

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330698032>

Public Administration in the 21st Century: A Global South Perspective

Book · January 2019

DOI: 10.4324/9780367140106

CITATIONS

2

READS

12,225

1 author:



Rumki Basu

Jamia Millia Islamia

27 PUBLICATIONS **25 CITATIONS**

[SEE PROFILE](#)

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

A Global South Perspective

Rumki Basu



PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Public administration has experienced a fundamental rethinking of its basic objectives, concepts and theories during the 21st century.

This book examines transformations happening in global societies, the economy and in politics, to trace the trajectory of public administration as an academic discipline as well as being a focus of social science research. It presents a reassessment of governance in heterogeneous developing countries that goes beyond the traditional Weberian bureaucratic model, toward new models of organization and management, informed by their legal, constitutional, economic and political needs, aspirations and ground realities. This is especially important in relation to the marginalized sections of society that primarily rely on citizen entitlements through public service delivery systems. The author looks at widening the range and scope of public administrative agencies with the gradual cooperation of multiple actors, such as the civil society, people at large and even the private sector, in a partnering role. The author revisits the discipline to tackle intellectual dilemmas that current governance theories and practices are confronting, or will have to confront in future administrative situations.

There will be key discussions on mandates and challenges for the state regarding the rising South; this book will be indispensable to scholars and researchers of politics, especially governance and public policy, sociology and development studies. It will also be of interest to bureaucrats, NGOs and government officials.

Rumki Basu is Professor of Public Administration and former Head of the Department of Political Science at Jamia Millia Islamia, New Delhi, India. She was also Director of Sarojini Naidu Centre for Women's Studies, Jamia Millia Islamia. She has published 12 books and 40 journal articles on issues of public policy and governance, international organization and the political economy of development in India. She has presented papers at the World Congress of Political Science in Berlin (1994), Seoul (1997), Santiago (2009), Madrid (2012) and Poznan (2016), in addition to participating in international workshops. She has received the Indian Council of Social Science Research Teacher Fellowship Award and the Bharat Jyoti Award (2013) from the India International Friendship Society. Basu's prominent works include *Economic Liberalization and Poverty Alleviation: Social Sector Expenditures and Centre-State Relations* (2000); *Public Administration: Concepts and Theories* (2007); *Globalization and the Changing Role of the State* (edited, 2008); *Governance and Human Capital: The 21st Century Agenda* (co-edited, 2011); *Democracy and Good Governance: Reinventing the Public Service Delivery System in India* (co-edited, 2014); *Public Administration in India: Mandates, Performance and Future Perspectives* (2015) and *Governance in South Asia* (co-edited, 2016).

This page intentionally left blank

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION IN THE 21ST CENTURY

A Global South Perspective

Rumki Basu

First published 2019
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an Informa business

© 2019 Rumki Basu

The right of Rumki Basu to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A catalog record has been requested for this book

ISBN: 978-1-138-05621-3 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-367-14009-0 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-0-367-14010-6 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Swales & Willis Ltd, Exeter, Devon, UK

To Sankar, in celebration of our forty-year-old friendship

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xii</i>
1 The changing world of the 21st century: building new administrative capacities	1
2 The discipline of public administration today	14
3 The public and its policies	30
4 Democracy, the state and the citizen	52
5 Good governance to governing development today: comparative research studies	65
6 Public administration in the 21st century: dilemmas and challenges	82
7 Summing up	100
<i>Index</i>	<i>107</i>

PREFACE

The transition from an era of “government” to “governance” has brought public administration to the forefront of seminal changes in the operational context of developed and developing countries in the 21st century. Public administration, as an academic discipline, is changing rapidly due to the impact of globalization, the changing ideologies of government and the resultant changes in public agendas and discourses across the globe. Since World War II, the role and function of governments had witnessed an unprecedented increase, in both developed and developing societies; this being largely due to the fact that “development” was considered a state (public sector) activity. Since the 1980s, the world has seen a reverse swing; with the term globalization being created for the paradigmatic shift of emphasis towards a market driven, private sector led development model, with a basic philosophy to roll back the “administrative” state by reducing the size of the government and by streamlining public expenditure.

Changes in public administration in the 20th century was, in large part, a reflection of the changing nature, function and ideology of governments in different parts of the globe. Practicing traditional public administration came under persistent attack from neoliberal economists: the “public choice” school who have spearheaded philosophical arguments for reducing the size and spending of the public sector.

In this book, it will be argued that today’s agenda for public administration, as reflected by the New Public Management (N.P.M.) paradigm, may have to be reversed or substantially revised in accordance with the needs, aspirations, ground realities and field practices of developing countries, who want the state to remain proactive and interventionist on behalf of the marginalized, whilst delivering “development” promises, implementing public policies and transferring citizen entitlements through effective public service delivery systems. This is the unfinished agenda

of public administration in the South, which has to be brought to fruition in the 21st century.

The rise of the South is one of the concurring narratives (parallel to the grand narrative of globalization) which will dominate world politics and economies in the 21st century. The importance of China and India in this context should be clearly understood; as the 21st century is often referred to as the “Asian Century”. Today, China and India are strong economic powers, both having withstood the global economic recession since 2008. Together they account for one-third of the world population. In the 20th century, global politics was viewed from a North-centric perspective. New developments in the discipline and practice of public administration will be influenced by the rise of the South in the 21st century.

Waves of democratization have swept the globe, transforming state-citizen relations and the way administration functions in the South. Globalization induced changes in the “what” and “how” of public administration, triggering administrative reforms which have swept through the public sector over the last two decades in several countries. N.P.M. introduced the rationale of debureaucratization and fiscal prudence in public expenditure. The logic behind it was accepted by ex-socialist states and the developing world, presuming that “wasteful and incompetent” bureaucracies had led to the failure of the “socialist” experiment and “development administration” in the Third World in the first place. However, N.P.M. reforms could only help the South marginally, and not in any fundamental way.

The developed “South” introduced development through proactive state intervention in key sectors of the economy, human development and state sponsored innovations in indigenous technology—an ideal model for others to follow. “Developmental” states are unlikely to wither away anywhere in the South, as the concept of “good governance” has been universally accepted. Although, development is not a rigid concept. Governing development is an ongoing endeavour in any country. Both developed and developing countries need to administer development models, plans and strategies so as to successfully deliver public goods and services to the people. When implementing all of these, the “state-market divide” will have to be clearly demarcated by political mandates in all countries.

