

Spring 1976

The cross-eyed route to intergovernmental anarchy

Donald C. Stone

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalscholarship.bjmlspa.tsu.edu/rbjpa>

 Part of the [Environmental Policy Commons](#), [Other Political Science Commons](#), [Public Affairs Commons](#), [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stone, Donald C. (1976) "The cross-eyed route to intergovernmental anarchy," *Ralph Bunche Journal of Public Affairs*: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 3.

Available at: <http://digitalscholarship.bjmlspa.tsu.edu/rbjpa/vol1/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Barbara Jordan Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs - Digital Scholarship. It has been accepted for inclusion in Ralph Bunche Journal of Public Affairs by an authorized administrator of Barbara Jordan Mickey Leland School of Public Affairs - Digital Scholarship. For more information, please contact rodriguezam@TSU.EDU.

The cross-eyed route to intergovernmental anarchy

Cover Page Footnote

Ralph Bunche lecture at Texas Southern University, April 8, 1976

Donald C. Stone

THE CROSS-EYED ROUTE TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL ANARCHY

Ralph Bunche lecture at Texas Southern University, April 8, 1976

The subject of my remarks is not a capricious selection. It is based on a story my wife told some time ago which seemed to sum up our failure to find more rational solutions for the way we organize and manage both domestic and international relations.

The story is about two cross-eyed persons who collided on a shaky bridge from opposite directions. Said the one, "If you wuz lookin' where you wuz goin' you wouldn't have bumped into me." Responded the other, "If you wuz goin', where you wuz lookin', you wouldnt' have bumped into ME." A reporter happened to see the altercation, and learned that one was a "Fed" and the other a county commissioner.

Whether the federal government is not going where it is looking or looking where it is not going, I leave you to decide. I cannot detect that the present Administration is looking at all. Reversing the role, neither do the uniformed and unstated goals of most states, municipalities, and counties suggest there is much looking, or even squinting.

A changed system. The functions and methods of both the federal-state-local system and the international system have no resemblance to that envisioned by our constitutional fathers. Instead of a simple and discrete allocation of responsibilities between the federal government and the states and in turn between the states and local governments, nearly all important domestic policies and programs involve action by all three levels of government. In our international relations, we are handicapped by irrelevant concepts of sovereignty, failure to appreciate the interdependencies which require multilateral decision, and by inadequate organization and processes. We are in an era of intergovernmental policy making and implementation both domestically and globally.

Perhaps we should call our federal system a non-system in view of the many unstructured interdependencies in the wake of industrialization and urbanization. Despite much rhetoric, we have not yet found the means for reconciling national goals and programs in the interest of all citizens with the parochial perceptions and passions of people who live in cities, towns, townships, boroughs, counties, and special districts.

States have served as inadequate brokers, consensus builders, and coordinators. They do not provide a good bridge for the increasing traffic of federal concern with local problems and local dependency on federal funding and guidelines.

Altogether, we have about 78,000 units of general and special purpose government in this country. Thirty-nine thousand governments are out on the highway collecting General Revenue Sharing checks. To these must be added the hundreds of thousands of local health, education, law en-

forcement, housing, environmental protection, sewer, community development, and other specialists seeking allocations under block and categorical grants. No wonder bridge traffic moves slowly.

The distemper of the American people about government is warranted. The system that has evolved is not suited to the complexity of today's problems. Effective partnership is essential between the federal, state and local governments. However, the congestion created by dispersion of local government, and by inadequacies at all levels, is a massive deterrent to good performance. The citizens themselves are responsible for this situation, but government leadership is essential to chart the way.

Built-in conflicts. The U.S. federal system produces cross-eyed em-
branglement because our predecessors built stress and conflict into it. The constitutional distribution of powers is a prescription for dissension. It guarantees competition, defiance, recrimination, altercation, and other seductions of harmony. This occurs in every federation. It conditions our responses so that we generally brand compatibility or agreement between the President and the Congress, or a Governor and the State legislature, as being improper, a form of collusion. And the same assumption carries over to cities where councils and strong mayors are often viewed as inevitable combatants.

