

Woodrow Wilson's Theory's Implications in a Cambodian Context: A Review of "The Study of Administration"

Chhun Seakkeav

ABSTRACT

The issue of the politics-administration dichotomy is one of the great issues in the field of public administration which has a very long history, and it has been one of the most complicated points in the field. At the centre of public administration is the relationship between administrators on one side, and politicians and the public on the other side. That relationship's nature and the proper role of political leaders and administrators in the administrative and political process have been the subject of considerable debate. This article is a documentary-based paper conducted to express the general concept and analysis of Mr. Woodrow Wilson's theory on his written work "The Study of Administration" (1887), which mainly focuses on the politics and administration dichotomy, the bureaucracy (top-down management), and its general implication. Moreover, there is a discussion and review of the relationship between politics and administration from various thoughts and theorists including analysis and opinion related to the use of those concepts in real society especially in Cambodia.

Keywords: public administration, politics-administration dichotomy, bureaucracy, Cambodia

I. Introduction

The early proposition of separating the fields of politics and public administration occurred during the late 1800s. Specifically, in 1887, an essay of President Wilson entitled "The Study of Administration" which suggested the idea of a politics-administration dichotomy emerged. During the postwar period, education in public administration was spread widely by American political science professors and civil service reformers. "Public administration embraces every area governed by public policy... including the formal processes through which the legislative exercises its power [and] the function of courts in the administration of justice" (Fesler *et al.*, 1946). Now, the call for an administration that listens to people's demands, for public administrators who serve the marginalized, as well as for future administrators who will rise to the challenge of upholding good governance, will

always remain loud and clear. However, if we look at public administration in Cambodia, a study found out that decentralization in Cambodia is limited by both cultural (Blunt and Turner 2005) and legal constraints (Prum (a), 2005). “Deconcentration in Cambodia remains piecemeal and can only be found in individual practice by individual ministries. There is not a harmonized policy for it” (Prum (b), 2005). “Public Administration Reform can be very comprehensive and include process changes in areas such as organizational structures, decentralisation, personnel management, public finance, results-based management, regulatory reforms etc.” (UNDP, 2005).

The purpose of this paper is to focus on and relate the concept of Wilson about the relationship between politics and administration (the politics-administration dichotomy) and its implications to Cambodia context. Based on existing studies and views, this study demonstrates whether politics and administration should be separated or connected with each other relying on Wilson’s theory and whether it is now still relevant, especially in the Cambodian context, though analysis and discussion. Moreover, it is essential to consider how the politics-administration dichotomy can be applied successfully correlated with the assistance of other relevant aspects.

There are seven sections in this paper. After the introductory one, a summary of Mr. Woodrow Wilson’s theory based on his work “The Study of Administration” (1887) is conducted. Next, in section three, there is a brief literature review associated with the general concept of Wilson which consists of both similar and contrasting ideas from several other scholars. Moreover, an analysis of this theory is also conducted, informed by the perspectives in public administration practices under current circumstances and their implementation – especially in developing countries. In the fifth section, the study will focus on the general ideas of Wilson’s theory’s implication in the context of Cambodia’s public administration and political situation. Later on, there is a discussion whether Wilson’s theory is able to be applied to Cambodia or not, and how to make it useful and successful. Finally, the last section is a conclusion of overall thoughts and discussion related to public administration and political development specifically in Cambodia which should be taken into consideration to reform or develop a better and reliable national administrative system.

II. A Summary of Mr. Thomas Woodrow Wilson's Theory from "The Study of Administration" (1887)

Thomas Woodrow Wilson was the 28th President of the United States (1913-1921). He became President of Princeton University (1902-1910) and later on, he continued to be Governor of New Jersey (1911-1913). Wilson expressed his ideas on public administration in his essay: "The Study of Administration" (1887). He presented the idea that politics and administration are completely different and separated from each other and he also wanted public administration to stay independently of politics. "The field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics..." (Wilson, 1887, p. 209) and "Administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not political questions. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices." (Wilson, 1887, p. 210). He added that politics is a state activity that is "great and universal". In contrast to politics, administration is state activity in "individual and small things".

Wilson defined the science of administration as the latest study of the science of politics which began approximately 2,200 years ago (Wilson, 1887, p. 198). He also clearly described public administration's nature and confirmed that the study of public administration can allow officials to increase governmental efficiency by stating that "Administration... is government in action; it is the executive, the operative, the most visible side of government, and is of course as old as government itself" (Wilson, 1887, p. 198). Moreover, his essay proved that public administration is a specific part of and systematic application of public law. All concrete execution of general law is an act of administration. Therefore, the functioning of general laws appears to be external to but dependant on administration. "The broad plans of governmental action are not administrative; the detailed execution of such plans is administrative" (Wilson, 1887, p. 212).

In his essay, "The Study of Administration", Wilson demonstrates that administration was not widely focused until he looks at Europe (England, Germany, and France) and finds his model for American administration. He said, "No one wrote systematically of administration as a branch of the science of government until the present century had passed" (Wilson, 1887, p. 198). Furthermore, he explained the goal of public administration reform by saying that "A science of administration shall seek to straighten the paths of government,

to make its business less unbusinesslike, to strengthen and purify its organization, and to crown its duties with dutifulness” (Wilson, 1887, p. 201).

After the Civil War, the United States’ constitution was reframed. Wilson thought that America had to be ready for developing its administration under the new constitution. He confirmed that based on popular sovereignty; the way of organizing administration for democratic society is harder than for a monarchical society because there were obstacles to spreading public opinion during that reign. As a result, he suggested that “In order to make any advance at all we must instruct and persuade a multitudinous monarch called public opinion, a much less feasible undertaking than to influence a single monarch called a king” (Wilson, 1887, p. 207).

Furthermore, Wilson emphasized that the administrator has to be active and pro-active with full responsibility for the job without waiting for orders from politicians or higher ranking managers. He specifically mentioned that “the administrator should have and does have a will of his own in the choice of means for accomplishing his work. He is not and ought not to be a mere passive instrument.” (Wilson, 1887, p. 212). Additionally, he noted that it is absolutely crucial to focus on civil service culture and public opinion by means of elections and constant public counseling on democratic society.

