

Term Information

Effective Term Spring 2017

General Information

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area Public Affairs, John Glenn Col
Fiscal Unit/Academic Org John Glenn College of Pub Aff - D4240
College/Academic Group John Glenn College of Pub Aff
Level/Career Undergraduate
Course Number/Catalog 2500
Course Title History of Public Administration
Transcript Abbreviation Hist Pub Admn
Course Description This course is an introduction to the administrative history of public administration around the world from the earliest time up to the present, and the emergence and development of government and governing over time.
Semester Credit Hours/Units Fixed: 3

Offering Information

Length Of Course 14 Week, 7 Week, 12 Week (May + Summer)
Flexibly Scheduled Course Never
Does any section of this course have a distance education component? No
Grading Basis Letter Grade
Repeatable No
Course Components Lecture
Grade Roster Component Lecture
Credit Available by Exam No
Admission Condition Course No
Off Campus Never
Campus of Offering Columbus

Prerequisites and Exclusions

Prerequisites/Corequisites Prereq or concur: English 1110.xx
Exclusions

Cross-Listings

Cross-Listings

Subject/CIP Code

Subject/CIP Code 44.0401
Subsidy Level Baccalaureate Course
Intended Rank Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior

Requirement/Elective Designation

General Education course:

Historical Study

The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units

Course Details

Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Upon successful completion of this course students will:
- Gain a fundamental understanding of the history of government in the United States and throughout the world
- Develop familiarity with motives and methods of comparative analysis
- Be able to apply public administration and social science concepts that provide understanding of the role of government in society over time
- Be able to effectively communicate course subject matter through written and oral formats
- Be able to speak and write critically about primary and secondary historical sources by examining diverse interpretations of past events in their historical context.

Content Topic List

- Comparative public administration and administrative history
- Organizing government throughout history
- Functions of government over time
- Financing government services
- History of American government

Attachments

- GE Rationale and Assessment Plan.docx: GE Rationale and Assessment Plan
(GEC Course Assessment Plan. Owner: Adams, Christopher John)
- Email exchange.pdf: Email exchange with department of history
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Adams, Christopher John)
- Comments re GE 2500.docx: Summary of GE discussion with dept.of history
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Adams, Christopher John)
- Additional background information.pdf
(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Adams, Christopher John)
- Poli Sci Concurrence for PA 2500.pdf: Concurrence from Political Science
(Concurrence. Owner: Adams, Christopher John)
- PA 2500 History of Public Administration.pdf: Syllabus
(Syllabus. Owner: Adams, Christopher John)

Comments

- Returned per Steve Fink's request: attach concurrence from Political Science. *(by Vankeerbergen, Bernadette Chantal on 06/23/2015 02:08 PM)*
- Please use "PUBAFRS 2500 GE history of government Syllabus.pdf" rather than "PA GE history of government Syllabus (2).docx" *(by Greenbaum, Robert Theodore on 06/23/2015 10:45 AM)*

COURSE REQUEST
2500 - Status: PENDING

Last Updated: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette
Chantal
01/26/2016

Workflow Information

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Adams, Christopher John	06/23/2015 09:39 AM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Hallihan, Kathleen Mary	06/23/2015 09:48 AM	Unit Approval
Approved	Hallihan, Kathleen Mary	06/23/2015 09:48 AM	SubCollege Approval
Approved	Greenbaum, Robert Theodore	06/23/2015 10:45 AM	College Approval
Revision Requested	Vankeerbergen, Bernadette Chantal	06/23/2015 02:08 PM	ASCCAO Approval
Submitted	Adams, Christopher John	01/20/2016 06:12 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Adams, Christopher John	01/20/2016 06:13 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Hallihan, Kathleen Mary	01/21/2016 10:53 AM	SubCollege Approval
Revision Requested	Greenbaum, Robert Theodore	01/21/2016 11:02 AM	College Approval
Submitted	Adams, Christopher John	01/21/2016 05:57 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Adams, Christopher John	01/21/2016 05:57 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Adams, Christopher John	01/24/2016 04:12 PM	SubCollege Approval
Approved	Greenbaum, Robert Theodore	01/24/2016 04:18 PM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Vankeerbergen, Bernadette Chantal	01/24/2016 04:18 PM	Ad-Hoc Approval



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN GLENN COLLEGE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS

PUBAFRS 2500

History of Public Administration

3 Credit Hours

General Education: Historical Study (proposed)

Spring 2017

day, time

place

Instructor Professor Jos C.N. Raadschelders, PhD

Email raadschelders.1@osu.edu

Office 350d Page Hall

Office hours by appointment

COURSE OVERVIEW

General Education Category Learning Objectives – Historical Study

Goal: Students recognize how past events are studied and how they influence today's society and the human condition.

Expected learning Outcomes:

1. Students construct an integrated perspective on history and the factors that shape human activity;
2. Students describe and analyze the origins and nature of contemporary issues;
3. Students speak and write critically about primary and secondary historical sources by examining diverse interpretations of past events in their historical context.

Course Learning Goals and Objectives

Upon successful completion of this course students will:

- Gain a fundamental understanding of the history of government in the United States and throughout the world;
- Develop familiarity with motives and methods of comparative analysis;
- Apply public administration and social sciences concepts and frameworks that provide understanding of the role and position of government in society over time and in its context;
- Communicate course subject matter through written and oral formats.



BASIS FOR ASSESSMENT

Your grades will be based on the following exams and assignments:

Exam #1 (10% of grade; week 4, regular class time)

The first exam will cover the basic concepts with which we can understand the emergence and development of government over time, and will include basic knowledge about comparison as a method to acquire knowledge and understanding and about primary and secondary sources concerning the role and position of government across time. **I do not administer make-up exams.**

Exam #2 (20% of grade; week 7, regular class time)

The second exam will cover knowledge about structures of government over time, including attention for territorialization and bureaucratization, state-making and nation-building, types of political-administrative systems, and bureaucracy as organization and personnel system. **I do not administer make-up exams.**

Exam #3 (20% of grade; week 13, regular class time)

The third exam will cover functions and services of government over time, specifically traditional (defense, order and safety, taxation, economy) and welfare tasks and services (including health care, social security, and education). **I do not administer make-up exams.**

Paper #1 (20% of grade, due by week 10)

Describe Role and Position of Government on the Basis of a Primary Source in its Time and Context (4 pages)

The role and position of government in society are not set in stone. What the proper role and position of government ought to be in relation to society at large has been debated over time and in any context. The object of this paper is to develop familiarity with using a primary source to inform yourself about this role and position of government in time.

Specifically, your paper should include:

a) a brief description of the document you selected (1 page).

You can pick any document, ranging from, for instance, the Code of Hammurabi, the American Bill of Rights, the 1954 Brown V. Board of Education decision, but it could also be a speech (e.g., George Washington's Farewell Speech), a treatise (Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*) or even a book (e.g., Machiavelli's *The Prince*). You can find many examples of such documents on the website of a large project spearheaded by Yale University: <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/>. This website contains documents organized by time period (ancient; medieval; and then one page each for the 15th up to the 21st century). As you might expect, many documents concern the colonies and the states that became part of the United States. However, you are certainly welcome to pick a document from another country (for instance, when you are a foreign student). A website where you can find primary documents organized by time period from all European countries is <http://eudocs.lib.edu/index.php/>;



- b) a description of the time and context in which it was issued (1 page);
 - c) a description of who issued the document and why it was issued (1 page);
 - d) a description of the reception of the content of the document (for instance: the reception of the content of the Magna Carta; the published disagreement about the content of the American Constitution between Federalists and Anti-Federalists; the reception and subsequent references to George Washington's Farewell Speech) (1 page).
- For this paper the student should discuss her/his choice of document with the instructor. It is advised to begin selection early in the semester.

Paper #2 (20% of grade; due at beginning of last class meeting)

Public Organization History or Policy History Paper (4 pages)

The *public organization history* paper or the *policy history* paper is meant to provide you with an opportunity to examine the emergence and development of an organization or a policy over time. This enables you to see how role and position of government. Select an organization or a policy that is of interest to you, and you are free to choose any country and any level of government. You will be graded on the quality of your writing and your content.

Specifically, the paper should include:

- 1) a brief description of the contemporary organization or policy and of the societal and cultural context in which the organization operates or the policy unfolds (0.5 page);
- 2) a description of the emergence and development of the organization or policy on the basis of written, primary and secondary, sources (2 pages);
- 3) a description of how employees perceive the development of the organization or policy on the basis of an interview (1 page);
- 4) a reflection upon how knowledge and understanding of emergence and development of an organization or a policy helps to understand contemporary challenges (0.5 page).

For this paper the student is advised to focus on the past two centuries. The instructor can provide suggestions for literature sources and help with selecting an organization or policy as well as a country and a level of government.

Both papers must meet the following formatting requirements: double-spaced, 12 point font, page numbers, stapled in top-left corner, and 1" margins. Hard copies are due at the indicated due date. **You will lose half a letter grade for every day that a paper is late.**

The instructor will be available to read a draft paper and/or final paper, but will only comment upon its substantive content and not upon the quality of writing. Grading, however, will include syntax, grammar, and spelling. It is the student's responsibility to check for typos, inconsistencies, misspellings (such as: do to the circumstances; stakeholders; the write thing to do; weather she is able; government buy the people, its the right thing to do; it's features are, etc. etc.).