What does it mean to be an effective public administrator in the 21st century? Public governance is the art of managing collective goals of society through joint endeavours in the public sphere: government bureaucracies, private sector administrations and voluntary sector bodies, involved in the development of the “commons”, have to work together to provide essential public services to citizens.

If public administrators have to work in evolving democratic societies, in direct competition with the private sector and under changing ideological regimes, they need to radically rethink how they should govern in the modern age. New modes and procedures have to be learnt; there will be less paperwork, but digitalized records have to be stored because people (armed with Right to

Information laws) will interfere or intrude whenever they want to “know” more. Previously, the “public” were never really a part of the policy making, implementation or evaluation process, due to bureaucratic “immunity” and laws of secrecy. Times have changed, their work will be more open to scrutiny and social audit. This is a healthy change in the context of Third World bureaucracies, who were notoriously non-transparent, unanswerable and non-accountable, in their work or in their behaviour towards the public. Aspiring public administrators must understand that they have to co-govern, not only with other stakeholders, whether they are private sector employees in a private-public partnered project or the beneficiary public target group in a welfare administration program.

There are numerous textbooks which look at public administration; this book invites the reader to explore the tasks and mandates of public governance in the 21st century, whilst keeping in mind the mandates in the developing world. Public bureaucracies do not need to shrink in size, because from a “development administration” to a “governing milieu”, through a consensually agreed Minimum Agenda of Good Governance, public administration will have to be at a commanding level. This book makes a strong argument for *revisiting, rethinking, reinventing and eventually refounding*, public administration from a South-centric perspective. It is my belief that the principal dilemmas and challenges of public administration lie in developing countries—where the philosophy of “doing much more with much less” (N.P.M.) cannot be rationalized. Governing development will require additional investments (public and private), and the public will require more accountability and more openness with the diversification of bureaucratic mandates. Governments cannot be run like business; the privatization of public services does not necessarily serve the “public interest”. Not all civil servants are “corrupt” or “incompetent”; bureaucratic failures have a much deeper structural meaning in the context of developing countries.

Drawing on my own experiences in India (the world’s largest democracy), I have carefully selected the major themes of this book, all the while keeping in mind the Asian, African or Latin American reader who will empathize with the effort it takes towards achieving democratization and bringing in a new bureaucratic culture of “legality, rationality, citizen centricity, public accountability and responsiveness” in administration. Readers in the developed world, who have acquired a basic understanding of the major themes and issues, are more likely to delve deeper into the dilemmas and challenges involved, and thus become more engaged in informed debates about the developing world. This is not a conventional textbook about public administration, but an introductory reading which begins, and seeks, to answer the following questions:

- Is there a need to re-evaluate the role and mandates of government and public administration in the context of the emerging contradictions of globalization and the rise of the South?

- How, and for whom, does public administration work in heterogeneous developing societies?
- What are the new mandates and challenges in the 21st century, especially in the context of the developing world?

At the advent of the 20th century, emphasis was placed on industrial productivity, organizational efficiency and strong control mechanisms for the strengthening of the structural and procedural components of public administration. In the 21st century, focus has shifted toward human development and broadening people's choices: these choices can be infinite and can change over time. We now live in a "knowledge" economy where "information" can, and will, change societies. E-governance is an invaluable tool of transparent, accountable citizen centric administration. The "public" are now truly at the centre of "public administration" like never before.

Public administration has historically reflected the changing socioeconomic and political concerns of contemporaneous times and its impact on the functions of government. At present, it faces contradictory ideological and functional pressures which are pulling it towards an expansionist agenda (the agenda from the South) and a reductionist agenda (North-centric agenda). The onus rests on the public administration of every state to re-establish its *raison d'être* in accordance with particular legal, constitutional, economic and political needs of every nation, from time to time.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Whilst writing this book I have greatly benefited from the works of eminent scholars of public administration. I owe a deep sense of gratitude to all of them. I have acknowledged my intellectual sources and references at the end of each chapter, not only to acknowledge my indebtedness but to also facilitate further reading. Regarding facts and data, as far as possible, official documents which are easily available in the public domain have been relied upon. Finally, I must confess to have borrowed from my earlier publications (books, book chapters and journal articles): there are quite a few to be listed here. Special efforts have been made to make this book student-friendly and easy to comprehend. I am grateful to Aakash Chakrabarty and Rimina Mohapatra at Routledge (India) for their encouragement, assistance and patience in getting this book published, despite my delays and difficulties in meeting deadlines. I would like to express my gratitude to my daughter Devanjali and my husband Sankar Basu, for their encouragement and valuable support at all times. I apologize for all errors inadvertently made.

1

THE CHANGING WORLD OF THE 21ST CENTURY

Building new administrative capacities

As a scholar of public administration, I think it is time to re-evaluate the functions of government in diverse political settings from a public administration perspective in the rapidly globalizing and changing world of the 21st century. There are 193 sovereign nations who are members of the United Nations, two-thirds of them belong to the developing world, while the rest are either underdeveloped or are part of the developed world.¹

What does it mean to be a public administrator in this global age? There are a few mandatory functions every public administrator will have to perform irrespective of the ideology of the political regime, e.g., collection of taxes, maintenance of law and order, provision of public goods and utilities, such as roads and public safety, banking and currency, water and power. These functions are known as system maintenance functions. The rest are referred to as context-specific because they vary from government to government across the ideological spectrum. Theories of public administration offer clues to the diversified and changing tasks of public administrators. Public administrators help shape and implement public policies framed by different governments in different state locales.

What is the environment in which policies are being made in today's world? There are images of the emergent new world order in popular discourse, which have, for example, announced the arrival of a borderless world, the rise of the South, networked national governance and the emergence of an Asian century. Such images have been created by the seminal shifts and deep transformations that have occurred in global politics since the closing decades of the last century—the end of the Cold war, advancement of globalization and the slow but persistent rise of the Global South (developing countries) in world affairs. Recurring regional conflicts, unexpected alignments among states, cross-border migrations and changing power equations, have surfaced at such a pace that fresh thinking

