

# Governance

An International Journal of Policy and Administration

## C O N T E N T S

The Executive Establishment and Executive Leadership: A Comparative Perspective

*John Hart*

Recent Evolution of the French Executive

*Harvey B. Feigenbaum*

Political Executives and the Struggle to Lead Strategically in Small Federal Systems: Switzerland

*Ulrich Klöti*

The Executive in the Third Turkish Republic, 1982-1989

*Metin Heper*

Country Report: The First Year of the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement from a Canadian Perspective

*George J. Szablowski*

Book Reviews

SOG Bulletin

Volume 3 Number 3 July 1990

ism. Some of the events, such as the Vehicle and General affair, in which the FDA witnessed its members exposed to public scrutiny and judgment without the protection of a doctrine of ministerial responsibility, are well presented and of substantial interest to students of public administration anywhere.

What they do for me is to underscore something which O'Toole mentions but does not emphasize enough. In a section entitled "Reasons for the Growth of Trade Unionism" he makes the point that the adoption of certain trade union characteristics by the FDA cannot be ascribed to deliberate decisions to behave like a trade union. Such decisions as were made, he tells us, were responses to specific stimuli in peculiar circumstances.

Here is the meat of the matter. The senior civil servants in Britain have seen their world change greatly in the years since the founding of the FDA, and with it their attitudes have had to change. O'Toole cites one FDA document which makes the point that the Association "has always operated on the premise that our interests are best served not by muscle power but by cogent reasoned argument" (p. 165).

Having represented small "unions" of senior civil servants, I understand only too well the allure of such a claim, and only too well how it was usually underpinned by the power of interconnection between those senior civil servants constituting the "employed" and those acting, however temporarily, as the "employer."

It is, in short, the emergence of a culture, and its accompanying reality expressed through narrowing of pay and status differentials, that uses the language of employed and employer that has brought about a response — and not just in Britain — whereby senior civil servants have indeed become trade unionists. Sometimes the first step, their being organized into trade unions, which is not the same as their becoming trade unionists in any meaningful sense, has been literally forced on them by the state through legislation. Sometimes, the process has been one where the stimuli O'Toole speaks about were just so strong that a trade union response was inevitable.

O'Toole makes it clear in his book that pay was always an enduring concern of the FDA and he tellingly quotes a former head of the Home Civil Service in Britain, Lord Bancroft, on the decline of morale in the service. While Bancroft was also convinced that the problem could not be addressed only by money, he however it is fixed, was essential to good morale.

In the experience of this reviewer, and as is made clear in recent ILO studies of the condition of civil or public servants world-wide, pay and those conditions of work that can be costed will only be "fair," or perceived to be, when the civil servants are directly involved in how it is "fixed."

Long gone are the days when senior civil servants felt secure in the certainty that the state recognized so clearly their contributions that their "private gain" would be attended to just as diligently as they themselves concentrated on their "public service."

But here we reach a point where it is hard not to take issue with O'Toole. After positing that with the decline of trade union influence, senior civil servants might have to move on to some other form of expression, the author observes that "as far as FDA civil servants are concerned it is now no longer the case that public service must inevitably come before private gain" (p. 213).

Is the defense against erosion adequately conveyed by the term "gain?" I think not, though the use of the term brings us back full circle to O'Toole's introduction, where he tells us that in the traditional literature, civil servants

are portrayed as having a profound sense of public duty, whereas trade unions defend private interests.

For me, the case has yet to be made that we must see public duty and private interest as irreconcilables. In fact, both with respect to ethical or professional concerns (such as those raised by the Ponting affair which is covered in this book) and to affairs of pay (which are a focus of much of the book), it could be argued that only when civil servants properly attend to their private interests will they most effectively carry out their public duties. This is certainly the finding of ILO studies, which show that unless the "employed" are central to the determination of terms and conditions at a time of global compression of public spending, state efforts to improve effectiveness and efficiency seem doomed to limited success.

Barry O'Toole's very worthwhile book, which is the first in the Routledge Public Sector Management Series, launches the series successfully and appears at a propitious time.

H. JOHN HARKER, Director, Canada Branch Office, International Labour Organization

[Note: Mr. Harker has contributed this review as a private individual and not in his capacity as an official in ILO.]

*Ulster: Conflict and Consent.* By TOM WILSON. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989. £30.00 hard, £9.95 soft.

Tom Wilson, born in 1916 in what later became Northern Ireland, is a former Oxford don and Glaswegian professor of political economy. In 1955 he edited a complacent book, *Ulster Under Home Rule*, in which he suggested that Northern Catholic grievances were more spiritual than "real." "They have less to complain about than the US negroes, and their lot is a very pleasant one as compared with the nationalists in, say the Ukraine." He also held that "[Catholics] were made to feel inferior [in the past], and to make matters worse they often were inferior, if only in those personal qualities that make for success in competitive economic life." He went on to become a key economic adviser to the Unionist governments of the 1960s, and authored the controversial Wilson Plan of 1964.

*Ulster: Conflict and Consent* suggests that Wilson is now endowed with slightly greater tact and broader intellectual acumen than he displayed in 1955. His new book is part history, part analysis, and part prescription. In some respects it appears a plausible contemporary defense of the Unionist position, and doubtless will be cited as such. It therefore merits attention, even if it too often reads like an *apologia pro vita sua*.

The book has four sections. The first is an historical introduction to Ulster questions. Wilson argues that the responsibility for partition lay not with the British government but with the historically developed ethnic and religious cleavages in the island, and in the sectarian pattern of mobilization of Irish nationalism. However, even if partition of some sort was inevitable, the partition of 1920 was dramatically imperfect — as he subsequently concedes.

If Wilson's historical résumé is otherwise more competent its deficiencies are nonetheless revealing. His account of the Irish Famine is entirely Malhusian; UK rather than complete independence; and given his commitment to the merits of constitutionalism he is unduly sympathetic to Unionist illegality and armed

defiance of the British government before 1914. His ethnic empathies also presumably explain why he anachronistically talks of a Northern majority before it became a majority in the newly-created devolved government of Northern Ireland. Wilson emphasizes that Unionist dominance was not established by a police state or electoral malpractices, but rather that support for the Stormont government rested upon the will of a large majority. Nobody denies this fact. What critics suggest is that police state features and electoral malpractices *reinforced* Unionist dominance within the boundary of a statelet designed to guarantee an in-built sectarian majority for Ulster Protestants.

Part II, the analytical core of the book, is a detailed examination of public policy in Northern Ireland from 1920 until 1972, with some further analysis up until the present day. Wilson presents a very solid discussion of the fiscal constraints facing the Belfast government and the minutiae of the British subvention. His analysis of economic progress and development in the province is also quite good, although his discussion of the industrial location policies of the 1960s read like special pleading.

Where his analysis is defective is in examining the distributive consequences of public policy and its treatment of the minority. He contends that discrimination in housing policy was confined to councils west of the Bann but fails to underline that these were the areas in which Catholics were more likely to be local majorities but for gerrymandering practices. Wilson favors integrated education, blaming Catholics for being against it, but is less than warmly sympathetic or liberal to the demand for equal-funding of Catholic schools and frankly romantic about the nature of the state (Protestant) schools.

However, where Wilson shows himself to be a guiltless liberal is in his discussion of discrimination and unemployment. For him, as with a well-known school of American economists who bring their discipline into disrepute, the free market is touchingly color-blind. Discrimination, for him, must normally be intentional — although he does concede the possibility that the prevalence of informal employment networks might produce sectarian bias of a “thoughtless” kind. Wilson challenges the research conducted for the *Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights* (a British government-appointed body), which shows that Catholic males remain two-and-a-half times as likely to be unemployed as Protestant males and suggests that much of the differential can only be explained by intentional and indirect discrimination. (This research lay behind the recently passed *Fair Employment Act*). Wilson’s methodological quibbles are unpersuasive and would take too long to refute here. Interested readers should examine the work of David Smith (*Equality and Inequality in Northern Ireland*, Policy Studies Institute, 1987 and Oxford, Clarendon Press, forthcoming) and David Eversley (*Religion and Unemployment in Northern Ireland*, Sage, 1989). Wilson’s reasoning suggests considerable unwillingness to recognize reality.