Attendance (10% of grade)

Your attendance grade is a straightforward calculation of the percentage of classes you attended. Attendance is only a small portion of student grades, but performance on



graded assignments and exams typically depends on the extent to which students have absorbed information provided in class. **I do not excuse absences except in cases of family or health emergency and religious holidays** (in any of these cases examination can be rescheduled).

Transformation of numerical grades to letter grades will correspond to this schedule:

A	93-100	C+	77-79.9	E <	59.9
A-	90-92.9	C	73-76.9		
B+	87-89.9	C-	70-72.9		
B	83-86.9	D+	67-69.9		
B-	80-82.9	D	60-66.9		

TEXTS

The following literature is prescribed for class:

- Jos C.N. Raadschelders, Eran Vigoda-Gadot (2015). *Global Dimensions of Public Administration and Governance: A Comparative Voyage*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley. ISBN 978-1-119-02619-8 (pbk), 978-1-119-02612-9 (ebk).
- Mordecai Lee (2012). US Administrative History: Golem Government. In B. Guy Peters, Jon Pierre (eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Public Administration*. Los Angeles: Sage Reference, 187-199.*
- Jos C.N. Raadschelders (2000) Administrative History of the United States: Development and State of the Art. *Administration & Society*, 32(5), 499-528.*
- Jos C.N. Raadschelders (2010) Is American Public Administration Dissociating from Historical Context? On the Nature of Time and the Need to Understand Government and its Study. *American Review of Public Administration*, 40(3), 235-261.*
- Jos C.N. Raadschelders (2015). Changing European Ideas about the Public Servant: A Theoretical and Methodological Framework. In Fritz Sager, Patrick Overeem (eds.), *The European Public Servant: A Shared Administrative Identity?* Colchester: ECPR Press, 15-34.*

* These readings will be posted to Carmen; additional reading may be posted on Carmen.

Students can access textbook information via the Barnes & Noble bookstore website: www.shopOhioState.com as well as from their BuckeyeLink Student Center. This information is disseminated by B&N to all area bookstores. You may buy from a store of your choice and/or shop for books (always use ISBN# for searches) online.



SCHEDULE

***Available on Carmen**

- RV = Raadschelders/Vigoda-Gadot; ML = Mordecai Lee; R00 = Raadschelders 2000; R10 = Raadschelders 2010; R15 is Raadschelders 2015;
- a) and b) refer to day 1 and day 2 in every week of class.

PART 1: The Study of Administrative History

Students will be assigned approximately 40 pages of reading per week. This will be less or none in the weeks that there are exams.

Week 1: Introduction to Class

- a) introduction
(reading: none)
- b) Government in Society: Contemporary and Historical Perspectives
(reading: RV pp.1-12 and pp.407-421)

Week 2: Comparative Public Administration and Administrative History

- a) The comparative approach to understanding government and the importance of (geographical) context
(reading: RV pp.427-474)
- b) A historical perspective upon practices by and thoughts about government through primary and secondary sources
(reading: R10, 25 pp.)

Week 3: Core Concepts for Understanding Government and Society in Time

- a) From physical to imagined communities
(reading: RV pp.17-22)
Brief description due of paper #1.
- b) Nomadic, agricultural, industrial, and service societies
(reading: RV pp.23-32)

PART 2: Structure of Government over Time

Week 4: Organizing Government throughout History

- a) **Exam #1:** Concepts and Comparison for Understanding Governing in Time (20 minutes)
All government started local and became upper-local
(reading: RV pp.32-40)
- b) Brief discussion and feedback on exam #1 (20 minutes)
Two main structural features: territory and bureaucracy
(reading: RV pp.41-69)



Week 5: The Basic Superstructure of Government

- a) State-making, nation-building, and citizenship
(reading: RV pp.71-95)
- b) Types of political-administrative systems
(reading: RV pp.98-128)

Week 6: Bureaucracy as Iron Cage and Scaffolding for Thought

- a) Bureaucracy framing action: stereotype, culture, and continuous reform
(reading: RV pp.129-186)
- b) Bureaucracy as personnel system
Brief description due of paper #2.
(reading: RV pp.187-217; R15)

Week 7: Exam Week

- a) Review of material for exam #2
- b) **Exam #2:** structures of government over time, including attention for territorialization and bureaucratization, state-making and nation-building, types of political-administrative systems, and bureaucracy as organization and personnel system.

PART 3: Functions of Government over Time (especially in the past 200 years)

Week 8: Government's Regalian Functions

- a) Defense of the territory against outside threat: military and defense
(reading: RV pp.221-236)
- b) Defense of the territory against internal threat: police and justice
(reading: RV pp.236-274)

Week 9: Financing Regalian Functions

- a) Taxation: we cannot make it nicer, but can make it easier
(reading: RV pp.292-309)
- b) Monitoring and structuring the economy
(reading: RV pp.276-291)

Week 10: Spring Break

Week 11: Social-Economic Services

- a) Planning and zoning
(reading: RV pp.322-332)
Paper #1 due
- b) Industry, trade and energy
(reading: RV pp.311-321 and 332-348)



Week 12: Welfare Services

- a) Education and health care
(reading: RV pp.349-381)
- b) Social security
(reading: RV pp.381-406)

Week 13: Exam Week

- a) Review of material for exam #3
- b) *Exam #3*: functions and services of government over time, specifically traditional (defense, order and safety, taxation, economy) and welfare tasks and services (including health care, social security, and education).

PART 4: History of American Government

Week 14: American Government: From the Colonies to the Present

- a) Major phases in the development of American government
(reading: R00, 29 pp.)
- Paper 3@ due*
- b) Is American government too big?
(reading: ML, 12 pp.)

Week 15: Conclusion of Class

- a) Discussion of student papers: primary documents
- b) Discussion of student papers: organizations or functions/services of government



THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHN GLENN COLLEGE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS IMPORTANT INFORMATION

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT)

The Ohio State University and the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) expect that all students have read and understand the University's [Code of Student Conduct](#), and that all students will complete all academic and scholarly assignments with fairness and honesty. Failure to follow the rules and guidelines established in the University's Code of Student Conduct may constitute "Academic Misconduct." Sanctions for the misconduct could include a failing grade in this course and suspension or dismissal from the University.

In the Ohio State University's [Code of Student Conduct](#), Section 3335-23-04 defines academic misconduct as: "Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University, or subvert the educational process." Examples of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the University's [Code of Student Conduct](#) is never considered an "excuse" for academic misconduct.

If you have any questions about the above policy or what constitutes academic misconduct in this course, please contact me.

ADA Statement

Students with disabilities that have been certified by the Office for Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs. The Office for Disability Services is located in 150 Pomerene Hall, 1760 Neil Avenue; telephone 292-3307, TDD 292-0901; <http://www.ods.ohio-state.edu/>.

GE Rationale and Assessment Plan
Public Affairs 2500: Governing Over Time

Jos C.N. Raadschelders
raadschelders.1@osu.edu

Course Description and General Education Rationale

This course is an introduction to the history of government around the world from the earliest time up to the present. This is important to anyone given that governments have become the primary social actors in the shaping of society through

- a) having the authority to make binding decisions on behalf of a population as a whole;
- b) having the authority to coerce; and
- c) being the primary actor for collective decision making from the local up to the global levels.

It is only in the past 200 years or so that states and their governments have been able to successfully penetrate the entire territory of their respective countries; it is also only in the past 200 years or so that governments not only extract resources (in labor, kind, or money) from their populations but also provide many services to them. In this course attention is given to the emergence and development of government and governing over time. This includes attention to different opinions about the role and position of government in its own time and context, as is documented in legislation (e.g., Code of Hammurabi, Magna Carta, American Constitution), judicial actions (e.g., *Brown v. Board of Education* 1954), literature advising rulers (e.g., the Admonition of Ipuwer, Kautilya's *Arthashastra*, Machiavelli's *The Prince*), treatises (e.g., Thomas Paine's *Common Sense*), early (administrative) histories (e.g., Ibn Khaldûn's *Muqaddimah*), speeches (e.g., Pericles' funeral speech, George Washington's Farewell speech, Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural, Martin Luther King's "I have a dream"), and even books about the nature of government in society (e.g., Jean Bodin, Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Montesquieu, Von Seckendorff, De la Mare, etc., etc.)

In the first part of the course the focus is on administrative history as an example of comparative study and on the development of communities and societies over time. This part of the course provides the students with the conceptual framework for the second and third part of the course. In the second part of the course the focus is on how governments have structured themselves, namely via defining nested jurisdictions and via bureaucratic organization. The focus in this part will be on the so-called superstructure of government around the globe, with attention for the local up to national government levels. In the third part of the course the focus shifts to what functions and services governments provided over time, organized around information about the so-called regalian functions (the classic or traditional governments policies and services) and the welfare functions as they evolved from the late Middle Ages on. Each of these three parts will be concluded with a written exam.