Woodrow Wilson (1887) expressed the theoretical basis for political administrative concepts and, likewise, Max Weber (1947) contributed a similar idea to identify the pattern of rational administration as a distinguished area separated from and subordinate to politics. Weber proposed the ideal type of bureaucracy as assumptions which have written purpose by laying down laws, papers, and policy statutes. This apparently established a hierarchy of the ‘primacy of policy on paper’ and also identified a hierarchy in the view of policy implementation. Regarding Wilson (1887), he states that “Bureaucracy can exist only where the whole service of the state is removed from the common political life of the people, its chiefs as well as its rank and file. Its motives, its objects, its policy, its standards, must be bureaucratic.” (Wilson, 1887, p. 217).

Woodrow Wilson’s essay (The Study of Administration) instigated a long academic discussion between different schools of thought which called attention to public administration. The development of three essential approaches or paradigms brought about by this knowledge allow the description of the structure, purpose, power, function, and

implementation of public administration theory. Universalism, pluralism, and participatory democracy are three paradigms that have become crucial standards for public administrative practices. All three paradigms have specific perspectives relevant to public administration - political system relationship, the nature of administrative tasks, the administrative decision-making model, and the rationale for the paradigm (Crate, 2003).

According to Crate (2003), universalism is a top-down process of administrative structure which illustrates that the executive is the supreme authority so the relationship of public administration is differentiated from the political system. The public and elected officials have equal influence in executive decisions directly via the process of administration and public opinion by the process of election. In accordance to this, Wilson (1887, p: 214) stated that “public opinion shall play the part of authoritative critic”. Later, Huntington and Nelson (1976) stated that public interest deals with the interest of public institutions. Also, Amsden (1988) mentioned that the critical necessity of the state is ultimately the role of public institutions in the development process, which implies that public institutions must follow modernization. The administrative tasks of universalism are fixed in science and law, following cause and effect by scientific method processes. Woodrow Wilson described his view on universalism as “Public Administration is the detailed and systematic execution of public law” (Wilson, 1887, p. 212). Moreover, Fredrick W. Taylor (1912) provides a deeper definition and description in his article “Scientific Management” with particular control led by management such as rewarding initiative with incentives which is able to encourage workers to become more efficient. Likewise, Fredrick’s view also supports Wilson’s opinion of exploring a top-down system in order to produce efficient workers for effective cost of products and service.

Furthermore, “pluralism is the theory of a multitude of groups such as unions, trade associations, professional associations, business and financial lobbies, civil rights activists, environmentalists, and formal or informal coalitions of citizens, who influence the making and administration of laws and policy” (Reynolds, 2001). Interest groups of different strengths participate in the function of administration as, for example, through officials, consultants, socioeconomic factors, representatives of various citizens, and ethnic or other groups all of whose views are counted in pluralism (Crate, 2003). Based on the view of Laverty (2002), groups’ strength depends on the group’s size. However, power, strength, and group effectiveness are also considerably based on the amount of funds used for supporting

the group, their particular political practical experience, and the representative's negotiating skills. "To make matters worse, as the issues grow more numerous and technical, less well-financed interest groups find it hard to continue participating in the process. They often lack the time, the resources, or the expertise to continue reviewing all of the information that becomes part of the rule-making record. Yet as their engagement wanes, so does the pluralistic engine considered so fundamental to the administrative process" (Wagner, 2010). The administrative task of pluralism could be completed by proceeds from a negotiated action between interest groups. The actual decisions on administrative tasks and changes of policy are conducted as an additional aspect to groups' negotiation and administrative executives.

The third paradigm is participatory democracy, which includes all participants who desire to take part in the process; therefore, there is a direct relationship among public administration and the political system with citizens, interest groups, and other citizens who are interested or motivated for participation (Crate, 2003). In a participatory democracy, the model of administrative decisions model uses mixed scanning strategy which integrates a detailed and logical examination of some sectors with a short review of other sectors (Etzioni, 1967). Based on the view of Abraham Lincoln, participatory democracy is the ideal expression of democracy that "this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the earth" (Wendt, 1999). Put another way, it can be said that it is not only a question of democratic development (democracy). Political development therefore is not integrally linked to democratic development, but it can be measured by the degree of institutionalization (Binder, Pye, Coleman, Verba, Palombra, & Weiner 1971). Democracy, however, *may* lead to more transparent control over the bureaucracy and it may create more visible accountability.

III. Literature Review

Similarly to Woodrow Wilson thoughts, Nicholas Henry mentioned in his book "Paradigms of Public Administration" (1975) Paradigm 1: The Politics/Administration Dichotomy (1900-1926) which he quoted from "Politics and Administration" (1900) by Goodnow and White, and emphasizes that there are two different functions of government such as politics, which deals with policies or expressions of the state, while administration deals with the implementation of these policies. The divided powers provide the distinction

between the legislative branch, which is helped by the informative abilities of the judicial branch, showing the state's will and which shapes policy, while the executive branch implements those policies equally and without political bias. The final result of Paradigm 1 is to make the thought of separating politics and administration become strong by relating it to matching values or facts. Hence, everything that public administrators examine in the executive branch is correctly influenced by both factual and scientific values while the study of public policy-making and relevant issues is left to political scientists. He confirmed that it is a possibility to separate administration from politics, but that it is impossible to practice by having two functions for one branch of government (Goodnow, 1900, pp. 9-13). Goodnow described that the actual aspects of administration were violated by politics and thus they should be kept apart from each other. According to his phrase, "political control over administrative functions is liable...to produce inefficient administration in that it makes administrative officers feel that what is demanded of them is not so much work that will improve their own department, as compliance with the behests of the political party" (Goodnow, 1900, p. 83).

