

CFS NOTEBOOK

Conference for
Federal Studies

FALL 1973 VOL. III No. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Urbanization in Federal Systems Conference	1
Steering Committee Elections and Membership Meeting	3
Federal Grants-in-Aid Project	4
Delivery of Public Services Project	4
Three Syllabi, Lathef N. Ahmed, University of Missouri	
Comparative Urban Administration (Syllabus)....	5
Comparative Intergovernmental Administration (Syllabus).....	9
Comparative Public Organization (Syllabus).....	11
Intergovernmental Relations: Origins of a Term Deil Wright, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	13

URBANIZATION IN FEDERAL SYSTEMS CONFERENCE

We are very pleased to be able to report that the conference THE POLITICS OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS IN FEDERAL SYSTEMS: URBAN PERSPECTIVES sponsored by the Center for the Study of Federalism and the Urban Studies Program of Temple University, held in Philadelphia, August 26-29, 1973 was well received by participants and attendants. The broad range of issues and the various dimensions of federalism examined from cross-cultural and urban perspectives produced many findings and even more suggestions and aids for future research by our Urbanization in Federal Systems Program.

Many of these conference results will be further developed on a continuing basis, through ongoing instructional and research activities. In addition, seminars and conferences are currently being planned for the 1973-1974 academic year. They will be held at the Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. Conference members will be notified of these events as details are finalized and are invited to attend and provide suggestions for future activities.

The papers from the conference are presently being edited for publication by the Center. However, CFS members who are interested in receiving selected papers may do so by writing to:

Dr. Stephen Schechter, Coordinator
Urbanization in Federal Systems Program
Center for the Study of Federalism
Temple University
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122

The papers presented were:

"Comparing the Governance of Federal Capitals" Donald C. Rowat,
Political Science, Carleton University

"Conflict and Change in Federal Systems: Dialects of Communal
Federalism in Yugoslavia" William N. Dunn, Economic and Social
Development, University of Pittsburgh

"External and Internal Challenges to the Federal Bargain" Ivo
D. Duchacek, International Relations, The City College of the
City University of New York

"Federalism, Local Power and the Problem of Effecting Rapid
Change in India" Donald B. Rosenthal, Political Science,
SUNY at Buffalo

"Historical Attitudes Toward the Integration of Small Regions:
Traders vs. Princes" Howard Spodek, History and Urban Studies,
Temple University

"The Impact of Federalism on Educational Spending: Patterns
Within and Across Nations" David R. Cameron, Center for Political
Studies, University of Michigan

"Intergovernmental Profiles in the Federal Systems of Austria
and West Germany: A Comparative Perspective" Christa Altenstetter,
Department of Political Science, City University of New York

"International Values Project" Henry Teune, Political Science,
University of Pennsylvania

"Local Influence in the Federal Consultation Process" Richard
Reich, President, Swiss Political Science Association

"The Neglected Strata: States in the City-Federal Politics of Malaysia" Cynthia H. Enloe, Political Science, Clark University

"Remarks on Yugoslav Federalism" Jovan Djordjevic, Political Science and Law, University of Belgrade

"The Role of the States in Metropolitan Government" Joseph F. Zimmerman, Political Science, SUNY at Albany

"Substate Regionalism in Federal Systems" Carl Stenberg, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

"The Three-Country Region of Basil--A European Test Case" Hans J. Briner, Director, Regio Basiliensis

"Urban-Centered Federalism in the United States" Ira Sharkansky, Political Science, University of Wisconsin

"Urbanization in Federal Systems: An Introduction" Daniel J. Elazar, Director, Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University

"The Urban Municipality in the Canadian Federal System" Ronald M. Burns, Director, Institute of Intergovernmental Relations, Queen's University

* * * * *

CFS STEERING COMMITTEE AND MEMBERSHIP MEETING

Following is an alphabetical list of the members of the Conference for Federal Studies Steering Committee:

1. Earl M. Baker Coordinator, Conference for Federal Studies
2. Daniel J. Elazar Director, Conference for Federal Studies
3. A. Lee Fritschler School of Government and Public Administration, American University
4. Samuel K. Grove Institute of Government and Public Affairs, University of Illinois
5. Charles O. Jones University of Pittsburgh
6. Vincent Ostrom Department of Political Science, Indiana University
7. David Walker Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations
8. Aaron Wildavsky Dean, Graduate School of Public Policy, University of California
9. Deil S. Wright Department of Political Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

As a result of the membership meeting held at the APSA Annual Meeting in New Orleans, a questionnaire has gone out to all Conference members. If you have not returned your questionnaire, please do so as the information obtained from your responses will help us in determining this year's Conference activity. As some members have already noted, there is an error in question D, page 3, which should read:

Please indicate if you wish to review books for PUBLIUS.