Course learning goals and objectives are pursued via lectures, readings (of prescribed literature), but also of documents relevant to the role and position of government in society and to the emergence and development of an organization or policy, two written assignments (each a 4-page paper), class discussions of literature and lecture subject matters, and an interview with a public officeholder. The lectures closely follow the readings, and all readings and lectures relate directly to the course learning goals listed in the syllabus.

The course will fulfill the General Education (GE) course requirement in “history” by promoting student understanding of how past events are studied and how past events have shaped the present (cf., “the processes by which individuals, groups, and societies interact, communicate, and use human, natural, and economic resources.”) First, the class provides a nuanced understanding of the emergence and development of government around the globe from prehistory up to the present. Second, it introduces students to the application of social science concepts to historical context and time. Third, the students will learn how governments are very similar in their structural features, but vary in terms of policy content and challenges. This attention for government policy and services will make students aware of the importance of cultural context (including national history, societal cleavages, racial and ethnic differences, political tensions, etc.). In order to accomplish the learning goals stated in the syllabus, the instructor integrates and applies knowledge from public administration, history, political science, economics, sociology, evolutionary biology, anthropology, and psychology, and applies that knowledge to challenges governments face with regard to structuring society and helping solve societal (i.e., collective) problems in numerous policy areas, including, by way of example, law and order, economy, planning and zoning, education, energy, the environment, public health, and so on.

a) **How do the course objectives address the GE category expected learning outcomes?**

Goal: Students recognize how past events are studied and how they influence today’s society and the human condition.

Expected Learning Outcomes:

1. *Students construct an integrated perspective on history and the factors that shape human activity.*

One important element of human activity is how people organize themselves to pursue objectives that cannot be achieved by an individual.

Students will learn about three sets of concepts that help to understand how individuals and groups interact with their government. First, there is the distinction between physical and imagined community. The more people came to live in imagined communities, the more governments came to the foreground as the primary service delivery institution. The second set of concepts concerns the development over time of the interplay between society and government: from nomadic, hunter-gatherer, via sedentary agricultural and industrial society, to the service and information society of today. The third set of concepts is that of the distinction between primary and secondary sources. The former are mentioned in the course description and rationale above; the latter will be referenced throughout the course.

In physical communities people operate on the basis of self-organization and this has been a feature of societies from the earliest bands up to the present-day territorial states. That is, the capacity for self-organization is as present (though less recognized) today as in the past. Once people became sedentary and started to live in larger communities (tribe, chiefdom), they organized more formal governments. These formal governments served mainly to protect the territory from outside threat and from internal disturbances of the peace on the one hand, and to shore up the ruler or ruling elite. This has significantly changed in the past 200+ years, with

governments – at least in the Western world – providing services to people beyond the preservation of life and property. That people as citizens actually can have a say in defining government activity is even more recent.

Key to understanding the evolving role and position of governments in society over time is knowledge about how governments structured their activities. In anthropology and sociology a lot of research has been done into the territorialization of society; that knowledge will be applied to better understanding of government in time. A lot of public administration and sociology research has been spent on understanding bureaucracy, and students will learn that bureaucracy plays a much more vital and positive role in contemporary society than it did in historical societies.

2. Students describe and analyze the origins and nature of contemporary issues.

In this course students will acquire knowledge about the role and position of government in society over time, thus helping them understand how government-in-society came to be as it is today. How governments structure their activities is addressed under learning outcome 1. This learning outcome 2 focuses on activities of governments over time. Historically, governments served to support a ruler or a ruling elite. For various reasons this changed in a fairly short span of time (1780s-1820s) and governments today play a key role in social problem solving and policy making. Why and how this happened is important to anyone who wishes to play an active role as citizen. In several lectures government policies will be discussed, distinguishing between traditional tasks that governments conducted from early on (military, police, justice, taxation) to tasks and services governments have “adopted” since the nineteenth century (health care, education, housing, transportation, social security, etc., etc.). The student will come to understand the extent to which contemporary bureaucracy is different from its historical predecessor (i.e., bureaucracies before the end of the eighteenth century), and that this has everything to do with the shifting focus of bureaucracies serving the elite through resource extraction activities, to bureaucracies serving the needs of the population at large through resource enhancing policies.

The contemporary issues addressed in this class concern social problems that governments are expected to (re)solve through policy making and implementation. Governments face comparable challenges (for instance: pollution, migration, sex trafficking, global warming, health care, rising income inequalities, accessibility of education, housing conditions, etc. etc.), but how they tackle these varies from country to country. Many students in this class will be American, but – given Ohio State’s attraction to foreign students – we fully expect foreign nationals to be enrolled in this class. The lectures and most of the prescribed readings concern governing in time and context across the globe, but two readings will specifically address the United States. It is in the comparative perspective (i.e., cross-national, cross-time, cross-policy, and cross-level) that students will come to appreciate the time (twenty-first century) and context (home country) in which they live, and arrive at better understanding of the challenges governments face when tackling social problems that transcend individual capabilities..

3. Students speak and write critically about primary and secondary historical sources by examining diverse interpretations of past events and ideas in their historical context.

Students will focus on, first, describing the role and position of government at a specific moment in time and context and, second, on describing the origin and development of a public organization or a public policy in a country of their choice and at a level of government of their

choice. Mainly secondary sources will be used (i.e., published articles and/or books), but students will be able to access primary sources (e.g., a white paper, a charter, minutes of meetings, websites, etc.) about government at large and about the organization or policy of their interest. Students are expected to supplement the “long” historical view of a few centuries (as provided through the lectures and readings) with the “shorter” historical view of a few decades based on personal experience of a public servant who works in the public organization or policy of their interest. This experience has to be accessed through an interview with one of these public servants.

b) How do the readings assigned address the GE category expected learning outcomes?

Overall, the lectures and readings emphasize the historical origin and development of contemporary structures and functions of governments. With regard to the expected learning outcomes:

- Outcome 1: this is specifically targeted in lectures and readings in parts I and II of the class, assessed in exams 1 and 2, parts a and b of paper #1 and parts 1 and 3 of paper #2;
- Outcome 2: this is specifically targeted in lectures and readings in part III of the class, assessed in exam 3, and part c of paper #1, and part 2 of paper #2;
- Outcome 3: this is specifically targeted in part d of paper #1 and part 4 of the paper #2.

c) How do the topics address the GE category expected learning outcomes?

- Outcome 1: Chapters 1 through to 8 in the Raadschelders/Vigoda-Gadot book directly address the structural arrangements governments developed over time to control “their” territory. Appendices 1 and 2 in the same book address the nature of and need for a comparative perspective of understanding governing in time. The article by Raadschelders (2010) addresses the need for a historical perspective upon the role and position of government in society, the chapter by Lee (2012) discusses the specific nature of American government over time, the article by Raadschelders (2000) provides information about the study of American administrative history, and the chapter by Raadschelders (2015) describes changing perceptions and definitions of public servants over time as well as the major changes in the role and position of government in the 1780-1820 period.
- Outcome 2: Chapters 9 through to 12 in the Raadschelders/Vigoda-Gadot book directly discuss a variety of government policies, their emergence and development over time, as well as their contemporary content.
- Outcome 3: this outcome is achieved through discussions in class (during lecture, but also of exams and papers), as well as through writing two short papers that are based on primary (interviews, documents) and secondary (literature) sources.

d) How do the written assignments address the GE category expected learning outcomes?

Overall, the expected learning outcomes will be assessed according to the grade distribution table provided in the syllabus. A student does not meet expectations when unable to describe and/or connect concepts and information presented in lectures and readings, and thus scoring a grade of 69.9 or less (i.e., D+ or less). A student meets expectations when showing understanding of the material offered through lectures and readings, and scoring a grade between 70 and 92.9 (i.e., B- up to A-). A student exceeds expectations when not only

showing understanding of the material offered through lectures and readings, but when including information based on readings not prescribed for class and/or original insights provided in exams and/or paper. In the latter case the student will achieve the grade of A.

- Outcome 1: Exams 1 and 2 will assess the student's comprehension of Parts I and II of the class.
- Outcome 2: Exam 3 will assess the student's comprehension of Part III of the class.
- Outcome 3: The first paper will assess the student's communicative skills through reporting about the role and position of government in society at a particular moment in time and in a particular (geographic) context, and the second paper will assess the student's communicative skills through reporting about the emergence and development of an organization or policy over time.

e) How will students sharpen communication skills through the preparation of essay exams and a paper and through participation in discussions in this course?

Overall, the exams will test the student's written communication skills through assessing their knowledge of concepts relevant to and approaches important for understanding governing over time (exam 1), of structures of government over time (exam 2), and of functions of government over time (exam 3). During class students are expected to participate through questions and discussion with the instructor and with one another. Class participation is 10% of the grade. Written and oral communication skills are the target of the two paper assignments, since students need to access primary sources (published documentation, interviews with public servants) and use secondary sources (articles, books). The students will receive general feedback about the exams from the instructor in class. The instructor is also available upon appointment to provide individual feedback. In week 15 of the class the instructor will discuss in general terms the student papers (which are due in week 11 and 14 respectively) to illustrate various points made in weeks 4 to 12. The instructor is available upon appointment to provide individual feedback. These papers are an important learning tool, since the student must identify a primary source for description (paper #1) and will have to prepare and execute an interview, and must find primary written sources concerning their organization or policy of interest (paper #2). The instructor is available upon appointment to help the student with the selection of a primary document, and of an organization or policy, and with the preparation of interviews.