In early twentieth century, Max Weber also presented his agreement about a dichotomy between politics and administration but the direction that he explains is the opposite of Wilson and Goodnow. Weber demonstrated that politics are too weak to limit administrative power and this is the trouble of *Beamtenherrschaft* (government by functionaries). As a result, he claimed that it is crucial that administration stays out of politics (Weber, 1919, p. 28). In "Politikals Beruf" Weber showed a clear boundary between administrators and politicians: "According to his proper vocation, the genuine civil servant...should not engage in politics, but administer, above all impartially... . Hence, he shall precisely not do what the politician, the leader as well as his following, must always and necessarily do, namely, fight. For partisanship, fight, passion and stadium are the politician's element."(Weber, 1919, pp. 27-28). According to Weber, in political disagreement, public administrators should operate above all equally and remain in politics. Overeem (2005, p.317) contended that in its common concept, the separation between politics and administration inferred a deep concern about the political neutrality of administrators. Even though efforts are made to take politics out of administration as in the case of Wilson and Goodnow or as in the case of Weber, the aim is always to keep administration neutral and outside political debate.

Likewise, Van Riper (1984, p. 209-210) argued that between around 1910 to 1950 studies in the literature on public administration practice illustrate a distance between politics and administration. The necessity for shaping division is to allow the establishment of scientific methods which both keep administration from the untrained politician and also made the administrator an expert who is above politics. In Gulick (1933, p.63)'s view, the difference between politics and administration is not only in terms of principle, but also in terms of specialization and the division of labor. He stated that "The reason for separating politics from administration is not that their combination is a violation of a principle of government. The reason for insisting that the elected legislative and executive officials shall not interfere with the details of administration, and that the rank and file of the permanent administrators shall be permanent and skilled and shall not meddle with politics, is that this division of work makes use of specialization and appears to give better results than a system where such a differentiation does not exist." (Cited by Waldo, 1948, p.124) Regarding this view, it explains that the dichotomy model is not an idea directly noted by founders of public administration, but those ideas transform to make the designed approach. The idea of a strictly separated dichotomy model was part of scientific management as well as the administrative principle, however, it was forgotten in the early 1940s and the ideas that focus on interaction between politics and administration replaced it.

In contrast, in the late 1940s and early 1950s, the politics-administration dichotomy was criticized, attacked, and rejected by many other authors. Within the state, there was concern over democracy and bureaucracy to satisfy public servants in order to protect democratic principles. Dwight Waldo claimed that the political administration dichotomy of Woodrow Wilson was false in his book "The Administrative States" (1948). Waldo (1948, p. 128) reviewed the extensive literature on the issue and concluded that any ordinary division of government into politics and administration is insufficient. He noted that "As the 1930s advanced, doubt and dissent increased. In the 1940s refutation and repudiation came to the fore. By the 1950s it had become common to refer to the politics administration dichotomy as an outworn if not ludicrous creed." (Waldo, 1987, p. 93). Dwight Waldo believed that public servants' own political positions required more than just accomplishing policy implementation set by officials who are elected. They also have to consider efficiencies required by the scientific management movement with the right procedure and access to government. Government is unable to run the same way as a business. Following the constitution and other democratic orders make the management of the government unit far

more challenging than a comparable private sector organization. Waldo introduced The Great Society as his own concept that relied on the private sector. He also expressed that in the U.S., business supports the state while it should be the other way around. Additionally, with the evolution of social trends in the U.S., basis laws were ruined by new ideas so changing the whole concept of government and public administration.

Moreover, we can find another critique in Paul Henson Appleby's work. In "Policy and Administration" (1949), Appleby described politics as everything that deals with the government and the entire action that the government does. Therefore, he concluded that "administration could indeed not be no part of it" (1949, p. 3). According to Appleby's opinion, it is not possible to draw a distinction between politics and administration. Every issue relating to the government hierarchy is known as policy. "If an issue becomes more controversial, it will rise in the hierarchy and, thus, will be seen as policy by a greater number of functionaries and as administration by a smaller number of functionaries." (Tahmasebi & Musavi (2011). Appleby noted that "in the perspective of an outside observer or the public administration theorist, policy and administration are treated together at every level" (1949, p. 22). Hence, an issue can be either policy or administration and they relate to one another. Specifically, policy and administration seem to be two sides of the same thing so there is no use claiming that they are two separable governmental functions. Appleby concluded that public administration is "not autonomous, exclusive or isolated but is policy making nonetheless" (1949, p. 170). He drew a line between politics and other forms of politics by his explanation that "Everything having to do with the government and everything the government does is political, for politics is the art and science of government. But in terms of mass, only a small part of politics is partisan" (1949, p. 153).

Finally, the cause of rejecting the politics-administration separation was because of ethical considerations proven in the New Public Administration (NPA). According to George Frederickson in "The Lineage of New Public Administration" (1976, p. 167-169), it is argued that these democratic values should be executed by administrators as responsible individuals. Administrators for the first time were allowed to apply their own personal value judgements in public decision-making. Frederickson pointed out that their scholarly effort began by challenging old administrative values. The norms of classical and new bureaucratic theory were "efficiency, economy, productivity, and centralization" but the new public administration emphasized humanistic values that can be realized in "decentralized,

democratic organizations which distribute public service equitably.” Therefore, politics and administration could not to be separate to each other.

IV. Analysis of Woodrow Wilson’s Theory

In fact, Woodrow Wilson concluded that politics and administration have to stay apart from each other because politics deals with the expression of the will of people, politicians, elections, and power, while administration deals with the execution of the will of the people, civil servants, selection, and how to run administration successfully. “Let it be noted that it is the distinction, already drawn, between administration and politics which makes the comparative method so safe in the field of administration” (Wilson, 1887, p. 220). Likewise, it is true that administrative tasks are fixed in law and science so the process of scientific method with clear management empowers separated responsibility and the connection between politics and administration in order to produce effective and efficient results, products, or services. When we look to the administrative structure, the final authority is the executor and the relationship between public administration and the wider political system is discrete but the public and elected officials equally influence executive decisions directly through administrative processes and public opinion via the election process. The relationship is accelerated by improving participation of all citizens in formal and informal discussion organized to gain information, personal or individual perspective, and overall citizen opinion of a specific issue or policy. Then, this information is used in policy decision-making via the legislative, regulatory and administrative process.