* * * * *

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID PROJECT

A team of researchers at the Center for the Study of Federalism is currently engaged in a study which looks at individual state responses to categorized grants-in-aid program requirements. We would be pleased to hear of any work in this area, either completed or in progress that Conference members may be involved in or that they may know about. It seems that state agencies have at various times produced such reports, however, they remain elusive. Any help members can provide will be useful.

* * * * *

DELIVERY OF PUBLIC SERVICES PROJECT

Indiana University of Pennsylvania has received a grant under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to examine the "Delivery of Public Services in Rural Areas." The purpose of the program is to bring together social service agency personnel, local government officials, and consumers of services to identify and review the problems of delivery of services to the rural poor. Dr. Richard F. Heiges, Chairman, Political Science Department, will serve as the program director.

CFS NOTEBOOK is published by the Center for the Study of Federalism, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122.

Editor: Bernadette A. Stevens

Production: Mary A. Duffy

CFS NOTEBOOK is distributed free of charge to members of the Conference for Federal Studies. It is published three times a year.

One of the activities that is presently planned under this grant will be a series of two or three-day-long seminars and workshop sessions. The sessions and workshops will bring together social service personnel, borough, township, and county officers and academicians on the IUP campus. Additional services and an expanded educational program is planned.

For further information contact Dr. Richard F. Heiges at:
Department of Political Science, 103A Keith Hall
Indiana University of Pennsylvania, Indiana, PA 15701

COMPARATIVE URBAN ADMINISTRATION

Latheef N. Ahmed
University of Missouri - Kansas City

The course brings together two dominant themes of contemporary social science; a methodological focus on comparative analysis and a substantive focus on the city and the problems and promises of urban areas. Comparison is important at two levels, between American urban situations as well as international ones. Similarly, substantive analysis and discussions turn to American city and urban challenges but in the context of international experience and learning.

I. Methodological Focus Heady, Presthus, Walsh, Daland and Breese

The Behavioral approach vis-a-vis the legal and institutional approaches, the dynamic vs. the static.

The comparative method vis-a-vis the single case or single city method.

Definitions, concepts, theories

II. Substantive Focus (Elazar, Sharkansky, Downs, Walsh, and UN)

A. Environment of Urban Administration

- a. Historical perspective
- b. Cultural factors
- c. Demography and geography
- d. Political, economic and technological forces

B. Organization or structure

- a. The federal system
- b. Urban polity
- c. Local-urban government-administration
- d. The system(s) approach

C. Planning

- a. Planning the planning
National, regional and urban planning conflicts
- b. Administration of planning

D. Some problems

- a. Human vs. technical questions
- b. International involvements and urban budgets
- c. Intergovernmental relationships
- d. Community integration and role of urban elites
- e. Urban politico-economic forces
- f. Current Cultural and ethnic challenges

- g. Urban growth
- h. Urban services
- i. Local-urban government organization and behaviors
- j. PPBS

E. Prospects

- a. World trends
- b. Urban administrator as a change agent
- c. Cross-cultural administration

Required Readings

Elazar, Cities of the Prairie
 Breese, Urbanization in Newly Developing Countries
 United Nations, Administrative Aspects of Urbanization
 Sharkansky, The Maligned States
 Downs, Urban Problems and Prospects
 Walsh, The Urban Challenge to Government

Bobbs-Merrill Reprints

Davis, "The Origin and Growth of Urbanization in the World"
 Morrill, "The Development of Spatial Distribution of Towns in Sweden"
 Morrissett, "The Economic Structure of American Cities"

Reprint from "City" Magazine

The Suburbs: Frontiers of the 70's; Reprinted from Jan.-Feb. 1971 issue of "City".