Comments re. GE 2500, Governing over Time

The comments below are written in response to and reflection upon the remarks made by Dr. Paula Baker, director of undergraduate programs of the Department of History, in her email of May 23rd, 2015, on the proposed GE-class “Governing over Time” and regarding its fit as a GE-History course.

Before addressing her concerns, one preliminary remark needs to be made about the interdisciplinary framework within which the role and position of government in contemporary society can be understood. There is no historical precedent for the role and position of governments in their respective societies today. For millennia governments exercised their authority far beyond the reach of populations at large. Only in the past 200-250 years has the role and position of governments in society changed; and it has changed so rapidly and significantly that it has drawn attention from historians and social scientists alike. Historians most often have studied the administrative history or history of government of their own country. However, the first two histories of government that encompassed the world in its entirety were written by Americans (Augustine Duganne in 1860 and Woodrow Wilson in 1889) (See Raadschelders 1997, 2002). Social scientists have tried to develop concepts and theories with which to describe and understand the origins and subsequent development of government. One of the earliest to do so was the jurist, sociologist, and historian Max Weber. After the Second World War attention for the origins and development of government has spread across the social sciences. The prescribed book for this proposed GE-course (Raadschelders & Vigoda-Gadot 2015) is the fruit of 30 years of reading in the literature relevant to understanding origins and development of government (including: history, political science, anthropology, evolutionary biology, cognitive psychology, organizational sociology, economics). As I have argued elsewhere (2011), public administration is the umbrella study that brings together knowledge and insight about government from various studies and disciplines. As the study of public administration is interdisciplinary, so is, by definition, the subject of administrative history/history of government.

Dr. Baker wrote that she was not convinced that this proposed GE-course would introduce students to historical reasoning or methods. I will address her comments point-by-point.

She notes that the course’s methodological framework is comparative, and not historical. However, as I point out in appendix one of the prescribed book, there are four types of comparison: cross-national, cross-level (i.e., levels of government), cross-policy, and cross-time. The latter type of comparative study is by definition historical.

Dr. Baker observes that “To look at topic X in time Y is not the same as using the historical method to analyze primary source materials.” I agree with that observation, but this is not the objective of this course. First, this course is developed to provide any student (not just history or public affairs students) with basic understanding of the role and position of government. A comparative perspective that only focuses on the present cannot possibly suffice, because governments today are so different from those up to about two centuries ago. In fact, only a historical perspective provides sufficient contrast. Also, the question of why government’s role and position today is as it is can only be answered through a cross-time perspective. In this course, the student will learn how people had different understandings over time about the role and position of government. They will learn so through discussion of primary sources (see for the types I distinguish the rationale for this course) that, indeed, will illustrate how people

perceived government in their time (history) and context (geography). Second, I am not convinced that a GE-history class is the place where students should learn to use the historical method to analyze primary source materials. That would be more fitting in classes for history majors. As mentioned above, this course seeks to reach out to all students at OSU, in the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences, because it is important that the next generation of leaders in the public, nonprofit and private sectors have a basic understanding of the role and position of government in society. Present education at secondary and tertiary levels does not provide the historical perspective that I have developed in the past 30 years.

The historical method is that which Leopold von Ranke called *Kritische Filologie*, and this careful and critical textual analysis is, indeed, important to situate printed documents in their time and context. However, in the past 40 years or so this historical method has been complemented with the use of social science based concepts and theories that serve as yet another heuristic in the endeavor to understand of the past (see debate between Thuillier and Raadschelders 1995, attached as scan).

Dr. Baker's statement that "Only two weeks (4 and 14) seem to deal with historical periods other than the present..." is simply not true. The subject matter of every week will be historical, that is, providing the student through reading and lecture with the necessary historical background to help her/him understand the present. Having said that, however, does not mean that the concepts that drive the course organization are not historical but rather central to the study of governance today as Dr. Baker claims. As an historian (MA-degree) and social scientist (Ph.D.) I am very much aware of the possibility of reconstructing the past in terms of contemporary theories and models (known as *anachronism*) and of interpreting the past in terms of its contemporary outcomes (known as *present-mindedness*). What is done in this course is tracing the origins and development of government over time by means of neutral concepts such as bureaucracy, organization, ruler – subject/citizen relation, public servant, and so on and so forth.

Dr. Baker notes that none of the prescribed readings are primary sources. That is true, but, as mentioned above, I will refer to a variety of primary sources during the course and my ambition is to reach students with various backgrounds. That I have prescribed some of my own publications is because there is to my knowledge no other literature that provides the interdisciplinary umbrella necessary to understand government over time. As mentioned above, most administrative histories are national histories. The studies by Duganne and Wilson, and more recently by E.N. Gladden (1972) and S.E. Finer (1997) are global in scope, but only descriptive of various 'national' histories from Antiquity up to the present time. I have written a handbook of administrative history (1998) but that only concerns the Western world from the 12th century up to the present and merely discusses and provides access to such national histories. The volume prescribed for this course not only draws upon the wealth of research that has come available in history and across the social sciences at large in the past 40 years, but is also truly global in that it demonstrates how efforts to structure governments over time have converged toward territorially defined and layered jurisdictions and hierarchical organizations, while the functioning of these governments continues to vary with local/national political-administrative and social culture (i.e., there is significant variation in how countries deal with health care, education, transportation, energy, food, immigration, taxation, justice and policing, emergency management, etc., policies). Each of the various policies described and analyzed in chapters nine to twelve in the prescribed book for this course have emerged over time, and proper understanding of their meaning in our own time cannot but start with how and why they

became important. Thus, I cannot but disagree with Dr. Baker's observation as that this course is weak on the first and third expected learning outcomes. Instead this course meets all three learning outcomes, but is focused on being introductory and targeting a large variety of students.

Since it is my hope that this course will be taught at OSU as a GE-history course, I have from the outset included two lectures (week 14) on American government. However, foreign students can – and are explicitly invited to - explore the origins and development of government in their country through the two paper assignments. I am comfortable doing so, since I have taught comparative government since 1987. Throughout my career I have attempted in teaching and research to bridge the interests and approaches of the study of history with those of the study of public administration and that has culminated in this course. Finally, a course like this is not offered at The Ohio State University, nor – as far as I know – anywhere else.

References

- Finer, S.E. (1997). *The History of Government from the Earliest Times*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gladden, E.N. (1972). *A History of Public Administration*. London: Frank Cass.
- Raadschelders, Jos C.N. (1997). The Progress of Civil Society: A 19th Century American History of Governments. *Administration & Society*, 29(4), 471-489.
- Raadschelders, Jos C.N. (1998) *Handbook of Administrative History*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books (372 pp.) (2000, paperback).
- Raadschelders, Jos C.N. (2002). (2002) Woodrow Wilson on the History of Government. Passing Fad or Constitutive Framework for His Philosophy of Governance? *Administration & Society*, 35(5), 579-598.

Adams, Christopher

From: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 9:56 AM
To: Baker, Paula
Cc: Adams, Christopher; Hallihan, Kathleen; Brown, Trevor; Greenbaum, Robert; Fink, Steven
Subject: RE: re. GE-class Governing over Time
Attachments: GE Rationale and Assessment Plan.docx; PA GE history of government Syllabus.docx

Hi, Paula, Wednesday I send you my revised GE class on governing over time and the rationale and assessment plan. The two important elements you mentioned in your email of April 5 (see below), i.e., interpreting primary and secondary sources and assessing different interpretations of the past, are now included (one more required reading; paper 1 on discussing a primary source in its time and context). We'd like to move forward with this so that it can be offered in the spring of 2016. I am hoping that you can reach members of your undergraduate committee for comments within the next two weeks. I thank you for your input and look forward to hearing from you, greetings, Jos.

Jos C.N. Raadschelders
Professor and Associate Dean for Faculty Development
John Glenn College of Public Affairs
350D Page Hall
The Ohio State University
1810 College Road, Columbus 43210
Affiliated professor, Institute of Public Administration, University of Leiden
Fellow, National Academy of Public Administration
Phone: 614-688-4325
Fax: 614-292-4868

From: Baker, Paula
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:16 AM
To: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Subject: RE: re. GE-class Governing over Time

Hi all,
I looked over the course and the book, and also spoke briefly with John Brooke (he and I offer a sequence in U.S. political history). It looks like a good course -- and I was please to be able to look over the book -- but as it stands it's a better fit in a social science GE than in history. Missing are some important elements of the GE -- interpreting primary and secondary sources and assessing differing interpretations of the past.
If you like I can send the course through the undergraduate teaching committee.
Best,
Paula

From: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:09 AM
To: Baker, Paula
Subject: re. GE-class Governing over Time

From: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 8:54 AM
To: Baker, Paula
Cc: Adams, Christopher; Brown, Trevor
Subject: re. GE-class Governing over Time

Good morning, Paula, As you recall Trevor and I visited with you on April 17 concerning the proposal for a GE-class on governing over time. I brought you also a copy of the book that I propose to use. Can you tell me where we are in the process of approving the course? I look forward to hearing from you, greetings, Jos.