The early public administration’s hope was that both politicians and administrators would fulfill the public interest by working together. As Svara (2006)observed, “my interpretation of the nature of interaction between elected officials and administrators shifted (over the 9 years) from a partial endorsement of the dichotomy model to a demonstration that both sets of officials have extensive interactions, are interdependent, and have reciprocal influence” (Svara, *The Search for Meaning in Political-Administrative Relations in Local Government*, 2006, p. 1065). New research revealed that traditional thinkers like Wilson (1887) and Goodnow (1900) paid more attention to the clarification of mutual roles so that elected officials as well as professional administrators could work more effectively as a group of civic leaders (Svara, 1998). The point is that politics should have less power over administration than its description suggested for the public interest.

As Svvara (1985) noted, basically there are three important tasks for working out the question of how politics and administration should be connected to each other. We should (1) conceptualize the politics–administration relationship in a mode that is less dichotomous yet more cooperative, (2) evaluate the alternative model with systematic data in order to identify patterns in practice, and (3) provide support with empirical evidence that the alternative model to the dichotomy produces desired results without compromising democratic accountability and administrative performance. If these three steps are successful, it is less likely that discussion about the tension between how the political–administrative life actually works and how it should work would be an issue.

Accordingly, Wilson’s theory is of limited use. In fact, everything in this world is permanently changed over time and from one to another context of the country so there are exact differences in terms of governance, politics, culture, public mindset and so on. Therefore, the development study or research results of founders from one to another generation keep changing according to various situations. However, if Wilson’s theory is applied specifically Cambodia, it is not good enough to fulfill the development needs of the whole country. Cambodia’s politics system seems to be more subordinate than autonomous; hence, it is unable to adapt to changes. It seems impossible to change management easily. According to Riggs (2001), in developing countries, changes are related to the attitudes of political leaders and how far political elites support the changes. The level of development depends on the ruling elites and how willing they are to support development and share power (Rautakivi, 2014).

Apparently, the leader of Cambodia stays in the same position for more than thirty years, holding his highest power and supporting his acquaintances for protecting their own as well as their group interests but not public interest at all. This illustrates the relationship between politics and administration is too close. For example, the authority who has an important role as an administrator pays much attention to how to satisfy his upper-level authority who came from the same political party, the one who is corrupted, and has the ability to provide a higher position and other benefits for them and not focus much on public interest. As Kea (2005: 151) mentioned, “Communal leaders are loyal to the ruling party. They believe that they will benefit more [...] through maintaining good relationships with their political leader. If they do not follow their party’s policy, their villages may be cut off

from national level development assistance [...]. Sometimes, local leaders have to step down because of the lack of political performance [...].”

In the proposed idea of Wilson (1887), the politics-administration dichotomy may not be practically appropriate. Definition of the dichotomy model is ‘strict’. It is not conceptually possible, as Montjoy and Watson (1995) suggest and as many practitioners would prefer, to have a one-way dichotomy that keeps elected officials out of administration but allows administrators to be active in policy making” (Svara, 1998, p. 52). Svara simply illustrates that the dichotomy poses “A strict separation between elected officials and administration and a narrow, instrumental role of administrators” (Svara & Brunet 2003, p. 202). He adds the dichotomy model (Svara, 2007, p. 37) as follows:

1. Elected officials do not get involved in administration.
2. Administrators have no involvement in shaping policies.
3. Administrators occupy the role of a neutral expert whose responsibility is restricted to efficiently and effectively carrying out the policies of elected officials.
4. Presumably, administrators do not exercise discretion. To do so opens the door to interpreting policy and choosing how and to what extent it will be applied.

Politics sets up policy for administrators, known as public servants, to fulfill political positions that include more tasks, not just accomplishing policy implementation set by elected officials.

Public administration is "centrally concerned with the organization of government policies and programs as well as the behavior of officials (usually non-elected) formally responsible for their conduct (UN Economic and Social Council , 2006) ". Many unelected officials are known as public administrators such as census analysts, police officers, human resource administrators, state managers, budget/financial analysts, cabinet secretaries etc. (Kettl and James, 2009). “Public servants” refers to those whose position is in government agencies or departments in every level, simply, those officials are known as public administrators. According to Woodrow Wilson, civil servants and academics in the US improved the American civil service reform by making public administration academic in the 1880s (Wilson, 1887). In addition to this, Huntington expresses the idea of “a general

challenge to the existing system of authority, public and private. In one form or another, this challenge manifested itself in the family, the university, business, public and private associations, politics, the governmental bureaucracy and the military service” (Parashar, *Public Administration in the Developed World*, 1997). Because public service permits the chance of becoming rich which is not possible for private citizens, corruption occurs (Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, 1968).

Based on the idea of Huntington (1975), political institutions arrange tasks to maintain order, provide dispute resolution, as well as select leaders with authority. Hence, this could promote political unity between social forces so that political institutions will be more complex and authoritative. Social forces are strong; in contrast, political institutions are weak. Political parties and authorities stay uncertain and disorganized. The state development stays behind the evolution of its society (Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies*, 1968). Political institutions should be created before the occurrence of social and economic development for stable development (Organski, 1965). He added that “political development can be defined as increasing governmental efficiency in utilizing the human and material resources of national goals; additionally there is another aspect to political development. The primary function of national governments also change as nations move from one stage to another, and at each stage, national government, if it is to qualify as development, must fill a new function as well as consolidate the gains of previous developments” (Organski, 1965, p. 7).

Firstly, authority rationalization, relocation of traditional, religious, ethnic political authorities, and national political authority are included in political modernization. Secondly, for the sake of political modernization, new political functions need to be differentiated and develop specialized structures to perform those functions fruitfully. The hierarchies of administration become more specific, complex and more disciplined. Thirdly, active participation of social groups throughout society in politics is crucial for political modernization. In order to maintain stable development and modernization, it is necessary to focus on concentrating and expanding power (Huntington, 1971). For modernization and industrialization, development and nation or state building are considered necessary conditions (Organski, 1965).