Our federal constitution did not enumerate the complementary functions of federal, state, and local governments as is usually done for federal systems. This was fortunate because the founding fathers would have made a mess of it, like the state constitution drafters did. Neither did they identify functions for which there would be of necessity a dual or triple concern and provide for a political means for resolving these. Rather they relied on the Supreme Court to serve as the referee. This too has had many benefits. It enabled the evolution of sensible decisions to cope with changing times.

Another built-in conflict was the reflection of Thomas Jefferson's views that cities were the sources of corruption and evil. He and others envisioned the new country as a society of property owning farmers to be protected by the states. No mention of cities or any kind of settlements is made in the constitution.

The states were organized to serve farmers. Counties in turn were laid out to accommodate their interests. The constitution reflects the ideal of an agrarian society to be populated by increasingly affluent landowners. Slaves and immigrants were expected to do the manual work. The tacit constitutional acceptance of slavery as a matter of property right negated its human freedom and equality underpinning. The new democracy thus continued a despicable human institution which guaranteed a collision course ultimately leading to civil war. Even with the slavery compromise the constitution had hard sledding in securing adoption.

Second class citizens. One result of this system was the creation of first, second, and third class citizens. The first class were farmers. The second

class were urban dwellers — city slickers. The third class were not even citizens. They were slaves. Until recently, election districting assured strong dominance of farmers in state capitols and Congress. State constitutions and legislation shackled urban governments.

Then came the miracle of agricultural technology, enabling five per cent of the population to produce all of the food we require, and more for export. Urban populations grew to three quarters of the total population. The Supreme Court declared the one person/one vote principle and forced redistricting. These developments held out for city dwellers the possibility to become first class citizens and have some decision over their destiny.

The city/county syndrome. Transplantation from England of its 18th century pattern of local government without comparable adaptation as years passed has resulted in another conflict area. The entire state was divided into counties whether or not the areas contained people. The aim was to enable any farmer to ride by horse to the county seat and back in one day. Some counties do not have enough citizens to fill the prescribed offices.

Three states had enough vision to make some accommodation to local reality. Both Main and South Dakota decided that in areas without enough inhabitants to support county or town government, the area would remain unorganized, with the state providing such schools, roads, and other services as might be required.

In New England, counties were given few functions and for purposes of public service are replaced by towns and cities. Connecticut has abolished counties altogether. Otherwise all states, with the two exceptions noted, divided their territory into counties.

I need hardly remind you that counties were structured under state constitutions to be incapable of either doing anything of significance or, if given important functions, of doing them well. Invariably they were headed by supervisors or commissioners, each of whom wears two small hats — a legislative hat and an executive hat. Without a separation and strengthening of legislative and executive roles, the hats seldom became of sufficient size to attract outstanding citizens. The election of other officials — comptrollers, treasurers, auditors, district attorneys, sheriffs, school boards, etc. — dissipated much of the meager legislative and executive roles of commissioners.

Students of government are familiar with the way most cities began with mayors and councils and developed early as important service agencies. Since they were responsible for streets, sewers, police, water, fire protection and other critical needs, citizens insisted these be performed well. As cities expanded within counties and as residual functions of counties increased, tensions grew between the more competent city governments and the cumbersome county governments squatting on their backs.

Only one state, Virginia, which has accorded an important role to

county government avoided this collision course. Duplicating layers of city and county government were eliminated by the simple device of assigning county functions to first and second class cities.

The city/suburban syndrome. Another collision course has arisen from the failure of the states to prescribe structures of government for metropolitan areas that enable accommodated solutions for area-wide problems. Municipal and county boundaries, early frozen by constitutional and statutory action, have been adjusted in only a few states to fit population realities.

The trek of industry and higher level income people to the suburbs and the concomitant migration of the unskilled into central cities reduced resources and increased costs. Farm blocks in the legislature joined with suburban representatives to enable suburbs to avoid their share of responsibility for the physical and social infrastructure provided by the central city of which they were prime beneficiaries.