Jos C.N. Raadschelders
Professor and Associate Dean for Faculty Development
John Glenn College of Public Affairs
350D Page Hall
The Ohio State University
1810 College Road, Columbus 43210
Affiliated professor, Institute of Public Administration, University of Leiden
Fellow, National Academy of Public Administration
Phone: 614-688-4325
Fax: 614-292-4868

Adams, Christopher

From: Baker, Paula
Sent: Saturday, May 23, 2015 12:21 PM
To: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Cc: Adams, Christopher; Hallihan, Kathleen; Brown, Trevor; Greenbaum, Robert; Fink, Steven
Subject: RE: re. GE-class Governing over Time

The Undergraduate Teaching Committee had the opportunity to review the proposed course for a Historical Studies GE designation. We cannot offer concurrence.

While it looks like a fine public administration course that introduces students to a useful comparative framework for understanding the development of government, we were not convinced that it introduced students to historical reasoning or methods.

The course's methodological framework is comparative, not historical: this is very clear in the first few weeks and in the choice of textbook. A comparative method and historical method are hardly interchangeable. To look at topic X in time Y is not the same as using the historical method to analyze primary source materials.

Only two weeks (4 and 14) seem to deal with historical periods other than the present at all; this is hardly sufficient "historical content" to count as a history course.

The added paper on a primary source is fine, but none of the assigned readings appear to be a primary source. Tacking on one project that deals with a primary source does not adequately teach students how to find, analyze, and synthesize primary sources - which are, of course, the very basis of the historical method .

The reading list, all but one item of which lists the instructor as the author, uses examples from the past to illustrate issues in public administration in the present. The concepts drive the course organization and they are not historical concepts, but rather ones central to the study of governance today.

In short, the course appears to fill a social science GE, but not historical studies. It remains weak on both the first and third ELOs of historical studies courses.

Best,
Paula

From: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Sent: Friday, May 22, 2015 9:56 AM
To: Baker, Paula
Cc: Adams, Christopher; Hallihan, Kathleen; Brown, Trevor; Greenbaum, Robert; Fink, Steven
Subject: RE: re. GE-class Governing over Time

Hi, Paula, Wednesday I send you my revised GE class on governing over time and the rationale and assessment plan. The two important elements you mentioned in your email of April 5 (see below), i.e., interpreting primary and secondary sources and assessing different interpretations of the past, are now included (one more required reading; paper 1 on discussing a primary source in its time and context). We'd like to move forward with this so that it can be offered in the spring of 2016. I am hoping that you can reach members of your undergraduate committee for comments within the next two weeks. I thank you for your input and look forward to hearing from you, greetings, Jos.

Jos C.N. Raadschelders
Professor and Associate Dean for Faculty Development
John Glenn College of Public Affairs
350D Page Hall

The Ohio State University
1810 College Road, Columbus 43210
Affiliated professor, Institute of Public Administration, University of Leiden
Fellow, National Academy of Public Administration
Phone: 614-688-4325
Fax: 614-292-4868

From: Baker, Paula
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:16 AM
To: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Subject: RE: re. GE-class Governing over Time

Hi all,
I looked over the course and the book, and also spoke briefly with John Brooke (he and I offer a sequence in U.S. political history). It looks like a good course -- and I was please to be able to look over the book -- but as it stands it's a better fit in a social science GE than in history. Missing are some important elements of the GE -- interpreting primary and secondary sources and assessing differing interpretations of the past.
If you like I can send the course through the undergraduate teaching committee.
Best,
Paula

From: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 11:09 AM
To: Baker, Paula
Subject: re. GE-class Governing over Time

From: Raadschelders, Jozef C.
Sent: Tuesday, May 05, 2015 8:54 AM
To: Baker, Paula
Cc: Adams, Christopher; Brown, Trevor
Subject: re. GE-class Governing over Time

Good morning, Paula, As you recall Trevor and I visited with you on April 17 concerning the proposal for a GE-class on governing over time. I brought you also a copy of the book that I propose to use. Can you tell me where we are in the process of approving the course? I look forward to hearing from you, greetings, Jos.

Jos C.N. Raadschelders
Professor and Associate Dean for Faculty Development
John Glenn College of Public Affairs
350D Page Hall
The Ohio State University
1810 College Road, Columbus 43210
Affiliated professor, Institute of Public Administration, University of Leiden
Fellow, National Academy of Public Administration
Phone: 614-688-4325
Fax: 614-292-4868

Guy THUILLIER

Peut-on parler de **modèle napoléonien** de l'administration ? Nous croyons très difficile d'utiliser une telle notion sans prendre de grandes précautions : car on risque facilement de verser dans le nominalisme⁽¹⁾ et de généraliser des erreurs à la manière de Taine. Le concept de modèle ne s'applique guère à une administration aussi complexe, aussi divisée, aussi peu cohérente que l'administration napoléonienne : apparemment parler des principes d'uniformité, de hiérarchie, de contrôle serait méconnaître les réalités de la bureaucratie napoléonienne. Nous nous bornerons prudemment à quelques remarques.

PREMIERE REMARQUE : peut-on parler d'un "modèle" alors qu'il n'est ni décrit ni enseigné ? La littérature sur le système administratif sous l'Empire est fort réduite, on ne peut guère citer (en dehors de quelques textes fondateurs du Consultant)⁽²⁾ que les **Principes de l'administration publique de Bonnin**⁽³⁾, qui contenait un projet de **Code administratif**, et lui donnait une synthèse intelligente : mais Bonnin, qui était un homme de la Révolution, un libéral, ne différencie pas nettement droit révolutionnaire et droit impérial (notamment pour l'enseignement, les secours) et ses **Principes** ne sont guère

⁽¹⁾ La notion de *modèle* n'est guère utilisée par les historiens français, qui, de façon générale, se méfient des concepts des sociologues. Certes, la notion de "modèle" peut être utilisée mais, pour des raisons pédagogiques qui n'ont rien à voir avec les nécessités de la recherche (rien n'est plus dangereux que de simplifier un problème).

⁽²⁾ Comme Roederer, qui en l'an VIII, a fait un effort de doctrine, demeuré sans lendemain : c'est le seul grand texte de principe, à ma connaissance (cf. "Le système administratif d'après Roederer", *Revue administrative*, 1988, p. 18-21).

⁽³⁾ La 3e édition, la plus répandue, est de 1812. Sur Bonnin, un homme de Frochet, cf. notre étude *Les principes d'administration de Charles-Jean Bonnin*, *Revue administrative* 1992 n 202-214) l'ouvrage est encore cité par M

in: Bernd Wendt (ed.) (1985)

Les Influences du "Modèle"
Napoléonien d'administration sur
l'organisation administrative des
autres pays. Bruxelles: IIAS,

pp 25-34, 263-267

représentatifs⁽⁴⁾. Peut-on parler d'un modèle "exportable" quand on n'en a aucune vue générale ? Le Ministère de la Justice refusa de laisser se développer un enseignement général de droit public : l'enseignement du droit public et du droit administratif fut sacrifié et, par un tour de passe-passe, on a réduit en l'an XII l'enseignement à l'explication du Code Civil, à la procédure et des éléments du droit romain...⁽⁵⁾ L'Académie de législation disparut⁽⁶⁾, et tout enseignement du droit public fut pratiquement interdit⁽⁷⁾. En fait, il n'y eut aucun effort doctrinal sous l'Empire (et les tentatives de codification des lois en 1813-tournèrent court).

DEUXIEME REMARQUE : on peut difficilement parler d'un modèle administratif sous Napoléon, les principes directeurs de ce système demeurent presque inconnus, car ce qui fut appliqué sous ce nom dans quelques États correspond, en fait, à un mélange singulier de principes remontant à l'Ancien régime, à la Révolution et à l'Empire, sans qu'il fut aisé d'en faire le départ : cette confusion, qui dura longtemps, est difficile à concevoir aujourd'hui, et les administrateurs –souvent formés sous l'Ancien régime– mélangeaient volontiers des principes juridiques très opposés : ainsi au Conseil d'Etat, le comité d'Hauterive en 1808, pour fonder le contrôle d'une société de prévoyance, refuse de se référer au Code de Commerce, et s'appuie sur un arrêt du Conseil de 1787 autorisant la **Compagnie royale d'assurances sur la vie**⁽⁸⁾. Certes, dans ce domaine social, on rompt –plus ou moins discrètement– avec les principes révolutionnaires⁽⁹⁾, mais dans la

(4) Rappelons que Bonnin a exercé une grande influence en Espagne et surtout au Portugal où il passe pour un fondateur du droit administratif.

(5) Cf. L'ENA avant l'ENA, 1983, p. 40-41.

(6) Cf. La bureaucratie en France aux XIXe et XXe siècles, 1987, p. 75-90.

(7) L'Université de Düsseldorf réclama –vraiment un enseignement de droit administratif, mais le ministre écrivit en marge de la lettre : "Cette science n'existe point en corps de doctrine" : le mot est significatif (Archives Nationales, AFIV 1838).

(8) Conseil d'Etat, n°1725, 22 novembre 1808. Rapport et projet de décret concernant la Caisse des employés et artisans, le rédaction (ce rapport fut célèbre en son temps, il inspira la politique du Conseil en matière d'assurances sur la vie pendant trente ans...).