Political modernization involves increased participation in politics by social groups throughout society, not only a few social groups like the military or upper class, because then

the scope of administration is narrow and it lacks autonomy (Rautakivi, 2012). Huntington (1968) focuses more deeply and argues that the appearance of a political community in a complex society depends on the strength of political organizations and social procedures. It relies on supportive scope for organizations and procedures, as well as the institutional development level that they have achieved (Huntington, 1975). If political organizations consist of small or upper-class or any other particular group, there is limited scope. If a huge majority of the population is politically organized and follows political procedures, it achieves a broad scope. The broader scope of institutions can be associated with stable, accepted patterns of behavior based on definite values. Organizations differ from procedures in terms of their institutionalization degree.

V. The Implementation of Wilson's Theory in the Cambodian Context

The separation of politics and administration has been a feature of public administrative systems for a long time, and therefore aim to maintain a distance between the roles of administrators and politicians. However, modern research has found that public administration is also counted in politics. In fact, public administration is possibly able to exert political influence, regardless of which part of the public decision-making process is examined. This concept gives rise to several issues and has become a popular discussion topic of interest from a political science perspective. Obviously, because it is partly about governing, politicians have to develop an apparatus of administration that establishes the best possible conditions to ensure that political policies are actually effective. In addition to this, the claim that public administration is also counted in politics means that issues related to democracy are a considerable concern. In a democracy, power always goes along with political responsibility (Weinberger, 1991); however the idea that public administration uses political power leads to issues of how the administration can be accountable. Related to the citizen's perspective, this problem is associated with how to justify the legitimacy of public administrators in a democracy. Therefore, these issues are related to which type of institutions that are required to ensure that public administration does not abuse its powers. As Lord Acton says, "power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely" (Acton, 1887).

There is a failure in political order, weak authority, effectiveness, and governments' legitimacy throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America. Similarly, community and public spirit and political institutions are of inadequate capacity to give definition and guide the way to the public. The result of speedy social change is the quick movement of new politics including slow political institutional development. Political instability in Asia, Africa and Latin America arise from the failure to meet the condition that "Equality of political participation is growing much more than the art of associating together" and that is the institution that is necessary for orderly political behavior (Huntington, 1968).

As is a common characteristic of top-down societies and countries in early developing states, in Cambodia, the administration and politics seem to have a close network and because the public administrators violate their powers or are influenced by political powers, many issues arise and currently the biggest issues are relatively focused on democracy and corruption. Generally, corruption is likely to weaken or retain the weakness of the government bureaucracy (Huntington, 1968). Moreover, a bureaucratic monarchy is able to absorb individuals more than other traditional political systems, so it offers social mobility for the intelligent and skillful person (Huntington, 1968). The major concern is whether it is possible to make a positive change in society by trying to separate administration and politics and how it can be successfully done. In fact, Wilson's theory is applicable, yet it takes time, more political experts, and relevant participation. Moreover, to begin with this theory's implication, the specific roles and duties of public administrators and politicians have to be justified as they are a key area that should be compulsively reformed. "Bureaucracy in a developing country enjoys virtual monopoly in terms of expertise knowledge of rules and procedures." (Parashar, 2003, p. 11). He continues that "the mounting development expenditure in developing societies has been used by various political groups for enhancing their power." (Parashar, 2003, p. 197). In society, bureaucracy is a powerful institution which is capable of enhancing or lowering the state's capacity to perform effectively (Jreisat, 2002).

Complex political systems are not usually efficient like bureaucracies, (Gajdushek, 2003) and most of the time; their adaptability is insufficient to the ability of the political system to make changes within the bureaucracy (Yolles & Fink, 2011). "The primary function of national governments also change as nations move from one stage to another, and at each stage of the national government, if it is to qualify as development, it must fill a new

function as well as consolidate the gains of previous developments” (Organski, 1965, p. 7). Adaptability of function is the exact measurement of a highly developed organization (Huntington, 1968). Pye (1966, pp. 38 - 51) suggests that development and modernization are compulsory needs to establishing a more effective, more adaptive, more complex and more rational organization.

According to the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL), the power of the Cambodian People’s Party (CPP) keeps increasing and this leads to increasing authoritarianism in the Cambodian State. There is enormous concern from NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations) and other related parties about major issues regarding the merging violation of land rights and the restriction of fundamental human rights, especially the expression freedom and freedom of assembly (ICNL, 2014). Moreover, “the current legal framework is open to discretion and its implementation saddled by a weak understanding of the concept of civil society. There is no effective judiciary or effective rule of law in Cambodia” (ICNL, 2014). According to the World Bank report of 2004, in the “control of corruption and the rule of law, Cambodia ranks among the bottom quartile of performers among all countries. Domestic surveys confirm that corruption is endemic and high.” (World Bank, 2004, p. 3). The implementation of the rule of law has never been achieved.

Good governance is obviously critical for the future of Cambodia. Over the last decade, Cambodia’s policy-makers, donors and civil society have recognized that the governance system needs to be improved to match the changing role of the state and strengthening good governance during transition toward liberal democracy and a market economy which is imperative to sustain socio-economic development. The Cambodia Development Resource Institute (CDRI) (2000) conducted a study which emphasizes how to improve good governance in Cambodia for sustainable development. The findings and analysis resulted from the study aiming to contribute insights for policy-making by the Royal Government of Cambodia. Moreover, it identifies some important areas and strategies to assist ADB and other donors to consider.

In Cambodia nowadays, the centralized civil administration is seriously deficient from the point of view of governance. Local needs cannot be fulfilled due to the provision of autonomy or flexibility in expenditure disbursements to local authorities which is too little (CDRI, 2000). As the problem of public funds leakage in the expenditure process indicates,

the system is not capable of standards of fiscal transparency and accountability. Similarly, citizens and local administrators have less opportunity to take part in forming policy and making decisions which directly affect them. The government partially addresses this issue by the expenditure or public finance reform. The Council of Administrative Reform (CAR) determined decentralization as an objective in reforming public administration. Decentralization is planned and conducted through elections and the formulation of communes and commune councils. As Huntington mentions, “evidence suggests that policy innovations are encouraged by a power distribution which is neither highly concentrated nor widely spread out.” (Huntington, 1968, p. 140). “A study of literature on innovation in organizations indicates that systems in which power was dispersed would have many proposals of innovative reforms, but few adoptions, while systems in which power was concentrated would have few reform proposals but many adoptions.” (Huntington, 1975, p. 85).

The request of the Supreme Council on Administrative Reform of the Council of Ministers found that Cambodian households agree that corruption in the public sector is Cambodia’s leading problem and it has been worsening over several years. On the other hand, enterprise survey results show that corruption, by a close margin, is the second worst issue after street crime. “Households, enterprises, and government officials surveyed all ranks of the courts as having the least integrity, followed by the Officer of Prosecution and the Customs Authority.” (Kidd and Richter, 2003, p. 241) However, regarding the survey of poorer households among all households, the largest percentage of their income was paid in bribes and the largest bribes go to health and education authorities (United Nation, 2004). “UN Special Representative has described Cambodia’s shaky façade of democracy overlays a shadow state built on patronage, corruption and coercion” (Leuprecht, 2005). “Cambodia’s shadow state misappropriates public assets, extorts from businesses and manages an extensive illicit economy; moreover, it is administered by senior ministers who are fluent in the jargon of good governance and sustainable development” (Global Witness, 2007, p. 12).

VI. Discussion

A political analyst said on Voice of America (VOA) radio on April 06, 2012 that Cambodia’s public administration is required to be strengthened or else it will lead to instability risks. The analyst, Lao Monghay, provided a comparison that public

administration is like government's arms, legs, and body so in the purpose of responding to social change, the whole body must be strong enough. If this cannot be done, the challenges will be insurmountable which can enable social instability. Cambodian society keeps moving and changing so the administrative system must adapt with it. Laws must be re-enforced, power at both the local and national levels decentralized, corruption dealt with, and the abuse of power shortened. He continued that the main goal is people's well-being and to create a social atmosphere where people live "together as a nation" (Ankorcivilization, 2012).

In developing countries, institutional inexistence or improperness leads the political leaders to pay attention to maximizing their utility even at the expenses of the welfare of the citizens (Shahan & Posner, 2013). To achieve the purpose of accelerating change, both political and administrative institutions have to be evolved which are capable of assuring and sustaining more egalitarian values and nationally accepted political norms. "The functions and responsibilities entailed in these changes are of recent origin and the traditional values and institutions face irresistible pressures for modernization, which in the simplest terms implies restructuring or replacement" (Rothwell, 1987).

Huntington (1968) expresses his essential view which could be related as an example for implementing reforms in Cambodia. He refers to the role of institutions and notes that political institutions with high autonomy and high complexity have procedures to reduce or eliminate the use of violence in the system and clearly defined channels to influence wealth in the system. He emphasised the development of institutions rather than development of democracy and democratization. Huntington (1968, 1975) explored the factors of development and noted that the development process depends on order and institutionalization. Huntington (1968, 1975), argues that political development, political modernization, and democratization needs political institutionalization since institutions provide a space and delivery system of proper political participation, (Huntington, 1968, p. 216) and that power must be concentrated and expanded. In addition to this, Jreaisat (2002) suggests that in many developing countries, the major task needing to be done is not power dispersion but power centralization. Huntington (1968) is in agreement with this and demonstrates that the concentration of power and their roles within this power is what distinguishes developed from developing countries.

"After decades of greater democratization, a new report says that democracy is in retreat throughout ASEAN." (Keck, Z., 2014). He remarkably states that the human rights

commitment of ASEAN has lacked substance, and the growing political, economic and social ties in region work against democratization. “Kurlantzick notes that Cambodia and Myanmar have successfully rolled back some of their already limited political reforms” (Keck, Z., 2014). However, Surya Subedi, the UN’s special envoy for Cambodian human rights, reporting to international groups and the media in Washington, says that the rights environment has improved, but there is still not enough political will, nor enough determination. He pointed out that the government must be pushed by donors and the international community towards serious reform in the judiciary, parliament and other agencies which are responsible for human rights. Clarifying specific improvements are required in the areas of land grabbing, laws to regulate NGOs, and the judiciary, among others, he said (Ankorcivilization, 2012).

In short, in order to apply Wilson’s theory in Cambodia’s context successfully, effective reforms play a truly essential role. Cambodia’s key sectors of reform that are directly related to the above issues of governance are; public administration, decentralization, and legal and judicial systems, including strengthening accountability of institutions and the legal framework for the private sector. In public administration reform, the government needs to work on the necessary activities of its administrative reform program, the civil service census and functional analysis. The government has to consider wisely the foundation activities for the entire administrative reform effort. The government must accelerate the civil service census and other technical activities without the benefit of substantial financial support from donors. The civil service census is related to controls that should be strictly implemented for significant integrity to the re-organized payroll system and personnel database. Moreover, regarding decentralization, the government has to promote rural development which represents the most ambitious and advanced decentralization initiative implemented to date. Substantial training and infrastructure work have to be performed and planning for the election of commune councils which will represent a major decentralization reform. Finally, for the sake of legal and judicial systems reforms, the government should create a high quality and fair inter-ministerial Council on Judicial Reform to coordinate its efforts to reform the judiciary. At the same time, the Ministry of Justice must draft a number of key laws on criminal and civil procedures and implement them effectively. For instance, there should be a highly publicised investigation into corruption within the courts that has resulted in the re-arrest of persons previously released in criminal cases and the replacement of the Judge and Prosecutor of the Court.

VII. Conclusion

Woodrow Wilson started a breakthrough in the study of public administration so that he deserved to earn the title “the father of public administration”. The effort of Woodrow Wilson’s work is notable as the basis for the distinction between public administration and political science which is known as two separated fields of study. However, the scope of political science is broader than public administration in addition to their areas of convergence. Presumably, “the study of administration” is crucial and which emphasizes the major knowledge of public administration. Wilson discussed what developed and developing governments have performed in order to overcome the difficulties of physical application management of the laws imposed by their constitutions as well as their lawmaking bodies. Furthermore, Wilson explained exactly what administration is in the context of United States government and pursued clarification of the best methods of how to develop administration which could be undertaken and improved under its constitution.

