

Post-print version of:

Sager, F. & Rutgers, M.R. (2014). Symposium Prelude to Public Administration: Essential Early German and Dutch Thinking on Administration, *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 36(1), 25-30.

Symposium: Prelude to Public Administration: Essential early German and Dutch thinking on Administration

Prelude to Public Administration: the value of early thinkers

Fritz Sager & Mark Rutgers

The present symposium discusses European classics in Public Administration, with the aim to identify core ideas, authors, and texts, and to make their work known to a wider audience. The symposium presents examples of what can best be described as the history of “*administrative thought*”. The contributions in this issue specifically focus on European ‘classics’ in *Public Administration (PA)* as a scientific discipline and on *public administration (pa)* as praxis from the era before the development of the study of public administration in the USA. The study of public administration is based on a long tradition of scholars taking a special interest in the organization and running of a state. In the early 17th century a specific literature emerged dealing with what is now known as *public administration* or *governance*. Various authors such as Von Seckendorff (1626-1692, DelaMare (1639-1723), Von Justi (1702-1771), Bonnin (1772-1830), Von Mohl (199-1875), broached the issue to the importance of a specific study of public administration which forms the basis for ideas about what would nowadays be labeled as governance. Of course, these ideas have not evolved in a vacuum, and although the focus of this symposium is more on scholarly debate on the nature of public administration, these ideas developed in close relation to administrative practice of the day. The aim is to identify core authors and texts, and to discuss their meaning as well as impact on the development of *administrative thought*.

Looking more closely at these preludes to the twentieth and twenty-first century *administrative thought* can enhance our insights into contemporary debates. This provides us with answers response at the following questions: to what extend are our concerns and solution novel? Where do apparently self-evident insights originate? And should we take them for granted considering the reason they were introduced? Why and when where some of our core concepts actually developed, and did their meaning stay constant? While American classics from the late 19th century and early twentieth century are well studied and known among the international PA community, the same is not necessarily true for some of the European authors and their ideas presented in this issue due to linguistic turfs. However, as can be illustrated in this symposium, these well-known US classics were also building on a longer (European) tradition, and developed new ideas and practices on these bases.

Delving into older intellectual history is not always straightforward, as the ‘ancient’ history of our field has been hidden for a long time due to ‘disciplinary biases’ in the history of the social sciences. Everyone knows August Comte’s (1798-1857) conception of positivism. But does the average scholar know Bonnin’s approach to create a positive administrative science as early as in 1812? The history of political philosophy, economics, and legal thought is well documented and its classic texts are widespread. In contrast, ideas on public administration are generally still marginalized in the context of other fields of interest. For instance, Cameralism from the 18th century is often reduced to being just a forerunner of economics, ignoring the majority of works in this field that deal with much broader issues regarding governance. This disciplinary bias can first be explained by the strong focus of the PA on contemporary issues due to its close links to administrative practice. Second, social science historians study the history from the perspective of the discipline they are interested in. Thus they do not approach history neutrally (as if that would be possible to begin with), but focus on the development and origins of specific problems or concepts, and (re)construct the development of a specific discourse over time.

The history of public administration goes back to Gladden’s book ‘An Introduction to Public Administration’ from 1971. Raadschelders’ ‘Handbook of Administrative History’ (1998 and later editions) provides an overview of the rich literature. The history of public administration is also a history of administrative thought. For instance, ideas about the civil service have been developed over the centuries, ranging from double bookkeeping to pension scheme’s (cf. Raadschelders and Rutgers, 1999). Just as the development of sociological ideas and

theories is a specific subject matter compared to social history, the history of administrative thought is a proper subject as such. It opens a new horizon for understanding and reevaluating contemporary administrative thought, and does so by calling attention to the underlying assumptions and inspirations for contemporary ideas. To illustrate this point, one should ask how many students of public administration are aware of the 18th and 19th century arguments calling for theoretical guidance for administrative practice, and how many are familiar with Immanuel Kant's rejection of the normative foundations of 17th and 18th century administrative argument. Yet these authors are arguably important to understanding the development of administrative thought on both sides of the Atlantic. An interesting example also provides the more common known links between Prussian administrative practices, Georg Hegel's appropriation of these insights and use in his theories on the state, resulting in, what Avineri called, "a model of a bureaucracy almost identical with the Weberian ideal type" (1980: 160). Hegel did certainly have an impact on administrative authors such as Lorenz Von Stein and Max Weber. Von Stein, just like, Bluntschli, was in turn known by early American authors, such as Woodrow Wilson (Sager and Rosser 2009).