(9) Cf. La protection sociale sous la Révolution française, sous la direction de G. Thuillier "Il a régressé au point de vue du droit social

la plupart des domaines, on vit toujours sur les anciens principes (même la loi de germinal an XI pour le jugement des monnaies, reprend le principe d'avant 1789)⁽¹⁰⁾. Il suffit de parcourir le volume **Du pouvo. exécutif de la Science du publiciste** de Fritot⁽¹¹⁾ pour voir comme toute l'administration vit sur un héritage touffu de textes de toutes dates souvent contradictoires, dont certains sont tombés en désuétude; e 1818, Cormenin expliquait comment, devant ce fatras de textes, "j'jurisprudence a partout expliqué, commenté, remplacé la loi", mais "cette jurisprudence est elle-même inconnue, parce que les décrets et ordonnances qui la renferment n'ont jamais été rendus publics, ho quelques uns dont l'insertion est éparse dans le réceptacle a Bulletin"⁽¹²⁾ : ce qui accroissait d'autant la confusion. Et Bérèngè déclare, dans **De la jurisprudence criminelle en France** : "L'égislation administrative, si toutefois on peut appeler législation u amas de dispositions qui n'ont aucun lien entre elles, est si ténébreus que, semblable aux livres sibyllins, les seuls initiés peuvent se flatter a la connaître. Elle se compose d'une multitude de décrets impériaux, d'avis du Conseil d'Etat, de décisions ministérielles, et pour en donner une idée, il suffit de dire que la collection des décisions relatives à ur seule branche d'administration, celle de l'enregistrement, forme dé, quatorze gros volumes in-4°. Comment espérer de trouver là de

de l'Etat en 1800-1802", Bulletin d'histoire de la Sécurité sociale, 1988, p. 95 116.

(10) Cf. G. Thuillier, La réforme monétaire de l'an XI, 1993.

(11) Science du publiciste ou traité des principes élémentaires du droit. par M. Alb. Fritot, t. IX 1822.

(12) Du Conseil d'Etat envisagé comme Conseil et comme Jurisdiction: 1818. Cormenin –qui a été auditeur en 1810, et était alors maître des requêtes critiquait l'immovibilité des membres du Comité du contentieux, qui expose cette jurisprudence "à varier continuellement". Cormenin rappelle que la législative administrative entièrement à refaire, car certaines lois sont tombées e désuétude, sans être abrogées, d'autres "ont déterminé le but et les pouvoirs de anciennes autorités, et ne peuvent évidemment servir à fixer les attributions nouvelles", et "les uns sont noyées dans des détails fastidieux et perdent de vue le principe général, les autres sont trop brèves, et d'une disposition telleme générale qu'on ne peut y puiser aucune interprétation pour les cas particuliers" dans ces conditions, il n'y a ni règles, ni principes.

règles et des principes fixes ? Aussi l'autorité administrative n'a-t-elle point de jurisprudence, elle ne peut même s'en former une...⁽¹³⁾

TROISIEME REMARQUE : on parle de "modèle administratif", mais c'est là une vue réductrice, et même mutilante : car ce qui était le plus important, ce qui créait la rupture quand on introduisait le système français dans un Etat étranger, c'est :

- 1) Le système du Code Civil (et du Code pénal) avec leurs conséquences (par exemple pour les ordres religieux),
- 2) La fiscalité avec ses principes "révolutionnaires" de simplification et le refus de la fiscalité personnelle : or on imagine mal les conséquences de **blocs juridiques** comme l'enregistrement et les domaines (dont les principes, en fait, tiennent à l'Ancien régime)⁽¹⁴⁾,
- 3) Les principes économiques de **liberté du commerce et de l'industrie**, avec la suppression de toutes les entraves malthusiennes, qui a eu souvent des effets considérables⁽¹⁵⁾ : or, il s'agit là du décret d'Allarde de 1791...

On a sous estimé l'effet de ces trois "systèmes", par exemple en Rhénanie, qui touchent à toute la vie de la société, à tous les intérêts,

⁽¹³⁾ Et le comte Bérenger d'ajouter : "Aussi l'autorité administrative n'a-t-elle point de jurisprudence; elle ne peut même pas s'en former une. Chaque affaire est décidée d'après des considérations de circonstances. Quelquefois, des décrets impériaux étaient rendus pour le besoin d'une cause, et d'autres fois, c'étaient des décisions ministérielles qui arrivaient au moment du jugement, pour tracer une direction. Ces décrets, ces décisions, enregistrées à mesure, pour servir de règles jusqu'à nouvel ordre, imitaient ces constitutions que, dans la décadence de l'Empire, l'opportunité arrachait à la faiblesse et qui, s'abrogeant tour à tour, jetaient le trouble dans les familles et le désordre dans la législation" Bérenger réclame un **code administratif** "qui trace des règles uniformes, sûres et invariables".

⁽¹⁴⁾ M. Massaloux l'a bien montré à propos de la Régie de l'enregistrement.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Nous avons montré l'importance de l'introduction du principe de liberté de l'industrie dans les forges rhénanes sous l'Empire (cf. "La métallurgie rhénane de 1800 à 1820" Annales E.S.C. 1961 n. 877-908)

et qui en soi ne sont pas administratifs : s'il y a **modèle**, c'est u "modèle de société" –juridique, économique–, ce qui accro nécessairement les équivoques. Or c'est là ce qui a été véritablement exporté, car pour l'essentiel, c'était nettement décrit et formalisé⁽¹⁶⁾.

QUATRIEME REMARQUE : les principes de l'administration napoléonienne ne sont pas toujours nettement saisis, tant elle es encore mal connue : une grande partie n'était pas explicite, elle tenait à la **coutume**, à la **pratique**. Ainsi le rôle du Conseil d'Etat : le Conse avait pour mission de contrôler étroitement l'action du ministre, de le **censurer** quotidiennement⁽¹⁷⁾ : or ce n'était guère un principe clairement décrit, défini, c'était un **rapport de forces** variable, suivant les occurrences et les domaines. De même, le rôle de l'auditeur comme **école d'administration** est un principe qui n'est pas affirmé, on préfère rester dans le flou⁽¹⁸⁾. Ces deux points –essentiels dans la pratique– n'entrent pas dans le "modèle"⁽¹⁹⁾, et on pourrait en trouver bien d'autres exemples.

⁽¹⁶⁾ L'histoire administrative ne peut être séparée, sinon artificiellement, de l'histoire du corps social et de l'histoire économique.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ce rôle disparaît après 1814 et ne fut jamais rétabli (sous la Restauration les ministres présidaient les Comités du Conseil : on avait restauré leur autorité). Or ce pouvoir du Conseil sur les ministres n'a jamais été étudié pour lui-même c'était une tutelle parfois vétilleuse (par exemple pour les Finances). On n'a guère étudié non plus les **Conseils d'administration** présidés par l'Empereur.

⁽¹⁸⁾ "Le but de l'institution est de mettre sous la main de l'Empereur de hommes d'élite(...) C'est de là que sortiront de vrais magistrats, de vrais administrateurs. Sa Majesté a essayé l'institution lorsqu'elle a chargé de auditeurs de l'administration des pays conquis. Elle a trouvé en eux du zèle, de la probité, de l'intelligence. Elle espère que la nouvelle organisation qu'elle v. leur donnera fondera l'administration en France, fournira pour toutes les branches des hommes agréables et sûrs" (**Procès-verbal**) –inédit– de la séance du 2 novembre 1809 du Conseil d'Etat; nous en devons connaissance à l'amitié de M de Maurepas), **Fonder l'administration** : c'était le but de Napoléon, il lui fallait des gens neufs. Sur l'auditorat, comme école, cf. **L'ENA avant l'ENA**, ouv. cité.

⁽¹⁹⁾ En 1814, on ne s'y trompa, on supprima ces deux "pratiques" (et les ministres dans leurs mémoires, se gardèrent bien par la suite de parler de la tutelle que le Conseil exerçait sur eux).

CINQUIEME REMARQUE : la notion de "modèle" relève peut-être de l'illusion : car ce que l'historien découvre pour cette période, c'est un désordre étonnant, multiforme, permanent, qu'on a du mal à comprendre (aucun "modèle" ne peut en rendre compte) et qui tient, en grande partie, à l'absence de principes véritables, à la médiocre formation des administrations, à certaines formes d'impuissance⁽²⁰⁾ :

– on est obligé de tolérer le désordre : ainsi a-t-on plus ou moins renoncé à toucher à la monnaie de cuivre –alors dans un état déplorable⁽²¹⁾–, à la circulation des monnaies étrangères⁽²²⁾. De même, on renonce à réformer les systèmes obsolètes, de peur de toucher à des principes du "bloc révolutionnaire" : ainsi en matière de pensions de retraite, le Conseil d'Etat n'ose toucher à la loi de 1790 –inapplicable– et refuse de généraliser les caisses de retraite, contre la volonté de l'Empereur⁽²³⁾. Le Conseil donne parfois des avis –approuvés par Napoléon– qui ne sont suivis d'aucun effet, parce que les ministres se dérobaient à ses ordres...⁽²⁴⁾

– chaque fois qu'on examine par le menu un secteur d'administration, on s'aperçoit d'extraordinaires faiblesses, de surprenantes "zones d'ombre", de singuliers compromis : ainsi les billets de sols –payables en sols de cuivre– émis par des "banques de sols" à Rouen, condamnés dès l'an XI, sont toujours

⁽²⁰⁾ La machine tourne de façon médiocre, notamment à partir de 1810–1811 : c'est là une crise de l'administration qui mériterait d'être étudiée.