Additionally, for the sake of developing Cambodia, the idea of the politics-administration dichotomy proposed by Woodrow Wilson is merely one part for the discussion while many other theories should be included. Development refers to the ability of a society to cope with changes caused by modernization and therefore it is necessary to develop institutions capable of controlling the modernization process, which in certain circumstances could mean authoritarian or totalitarian regimes (Huntington, 1965, 1968). For the purpose of enhancing Cambodian development, it is necessary to address administrative reform. Farazmand (2002) mentioned that administrative reform in developing nations mostly referred to modernization and the social changes influencing economic as well as social transformation. Also, he explained that “administrative reform is an essential function of public administration and governance in developing countries because of the acute problems that most of these nations and their governments face on a daily basis” (Farazmand, 2002, p. 2).

Accordingly, in order to achieve this administrative reform, Peter and Savoie (1994) classified three broad perspectives on administrative reform such as top-down models, environmental (bottom-up) models, and institutional models. Top-down models conclude that there must be a particular purpose in mind of powerful individuals, specific actors (elites), or authorities in the pursuit of reform and re-organization which are determined at the

top. In contrast, bottom-up or environmental models point out that government and administrative systems' structures have to adapt to the conditions of various environments that are likely to make changes in the structure. Lastly, institutional models represent a separate group of approaches to reorganization and reform. In conclusion, even though administrative reform is an important factor that governments should take into account, there are other key factors to consider such as democracy, decentralization, bureaucracy, politics, the justice system, corruption, human rights, etc.

REFERENCES

- Acton, L. (1887). *Letter to Bishop Mandell Creighton, Historical Essays and Studies*. edited by J. N. Figgis; R. V. Laurence (London: Macmillan, 1907) .
- Amsden, A. H. (1988). Taiwan's economic history: A case of teatime and a challenge to dependency theory. In R. H. Bates (Ed.), *Toward a political economy of development: A rational choice perspective* (pp. 142-175). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ankorcivilization. (2012, April 06). Stronger Public Administration Needed: Analyst. Retrieved December 18, 2014, from <http://ankorcivilization.blogspot.com/2012/04/stronger-public-administration-needed.html>
- Appleby, P. H. (1949). Policy and Administration. *University of Alabama Press, University, ALA*.
- Binder, L., Pye, L.W., Coleman, J. S., Verba, S., La Palombara, J. & Weiner, M. (1971). *Crises and sequences in Political Development*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Blunt Peter and Turner Mark. (2005). Decentralisation, Democracy and Development in A Post-Conflict Society : Commune councils in Cambodia. *Public Administration and Development, Vol. 25 (1)*.
- Cambodia Development Resource Institute (CDRI). (May, 2000). *Cambodia: Enhancing Governance for Sustainable Development*. Working Paper No. 14, Phnom Penh: Japan Printing House, By Toshiyasu Kato, Jeffrey A. Kaplan, Chan Sophal, & Real Sopheap.
- Crate, S. C. (2003). Three Paradygms of Public Administration. University of Maine – Orono. Retrieved April 1, 2015, from http://www.oocities.org/scrates/three_paradigms.html
- Etzioni, A. (1967). Mixed Scanning: A "Third" Approach to Decision-Making. *Public Administration Review*.
- Farazmand, A. (2002). *Administrative Reform in Developing Nations*. Greenwood Publishing, USA.
- Fesler James W.; Graham George A.; Price Don K.; Vieg John A.; Waldo Dwight. (1946). *Elements of Public Administration*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Frederickson, H. G. (1976). The Lineage of New Public Administration. *Administration and Society*, pp. 149-174.

- Fredrick, W. T. (1912). *Scientific Management. Reprinted in Classics of Public Administration*, Edited by Jay M. Shafritz and Albert C. Hyde, Harcourt Brace & Company 1997.
- Gajduschek, G. (2003). *Administration & Society*. Vol. 34 No. 6, January 2003, 700-723 DOI: 10.1177/0095399702239171, 2003: Sage Publications. Available at <http://cc.scu.edu.cn/G2S/eWebEditor/uploadfile/20121216002248421.pdf>.
- Global Witness. (2007). *Report "Cambodia's Family Trees," Illegal Logging and The Stripping of Public Assets by Cambodia's elite*. Washington DC: Global Witness Publishing Inc. Retrieved April 01, 2015 from https://www.globalwitness.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/cambodias_family_trees_low_res.pdf.
- Goodnow, F. J. (1900). *"Politics and Administration" A Study in Government*. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Gulick, L. (1933). Politics, Administration, and The New Deal. *Annual of The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 169, (September, 1933)*, pp. 55-66.
- Henry, N. (1975). Paradigms of Public Administration. *Public Administration Review, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Jul.-Aug., 1975)*, pp. 378-386.
- Hodge, P. (1980). *Community Problems and Social Work in Southeast Asia*. Hongkong University Press, Pearl Island Filmsetter.
- Huntington, S. P. & Dominguez, J. (1975). Political Development. in *Greenstein/Polsby, vol. 3*, 1-114.
- Huntington, S. P. (1965). *Congressional Responses To The Twentieth Century*. Eglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Huntington, S. P. (1971). The Change to Change: Modernization, Development, and Politics. *Comparative Politics, Vol. 3, No.3 (Apr., 1971)*, 283-322.
- Huntington, S.P. and Nelson, J. M. (1976). *Political Participation in Developing Countries: No Easy Choice*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Jreisat, J. E. (2002). *Comparative public administration and policy*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Kea Kiri Renol. (2005). A Perspective from the Village in Cambodia: Toward Democratization from Below. *Forum of International Development Studies*(Number 28.).