Though Wilson bends over backwards to appear reasonable to the non-Ulster reader, the effect is spoiled when he tells us that “In preferring Protestants to Catholics, many employers may well have *believed* that, apart altogether from satisfying any religious or political preferences, they were likely, as a rule, to be employing the more efficient workers.” He seems to have retained two habits from the 1950s: when engaged in apologizing for “Ulster,” meaning the Protestants of Northern Ireland, he is liberal in his use of italics, and deficient in his citation of evidence. He is not denying the existence of discrimination any longer, just denying its scale, and although in favor of legislation to outlaw it, he is hostile to (the mildest forms of) affirmative action, and admonishes the (now deceased) Fair Employment Agency not to harass managers. Would

that the FEA could have been guilty of such charges! Wilson complains elsewhere that “When Catholics are bigoted, they usually manage to be so in a better tone of voice.” If so, the author might benefit from elocution lessons.

Part III of the book is a survey of the last twenty years in Northern Ireland, culminating with the impasse before and after the Anglo-Irish Agreement. Wilson dislikes the latter because of the lack of symmetry that allegedly works to the disadvantage of Unionists.

Part IV is an analysis of key issues affecting the Northern Ireland conflict — religion, the nature of the Irish Republic, and the questions of violence and security — all as a prelude to Wilson’s prognoses and prescriptions. He rightly berates the inhospitable nature of the Republic’s constitution as regards Ulster Protestants, but erroneously suggests the Republic is inadequately policed. He is apparently unaware that the *per capita* costs of security of Northern Ireland are three times higher for Irish as opposed to British citizens. However, it is his discussion of violence, security and the administration of justice which is most tendentious. He believes that the defeat of terrorism, which he understands as primarily a policing *cum* military activity, is the most urgent task for public policymakers. He asserts that the use of single-judge and no jury courts is reasonable, and that the Republic’s request for three-judge courts is both unnecessary and impractical. He advocates the use of “quasi-judicial detention” — judicial as opposed to executive internment — in tandem with increased jail sentences and the removal of the right to silence. Some public policy analysts seem cheerfully indifferent to the lessons of experience.

Wilson’s incidental discussions of a range of controversial episodes — from Bloody Sunday through to the Stalker Affair — run true to sectarian expectations, and one passage of the book seems to suggest a liberal attitude towards a policy of shoot-to-kill by the security forces. Moreover, he repeats the canard that the SDLP, the peaceful constitutional nationalist party in Northern Ireland (led by John Hume) does not back the police. The evidence? The fact that the SDLP does not endorse everything the police do and their insistence that the Royal Ulster Constabulary act impartially in upholding the law. Nothing less than a blank check endorsement of the actions of the RUC, the British Army and the Northern Irish courts would satisfy Wilson. It does not seem to occur to Wilson that mandatory unconditional support for all the actions of the authorities is a hallmark of anti-democratic philosophies.

After 330 large and closely-typed pages, the reader is at some loss to discover what Wilson believes is the optimal solution for Northern Ireland. The answer seems to be threefold. First, the Republic should abandon its irredentist claims while Britain must commit itself unconditionally to Northern Ireland’s status as part of the UK, complete with the organization of British parties in the province. Second, devolution is a sensible proposal, but need not necessarily rest upon power-sharing with the minority nor an Irish dimension, and if it can’t work, then administrative devolution along current Scottish lines is a good idea. Finally, a security-offensive, North and South, incorporating a modified mode of internment, is necessary before further political progress can be made.

If this resumé sounds desperately familiar it is because it is so conventionally Unionist. It is not a solution. The pattern of thinking it exhibits is part of the problem. Such a solution would do nothing to accommodate the interests and aspirations of the nationalist and Catholic minority to build bridges between Dublin and Belfast or to persuade the IRA to lay down their arms. It would also require the London government unilaterally to abandon the Anglo-Irish Agreement in 1985.

The Bourbons were said to have learned nothing and to have forgotten

nothing. Professor Wilson is not a Bourbon, but despite his education and skill as an economist, he has learned nothing important about his homeland while managing to forget a great deal under the pressure of wishful thinking. This book should have been sub-titled "The Guiltless Passions of a Liberal Unionist."

BRENDAN O'LEARY, *London School of Economics*

*Guide to the Presidency*. Edited by MICHAEL NELSON. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, 1989. 1521p. \$145.

For presidency junkies the desert island problem has been solved. If you were allowed to take only one book on the presidency this would be it. But you might be cheating since this "book" is really a reference volume of 1500 double column pages that are the equivalent of two or three regular type-set pages. It weighs about 10 pounds. This important reference work covers all significant aspects of the presidency and quite a few minor topics.