Woodrow Wilson's famous essay provides a nice example of the twists and turns of the developments of administrative thought. Wilson himself explicitly points at European forerunners, and calls for their Americanization (Wilson, 1887), and the essay itself remains fairly obscure for a number of decades. The latter implies that it can hardly be regarded the start of the study of public administration, however, the importance of the reception of Wilson's essay in the later discussion on, for instance, the politics and administration dichotomy, can hardly be overestimated (Overeem, 2012: 53). It also indicates that a history of administrative thought should include 'reception' histories, as well as the global exchange of ideas. Such global exchanges can be surprisingly old as well, thus Lorenz Von Stein (1815-1890) advised the Japanese government in the late 19th century, and Christian Von Wolff (1679-1754) was severely attacked for his positive assessment of Chinese ideas in 1721.

Research on the history of administrative thought is confronted with all the issues and difficulties of historical research, and in particular the 'history of ideas.' It concerns issues such as the possibility to understand the past, to correctly represent and trace original thought, as well as, problems of translation, not just from past to present, but also from local language to scholarly English. As such this is nothing special, and beyond the scope of this introduction to elaborate on these issues. What seems needed is the development of a broader

context what issues are specific to our concern: the comparison of practices in relation to (transfer of) ideas on public administration (Rutgers 2001, Sager et al. 2012).

This symposium can be regarded as part of the endeavor to build such a discourse on the history of administrative thought. The contributions are based on papers originally developed in the context of the panel *Prelude to Public Administration: Essential early European authors on Administration* at the 14th Annual Conference of the International Research Society for Public Management (IRSPM), Bern, April 7-9, 2010.

For the sake of parsimony, we restrict the symposium linguistically to the German and Dutch traditions of thought. This does not mean that other parts of Europe did not provide us with classics and original thought. However, Europe is too heterogeneous in cultures that by any means we can come only close to represent it in its full richness. The two linguistic regions are not chosen arbitrarily. First, both German and Dutch root in the West Germanic language family and thus share closer common cultural roots than other European linguistic regions. Second, and more importantly, this has led to the formation of what Painter and Peters (2010: 22) call the *Germanic tradition of public administration*: “The German *Rechtsstaat* is often held up as the prime example of a statist view of governance with a very strong and all-encompassing body of public law governing every administrative sphere. Members of this group along with Germany are Austria, Switzerland and the Netherlands. Civil servants (and judges) tend to be trained to think that they alone possess the capacity and the right to define what constitutes the public interest.” Third, both cases produced important thinkers within and beyond administrative thought and thus are clearly worth a close look. Finally, the two regions were also formative for the historical development of modern administrative practice and hence, it is justified to investigate in the thinking that took place in this specific context. The contributions illustrate a number of different ways of approaching the intellectual history of our field: discussing big ideas, important authors.

In the first contribution, Patrick Overeem offers an exploration of Althusius’ discussions of administration and its relation to other important concepts in his work, such as politics and communication. In particular, Overeem discusses what Althusius actually means by (public) administration, who is to exercise it, and how it should be performed. Overeem convinces us that Althusius is worth listening to, not only for political theorists, but also for students of public administration, even though Althusius’ Calvinist approach reads out of time in an

anachronistic reading. Althusius reminds us that public administration is a mandate from the people and needs to be exercised with prudence. Overeem argues that Althusius' understanding of public administration is remarkably constitutionalist, i.e., legitimated and limited by law. Entrusted to 'public servants' by the people in order to serve the people, it has to be moderate and accountable.