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. notre étude, "La monnaie de cuivre et de billon au XIX siècle", *Annales, E.S.C.*, 1959, p. 65–90.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. La réforme monétaire de l'an XI, ouv. cité, p. 855–866.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. Les pensions de retraite des fonctionnaires au XIXe siècle, 1993, Comité d'histoire de la Sécurité sociale, p. 31–44.

⁽²⁴⁾ Ainsi en 1809, un Avis du Conseil, approuvé par l'Empereur, demande au ministre de l'intérieur une unification des principes des retraites des employés communaux : ce n'est qu'en novembre 1811 qu'un nouvel Avis – publié au Bulletin– régla la matière en donnant le modèle de la Caisse du ministère de l'Intérieur... Un autre Avis du Conseil d'Etat, du 1er avril 1809, pourtant publié au Bulletin, fixe les principes du contrôle des tonines : aucun ministre n'étant spécialement chargé de l'exécution, l'Avis resta inexécuté, si bien que faute de tout contrôle un directeur de caisse pût voler librement 800.000 fr. en 1810. L'administration se montrait souvent faible, divisée : mais pour le voir, il faut étudier par le menu un secteur d'administration, et retrouver les bonnes

émis en 1808⁽²⁵⁾, et sur bien des points, l'administration ministérielle est médiocre, incertaine, inefficace⁽²⁶⁾ : la province n'obéit pas (les préfets sont parfois complices), on affirme partout la régularité des comptes hospitaliers, mais en 1817, l'Inspection des finances découvre que les comptes des hospices ne sont pas rendus depuis 6 ou 7 ans dans tel ou tel département⁽²⁷⁾.

Bérenger dans **De la justice criminelle en France** souligne – sous la Restauration– que les conseils de préfecture fonctionnent de la façon la plus médiocre, que le gouvernement impérial "mettait fort peu d'importance au choix de ces officiers (les conseillers); presque de toutes parts, il nommait des hommes nuls, ou peu versés dans les affaires, afin sans doute que chaque préfet pût plus facilement s'en rendre maître. On ne les soumet d'ailleurs à aucun noviciat, on n'exige d'eux ni stage, ni études préalables. Il semblerait que la loi qui les a institués ait craint de leur trop d'instruction et de caractère"⁽²⁸⁾ : le flou paraissait, en ces périodes difficiles, la meilleure solution,

– il faudrait détailler un jour les formes de ce désordre général, les lenteurs d'une administration à principes variables, les excès d'un

⁽²⁵⁾ Et probablement jusqu'en 1814 (les billets de sols, d'une légalité douteuse, existaient dans nombre de villes jusqu'en 1848). Cf. La monnaie en France au début du XIXe siècle, 1983, p. 215–223.

⁽²⁶⁾ Denis Woronoff pour l'administration des mines et les forges, donne quelques exemples dans L'industrie sidérurgique en France sous la Révolution et l'Empire, 1984.

⁽²⁷⁾ Archives Nationales, F 15 111. Une histoire de la comptabilité des communes sous l'Empire montrerait de singulières pratiques.

⁽²⁸⁾ Bérenger souligne méchamment que "la manière de procéder devant ces espèces de commission, n'est environnée d'aucune formes; les affaires n'y sont pas instruites; il n'y a point de plaidoiries, point de séances publiques, rien de ce qui peut mettre le juge en garde contre l'erreur, ou préserver les parties des sourdes insinuations (...). Tout est surprise, tout est fait dans le mystère, sur des mémoires qui peuvent n'être pas lus, et dont il est facile de soustraire la connaissance aux parties...". Aussi la justice des Conseils de préfecture est-elle "très incertaine, très douteuse". Il nous manque de bonnes études sur les

formalisme médiocre – Fiévée les a dénoncés brutalement⁽²⁹⁾ –, les obstacles rencontrés par les administrateurs pour faire appliquer les règles (par exemple en matière de mines)⁽³⁰⁾ : on a souvent une vision très déformée de l'administration napoléonienne (il est vrai qu'elle passait pour plus efficace, plus éclairée, moins arbitraire que celle de la Restauration, souvent fort médiocre)⁽³¹⁾, mais les **zones de désordre** sont fort nombreuses⁽³²⁾ : il aurait fallu du temps, beaucoup de temps – 10, 20 ans – et des hommes neufs, bien formés, pour "régulariser" cette administration, qui fut certainement plus faible, moins efficace, moins intelligente qu'on ne l'a cru⁽³³⁾.

On voit où tendent ces quelques remarques : l'idée de "modèle napoléonien" nous paraît, dans sa généralité, quelque peu illusoire : c'est une idée **ni claire ni distincte**, au mieux une **commodité de langage** (le mot "modèle" est étranger à l'histoire administrative, il est emprunté abusivement aux sociologues)⁽³⁴⁾. Il faut beaucoup de prudence pour explorer ce qui s'est passé dans ces années difficiles, où l'on a été obligé de **reconstituer** une économie, une société : par

⁽²⁹⁾ Cf. **Témoins de l'administration**, 1967, p. 80-81 (Fiévée a dénoncé, non sans raison, "la légèreté, le désordre et la confusion" qui règnent dans certaines affaires : certain décret suspendu pendant huit ans aurait rapporté à une entreprise 860.000 fr. de bénéfices (*Correspondance*, t. III, p. 89).

⁽³⁰⁾ Fiévée donne ainsi un exemple à propos des mines de houille de la Sarre (*ibidem*, t. III).

⁽³¹⁾ Il faudra un jour faire une analyse détaillée de la médiocrité de l'administration sous la Restauration, surtout après 1820.

⁽³²⁾ Rappelons de Michel Bruguère **Gestionnaires et profiteurs de la Révolution** (1986) qui donne nombre de pistes intéressantes pour l'Empire. Pour une théorie du désordre administratif, cf. les réflexions de Pierre Lenain, **Le désordre politique**, 1992, p. 8-13 : une **sémiologie** du désordre administratif devrait être établie.

⁽³³⁾ La passion politique a souvent joué en ce domaine : et le Second Empire a cherché souvent à présenter sous son beau jour la bureaucratie napoléonienne.

⁽³⁴⁾ Il est possible qu'il y ait pas des **modèles partiels**, pour des administrations techniques (comme celle des Ponts & Chaussées), modèles "exportables" sans doute, mais ce sont plutôt des **modes d'organisation** (et pour

métier, l'historien est sceptique, il se méfie des grands principes, des constructions doctrinales ou juridiques, des "vues générales" déconnectées des archives⁽³⁵⁾, il sait d'expérience que l'on a toujours grand mal à saisir les tâtonnements les hésitations, les tensions, les contre poids : ce qui va directement contre l'emploi des "modèles"...

SUMMARY

G. Thuillier criticizes the very use of the phrase "Napoleonic model" and explains his opinion with a series of notes :

1. This "model" is neither described nor taught. There is hardly any documents about the administrative system under the Empire. Moreover, there was no teaching of administrative and public law;
2. What people call "Napoleonic model" is the administrative system that was enforced in some states; now, this system borrowed as many principles from both the old regime and the French Revolution than from the Empire itself. The result was an amount of often contradictory administrative laws which were thus unusable. So the case law "replaced" the law itself, but the enormous amount of precedents made it impossible to draw up rules and principles. The only solution was to consider each case according to the circumstances;
3. Moreover, the phrase "administrative model" is a reducing one. Indeed, the most important part of the system was the introduction of the Common Law, the penal code, the new principles of fiscality and the economic principle of freedom of trade and industry. That is why one can talk about a "judicial and economic model of society" because these principles were explicitly formalized;
4. The principles of administration were not codified: custom and practise played a major role. Moreover they were not clearly defined and thus the circumstances played a major role as well;

⁽³⁵⁾ Malgré sa bonne volonté, Taine, par ses généralisations hâtives et ses interprétations "politiques", a rendu les plus mauvais services à l'histoire administrative.

5. Maybe it is not reasonable to talk about a "model" at all. Historians can only find out an enormous and persistent disorder in this period, because of the lack of actual principles, the unefficient making up of administration and the appointment of unqualified people to important offices.

REMARQUES SUR L'ADMINISTRATION FRANÇAISE D'ANCIEN RÉGIME (L'ÉMERGENCE DE LA SPÉCIFICITÉ ADMINISTRATIVE FRANÇAISE)

François MONNIER

Il est peu de domaines qui véhiculent autant d'idées reçues que l'administration d'ancien régime. Il est vrai que l'agencement des pouvoirs aboutissait à une organisation dans laquelle la souveraineté, avec tous ses attributs, appartenait formellement à un seul homme. D'où des amalgames faciles à réaliser et des accusations d'absolutisme et d'arbitraire aisées à prononcer.