Modernization. I hasten to say that counties are undergoing modernization and that the reform of city government began early in this century. The National Association of Counties recently reported that 614 of 1,044 counties have adopted new structures and systems. In 64 counties, the administrator or executive is elected. In about 550, the county legislature appoints the chief administrator. Texas has considerable company in refusing to provide optional charter or home rule provisions.

City administration has undergone major change during the past 25 years. The majority of cities over 25,000 have adopted the council manager form. Most large cities which still retain a strong mayor also provide for a professional chief administrative officer. Trained staffs are appointed to manage and improvement budgets, personnel, programs, and operations. Professional management and application of merit principles have become the rule, notably in California, Texas, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Florida, Michigan, North Carolina, and take note — Texas. I estimate that about 50% of cities over 25,000 population are well or exceedingly well managed.

In several metropolitan areas, new area-wide governments have been created either by city/county consolidation or more frequently by expanding the role of the county under modernized structure, or by a new general authority to carry out specified area-wide functions. Dade County, Indianapolis, Nashville, Seattle, Jacksonville, and the Twin City area are illustrative. Most efforts at metropolitan reform have failed because state legislatures have generally required a majority vote in every local unit within the area. Incorporated communities of 500 persons could frustrate the preferences of a million.

A general purpose local government requires 5-10,000 inhabitants to enable even elementary services. At least 50,000 is needed to support a team of trained generalists and specialists. General Revenue Sharing, which channels federal checks to 20,000 local governments with less than 1,000 inhabitants has increased their ability to block fiscal and structural

reform. Over 2,500 units with less than 100 persons receive largesses. Altogether less than 38,000 of the 39,000 general purpose local governments encompassed by General Revenue Sharing have enough of a role or administrative capability to serve any substantial purpose in the intergovernmental system.

States also have been improving their structures and performance. Perhaps a third can be branded "capable" as effective partners in the intergovernmental system. Many still cling to such poor administrative practices and personnel standards that they are barriers to intergovernmental cooperation. These latter states are usually the ones that block modernization of local government. As to where Texas falls in this spectrum, I leave you to decide.

A new ball game. This governmental mish-mash would not be serious if the country had developed as Jefferson had envisioned. Industrialization and urbanization brought acute economic and social problems which changed fundamentally the operational character of the federal system. The depression of the 1930's awakened social consciousness. Sheer necessity produced federal legislation and appropriations for social and economic purposes never before envisioned as appropriate. The states had proved impotent to deal with massive problems of unemployment, destitution, bankruptcies, and other afflictions.

World War II further dramatized the federal role in mobilizing the human and productive resources of the nation. Fear of post-war unemployment led to the Full Employment Act of 1946. This and other forces involved the federal government in a wide range of fiscal, economic, and social initiatives to maintain an expanding economy with greater social equity.

Inequitable access to resources between levels of government and among communities resulted in unacceptable disparities in education, health, and other services. Grants-in-aid became the means to increase equal opportunity and a more equitable share for disadvantaged persons. Many grant programs had the dual purpose of remedying both fiscal incongruities and social maladies.

Categorical grant programs during the past two decades have produced many benefits. At the same time, the sheer diversity of the avalanche has wrought such confusion and waste of funds at the local level where the pieces must mesh. Today there are about 1,100 different kinds of federal grant and assistance programs.

Government by guilds. Each new grant program produced a new group of specialists in the assigned federal agency. These program or functional specialists cultivated their counterparts in state governments and in counties or cities, as the case might be. The ensuing guild bureaucracies balkanized the entire system. The agricultural guild predates all of them and became the prototype for others: the highway engineers, public health specialists, social workers, etc. The educational guild, for instance, comprises the professional educators in the Office of

Senate and House concerned with education. There are many sub-guilds in these groupings. All have national associations which serve as territorial guardians. Master's degrees in back scratching are accredited. By pooling their weapons, the guilds secure a disproportionate share of resources and keep funds flowing even after the need has passed.