2 The changing world of the 21st century

regarding the impact of state and non-state actors in relation to political administrative regimes have become an absolute imperative. Turbulence in the Middle East, the short lived “Arab Spring” and its “democratizing” effect on the entire region, the rise of new terror axes in different parts of the world, the “national interest” compulsions of the U.S.A., Russia and other smaller regional powers to intervene in troubled waters, have led to serious global ramifications. The gross violation of human rights in Syria and Iraq have triggered unprecedented situations in intrastate conflicts and interstate wars. Middle East wars between 2014–17 have left more people displaced and homeless than any period of 20th century history.² Even after World War II the “refugee” crisis did not assume such serious proportions. These global events did have serious repercussions for the domestic politics and governance capacities of states hit by civil war or interstate conflicts. Laws and constitutions work during “normal” periods of civil governance; in conflict-hit states these norms do not work and citizen rights are never fully protected. For citizens living in conflict zones or during times of civil war (as millions of people did and still do), violations, curtailment or suspension of rights is the norm for both citizens and immigrant populations. The U.N.’s International Migration Report (2017) estimates that there were 258 million migrants in 2017. Between 1990 and 2017, the immigrant population has increased by over 100 million. We now live in a truly “globalized” world where more and more people are leaving their country of birth for places which have better opportunities and a greater chance of access to higher standards of living. Contrary to popular belief, that the West hosts the largest immigrant (legal or illegal) population, it is developing countries that bear the burden of immigrants worldwide. Although the U.S. is still home to the greatest number of immigrants in the world, in 2017, India was the largest source of immigrant populations. In the 21st century, every state will have to absorb and provide for both citizens and non-citizens in equal measure, stretching their governance capacities to the limit. Throughout the greater part of the 20th century, states and public institutions did not deliver the same package of citizen entitlements, which is universally recognized today as a Minimum Agenda of good governance: protection of social, economic and political rights that are required for human beings to flourish and develop their capabilities. In the 21st century, can we expect less violence and conflict to lead to a greater protection of human rights for all citizens through the agencies of the state and instruments of public governance?³ Let’s hope we can. Although, looking at the world today, it is perhaps not difficult to guess that inequality will continue to remain the most intractable public policy challenge in all states, even in the 21st century.

Today, global politics tilts towards multipolarity, the gradual lessening of violence, “regionalization” of world politics with state and non-state actors, both of which influence internal policies of states. Religious fundamentalism raises its ugly head every now and then, terrorism continues, and although “democratization” is the current buzzword, it will take decades before the world becomes fully democratic. Across the world, experts lament that democracy is

eroding, backsliding, withering or buckling under authoritarian pressures. If the 21st century is to be dominated by China and India, there are a number of good reasons why this may happen. China and India remain the world's two most populous countries, home to one third of mankind. The recent upsurge in the growth rates of these two countries, apparently bucking the trend during the financial crisis that spread from the U.S.A. in 2007 to most of the developed and developing world, attracted the attention of scholars to the developmental trajectories of Asia's two largest powers. Both are currently undergoing capitalist transformations from socialist/mixed economy models of growth. China is a "hard" state, retaining its strong authoritarian one party regime with above average policy outcomes in most sectors; whereas India's democratic state previously under-performed in most developmental sectors, but over the last two decades it has begun to do much better.

China has many firsts: it is the world's most populated nuclear state with the world's largest armed personnel and police force. China holds a remarkable record of growth: it is the only country which grew at a rate of 10% for 30 years, enabling the largest number of people to exit poverty (500 million) between the years 2002–12. It has the second largest economy, with the highest foreign exchange reserves, and is the second highest remittance receiving country in the world. Furthermore, it has one of the highest savings and investment rates in the world. It is also number one in the production of gold and interestingly, despite its professed ideological stance (socialistic), houses the highest number of billionaires in any city (Beijing) in the world (Bagchi and D'Costa 2012).

The rise of the South

The ascendance of the South, which began in the latter half of the 20th century, has been unprecedented in its pace and outcomes. Never before, in recorded history, have the living standards of the average masses changed so rapidly in such a compressed time span. In England, where the Industrial Revolution started, it took 150 years to double its per capita output, while in the United States, which industrialized much later, needed about half a century. Both countries had a population under 10 million when they began to industrialize. In contrast, the current economic resurgence in China and India started with about a billion people in each country. Doubling their output per capita in less than two decades is an economic phenomenon that has made a developmental impact, no less radical than the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century!

Most developing countries have raised their living standards in the last quarter century, but some have done particularly well—in what can be called the "rise of the South".⁴ Some of the largest countries have taken impressive strides, notably China, Brazil, India, Indonesia and South Africa. But there have also been seminal changes in smaller economies, such as Bangladesh, Chile, Ghana, Mauritius and Tunisia. By 2050, China, Brazil and India cumulatively, are expected to

4 The changing world of the 21st century

account for 40% of world output in purchasing power parity terms (U.N.D.P. 2013).

Over the last two decades, countries from several regions of the world have been converging towards higher levels of human development, as is evident from the U.N.D.P. Annual Human Development Index (H.D.I.); a composite measure of indicators involving three dimensions: life expectancy, educational attainment and command over the resources needed for a decent living. All groups and regions around the globe have made notable improvements in relation to H.D.I. components, with greater progress in countries which are ranked low and medium in the H.D.I. range. On this basis, it can be surmised that the world is becoming a better place to live for most people around the globe. However, national averages often conceal large disparities in living conditions. Disturbing inequalities remain within, and between, countries of the North and the South; removing these inequalities will remain the single most difficult challenge of public governance in the 21st century. Let's not forget that for centuries inequality has remained the single most important destabilizing force in society.

The 20th century has witnessed numerous "egalitarian" revolutions, transitions and changes across several parts of the world. Most of these revolutions, whether they be socialist, feminist, environmentalist or other kinds of revolutions, furthered the cause, not only of individual rights and liberties, but highlighted issues, such as sustainable development, equity and gender justice. Also, waves of democratization swept across the globe from time to time; all of these have acted as great "levelers" and catalysts of progress and equality in the 20th century. However, they also necessitated the rise of "administrative" or "developmentalist" states, to ensure economic development, gender justice, human development and environmental protection. *Politics willed and administration executed, that seemed to be the pattern of development everywhere.* Even today the developed world leads the way, because their public management systems provide a sufficient and efficient infrastructure of public goods and services to citizens (invisibly, impeccably and imperceptibly), maintaining roads, communication, public safety and sanitation, primary education and health care, recreational facilities, banks and currency; with a public service ethos that makes them very different from private service operators who serve "clients" in the market with an underlying motive to be profitable.

Southern countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, through individual or cumulative efforts, are raising world economic growth, helping each other in their development efforts, reducing poverty, increasing national income and persistently trying to promote socioeconomic development by raising living standards in their own countries. Nonetheless, they still retain the largest percentage of the world's poor. These countries, in the process of trial and error, have often demonstrated how indigenously designed policies or "home adopted" global technologies with a sharp focus on growth and human development, can bring about the desired turn around in the economy. Each experience is unique and needs to be studied.