Urban Research

Presthus, Public Administration, Chapter 4, "Comparative Administration".
 Heady, Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective, Chapters 1 & 2, "Comparison in the Study of Public Administration" and "A Perspective for Comparison."
 Breese, Urbanization in Newly Developed Countries, "Comparative Analysis of Urbanization." pp 46-55.
 Daland, Comparative Urban Research: The Administration and Politics of Cities.
 Elazar, Appendix A, B, C. (above book)
 Gibbs (ed.), Urban Research Methods

PROJECT PAPER

The Project paper could follow the format given below. It is suggested keeping in mind also the practical situations that middle and upper level public administrators face almost every day. Small and big problems and promises of urban administration keep coming up constantly and you have to quickly arrive at conclusions, recommendations and decisions, based upon as complete and as accurate a data as you can muster. The format may also be considered a new and experimental way of organizing our thoughts as against the traditional chapters method.

You can approach the project mainly from the angle of a practical administrator, not necessarily as one who is interested in advanced scholarly research. You may find these steps useful practical steps.

1. Problem (or promise) identification

What urban problem(s) do you see?

What priority would you give it?

What is your assumption (hypothesis) in this regard, as you proceed to investigate the problem and act on it?

2. Data

Collection (Library and field sources or primary and secondary sources.)

Analysis (Qualitative, quantitative)

Interpretation (Fact-Value distinction)

3 Conclusion and Recommendations

What immediate action is necessary and possible?

Future possibilities?

Further research?

Any model(s) of your own.

Computer simulation?

Theoretical model?

Any design, plan or program out of your hat which is future oriented?

Comparative framework is important. Comparison helps a better understanding of the problem or promise of urban administration that you are faced with. Depending upon your facilities, it may be done in any one of the following ways:

1. Select a program where you can compare:

(a) Two or more cities, plans, programs, projects, budgets, and so on.

(b) Ideally, you should be able to empirically examine yourself, firsthand, any comparative situation you select, through interviews, surveys and documentary evidence.

(c) This may not always be possible. Then you can use the case study approach.

Reagan, New Federalism

Macmahon, Administering Federalism in a Democracy

Sharkansky, The Maligned States

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Urban America
and the Federal System

Committee on Economic Development, Reshaping Government in Metropoli-
tan Areas

COMPARATIVE PUBLIC ORGANIZATION*

Latheef N. Ahmed
 University of Missouri - Kansas City

Comparative study of specific public organizations. Examinations of sample research and case studies on organization behaviors in relation to the particular environmental and internal challenges that public organizations face, from planning to implementation stages of their operations.

The course proceeds on the hypothesis that all organizations have certain commonalities as well as special features. Organization charts always show common features, in terms of boxes arranged vertically, horizontally, and even in circular form. Structures are also approached this way, defining common hierarchical arrangements as tall and flat, leading to general types of command structures, span of control and so on. These are oversimplifications, at best, pointing to superficial commonalities. They need further examination, to say the least.

Approached behaviorally, the situation becomes much more complex. Individual interpersonal, small and large group, sub-organization, organization behaviors as a whole and environmental behaviors offer the challenge of empirical validation of definitions, concepts, hypotheses and theories that are applicable to all organizations. A great deal of research has been done here in the USA, especially, that offers promise in this behalf; though practitioners such as Harvey Sherman continue to question such approaches and prospects, holding that It All Depends (title of Sherman's book) upon individual situations that each organization and its managers or administrators face, without much scope for generalizations. For this reason, Herbert Simon, a public administration man, as it were, invented the concept of "satisficing" decision-making. That is, an administrator makes the most satisfying decision he can make at the moment, depending upon what he has to work with, information-wise and so on, in given decisional situations.

It is such unique or special dimensions or aspects (a la John Dewey), not exclusively separate features of organizations, as they apply to public organizations and their management that will be the particular focus of this course. Benefitting from organization theories and case studies in general, it will proceed to examine mainly the particular environmental and internal challenges that public organizations face, the facilities they enjoy and the prospects they have before them in the face of new and futuristic demands that they are encountering today in our country in all areas of planning, programming, budgeting and implementing public services.

All of this will be done in a comparative framework. The assumption being that comparative method is the major, if not the only, tool that is available to social scientists to come up with reasonably "scientific" findings and answers; that is, with reasonably verifiable and reliable data, analysis, interpretations and recommendations that can assist us in solving the present social problems and going on to new promises (The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry, Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune). The comparisons will be behavioral, using the social science or interdisciplinary approaches and findings, and turning to American as well as appropriate international comparative data and case studies. The international data, wherever available, will, hopefully, throw into better relief the problems and promises of American public organizations through serious comparisons. Students will be encouraged, in this context, to turn to empirical research projects, using the comparative facilities that Kansas City and nearby public organizations offer.