Ce système appartient à l'histoire. Il ne peut être question de le louer ni de le condamner, seulement de s'efforcer de l'appréhender sans parti pris. Mais avant tout, force est de constater que c'est un système qui s'inscrit dans le temps, qui a duré. Et pour ce faire, il a du s'adapter. Il ne forme pas un tout unitaire, comme on est trop habitué à le croire. De fondement philosophique aristotélécien, la monarchie administrative n'a jamais cessé de se chercher, sans jamais pour autant réussir à trouver sa forme définitive, à la poursuite toujours d'un incertain et improbable équilibre. Ce faisant, elle a inventé bien des principes modernes d'administration, repris tant par la révolution que par les XIXe siècles, mais aussi bien de ses carences ou de ses anomalies. En fait, la construction s'est révélée plus solide qu'on ne l'a fait croire, notre administration moderne reproduisant le système monarchique du roi siégeant en ses conseils, administrant le territoire au moyen de ses intendants. Un système repris par l'Empire démocratisé sous la IIIe république et restauré sous la IVe.

I. LES PRINCIPES D'ORGANISATION DES POUVOIRS

S'il ne faut certes pas nier, à l'image de Tocqueville, la rupture révolutionnaire et son lot d'innovations profondes, il ne faut pas pour autant méconnaître certains éléments de continuité. On discerne sans difficulté les innovations que la révolution a mises en oeuvre et proposées au reste du monde, notamment sa reconnaissance du concept de nation, son rationalisme, ses principes théoriques de

THE USE OF MODELS IN ADMINISTRATIVE HISTORY, A REPLY TO THUILLIER

Jos C.N. RAADSCHELDERS

The *Napoleonic model of administration* refers to an omnipresent government based on a uniform division of a territory, a uniform organisation of the administrative apparatus (hierarchical, unity of command), an administration separated from politics (elected assemblies with limited powers, depoliticised administrative apparatus, appointed instead of elected officeholders), and a civil service that is internally controlled by administrative law and recruited on grounds of expertise.⁽¹⁾ Vincent Wright noted how this 'model' is both rational in its organizational form as well as ambivalent in its governing principles. One could raise the question whether or not a Napoleonic model of administration exists/existed. In my view it did since Bonaparte applied various ancient and medieval practices in administration (such as a uniform territorial division, experts in administration, hierarchy, the use of records), ideas from the middle ages and Renaissance (separation of office and officeholder), and ideas from the early modern period (unity of command, separation of politics and administration, use of statistics). It is the combination of these practices and ideas dispersed in time that was put to use by Napoleon and it is possible to speak of a Napoleonic model. Thuillier argues that a distinct Napoleonic model of administration does not exist, since it was "...ni décrit, ni enseigné..."; and consisted of elements from both the Ancien Régime, the Revolution, and the Empire. His point of view is clearly summarized in the last sentence:

"...par métier, l'historien est sceptique, il se méfie des grands principes, des constructions doctrinales ou juridiques, des "vues générales" déconnectées des archives, il sait d'expérience que l'on a toujours grand mal à saisir les tâtonnements, les hésitations, les tensions, les contre poids: ce qui directement contre l'emploi des "modèles..."

⁽¹⁾ The tentative based on Bernd Wunder, 'Rapport général', presented at meeting of working group on Administrative History The Napoleonic model of

His arguments, though, seem to go beyond and address the issue as to whether or not 'models' are useful. And so I will address the usefulness of the Napoleonic model in the wider framework of the use of models in historical and social-scientific research.

Thullier's argument is one of a classical Rankean historian. It is well-known how history became an academic discipline in the early 19th century. Textbooks on the development of the discipline invariably refer to Leopold von Ranke as the man who gave history a scholarly background. At the time history was badly in need of undisputed facts (separating facts from fiction) through document-research and interpretation (*Kritische Philologie*) and meticulous archive research. The historian's goal was to establish *Wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* and creating understanding through displaying the events in their *Zusammenhang*.⁽²⁾ In the second half of the 19th century Weber, *inter alia*, made clear that facts are interpreted in the framework of the observer: facts are not objective, and therefore our interpretative framework needs to be presented explicitly. At that time the search for *Warum es eigentlich passiert ist* had become full-blown. Many historians and social scientists in the 20th century have taken the up habit to explicit their framework and search for 'why'. And not only that, after the Second World War many historians pursued research along social scientific lines using theories and models, and many a social scientist entered the realms of history by searching in primary sources for support or refutation of theories and models.⁽³⁾ However, in its 20th century variety the Rankean historian⁽⁴⁾ is weary and even suspicious of the social sciences' methods when penetrating the past.

Thullier's opposition appears to gravitate around the use of models. In the natural sciences a 'model' is a formal representation of reality and phrased in 'mathematical' language. In the social sciences models are of quite a different nature. Sometimes they seem to be

(2) T.R. Tholfsen, *Historical Thinking: An Introduction* (New York, 1967), 173.

(3) See for overview Michael Kammen (1987). 'Historical Knowledge and Understanding' in: *ibidem*, *Salvages and Biases*. *The Fabric of History in American Culture* (Thaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1987) 3-63.

(4) Admitted, the expression 'Rankean historian' does not do justice to Ranke. Maybe I should speak of 'Buryan historian' after J.B. Bury who, in his inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge (1902), presented *Wie es eigentlich gewesen ist* as a " warning against transgressing the province

used as a straightjacket within which the facts are made to fit.⁽⁵⁾ In the field of history this is known as anachronism and present-mindedness and should be considered quasi-scientific. The correct use of a model in the social and historical sciences is when it serves to compare reality with. A model of this kind is known as *idealtyp*, a concept developed by Weber. In his exploration of history through the use of idealtypes Weber is extremely cautious and goes to great length explaining the proper use of idealtypes.⁽⁶⁾ His idealtyp of bureaucracy did not, does not, and never will exist, but combines various elements from ancient, medieval, and early modern administrative practices and ideas. Despite his warnings the notion of idealtyp was frequently misunderstood, and required reminders.⁽⁷⁾

Why are models used? First it helps to interpret facts instead of just piling them up in the belief that through chronology and *Zusammenhang* the understanding will emerge of its own accord. Second a model is meant to simplify, but does not necessarily mutilate (past) reality as Thuillier suggests. Through the use of models we can understand how things came about, and more importantly maybe even why. The mechanisms behind events may never be revealed, but models do get us closer to the why. Third the use of models may help to raise new questions. Such trivial facts as dates of birth and death, ancestry, the publication of a charter, or a military battle, may – in principle – not change, but our interest in the past changes and so does our interpretation of the past. The use of a model redirects and channels our interests into unexplored topics (economic history; the history of homosexuality; the history of women; the history of labor) that

(5) This is *inter alia* argued by G.R. Elton, *The Practice of History* (Bungay: Richard Clay Ltd, 1984; originally 1967). I quote: "Sociologists establish 'models' which they test by supposedly empirical evidence. To an historian this seems a very dangerous procedure: far too often the model seems to dictate the selection of facts used to confirm it". (p. 55) and the continues "Saving the social scientist from himself (and society from the social scientist) may be a worthy reason for studying history..." (p. 56).

(6) Max Weber, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre* (hrsg. Johannes Winckelmann) (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1985) 146-214.

(7) Renate Mayntz, 'Max Webers Idealtypus der Bürokratie und die

help us understand our own times. The fourth reason is maybe the most important, for it is through the use of a model that *systematic comparisons* (cross-time, cross-national, cross-level, cross-policy) are made possible. In comparative research we seek not to force the facts in a framework, as Thuillier and Elton fear, but we seek to uncover similarities and differences among and between systems. Indeed, it positively helps to identify the specificities and peculiarities of a particular system. From a normative point of view comparative research helps us to be both more appreciative and more critical of the society wherein we grew up. From an empirical point of view systematic comparison reveals both common traits as well as indigenous adaptations. Thuillier warns that the use of models does not allow for disorder. I would argue that proper use of models (their comparative relation to reality) presupposes disorder.

Some researchers will favor to stay close to the facts, like Thuillier. Others embark upon a search for mechanisms and trends. The one cannot do without the other. How poor historical research would be if not supported by data from primary, archival sources. But also, how boring historical research would be if no attempt was made to develop a more generalized framework building upon and arising from the very same archives Thuillier cherishes, and pulling together a mass of information from secondary sources.⁽⁸⁾ A model in general is definitely not "... une commodité de langage..." as Thuillier argues, nor is the Napoleonic model as defined above. To be sure: "This is not a plea for writing history 'backwards', for structuring history in the light of current preoccupations. It is merely a reminder that, perhaps, social scientists and historians (...) are locked into interdependency, and that inherent tensions should not prevent interaction".⁽⁹⁾

I would like to rephrase Thuillier's final remark: "by trade the historian and the social scientist (and so: the student of administrative history) is sceptical, he searches for facts as well as grand principles, and attempts to develop generalized views based on archival work, from experience he knows both the risks and the attractiveness of the

use of models, and therefore does not need to hesitate when using them: all this argues directly in favor of the use of models....".

⁽⁸⁾ An excellent example in my view is Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990* (Oxford/Cambridge, Mass.: Basil Blackwell, 1990).

⁽⁹⁾ Vincent Wright, 'The History of French Mayors: Lessons and Problems' in: