There is burgeoning literature on "development administration". Much of it is produced by political scientists, mainly of the behavioral persuasion. In the mid-fifties and early sixties, the political scientists spawned a variety of theories to explain and predict political behavior and developments in the developing countries—theories of nationalism, charismatic leadership, mobilizing parties, reconciliational systems, etc. Experience demonstrated the inadequacy of most of these theories. Equally, the new states were sensitive about research along the lines of these theories. It was not really surprising that many of these scientists have fastened on the study of "administration," which has a nice neutral ring about it, and whose relevance to "development" can be made obvious to the political leaders.

The basic theme in "development administration" is that the tasks for the bureaucracy are no longer those of control but those of change. "Law and order" which was the colonial pre-occupation no longer provides the suitable model. The primary responsibility for development lies with the government, and the bureaucracy is its main agent. One of the concerns of the students of "development administration" is the adaptation of the bureaucracy from the tasks of the colonial to the independence "models." The other is the examination of the socio-cultural environment—the "ecology"—in which the bureaucracy functions, and how its functions are affected by the environmental factors.

It is unclear what precisely is meant by "development administration" and what matters it covers. The two volumes under review do not help much in this respect. The Kenya volume is an interdisciplinary effort, of political scientists and economists as well as civil servants. All of them have lived and worked in Kenya. There is no lawyer. The exclusion of lawyers, from this and other similar studies, is surprising. The rules and structure of the bureaucracy has been a primary concern of the lawyers—in the form of constitutional and administrative laws; while much of the recent
law for "development" is an extension and elaboration of governmental powers and structures. On the other hand, the Tanzania volume is by a lawyer, a young German graduate who spent a few months in the country collecting material for the book.

A wide range of topics is covered in these books. The Kenya volume deals with the environment within which the bureaucracy works, the structure of administration, planning, foreign aid, trade unions, local government and co-operatives. The Tanzania volume deals with colonial history (of a rather potted nature) going back to the German period, legislature, the executive, local government, economic planning, party and public agencies like the development corporations. In spite of this range, perhaps because of this range, it is never really very clear what is "public administration." One cannot avoid the suspicion that having burnt their fingers in a "frontal attack" on political parties, charisma, etc., the social scientists are having a shot at these via "public administration." It may well be possible to relate many of these matters to the central concerns of "public administration," but the volumes fail to do so in several instances. For example, in the Kenya book, it is very difficult to see how and where the chapters on foreign aid and trade unions fit in. There is no doubt that foreign aid, and more particularly technical assistance, has several implications for public administration, but these are nowhere touched on. The chapter on trade unions is positively misleading in that it is politicians and not the bureaucrats who have been responsible for the restrictions on and manipulation of unions.

The books have very different approaches to the study of public administration, and so they do not provide the basis of a comparative examination. This is a pity for the place and role of bureaucracy in Kenya and Tanzania are very different. At independence Kenya had both a stronger civil service and a weaker political party than in Tanzania. Whereas Kenya has preferred to rule through the civil service, underplaying the role of the party, Tanzania has established a strong party which is clearly more dominant than the civil service. A whole series of implications for the bureaucracy, role of law, the form of political development, follow from each of the strategies which are not spelled out.

The Kenya volume is more sophisticated. It contains much information, some original, of value about Kenya. The authors are well aware of the general (for which read, Western) theories of public administration. The authors say, "We have been influenced by
theoretical models of public administration developed elsewhere while remaining open to suggestions of propositions and theories generated by our African subject matter. We have assiduously tried not to prejudge the Kenyan experience with development administration by uncritically employing theories and models framed in different settings." In some of the chapters, there is no doubt that the use of theory illuminates the Kenyan situation, but all too often the theoretical propositions are asserted without a serious attempt to relate them to the Kenyan situation—like the chapters on "The Economic Environment" and "Communication and Deconcentration." At the end of the book one is still not clear how decisions are made, what the influences are, what is the clash of interests. To some extent, the somewhat bland character of the book is due to the fact that the authors are pulling their punches. They seem afraid to say what they feel is true: that there is racial discrimination against the Asians, that there is a process of Kikuyulisa- tion under way, that the bureaucracy is a selfish and powerful group which has been primarily concerned with feathering its own nest.