Books

Blau and Schoenherr, The Structure of Organizations
 Landsberger, (ed.) Comparative Perspectives on Formal Organizations
 Zald, Occupations and Organizations in American Society

Reprints

Smelser, "Mechanisms of Change and Adjustment to Change"
 Thompson, "Organizational Management of Conflict"

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS: ORIGINS OF A TERM

DEIL S. WRIGHT
 University of North Carolina
 Chapel Hill, N. C.

Federalism is a commonplace term. Its meaning and significance have varied through the eighteen decades of U.S. constitutional history. Indeed, the framers of the Constitution had a very different understanding of the concept than the conventional one which today might be elicited from a candidate for public office, a student in an introductory American government course, or an academic social scientist specifically concerned with the problem of "area and power." Federalism has had a heralded and hallowed albeit somewhat checkered career and usage. In simple and direct terms, it now stands for a form of government in which power is divided between a central government (jurisdiction, authority) and a number of constituent units on the basis of a written document not subject to unilateral change. (We could debate at length various aspects, elements, and emphasis in arriving at a satisfactory definition).

While federalism has enjoyed extensive usage and political significance, the same cannot be said for the term "intergovernmental" or the phrase "intergovernmental relations." It is true that IGR has recently and increasingly pressed its way into the parlance of public officials. And, like the proverbial camel's nose inserted in the tent, its usage has expanded. Illustrations of its official recognition appear in U.S. Statutes, e.g. P.L. 83-109; P.L. 86-380; P.L. 90-577. At least half of the three-hundred-nine cities over 50,000 population report the presence of "municipal intergovernmental coordinators" within their city administrative structures. Despite its meaning, especially as contrasted with federalism, and equal doubt about its political significance. For example, IGR does not rate recognition in any dictionary or encyclopedic references. It is also conspicuous by its absence in selected major textbooks in introductory American government. Some attention to its origins is advisable.

An early use of IGR in print occurred as the issue title of The Annals for January, 1940. "Intergovernmental Relations in the United States." Edited by W. Brook Graves, the series of twenty-five articles plus bibliography constituted the chief initial intellectual wedge into the subject. (William Anderson and Clyde Snider had used IGR previously in their writing and lecturing but The Annals issue appears

to be its first major exposition.) Curiously, however, neither the editor nor any authors felt the need to define IGR. Its use was indistinguishable from federalism, "new federalism," "cooperative federalism," and similar formulations extensively employed throughout the discussions.

On the heels of The Annals issue came the creation in 1941 of the U.S. Treasury Committee on Intergovernmental Fiscal Relations. The late 1940's saw the creation of House and Senate subcommittees on IGR plus efforts, growing chiefly out of World War II coordination concerns, to establish an intergovernmental tax conference of federal, state, and local officials. This latter effort was short-lived, but administrative-level cooperation entered a promising experimental period with PACBIR, the Pacific Coast Board of Intergovernmental Relations. Leadership for this group, which lasted from 1945 to 1953, came from the Chief of the Bureau of the Budget field office in San Francisco and the Director of the Bureau of Public Administration at the University of California. Deep concern for our "federal system" was expressed in the 1952 elections, but the precise expression of that anxiety took the form of a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (1953-1955), more popularly known as the Kestnbaum Commission. The more novel and focal term IGR was used instead of "federalism." Attention continued to center on whatever IGR stood for. In 1959 a permanent Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) was created. Presidential and Vice-Presidential staffing patterns have subsequently reflected similar interests, e. g. the Office of Intergovernmental Relations within the Vice-President's jurisdiction.

Academic attention to IGR has paralleled the developing interest among public officials. For the moment only two undertakings will be noted. One is the series of ten monographs published from the University of Minnesota "Intergovernmental Relations Study Project" initiated in the late 1940's under the direction of William Anderson. A second acknowledgment is to the major work by W. Brook Graves, American Intergovernmental Relations. Anderson and Graves were the chief originators and long-time leaders of intergovernmental explorations. Their works have helped to solidify the field while at the same time leaving it somewhat less than exciting and not at the leading edge of scholarly pursuits.