Bewildered by the number of federal agents prowling around the state, governors became isolated from their departments. Mayors and city managers charged with meshing the programs found their control eroding, while ending up holding the bag. The collisions of cross-eyed persons at intergovernmental cross-roads became a national embroglio.

Administrative response. Rebellious mayors, governors, and state legislatures led to the "Creative Federalism" measures under President Johnson and the "New Federalism" of President Nixon. A variety of remedies are in some stage of development: grant consolidation and simplification, notably block grants; common information requirements for grants; clearance of grant proposals with state and local agencies concerned; the OMB A-95 review system; general revenue sharing; establishment of ten standard regions and field headquarters for federal agencies primarily concerned with grant programs; creation of the federal regional councils and boards; decentralization and devolution of activities and authority, and other measures.

Success in these matters and in the broader challenge of making the entire system manageable calls for more comprehensive efforts. Acute problems of energy, inflation, unemployment, environment, demography, depletion of irreplaceable resources puts this challenge at the top of both our domestic and international agenda. Yet, the President seems unaware and has no proposals. Presidential candidates do not recognize this as a systematic problem, except in such simplistic terms as reducing the federal bureaucracy, turning functions over to state and local governments, closing income tax loopholes, or adjustments in general revenue sharing.

Agenda for action.

1. First is a commitment by the President and the Congress to accord high priority to improving the intergovernmental system. Without positive Presidential initiatives little will be accomplished.

2. A Presidential "office of intergovernmental affairs or cooperation is proposed to deal with crucial policy strategies and maintain linkages with the Congress, governors and state legislatures, local governments and their representatives. Some kind of a representative advisory council attached to the office could provide a continuous forum for achieving partnership and consensus. Division of function between, and close relationship with, the Domestic Council is needed. The office could be placed under the Vice President or headed by a senior presidential assistant.

3. Paralleling this vitalization of strategy formulation and intergovernmental leadership, the President should reorganize the Office

of Management and Budget to develop the government-wide and federal-state-local system-wide administrative capability for planning and implementation of the many program and administrative reforms required, and for cooperative effort in improving the operation of the system.

4. If acceptable policies and proposals for improving grant-in-aid administration are to be designed and implemented, and if the multifarious governments are to work on concert in policy and program execution, officially recognized and utilized channels of communication, consultation, and decision making must be established between and among the three levels. This includes (a) the President and his Executive Office staff, (b) the governors and their executive management staffs, and (c) county and city executives and their management staffs.

5. To make this communication/negotiation network effective, positive measures must be instituted to foster establishment of executive management staffs in each general purpose government having an important role in the intergovernment system. Such a staff should consist in some combination of units or officers charged with assisting the chief executive in needs assessment; goal setting; policy and program planning and evaluation; budgeting; improving organization, management, processes, procedures, and systems; technology utilization; intergovernmental resolutions; personnel management; and liaison with universities and other organizations engaged in public service education and research.

6. The Federal, state, and local governments should work out a plan for providing information and funding for state and local capacity-building projects. These include administrative surveys, reorganizations, installations of new systems, improved methods of policy and program management, productivity studies, program evaluation, management audits, utilization of technology, modernization of procedures, information and reporting systems, and above all strengthening of executive management staffs.

7. Through such cooperative and funding arrangements state governments should be induced to modernize their constitutions, improve organization and procedures of state legislatures, strengthen the executive management role of governors, revamp administrative policies and processes, and increase productivity in program performance. Such arrangements should also provide incentives for states to restructure and enhance local governments by authorizing home rule and optional charters, councils of governments and other regional planning and service organizations, interstate consortia and compacts, intermunicipal and intercounty consolidations and annexations, transfers of functions, and intergovernmental contracts, etc.

8. Strong support should be given to the research work of the Advisory

Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), and to its efforts in conjunction with the National Civil Service League, National Municipal League, Council of State Governments, and other appropriate groups in developing and applying model legislation to achieve state and local modernization.

9. To reduce fiscal disparities, maintain urgent local government services, and foster local responsibility, general revenue sharing should be made a "piggyback" on the federal income tax system, utilizing a trust fund, rather than appropriations. Since state governments have ample access to tax sources, they should be eliminated from General Revenue Sharing. The formula for local governments should improve the equalization feature and eliminate all small units of governments (e.g., under 2000 or 5000). Use of funds should be unrestricted.

10. The block grant principle should be extended, with as much consolidation of categorical grants as is feasible without impairing genuine national objectives. Grant simplification, standardization, and flexible implementation in relation to local conditions should be accelerated. The A 95 clearance process should be strengthened and enforced.

11. The executive management network should provide an easy means for bringing grant problems and other intergovernmental business into the open so that expert teams will produce speedy resolution. This includes remedy of inadequate procedures, unnecessary delays, officiousness, inept handling of grant processing, meddling with local responsibilities, inadequate performance, political interference, etc. Regional ombudsmen for intergovernmental grievances is suggested.

12. Further delegation from Washington to the regional directors and to district or local offices is needed. The directors should be reestablished as career posts. The Federal Regional Councils would be strengthened by designation of an independent chairman and staff director. In depoliticizing the regions, steps should be renewed to secure Congressional appropriations for locating an OMB intergovernmental expert in each region.

13. To minimize duplication and expense and improve performance, more use should be made of the device of deputizing state and local officials or units as national agents to carry out federal activities; and local officials to fulfill state functions.

14. A national plan is urgently needed to produce and upgrade the requisite personnel for the entire system. This includes preservice education and staff development to provide the necessary policy and program generalists, intergovernmental and administrative management experts, systems and operations research analysts, management engineers, organization and methods specialists, technology utilization advisors, budget officers, and especially program administrators for each functional field. Funding for the Intergovernmental Personnel Act and Title IX of the Higher Education Act should be greatly increased.

15. Also required is a companion plan to produce, adapt, and utilize the research and technology essential to continuous improvement in policy, organization, administration, systems, and program performance.

16. In implementing the foregoing proposals 14 and 15, universities with relevant capabilities should be encouraged and assisted to develop public service education, research, and extension services in their states and regions.

17. The Committee structure of the Congress and state legislatures should be revised and staffed to provide comprehensive study and action in respect to the policy/legislative aspects of these 16 agenda proposals.

International Strategy. Our national perceptions and methods of working with other countries suffer from similar obsolete approaches. Many matters traditionally viewed as entirely domestic have become intensely international. For example, allocation of food, distribution of resources, population growth, drug traffic, monetary policy, protection of environment, labor standards. There is time only to hint at some of the anomalies.

First, is our obsession with maintaining military superiority and overkill potential. We frighten our allies and destroy the basis for rapprochement with the Soviet Union. Why should we have to remind ourselves in 1976 that the only valid purpose of armaments should be to keep peace while doing those positive things that will reduce the need for any offensive weapons. Presidential aspirants appear to have little understanding of alternatives to increasing overkill.

Second, we have lost the confidence of the have-not countries who see little evidence that we are genuinely concerned with the elimination of their social and economic maladies. The U.S. with the greatest GNP capacity ranks toward 12th among countries in readiness to share on a per capita income basis.

Third, the recent establishment of a unit in the state department to keep a tally on how countries vote in the UN and other forums as a guide for allocations of development assistance further evidences callousness and political ineptness. On this principal some could argue that public welfare assistance should be assigned only to persons who voted for the president then in office.

Fourth, the Ford/Kissinger foreign policy in its preoccupation with bilateral summitry and agreements overlooks the fact that most of the important international issues can only be resolved by multilateral action. Among these are peacekeeping, arms control, stockpiling of food, allocation of oils and minerals, commodity prices, population growth, foreign exchange, protection of the environment, use of ocean resources, control and taxation of multinational corporations, international air transportation, development assistance, and countless other interdependencies.

Fifth, we have retreated as a country from being the world model for political and social revolution in fostering freedom, human rights,

democracy, and opportunity. Our image is increasingly one of preoccupation with armament to protect an affluent, consuming society. Meanwhile the communist world, with ideologies designed to appeal to depressed peoples, captures support because of our lack of a counter strategy.

Sixth, in our development assistance efforts, which we carry out in part through the UN system, but largely bilaterally, we assume that economic policies and development plans are self-implementing. No matter how worthy a nation's development objectives or the goals of its 5 year plan, results will flounder unless national and international assistance strategies include parallel measures to create the administrative capability essential to implementation. The UN international Development Strategy (to which the U.S. was a major contributor) almost totally overlooks the requisites for execution. We have here another parallel with our domestic preoccupation with legislating national policies and programs, but little rigorous attention to administration.

Interdependencies. In this context, the parallels in the administrative requisites of the international and domestic intergovernmental systems are striking. They derive from the interdependent character of both the world's and this country's problems.

As we have seen, few of our country's domestic objectives can be met without the active participation of state and local governments. In a massively urbanized nation, the interdependencies are becoming so pervasive that no lesser agenda for achieving an integrated system than the one I have suggested will suffice.

Likewise, few of our foreign concerns can be resolved without action being taken in one or more of the literally hundreds of international organizations and conferences convened for this purpose.

Another kind of interdependency derives from the fact that almost every significant domestic problem has overseas ramifications, and vice versa. State and local governments are vitally affected by the availability and costs of foreign resources, imports, exports, labor standards, pollution, migration, international transportation, drug traffic, tariffs, markets, commodity prices, and many other matters. Isolation of a state or city in the interdependent world is no more possible than isolation as a partner in the federal system.

Harlan Cleveland, in analyzing these international interdependencies, points out the need for restructuring both the Executive Branch and Congressional committees.* Present arrangements assume that foreign and domestic problems are largely separable and that foreign affairs can be resolved primarily through bilateral diplomacy. There are now more than 150 independent countries. Aside from the fact that most of the subject matters in individual country contacts must be decided in multilateral forums, the task of negotiating simultaneously with even a few countries is overwhelming. Cleveland illustrates this by showing graphically the complications of engaging each of 16 nations in separate

contacts. At least 1920 negotiations would be required to reach the consensus that could be covered in one multilateral gathering. There is no alternative to support of the UN System and other multinational forums and restructuring the government to work with and improve these instrumentalities.

The National Security Council deals with only part of the international interdependence functions. U. S. policy on such matters as energy, food, finance, trade, oceanbeds, and mineral resources are presently determined largely by departments oriented to serving a domestic clientele. There is no place under the President to reconcile parochial views with international imperatives. This results in embarrassing and inept theatricals such as the differences between the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture about food policy during the World Food Congress at Rome. Energy offers another scenario.

To harness these incongruities, Harlan Cleveland recommends that an "Interdependence Council", expertly staffed, should supersede the Domestic Council and also cover the non-security interdependence functions excluded from NSC. In many ways the Cleveland proposals on the international front are comparable to those I have suggested to strengthen the administration of interdependence in the federal-state-local system.

Increasing capability. The proposed changes in policies and processes for administering domestic and foreign concerns requires far greater administrative sophistication than our government currently commands.

Most of the political and career executives of the government seized with these matters are drawn from limited or specialized backgrounds. Few have had much education or experience relevant to coping with these complexities. Seldom are they served by expert staff competent to develop improved structures and processes of this scope. Administration is generally viewed as dealing with trivia. Everyone wants to get into the policy area. It is much more fun to discuss policy alternatives without reference to implementation if you can avoid responsibility for results. Some schools of public affairs have been caught in this web.

Sustained efforts to evaluate and strengthen the political and administrative capability of the two systems are long overdue. There are few guidelines. Very little R and D of this kind is fostered by governments, foundations, or universities.

Two years ago in preparing a report for the UN on how to evaluate the administrative capability of countries to plan and implement economic and social development objectives, I could find no documentation on how to do this. So I designed a system. More recently I have adapted it to the evaluation of city, county, and state governments. In simple terms, it identifies the elements or factors to be considered and provides criteria for analyzing each element. Reduced to bare bones, administrative capability of a government department, or any public organization, is determined by the effectiveness of the mix of these requisites.