A case study

Take Mauritius, a tiny island state on the southern tip of Africa. It has taken giant strides in economic growth, due to the strength of its institutions (Subramaniam 2001). It stands as a role model, not only for Africa but for the rest of the world, for what could be achieved without the classic prerequisites of power: substantive land or mineral resources, population or nuclear capacity. The total land area of the country is 2040 km. The people are multi-ethnic, multi-religious and multi-lingual. Its Human Development Index is the highest in Africa. Since independence from Britain in 1968, Mauritius has developed from a low income, agriculture-based economy to a middle income diversified economy, based on tourism, textiles, sugar and financial services. Mauritius ranks highly in terms of economic competitiveness; a congenial investment climate, delivering “good governance” with impeccable democratic credentials. Its economic performance is nothing short of a miracle, having a gross Domestic Product per capita over U.S.\$16,820, one of the highest in Africa.

A well thought out strategy of nation building and development laid the foundations for sustainable growth in Mauritius. Its model of democracy relies on multi-culturalism, redistributive economic policies and strong autonomous institutions, which are critical when it comes to a country’s growth and stability. Democracy promoted incremental and changeable strategies for public policy formation and implementation. Education and health services were fully subsidized to encourage employment and inclusive growth. Mauritius is one of Africa’s least corrupt countries. High levels of public investment in selected competitive sectors of the economy yielded rich dividends, which could be further invested for human development.

At the crossroads

For many observers, the world today stands at the proverbial cross roads: a resurgent South—most notably countries such as China and India, where there is steady progress in human development, growth appears to remain sustainable, prospects for poverty reduction are encouraging—and a North in crisis—where recurring cut backs on “welfare” expenditure and the absence of steady or spectacular economic growth poses severe hardship to millions of marginalized, unemployed, poor and growing immigrant populations, as social welfare states increasingly give way to Right-wing political ones. There are also common concerns shared by the North and the South: growing intrastate inequalities, slow pace of recovery from recessionary trends, reduced rate of poverty reduction, as well as serious threats to the environment.

The world is becoming more connected; during the early years of the 21st century, the expansion of international trade led to a turnaround in global production, which, by 2015, accounted for nearly 60% of global output. Between 1980–2010, developing countries expanded their share of world merchandise

trade from 25% to 47%: South–South trade increased from less than 8% of world trade to more than 26% (U.N.D.P. 2013). Paradoxically, despite being hit the hardest by the Recession, the U.S. remains the largest economy in the world, in monetary terms, and will remain so for some time. If the U.S.A.'s recovery gets delayed and Europe is unable to extricate itself from the doldrums it finds itself in, there will be a large spillover effect on the economies of the developing world. Transnational challenges, such as moderating the effects of climate change or averting communicable diseases, require a certain degree of global cooperation. While the rise of the South is reshaping global power equations in more than one way, painstakingly achieved gains in human development will be more difficult to protect if the North–South dialogue fails and difficult decisions are postponed, as witnessed in global environmental negotiations after 2000.

Lessons from the South

The developmental trajectories of Brazil, China and India, as well as less recognized success stories such as Bangladesh, Malaysia and Chile, are reshaping ideas of how to attain steady economic growth with steady human development. However, some remarkable lessons are also learnt from the diverse and variegated development journeys of many Third World “developmental” states (not necessarily democratic) that have not been imitative of any one model. Their nation building efforts are dedicated to human development, openness to trade, technological innovation, besides concerns of equity and sustainability incorporated in people centric policies and strategies. Common traits include promoting economic growth by incentivizing certain sectors, training and using competent bureaucracies, promoting institutions which plan and implement policies amidst all the odds. The “legitimacy” of these states is mainly dependent on their record in development; e.g. China, South Korea, Singapore, Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos.

On the other hand, over a number of decades, democratic countries like India, Bangladesh, Brazil, South Africa, Chile and Mauritius, have considered pro-poor patterns of growth as electoral investments. Developmental transformations need to alter the structure of production and their capacity to create jobs, and the expansion of opportunities for large sections of people. Democracies have to be majoritarian and people friendly. They need pragmatic political leadership wedded to long term development, but have short term gains for the electorate as well. In “soft” democracies, where the demands of various sectors need to be balanced, public investments have to be made in both growth and human development. Since the 1950s, older welfare states, like the Scandinavian democracies, have derived their legitimacy from their welfare policies, state promotion of industry, institution building and technological research. These advanced welfare states guaranteed basic public goods and services—food, education, health and human security to all of its citizens.

In different ways, China and Russia are demonstrating that authoritarianism may “deliver” a better outcome than democracy. Both countries espouse a model

of state capitalism in which the strengths of the market are balanced against a strong state, which attempts to reduce the inequities associated with unbridled capitalism. Authoritarian states are usually in a better position, than democratic states, to take “hard” decisions. Suggesting that global politics may not entirely reap the democratic peace dividend, due to the continued coexistence of democratic and authoritarian states, even in the 21st century.

The unexpected turmoil in several Middle Eastern countries and their declining petroleum economies after the short lived “Arab Spring” (signified by prodemocracy movements), is a reminder that the educated young put a high premium on meaningful employment and on their right to expect “democracy” from their respective governments. A considerable amount of turmoil in Tunisia, Egypt and Syria, was introduced by the urban, educated, Internet-using young, who were disillusioned by the lack of civil and political rights within their countries.

Not all developing countries are participating fully in the rise of the South. The pace of change is slower, for instance, in the majority of the 50 least developed countries in the world, especially those that are landlocked or distant from world markets. Although, many of them have begun to benefit from South-South trade, investment, finance and technology transfer. The developmental take-off of these least developed countries is a significant challenge for the world community, as much of it involves moderating the uneven effects of development in many other developing countries.

By 2025, the annual consumption in “emerging” markets is estimated to rise to \$30 trillion. By then the South will account for three-fifths of the 1 billion households earning more than \$20,000 a year (U.N.D.P. 2013). Despite such expansion, significant pockets of deprivation, which undermine the sustainability of progress, will still exist, creating a fertile ground for tension and conflict. There is more intrastate conflict today (e.g. in Africa and Latin America) than inter-state conflict, which in itself poses huge challenges for domestic governance.

Challenges for domestic governance

Regarding dividends from “good governance”, the track record of African countries (with few exceptions) has been disappointing. Most African countries have faced poverty, inequality, poor infrastructure, capital flight, unemployment, civil war, famine, crime, ethnic conflict and authoritarian political regimes in the last century. Ill-informed public policies, mismanagement and misuse of scarce resources, reluctance to enable human or capital environment for development, corruption and lack of public accountability, have all been due to poor governance by ruling elites (Sharma 2007). Exceptions to this include Botswana and Mauritius. One million children in Africa, including Ethiopia, do not have steady access to food, largely because of El Nino. The weather phenomenon has helped trigger droughts in many parts of the world, leaving millions hungry in Africa alone.

Recent media attention in Latin America has focused on the recurring economic crises in several countries. Public anger erupts from time to time, people take to the

streets and political violence escalates, claiming thousands of lives. Opposition groups exert pressure on the government through street violence. Faltering economies, a shortage of the most basic consumer products, high inflation, high levels of corruption and unemployment, have fuelled riots, lawlessness and crime. Even Brazil, one of the better governed states, has faced corruption scandals, economic slowdown and high crime rates in recent years. Reforms meant to put Brazil's economy on track by reducing public expenditure have become very unpopular (Bremmer 2018).

It is well documented today, through data based research that inequality is socially divisive and can have a negative impact on the general wellbeing of society. There is sufficient comparative data on the effects of all forms of inequality in different societies, which show how corrosive its effects have been. New evidence proves that inequality provides the clinching explanation of why, despite remarkable economic prosperity, some societies remain least integrated socially; e.g. the U.S.A. has one of the highest homicide rates, the highest number of teenage pregnancies and the highest rate of imprisonment, something which is often attributed to the existence of the greatest intra-state income differences. In contrast, countries like Japan, Sweden and Norway, have smaller income disparities and do better in regards to all human development parameters. Violence is more common in more unequal states, not only because inequality increases status competition, but also because people deprived of the markers of status (incomes, jobs, houses, cars etc.) are more inclined to crime and violence.

During the next few decades, "green" politics will become dominated by "inequality" issues. The greatest threat to reducing carbon emissions is consumerism, which has been greatly driven by status competition, again intensified in significantly unequal societies. Narrowed income differences make us less vulnerable to these pressures, therefore, greater equality is crucial to achieving environmental sustainability. Despite being vilified as developing markets that guzzle carbon emitting energy, China, India and Brazil together, consume a fraction (50%) of what is used by advanced economies. In societies where income differences have been narrowed, statistics show that community life is stronger and more people feel they can trust one another. There is also less violence, including lower homicide rates, higher life expectancy, lower crime rates and children are better educated. Reducing inequality through conscious public policy interventions will require ideological commitment from the state and their executing agencies (Wilkinson 2016).

A proactive democratic state develops policies for both public and private sectors—based on a long-term vision, shared norms and values, rules that build trust between the trinity: state, the citizen and the private institutions, while promoting societal unity, cohesion and sustainable transformation.

Developmental states: divergent approaches

Developing countries rarely follow a uniform trajectory. Many of these ex-colonies have faced multiple challenges, adopted varying policies to deal with market

regulation, export promotion, industrial development and human development. In this post globalized era, public policies need to promote entrepreneurship while providing safety nets to protect the poor from the negative effects of unbridled pro-market policies. Governments can nurture domestic industries (public value based) that would not otherwise emerge because of free market competition. This has enabled several countries of the South to turn loss making industries into early drivers of export success, as their economies became more open under the leadership of strong authoritarian regimes, e.g. South Korea and Singapore.

Developmental states have experimented with different approaches. However, some features stand out: for instance, expansion of basic social services, like health, education with anti-poverty programmes and rapid expansion of employment opportunities, are critical features of growth that have promoted human development and created less unequal societies.

For the first time in 150 years, the combined output of the developing world's three leading economies—Brazil, China and India—is about to equal the combined G.D.P. of the long-standing industrial powers of the North—Canada, France, Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and the United States. This represents a dramatic rebalancing of global economic power. In 1950, Brazil, China and India together, accounted for only 10% of the world economy, while the six traditional economic leaders of the North accounted for roughly half. According to successive World Bank Development Reports, by 2050 Brazil, China and India, will together account for 40% of global output, surpassing the projected combined production of today's Group of Eight (Go8) bloc of economies (the major industrialized countries).

Today, the South as a whole produces about half of the world's economic output, which is up by about a third since 1990. The combined G.D.P. of the eight major developing countries alone—Argentina, Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, South Africa and Turkey—now equals the G.D.P. of the United States, which is still the world's biggest national economy. As recent as 2005, the combined economic weight of those eight countries was barely half of that of the United States (U.N.D.P. 2013). Other development challenges also exist. An estimated 1.57 billion (mainly in the South) live in multidimensional poverty; a measure of both the number and the intensity of overlapping human deprivations in health, education and standards of living in the world today. Between 1990–2010, the South's share of the global middle class population expanded from 26% to 58%. By 2030, more than 80% of the world's middle class is projected to be residing in the South and will account for 70% of total consumption expenditure.⁵

The 1994 U.N.D.P. Human Development Report argued that the concept of security must shift from the idea of a militaristic safeguarding of state borders to a reduction of insecurity in people's daily lives (or human insecurity) (U.N.D.P. 1994). In every society, human security is undermined by a variety of threats, including hunger, disease, crime, unemployment, human rights violations and environmental challenges. Let's look at what we understand as economic

insecurity. In the countries of the North, there are millions of young, unemployed in these recessionary times, while in the South, millions of farmers have been unable to earn a decent livelihood from low priced stagnant agriculture. Closely related is insecurity in food and nutrition. Many developing countries households face high food prices, and as a result cannot afford two square meals a day. Another major cause of impoverishment in many countries, rich and poor, is unequal access to affordable health care. Disease and hospitalization are one of the most important common causes of destitution. Meagre incomes are lost when heavy medical expenses are incurred by a household.

Therefore, perspectives regarding security need to shift from an old and exaggerated emphasis on military strength to a well-rounded, citizen-centric view. In this context, it is pertinent to state that global military expenditure exceeded \$1.4 trillion in 2015, more than the combined G.D.P. of the 50 poorest countries in the world, and 20 times more than the total money given annually as aid to eliminate poverty through multilateral aid.

Concluding observations

The 21st century is witnessing a seminal shift in global power relations and equations driven by the newly emerging new powers of the developing world. China has become the world's second largest economy, lifting hundreds of millions out of poverty through its planned economy and socialist policies. India has also made slow but steady progress in poverty reduction, as well as growth and human development through democratic political regimes.⁶ Brazil is raising its living standards and levels of human development through innovative anti-poverty programmes that are emulated worldwide. However, its growth trajectory has been erratic and less consistent in recent times. Russia, once a superpower, is now a B.R.I.C.S.⁷ country, undergoing painful transitions in an effort to dismantle its huge public sector and move towards the globalization, liberalization and privatization of its economy. All ex-socialist countries of Eastern Europe are similarly experiencing painful transitions to embrace globalization. Bureaucracies have had to adjust from ruling from a commanding height to sharing power with the private sector and competition from global markets. However, what is noticeable is that, in differing degrees, developing countries have built institutional and human capacities in the last three decades.

The South has finally arrived (Zakaria 2009) *a fact that needs to be celebrated in world politics*. Indonesia, Thailand, South Africa, Malaysia, Mauritius, Bangladesh, Rwanda, Ghana and other developing countries, are becoming leading actors on the world stage. The 2013 U.N.D.P. Human Development Report identifies more than 40 developing countries that have done better than expected regarding human development in recent decades, with their progress accelerating markedly over the last 10 years.

Each country of the “successful” South has its own unique history and as a result has chosen its own distinct development path for nation building and socio-economic

progress. Nonetheless, they share important characteristics and face many of the same challenges of public governance. They are also becoming more interconnected and interdependent. People throughout the developing world are increasingly becoming visible, vocal and rights conscious, demanding to be heard, as they share ideas through new communication networks and seek greater accountability from domestic governments and public administrators. Taking on a wider, more global perspective, the developing world does encounter challenges when arriving at “consensus” decisions with the developed world. However, these are some of the common issues they fight for as a bloc in global fora:

- Advancing the objective of a fair, balanced and development oriented multilateral trading system for all, for both developed and developing country members of the W.T.O.
- To contribute to the construction of a new global architecture to bring their collective voices together on global issues and to forge new areas of cooperation.
- Promotion of peace, security and development in a multipolar, and increasingly interdependent world.
- The importance of adhering to the principle of common, but differentiated responsibility, as well as the notion of national policy space.
- All nations should increasingly act not only as national sovereign entities but also as intermediaries to balance national, regional and global concerns.

The belief that public administration and governance can make a difference has been amply recorded in several examples in this chapter. True research lies in looking at the long term and steady trends of the last hundred years. If the world has become a more liveable and egalitarian place, where standards of living of the common man have been consistently rising, then credit goes to research in science and technology and its diffusion in modern societies, both of which have been due to active “state interventions” in society and the economy. People are “climbing out” of extreme poverty (every day 1,37,000 people lifted out of poverty in the past 25 years), fewer children are dying and life expectancy and literacy rates are going up. Through targeted public health interventions huge progress has been made against many erstwhile fatal diseases. Women who bore the brunt of violence, the burden of household work and child rearing, are now increasingly entering the workforce and empowering themselves with the rights they had previously been denied.

The Global Gender Gap Report measures performance on conditions necessary for women’s empowerment through four indices—education, health, economic and political participation. Iceland, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark, have closed 80% of the gender gap. The U.N.D.P. Human Development Index, over the past few years, have recorded the human development of 188 states. Norway is ranked no. 1 in the list, U.S.A. is 13th and India is ranked 130 in the Index. All three are democracies, the U.S.A. is the world’s richest economy and the latter is the world’s

largest democracy. A country's global power rating can never be insulated from its domestic policies and performance; a nation's true strength lies in the degree to which it can legitimize its citizens' claims and entitlements. The nations that can successfully do this fine act of balancing are, and will be, the nations to watch out for in the future. In this post globalized era, citizens need to assess the gains of the past century, and begin setting goals for this century. Setting Millennium Development Goals and Sustainable Development Goals is one such exercise. More importantly, any nation from any part of the world, developed or developing, can be a norm setter or a developmental role model for others to follow. No model can remain iconic forever.

Science, technology, sound public policy and good governance, can work wonders for those who are deprived. China and India's record in poverty reduction and human development through redistributive public policies, are worthy of emulation. Liberty, equality and justice were goals worth striving for in the last century—they are no less relevant now in the 21st century. It is also becoming clearer that if the Sustainable Development Goals (S.D.G.'s) are to be met by 2030⁸—it will be largely due to the efforts of the South to build new administrative capacities which can take us to a much fairer, freer and more egalitarian world than ever before. States can only translate promises of “good governance” through effective, efficient and committed public governance systems. Therefore, building “age and country” appropriate administrative skills and capacities is of paramount importance for all states (developed or developing) in the 21st century.

Notes

1 F.W. Riggs, well known scholar of comparative public administration, developed a typology to analyze the administrative systems of different and diverse countries in his model of fused (underdeveloped), prismatic (developing) and diffracted (developed) societies. Riggs gave the distinguishing features of each:

Fused	Prismatic	Diffracted
Particularism	Selectivism	Universalism
Ascriptive value	Attainment	Achievement
Functionally diffuse	Polyfunctionalism	Functional specificity

This author has followed the Riggsian scheme in her definitions of the terms “under-developed”, “developing” and “developed” countries.

2 65.6 million people count among the displaced in 2018, the highest in 7 decades: half of them are children. From Syria and Afghanistan, to more recently, DR Congo and Myanmar, civil wars and inter-state violence have swelled the numbers of refugee populations worldwide (2016 data, U.N.H.C.R., Source: Times of India, January 18, 2018).

3 The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (30 articles) was adopted on December 10, 1948 by the General Assembly as a common standard of achievement in the promotion and protection of human rights. The Declaration includes individual civil and political rights as well as economic, social and cultural rights. The Declaration accepts the principle that states can build human rights only for the “just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society”.

- 4 The term “Global South” refers broadly to the regions of Asia, Africa, Latin America and Oceania. They refer to ex-colonies, outside Europe and North America, mostly economically undeveloped low-income countries, often politically marginalized, ideologically “mixed” and clubbed together as the Third World.
- 5 Middle Class—By Human Development Report calculations based on Brookings Institution (2012) data, the middle class includes people earning or spending \$10–100 a day in 2005 purchasing power parity terms.
- 6 In October 2016 the World Bank reported that 767 million people live in extreme poverty: earning less than \$1.90 a day. In India, the number of poor fell by 218 million from 2004 to 2013. In China, it fell by more than 320 million from 2002 to 2012. The average person in extreme poverty lives on \$1.33 per day. It would take just \$0.57 per day (\$159 billion a year) or less than 0.2% of global G.D.P. to end extreme poverty.
- 7 The term “B.R.I.C.S.” was coined in 2001 in a report by Goldman Sachs, the investment bank, to highlight the growing economic might of four large countries on the world stage—Brazil, Russia, India and China. South Africa has now been added to this list. In addition to highlighting a shift in the power balances of the new global order, with most of the growth in world production coming from developing and emerging economies, the main intention of this group of countries is to checkmate the U.S. hegemony in world affairs. I.B.S.A. (India, Brazil and South Africa) is another platform of major developing countries.
- 8 Sustainable Development Goals (S.D.G.s) were initiated by the United Nations in 2015 to address key development challenges including climate change, economic inequality, sustainable consumption, peace and justice. The seventeen goals, to be achieved by 2030, are comprehensive and focus on the five P’s—people, planet, prosperity, peace and partnership.