- Keck, Z. (2014). Southeast Asia Retreats from Democracy. Retrieved May 29, 2014, from <http://thediplomat.com/2014/05/southeast-asia-retreats-from-democracy/>
- Kettl, Donald and James Fessler. (2009). *The Politics of the Administrative Process*. Washington D.C: CQ Press.
- Kidd, J. and Richter, F.J. (2003). *Fighting Corruption in Asia: Causes, Effects, and Remedies*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.
- Laverty, E. (2002). *PhD, Assumptions of Pluralism, Lecture and Handout, PAA 600, The Environment of Public Administration*. University of Maine, Orono, Maine, September 19, 2002.
- Leuprecht, P. (2005). Special Representative of the UN Secretary General on Human Rights in Cambodia, to the 61st Session of the UN Commission on Human Rights, 19 April, 2005.
- Lincoln, A. (1863). *The Gettysburg Address*. November 19, 1863.
- Organski, A. F. (1965). *Stages of political development*. New York: Alfred A. A. Knopf.
- Overeem, P. . (2005). The Value of the Dichotomy, Politics, Administration and the Political Neutrality of Administrators. *Administrative Theory & Praxis* , pp. 311-329.
- Parashar, P. N. (1997). *Public Administration in the Developed World*. Sarup & Sons, New Delhi.
- Parashar, P. N. (2003). *Studies in Public Administration, History and Problems of Civil Service in India*. Sarup & Sons, New Delhi.
- Peter, B. Guy and Donald J. Savoie. (1994). Civil Service Reform: Misdiagnosing the Patient. *Public Administrative Review*, 54, 418-425.
- Prum Virak (a). (2005). “Decentralization within the Centripetal Expression of State Power: Re-Guiding Cambodian Statutory Devolution”. *Forum of International Development Studies*(Number 28).
- Prum Virak (b). (2005). Reforming Cambodian Local Administration: Is Institutional History Unreceptive for Decentralization? *Forum of International Development Studies*, 30.
- Pye, L. (1966). *Aspects of political development*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Rautakivi, T. (2012). *The Role and Effects of Efficacy in Socio-Economic Development and Foreign Direct Investment: A Comparative Study of South Korea and Singapore* (Vols. 11, No. 3). Bangkok: Ramkamhaeng University.
- Rautakivi, T. (2014). Organizational Intelligence, Efficacy and Adaptability in Changing Environments. *Public Administration In The Time Of Regional Change (ICPM 2013)*.

- Reynolds, H. T. (2001). American Political System. *University of Delaware*. Retrieved April 17, 2015 , from <http://www.udel.edu/htr/American/Texts/pluralism.html>
- Riggs, Fred W. (2001). Bureaucratic Links Between Administration and Politics. In *Handbook of Comparative and Development Administration*. 2nd ed. Ed. A. Farazmand, New York: Marcel De Dekker.
- Rothwell, K. J. (1987). Administration in developing countries. *International Reader in the Management of Library, Information and Archive Services*, Paris, UNESCO, Retrieved April 01, 2015 from <http://www.unesco.org/webworld/ramp/html/r8722e/r8722e07.htm#1.2%20Administration%20in%20developing%20countries>.
- Rothwell, K. J. (1987). Administration in developing countries. *International Reader in the Management of Library, Information and Archive Services*, Paris, UNESCO, Retrieved April 01, 2015 from <http://www.unesco.org/webworld/ramp/html/r8722e/r8722e07.htm#1.2%20Administration%20in%20developing%20countries>.
- Shahan, Asif & Posner, Paul L. (2013). Politics-Administration Relationship in Developing Countries: The Case of Bangladesh (March 1, 2013). Retrieved from SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2573458> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2573458>
- Svara, J. H. & Brunet, J. R. (2003). Finding and refining Complementarity in recent conceptual models of politics and administration. In J.D White and M.R Rutgers, *Research in public administration: Retracting public administration* (Vols. 7:161-184). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Svara, J. H. (1985). Dichotomy and Duality: Reconceptualizing the Relationship between Policy and Administration in Council-Manager Cities. *Public Administration Review*, pp. 221-232.
- Svara, J. H. (1998). The Politics-Administration Dichotomy Model as Aberration. *Public Administration Review*, North Carolina State University, pp. 51-58.
- Svara, J. H. (2006). The Search for Meaning in Political-Administrative Relations in Local Government. *International Journal of Public Administration*.
- Svara, J. H. (2007). *The Ethics Primer for Public Administrators in Government and Nonprofit Organizations*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.
- Tahmasebi, R. & Musavi, S.M.M. (2011). Politics-Administration Dichotomy: A Century Debate. *Revista Administratie Si Management Public*, Faculty of Administration and Public Management, Academy of Economic Studies, Bucharest, Romania, vol. 2011(17), p.130-143.

- The International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL). (2014). NGO Law Monitor: Cambodia. Retrieved April 1, 2015, from <http://www.icnl.org/research/monitor/cambodia.html>
- The Work Foundation. (2006). *Public value, politics and public management, A literature review*. By Ricardo Blaug, Louise Horner, & Rohit Lekhi, London.
- UN Economic and Social Council . (2006). *Committee of Experts on Public Administration. Definition of basic concepts and terminologies in governance and public administration*.
- UNDP. (2005). Public Administration Reform, Practice Note. Retrieved June 09, 2015, from <http://reform.gov.bb/page/public%20administration%20reform.pdf>
- United Nation. (2004). *Kingdom of Cambodia Public Administration Country Profile*.
- Van Riper. (1984). The Politics-Administration Dichotomy: Concept or Reality? In Jack Rabin & James S. Bowman, *Politics and Administration: Woodrow Wilson and American Public Administration* (pp. 203-218). New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Wagner, W. E. (2010). *Administrative Law, Filter Failure, and Information Capture* (Vols. 59, DUKE L.J. 1321, 1325 (2010)).
- Waldo, D. (1948). *"The Administrative State" A Study of the Political Theory of American Public Administration*. New York: Ronald Press Company.
- Waldo, D. (1987). Politics and Administration: On Thinking about a Complex Relationship. In *A Centennial History of the American Administrative State*. ed. Chandler R.C. New York: The Free Press.
- Weber, M. (1919). "Politikalsberuf" [Politics as a vocation]. Berlin: Dunker and Humblot. (Original work published 1919).
- Weinberger, O. (1991). *Law, Institution and Legal Politics: Fundamental Problems of Legal Theory and Social Philosophy*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilson, T. W. (1887). The Study of Administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 197-222.
- World Bank. (2004, November 15). Cambodia at The Crossroads, Strengthening Accountability to Reduce Poverty, East Asia and the Pacific Region.
- Yolles, M.I., Fink, G. (2011). Agencies, Normative Personalities, and the Viable Systems Model. *Journal Organisational Transformation and Social Change*, 8(1)83-116.