1. A suitable legal (constitutional/charter) statutory framework.
2. An adequate political mandate
3. Capable executive leadership and direction
4. A structure facilitative of achieving the organization's purposes
5. Equally facilitative administrative processes and systems
6. Budgetary resources sufficient for the objectives
7. High quality human resources
8. Competent management and supervision

Also to be considered as counteracting forces are such elements as:

1. Political patronage, privilege, corruption, and discrimination
2. Uncooperative governments and agencies whose participation is essential to the outcome
3. Citizen apathy or ignorance
4. Unfavorable environment or access to resources
5. Natural disasters

Achieving such requisites and improving performance in both the domestic and international amphitheatres will require a lot of effort. Presidential candidates, governors, local executives, heads of departments, legislators, foreign secretaries, diplomats, and UN officials all need to be educated as to what needs to be done and how to get it done. Not only must workable plans be developed and agreed to, but literally hundreds of thousands of present officials must also be retreaded. New generations of young men and women must be professionally educated for public and international service.

Schools of public administration. If this country had been served over the past 50 years by a network of prestigious schools of public affairs/administration, as it has by business, medical, and law schools, we would not be so deficient in this capability.

In this context the establishment of the School of Public Affairs at Texas Southern University is an important and exciting event. Your greatest problem — assuming the school receives essential financial support — will be to select those jurisdictional and functional areas in which to concentrate efforts. The temptation will be to do too many things. Whatever you do, be sure to bring the substantive policy and operational aspects of each field or function into focus with the elements essential to achieve administrative capability and effective performance. Strategies and methods to bring about change is at the heart of the task. This means that in your chosen fields, the School will need itself to develop four capabilities.

First is to provide solid professional education for public affairs practitioners, both preservice and inservice.

Second is to help through varied kinds of training programs to upgrade personnel already in the service

Third is to engage in action-oriented research which contributes knowledge and guidance of the kind I have outlined.

Fourth is to develop working relations with governments and agencies in

respect to these three roles, and to lay the foundation for rendering advisory assistance on the gamut of matters in which the School develops expertise.

Today there are some thirty to forty professional schools of public affairs/administration, and 150 small programs of one kind or another. Most schools are starved for funds: There should be a minimum of 100 first rate schools with resources at least 10 times those available today.

One reason these programs are so emaciated is the failure of federal, state, and local governments to recognize their own administrative inadequacies, and the need for people educated to deal with complexity and the requisites of capability in a political environment. Another reason is the lack of leadership by university administrators, the paralyzing effect of academic collegial processes, and the desire of political science departments to either contain or destroy whatever is undertaken.

The federal government holds the key to the future. Today it has no policy or program to support this kind of education. The Administration has refused to recommend appropriations for Public Service Education under Title IX of the Higher Education Act, but the Congress with greater wisdom has made a small amount of money available — about \$4 million. Texas Southern has been helped by this.

This year the Administration cut the budget request for the very successful Intergovernmental Personnel Program from \$15 to \$10 million. Both of these appropriations should be increased many times. The lack of vision and understanding on these matters in Washington is appalling. Very few state and local governments have definitive staff development policies or support financially the programs of schools of public administration. Altogether it has been a dismal landscape.

However, times change and many persons are beginning to realize that there is no substitute for competence and integrity. If you do your part well and join with others of kindred interests, in time the necessary support will be forthcoming. I congratulate you on your many achievements in this short period, and wish you all success for the future.

Donald C. Stone is a founding member of the National Academy of Public Administration and the Society for International Development. He is holder of the Cecil Green Honors Chair at Texas Christian University and an internationally known public administration consultant. A Carnegie-Mellon University faculty member (advisor on intergovernmental relations), he holds the M.P.A. degree from Syracuse and his doctoral studies were taken at the University of Cincinnati and Columbia University.