References

- Bagchi, A.K. and A.P. D’Costa. 2012. *Transformation and Development: The Political Economy of Transition in India and China*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bremmer, I. 2018. *Stormy Days for Many Latin American Nations 15th July*, New Delhi, Hindustan Times.
- Sharma, C. 2007. “Towards Good Governance in Africa: Critical Dimensions and the Experience of Botswana” in R.B. Jain (ed.) *Governing Development across Cultures*, Verlag, Barbara Budrich Publishers.
- Subramaniam, A. 2001. *Mauritius: A Case Study*. Finance and Development, 38: 4.
- U.N.D.P. 1994. *United Nations Human Development Report*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- U.N.D.P. 2013. *Human Development Report*, New Delhi, Academic Foundation.
- Wilkinson, R. 2016. *The Spirit Level: Why Greater Equality Makes Societies Stronger*. Participation, 40(1): 9–11.
- Zakaria, F. 2009. *The Post American World*, New York, W.W. Norton & Co.

The changing world of the 21st century

- Bagchi, A.K. and A.P. DCosta . 2012. Transformation and Development: The Political Economy of Transition in India and China , Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bremmer, I. 2018. Stormy Days for Many Latin American Nations 15th July , New Delhi, Hindustan Times.
- Sharma, C . 2007. Towards Good Governance in Africa: Critical Dimensions and the Experience of Botswana in R.B. Jain (ed.) Governing Development across Cultures , Verlag, Barbara Budrich Publishers.
- Subramaniam, A . 2001. Mauritius: A Case Study . Finance and Development, 38: 4.
- U.N.D.P . 1994. United Nations Human Development Report , New Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- U.N.D.P . 2013. Human Development Report , New Delhi, Academic Foundation.
- Wilkinson, R . 2016. The Spirit Level: Why Greater Equality Makes Societies Stronger . Participation, 40(1): 911.
- Zakaria, F . 2009. The Post American World , New York, W.W. Norton & Co.

The discipline of public administration today

- Basu, R. 2016. The Discipline of Public Administration Today: New Perspectives . Indian Journal of Public Administration, 62(1), January/March: 18.
- Bellone, C.J. and G.F. Goerl . 1992. Reconciling Entrepreneurship and Democracy . Public Administration Review, 52(2), March/April: 130134.
- Considine, M. and J. Lewis . 2003. Bureaucracy Network or Enterprise? Comparing Models of Governance in Australia, Britain, Netherlands and New Zealand . Public Administration Review, 63(2): 131140.
- Denhardt, R. and J. Denhardt . 2007. New Public Service , New York, M.E. Sharpe.
- Goldsmith, S. and W.D. Eggers . 2004. Governing by Network: The New Shape of the Public Sector , Washington, DC, Brookings Institution Press.
- Moore, M.H. 1995. Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government , Cambridge, MA, London, Harvard University Press.
- Niskanen, W.A. 1971. Bureaucracy and Representative Government , Chicago, IL, Aldine Alterton.
- OToole, L.J. 1997. Treating Networks Seriously: Practical and Research-Based Agendas in Public Administration . Public Administration Review, 57(i): 4552.
- Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler . 1992. Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector , New Delhi, Prentice Hall.
- Peters, B.G. 2002. The Changing Nature of Public Administration: From Easy Answers to Hard Questions . Asian Journal of Public Administration, 24(2), December: 1020.
- Pollitt, C. 1993. Managerialism and the Public Services: Cuts or Cultural Change in the 1990s , Oxford, Basil Blackwell.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. and J. Wanna . 2007. The Limits to Public Value, or Rescuing Responsible Government from the Platonic Guardians . The Australian Journal of Public Administration, 66(4): 406421.
- Wilson, W. 1887. The Study of Administration . Political Science Quarterly, 2, June: 197222.
- The World Bank . 1994. Governance and Development , Washington, DC, The World Bank.

The public and its policies

- Bovens, M.A.P. 1990. The Social Steering of Complex Organizations . British Journal of Political Science, 20: 91117.
- Cain, B. , R. Dalton and S. Scarrow eds. 2003. Democracy Transformed? Expanding Political Opportunities in Advanced Industrial Democracies , New York, Oxford University Press.
- Castels, M. 2000. Materials for an Exploratory Network of the Network Society . British Journal of Sociology, 51(10): 524.
- Cohen, M.D. , J.G. March and J.P. Olsen . 1972. A Garbage Can Model of Organizational Choice . Administrative Science Quarterly, 17(1), March: 125.

de Vries, M.S. 2016. *Understanding Public Administration* , New York, Palgrave Macmillan.

Dror, Y. 1968. *Public Policy Reexamined* , San Francisco, CA, Chandler.

Fischer, F. 2003. *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices* , New York, Oxford University Press.

Goodsell, C.T. 1992. The Public Administrator as Artisan . *Public Administration Review*, 52: 246253.

Hecko, H. 1978. Issue Networks and the Executive Establishment in A. King (ed.) *The New American Political System* , Washington, DC, American Enterprise Institute, 82124.

Kaufman, F.G. , G. Majone and V. Ostrom eds. 1985. *Guidance, Control and Evaluation in the Public Sector* , Berlin, Wide Grynter.

Kingdon, J.W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives and Public Policies* , New York, Longman.

Lerner, D. and H.D. Lasswell , eds. 1951. *The Policy Sciences* , Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press.

Lijphart, A . 1999. *Pattern of Democracy* , New Haven, Yale University Press.

Lindblom, C.E. 1959. The Science of Muddling Through . *Public Administration Review*, 19: 7988.

Lowi Theodore, J . 1964. American Business, Public Policy Case Studies and Political Theory . *World Politics*, 16, July: 677715.

