultural, political & economic milieu of which it is a part.

- ✓ Civil servants are products of their socio-cultural milieu
- ✓ Social environ. - e.g. PA is affected by the nature of class system in context of recruitment and promotion.
e.g. Nepotism, favouritism & corruption in Nigeria
Michael Crozier's study of French Bureaucratic behaviour
→ influenced considerably by societal cultural norms in France.
- ✓ Political environ & PA : totalitarian political structure → neutral bureaucracy not tolerated. Study of East European bureaucracies : Carl Beck. ; Soviet Bureaucracy : subservient to the Party.
- ✓ CP Bhabhani : "Indian bureaucracy is a powerful social group and its neutrality in politics is a myth."
- ✓ Economic environ & PA : In developing countries State : dominant change agent. Debate : suitability of old structures for new socio-economic goals.
Whether ^{admin} dev precedes economic dev or vice versa.
Riggs : many characteristics of PA are patterned by the economic system. ⇒ Entire Dev Admin is economy centred. In dev countries, PA becomes major instrument of socio-economic change.
Industrial societies : Civil Service more efficient and have less of welfare fns.
Economically Backward Society : ↓ efficiency ↑ fns
- * Diff countries : though there is manifest similarity in formal orgs, yet their informal and behaviour patterns are diverse, each shaped by its ecology. ⇒ Cross cultural analysis should be ecological in character.

* Do CPA from \$50 also

DEVELOPMENT DYNAMICS

- Development: broad and narrow vision: narrow vision
→ some sections gain, others suffer.

Evolution

- 1950s & 60s: countries of Asia & Africa: pressing problems
→ impetus for dev projects
- initial years: focus on catching up with the west;
↑ growth through industrialisation, modernisation, education
- State ^{was} the key agency
- 'trickle down' assumption
- ↑ Education: IITs, ↑ Planning: 5YP, mega projects, steel plants, agri techniques, etc.

CRITICISM OF Dev Models

- huge costs → long term debt - (Africa still suffers)
- poverty, disease continue
- High social costs: Displacement of people: loss of livelihood, ↑ impoverishment, loss of culture
→ struggles. e.g. Narmada Bachao Andolan against Sardar Sarovar Dam.

Supporters of SSD: electricity, irrigation & drinking water to Kutch & Saurashtra

NBA: 1 million displaced - mostly tribals & dalits, ecological balance disturbed

- destruction of mangroves → more damage from Tsunami

- Global warming, pollution, ↓ forest cover

∴ → need to adopt a broader notion of dev →
↑ quality of life

- ✓ alternative ways of measuring dev. e.g. HDI of UNDP ranks on basis of performance against social indicators.

Sustainable Dev

- ✓ Socio-ecological process characterised by fulfilment of human needs while maintaining the quality of the natural environment indefinitely.
- ✓ UN Conference on Human Environment, 1972, Stockholm
→ UNEP set up
- ✓ Brundtland Commission set up by UN Gen. Ass.
↳ Sustainable dev: "meets the needs of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." (1987 report)
- ↳ Gen Ass called for UN Conference on Environment & Dev - The Earth Summit
- ✓ Earth Summit, Rio, 1992 → Agenda 21
- ✓ Agenda 21: comprehensive plan for global action in all areas of sustainable dev
- ✓ Commission on Sustainable Dev set up in 1992 → 53 member body, functional commission of ECOSOC
→ monitors implementation reports of Agenda 21 & other Earth Summit Agreements, & outcome of 2002 World Summit on SD in Johannesburg
- ✓ Johannesburg Declaration & Plan of Implementation
↳ priorities for action, reaffirmed SD as central element, broadened concept of SD, commitments to time bound targets, new targets - sanitation, chemicals, fish stocks, biodiversity, New issues: consumption patterns, energy, mining, needs of Africa, SIDC & Voluntary partnership initiatives.