The book is divided into seven major sections:

1. Origins and development, including a 50 page overview of the development of the presidency;
2. Selection and removal, including 113 pages on the electoral process and sections on all aspects of presidential removal;
3. Powers of the president, including essays on such presidential roles as chief executive, legislative leader, chief diplomat, commander-in-chief, chief of state, chief of party, and chief economist;
4. President and the public, including essays on the news media, public opinion, and interest groups;
5. White House and executive branch, including essays on all components of the EOP and each department and agency;
6. The president and the federal government, including sizable essays on presidential relations with Congress, the Supreme Court, and the bureaucracy.

The text is supplemented with more than 400 photographs as well as the tables, graphs, and charts that CQ Press is so good at creating.

Each of the 37 essays that comprise the volume was written by an individual scholar, some of them well-known presidency scholars (Nelson wrote a number himself), but many of them not well known as political scientists specializing in the presidency. The history and analyses are authoritative and well written. The editing is excellent. The prose does not read like 37 different essays but as an integrated text. On the other hand, the essays were not edited down to a uniform mush. Neither has the text been sanitized to avoid all controversy or judgments, though most of the opinions are mainstream interpretations of the presidency. I did not always agree with the judgments of the authors, but I never felt like they were way off base or had ignored an important aspect of the topic.

While the major aspects of the presidency are covered in depth, some less visible topics are also treated in some detail. For example, in addition to the history of presidential commissions and analysis of their operations, there is a list of the 60 active commissions and a breakdown of commissioners by profession. There is a section on the rating of presidents that includes surveys of scholars and public opinion on the "greatness" of presidents. The essay deals

with how presidential reputations have changed over time and criticisms of the rating game. There is a section on executive orders that includes their legal status, the history of their use, and their count by president. There is even a section on how former chief executives have conducted themselves as ex-presidents (though the book was published before former President Reagan's lucrative trip to Japan).

The historical, descriptive, and analytical essays are supplemented by impressive appendices that include all cabinet members of all presidents, public opinion summaries from Truman through Reagan, presidential support scores from 1953 to 1988, electoral college votes by state, and other important data. If your knowledge of political parties in the U.S. extends only to Democrats and Republicans, you may enjoy the list of all parties and their nominees for president and vice-president in presidential elections, from the four parties in 1789 to the 19 in 1988.

There is a section of biographies of each president and vice-president as well as first ladies. The appendices also contain the text of 40 major documents of the presidency, from George Washington's farewell address and the Articles of Impeachment of Andrew Johnson to LBJ's Gulf of Tonkin Message and the "Smoking Gun" tape of President Nixon. One of the features that makes this volume a truly useful reference work is the well-done and extensive (30 pages) index. Many topics are treated in several different essays, and the index is therefore helpful in gaining a rounded view of the topic.

But if you were not on a desert island, of what use would this book be? As a teacher I see two major uses. If you are preparing a lecture on a topic with which you are familiar but not expert, all you have to do is consult the appendix and you will have most of the information needed for the introductory course. As a research tool for student term papers, the book is invaluable. The problem is that a good term paper, including scholarly references, could be written almost entirely from the *Guide*. Instructors recommending this book in their classes should be careful that students seek out more than this book in their writing. For scholars the book is valuable as an authoritative survey of most important aspects of the presidency and a useful source of data.

There are few criticisms I would make of the volume. Some of the essays do not fully discuss all of the scholarly controversies surrounding the issues, but then the volume was written for the general reader. The bibliographies at the end of each essay are a good start for scholars, and entirely adequate for undergraduates, although they often do not cover all of the major scholarly works on the topics. But this seems purposeful; there was probably an editorial limit on the number of references to be included in the bibliographies. But these are merely observations, not criticisms of the book.

Anyone who teaches a course on the presidency or writes about it should consider purchasing this volume. Although it is expensive, the cost per page is probably less expensive than most books, considering that you get the equivalent of 3000 to 4000 pages. It also would be hard to find the comprehensiveness of coverage for the equivalent price.

It is difficult to review this reference work without sounding like an advertising flack for CQ Press, but this is an impressive and authoritative reference work on the presidency. No other single source comes close.

JAMES P. PHEFFNER, *George Mason University*