A lesser, albeit important, omission is any discussion of law or legal rules. In the discussion on control over the bureaucracy, there is no mention of the role of courts or the rules whereby a court can exercise control. The courts have attempted to check discrimination against Asian citizens, especially as practiced by licensing authorities. Nor is there any discussion of administrative appellate tribunals, which are able to review many of the decisions that are excluded from the jurisdiction of the courts. Also left out of consideration are rules on decision-making, e.g., the duty to invite various points of view and to consider them, which are set in some instances by the law.

Another omission should finally be mentioned. An important extension of governmental power and authority is represented in the outgrowth of a series of public agencies—public corporations or para- statals—which are juridically distinct from the government, and which in some sense be regarded as the heart of development administration—for their juridical separation from the government is justified on the ground that they are able to provide the flexibility, expertise, and autonomy that the civil service lacks. In other words, they are more oriented to change and development than the traditional bureaucracy. Most governments in the developing countries place a heavy reliance on public corporations, and
a book on development administration which omits any reference to them suffers from a serious deficiency.

The claims that one makes for law seem, alas, over stated when one turns to the Tanzania volume, which is by a German lawyer. The volume may also help to explain why the other social scientists hold the contribution of lawyers in such low esteem. Von Sperber's book is amazingly bad—poorly conceived, poorly organized, poorly written. There is no indication of what he means by public administration. His sections on history are sketchy, seldom related to current structures or problems, often inaccurate, lacking in time perspective, repetitious, and totally lacking in originality. On the present structure of public administration, there is neither enough analysis nor enough description. All through important and fundamental questions are left out. There is seldom any explanation for the changes in administration which have taken place; and on most occasions when he does attempt an explanation, it is inaccurate. It would be tedious to give examples, and the following must suffice: it is stated that the legislation in 1963 prohibiting claims by chiefs who had been deposed from their office was a "precaution" which proved unnecessary, whereas in fact the legislation was passed after Chief Marealle had obtained a court decision for damages for dismissal from office, and was intended in part to set aside that judgment; the integration of local or primary courts (which incidentally was effected by a 1963 Act, not a 1962 Ordinance) was not decided on because the new regional officers were not trained in the law (nor were their British predecessors) but because it was felt that justice required the separation of judicial from administrative functions; it is difficult to explain the Tanzania constitution as based on British rules and practices. He can also be faulted on expressions of opinion, that, e.g. that the ombudsman—the Permanent Commission of Enquiry—is of little value.

While expressions of opinion, however outlandish, may be tolerated, the same courtesy can scarcely be extended to factual errors, in which the book abound. How can one say that the union with Zanzibar did not bring any constitutional changes? Or that the Parliament and government of Zanzibar were left independent in defence and foreign affairs? Or that Zanzibar's members of the Revolutionary Council were appointed to Parliament (when the total membership of the Council has seldom exceeded 30)? And so on and on. Often the facts are out of date: a book published in 1970
talks of Intrata and the government's share of 90% in it, when in 1967 it had been totally nationalized and merged with the State Trading Corporation. There is no discussion of the work of the Permanent Commission of Inquiry which had produced at least two annual reports by the time the book went to press, and certain views are inaccurately ascribed to the present reviewer. (At another point, another publication of the reviewer is ascribed to his brother!) Various other footnotes are faulty—and the World Bank publications are attributed to an author by the name of John Hopkins! Throughout the English is atrocious.

Enough has been said to indicate that Von Sperber's book ought not to have been published. He has few facts or insights, and he totally misses the dynamics of development and its administration in Tanzania. Tanzania has made extensive changes in the structure of administration it inherited from the British; has tried to redefine the relationship between the politicians and the bureaucrats, and is searching for democratic, administrative structures. You would not get any real feel for this from Von Sperber.
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