Susan Richter in her paper analyses the reception of the two German authors Karl von Moser and Johann Heinrich Gottlob Justi. The political journalist Friedrich Karl von Moser (1723-1798) yearned for a reasonable and orderly political system, headed by a prince with "a pure and unfeigned love of God" and a *heart full of the true love of mankind*. The ideal of a state as described by the author has the clear countenance of the Prussia of Frederick II, known to Moser in his youth. In his work, he comprehensively described the ideal state of enlightened absolutism, also pointing out the weaknesses and dangers of this system. The same was true of Johann Heinrich Gottlob Justi. The influence of his cameralistic ideas on German political science was considerable. Justi postulated the maintenance of state assets as the most important part of the acts of authority aiming, at the science of policing as a scientific subject at universities which could impart the technique of governance. It was just in such a context of the cameralistic training of the elites that the work was highly regarded as a textbook in Spain, and it was consulted in the Russian Empire to aid in reforming the administration. Richter studies the perception of the two authors who had worked at new approaches to administration in the German territories of the mid-eighteenth century, and therefore consciously published their works in German. She deals not only with the evaluation of Moser's and Justi's writings in the various European review journals, but also the question of accessibility in the form of translations, as well as their purpose, in England, France, or Russia.

Toon Kerkhoff then shows in his paper how in the Netherlands between roughly the 1770s and 1813, a new political vocabulary emerged amidst processes of democratization, bureaucratization and politicization. Kerkhoff provides an overview of thinking on ethical reform as proposed by several exponents of these three currents of thought on reform. This intellectual process included new or at least reemphasized public values and, by extension, helped frame new normative foundations underlying Dutch administration. As Kerkhoff argues, the Dutch Republic is often ignored in discussions on the history of Public Management reform which tend to focus on Prussia, France or England. It is however exactly

the somewhat atypical nature of the Dutch Republic which makes it relevant for research. Kerkhoff shows how historical administrative and ethical reforms were influenced by a variety of important but neglected Dutch early modern writers.

Finally, Christian Rosser offers insights into the Swiss-born and German-trained Johann C. Bluntschli's organic theory of the state, his concept of public administration, and his understanding of the politics-administration dichotomy. Considering the intellectual influence Bluntschli exerted on classic American authors like Woodrow Wilson and Frank J. Goodnow, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of the normative foundation of early American Public Administration. The article concludes with a discussion of organic state philosophy as a source of inspiration for contemporary administrative research and theory. In this vein, Rosser argues with Bluntschli that public administration serves an important role in establishing and supporting social relations, and in providing citizens with an encompassing structure.

References

- Avineri, S. (1980). *Hegel's theory of the modern state*. 6th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gladden, E.N. (1972). *A history of Public Administration*. London: Frank Cass.
- Overeem, P. (2012). *The Politics-Administration Dichotomy. Toward a constitutional perspective*. 2nd ed. Boca Raton etc: CRC Press.
- Painter, Martin, and B. Guy Peters (2010). Administrative Traditions in Comparative Perspective: Families, Groups and Hybrids, in Painter, Martin, and B. Guy Peters (eds). *Tradition and Public Administration*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 19-30.
- Raadschelders, J.C.N. & Rutgers, M.R. (1999). The waxing and waning of the state and its study. Changes and challenges in the study of public administration. In R. J. Stillman & W. J. M. Kickert (Eds.), *The modern state and its study* (pp. 17-35). London: Elgar.
- Raadschelders, J.C.N. (1998). *Handbook of Administrative History*. New Brunswick/London: Transaction publishers.
- Rutgers, Mark R. (2001). "Traditional Flavors?: The Different Sentiment in European and American Administrative Thought", *Administration & Society* 33(2): 220-444.
- Sager, Fritz, and Christian Rosser (2009). "Weber, Wilson, and Hegel: Theories of Modern Bureaucracy", *Public Administration Review* 69(6): 1136-1147.

Sager, Fritz, Christian Rosser, Pascal Y. Hurni and Céline Mavrot (2012). “How Traditional Are the American, the French, and the German Traditions of Public Administration? A Research Agenda”, *Public Administration* 90(1): 129–143.

Wilson, Woodrow (1887). “The Study of Administration”, *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2): 197-222.