March, J.G. 1972. Model Bias in Social Action . *Review of Educational Research*, 42: 413429.

Olson, M. 1971. *The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups* , Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler . 1993. *Reinventing Government* , New York, Plume/Penguin.

Ostrom, E . et al. 2010. *Working Together: Collective Action, the Commons and Multiple Methods in Practice* , Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Rhodes, R.A.W. 1997. *Understanding Governance: Policy Networks, Governance and Accountability* , Buckingham, UK, Open University Press.

Ripley, R. and G. Franklin . 1991. *Congress, Bureaucracy and Public Policy* , Pacific Grove, CA, Brooks Cole.

Sabatier, P.A. and H.C. Jenkins-Smith , eds. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach* , Boulder, CO, Westview.

Simon, H.A. 1955. A Behavioural Theory of Rational Choice . *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69: 99118.

Smith, S.R. and M. Lipsky . 1993. *Non Profits for Hire: The Welfare State in an Age of Contracting* , Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Tilly, C . 1999. Power Top Down and Bottom Up . *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 7: 330352.

Wildavsky, A. 1974. *The Private Government of Public Money* , London, Macmillan.

Democracy, the state and the citizen

Bhagwati, J. and A. Panagariya . 2014. *Why Growth Matters* , U.S. Public Affairs, U.S.A., Perseus Book Group.

Fukuyama, F . 2018. The New Tribalism and the Crisis of Democracy . *Foreign Affairs*, September/October, 97: 5.

Kohli, A . 1991. *Democracy and Discontent: Indias Growing Crisis of Governability* , New York, Cambridge University Press.

Lijphart, A . 2004. Constitutional Design for Divided Societies . *Journal of Democracy*, 15(2): 96109.

Lipset, S.M. 1959. Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy . *American Political Science Review*, 53(1): 69105.

Morris-Jones, W.H. 1989. *The Government and Politics of India* , London, Hutchinson & Co.

Norris, P . 2016. Are Poor Societies Stuck with Their Dictators and Failed Elections? [theconversation.com](https://theconversation.com/are-poor-societies-stuck-with-dictators-57145), April 11. <https://theconversation.com/are-poor-societies-stuck-with-dictators-57145>.

Nyong'o, P.A. 2016. When Elections Fail Twice or More, Can Losers Accept the Victors as Legitimate? *Participation*, 40(1): 1820.

Rudolph, L. and S. Rudolph . 1987. *In Pursuit of Lakshmi The Political Economy of the Indian State* , Chicago, IL, University of Chicago Press.

Sen, A. and J. Dreze . 2013. *An Uncertain Glory, India and Its Contradictions* , London, Penguin.

Good governance to governing development today

- Asmerom, H.K. and R.B. Jain , eds. 1993. Politics, Administration and Public Policy in Developing Countries: Examples from Africa, Asia and Latin America , Amsterdam, VU University Press.
- Basu, R. 2017. Public Administration Concepts and Theories , New Delhi, Sterling.
- 81 Chaudhry, S.A. , G.J. Reid and W.H. Malik , eds. 1994. Civil Service Reform in Latin America and the Caribbean , The World Bank Technical paper No. 258. Washington, DC, The World Bank, 2225.
- Deaton, A. 2013. The Great Escape: Health, Wealth and the Origins of Inequality , Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.
- Farazmand, A. 2001. Comparative and Development Public Administration: Past, Present, and Future in A. Farazmand (ed.) Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration , New York, Marcel Dekker.
- Fox, C.J. 1996. Reinventing Government as Postmodern Symbolic Politics . Public Administration Review, 56(3) (May/June): 256262.
- Fukuyama, F. 1991. The End of History and the Last Man , London, Hamish Hamilton.
- Hyden, G. , J. Court and K. Mease . 2004. Making Sense of Governance; Empirical Evidence from 16 Developing Countries , Boulder, CO, Lynne Rienner.
- Jain, R.B. , ed 1989. Bureaucratic Politics in the Third World , New Delhi, Gitanjali.
- Jain, R.B. , ed 2005. Globalization and Good Governance; Pressures for Constructive Reforms , New Delhi, Deep and Deep.
- Jain, R.B. , ed. 2007. Governing Development across Cultures , Germany, Barbara Budrich Publishers.
- Kaufmann, D. , A. Kraay and M. Mastruzzi . 2003. Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996-2002 . http://info.worldbank.org/governance/kkz2002/sc_chart.asp (accessed April 26, 2004 , and November 2, 2005).
- Leftwich, A. 1993. Governance, Democracy and Development in the Third World . Third World Quarterly, 14(3): 605624.
- Mcintyre, D. , F. Mehens and J.A. Rottingen . 2017. What Level of Domestic Government Health Expenditure Should We Aspire to for Universal Health Expenditure Should We Aspire to for Universal Health Coverage? Health Economics, Policy and Law, 12: 125137.
- McSwite, O.C. 1997. Legitimacy in Public Administration: A Discourse Analysis , Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.
- Rosenbloom, D.H. and R.S. Kravchuk . 2002. Public Administration: Understanding, Management, Politics, and Law in the Public Sector , New York, McGraw Hill.
- Shand, D. 1998. New Public Management: Challenges and Issues in an International Perspective . Indian Journal of Public Administration, 44(3) July/September: 714721.
- Soni, V. 2003. Public Administration and Governance in Developing Countries in the Last Quarter Century: A Status Report . Paper prepared for IPSA Political Science Development 2000 project.
- Subramaniam, V. 1990. Introduction in V. Subramaniam (ed.) Public Administration in the Third World: An International Handbook , Westport, CT, Greenwood Press, 113.
- The World Bank . 1992. Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis to Sustainable Growth , Washington, DC, The World Bank.

Public administration in the 21st century

- Chandler, J.A. 1996. The Citizens Charter , Aldershot, UK, Dartmouth Press.
- Chapman, R.A. 1988. Ethics in the Civil Service , London, Routledge.
- Downs, A. . 1977. An Economic Theory of Democracy , New York, Harper and Row.
- Lucas, J.R. 1967. The Principles of Politics , Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Makridimitris, A. 2002. Dealing with ethical dilemmas in public administration: the ALIR imperatives of ethical reasoning . International Review of Administrative Sciences, 68(2): 251266.
- Niskanen, W . 1973. Bureaucracy: Servant or Master? London, Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Paul, S. et al. 2006. Who benefits from Indias Public Services , New Delhi, Academic Foundation.
- U.N.D.P . 2013. Human Development Report , New Delhi, Academic Foundation.