

Programme d'activités 2008 du Groupe de travail "Science politique comparée des administrations" (SPCA)

Le Groupe SPCA commence en cette année son activité effective par une première journée d'études en avril, au LaSSP de l'IEP de Toulouse, ce qui manifeste à la fois la continuité avec le Congrès de Toulouse où le Groupe a été lancé et la présence des deux co-responsables de SPCA dans les murs de Sciences Po Toulouse. Cette première journée d'études n'est de loin pas franco-française pour autant, puisque tenue en deux langues, elle accueillera certains des plus éminents spécialistes britannique (Edward Page) et allemand (Werner Jann) de l'administration comparée. Les activités suivantes du groupe SPCA qui s'enchaîneront jusqu'à l'automne tiendront ensuite le pari fondateur de ce groupe de travail de fonctionner à l'international et d'être un espace de collaboration transfrontalière et interculturelle, autour d'un thème particulièrement propice, entre chercheurs français et internationaux. Aussi la deuxième activité du Groupe se tiendra-t-elle sous la forme d'un Panel au Congrès britannique de science politique (58th Political Studies Association Annual Conference, Swansea, 1-3 avril), organisé par Alistair Cole. De même, la troisième activité du Groupe sera

1. Première activité :



**Groupe de travail de l'AFSP
« Science politique comparée des administrations »
(A. Cole/J.-M. Eymeri-Douzans)**

**Les redécoupages de départements ministériels en Europe :
politiques structurantes ou *Much ado about nothing* ?**

**1^{ère} journée d'études du Groupe,
Laboratoire des sciences sociales du politique (LaSSP)-IEP de Toulouse,
En Salle du Conseil, 4 avril 2008
(organisateurs : J.-M. Eymeri-Douzans et Julien Meimon)**

On observe, ces dernières années, un regain d'intérêt pour l'administration publique, pour certains de ses acteurs, pour les politiques qu'ils mettent en place, et les schèmes cognitifs dans lesquels s'inscrit leur action. Les travaux sociologiques prenant pour objet les hauts fonctionnaires de tel ou tel service¹, et les fonctionnaires « de guichet »² ; les analyses centrées sur la genèse administrative de politiques publiques sectorielles comme l'affirmative action³, les politiques de l'emploi⁴, du logement⁵ ou de l'immigration⁶; ou l'étude, dans une perspective historique, des principes à l'origine de la réforme de l'État telle que définie par le *New Public Management*⁷, ont réactualisé les approches antérieures. Avec des terrains et des méthodes d'enquête renouvelés, c'est ainsi une « Science politique de l'administration » qui est en cours d'épanouissement⁸. Abordée de manière dynamique comme une sociologie politique des institutions publiques, la science politique de l'administration s'enrichit du comparatisme en général et des travaux qui se sont imposés outre-atlantique et chez nos voisins européens.

Il reste que, dans ce cadre, les réorganisations administratives, au sens de créations, suppressions, démembrements, fusions et recompositions de ministères, ont fait l'objet de si peu de travaux qu'il n'est pas exagéré d'y voir un angle mort de la science politique. En dehors d'une typologie dressée par J. Chevallier dans une contribution à un ouvrage collectif sur l'environnement⁹ et d'ouvrages consacrés à un ministère ou une politique publique en particulier et abordant de ce fait, à un moment donné, la problématique des restructurations, il n'existe guère d'étude synthétique à ce sujet¹⁰. Certes, les ministères, ou certains d'entre eux, ont pu contribuer à restituer le cheminement sinueux dont ils sont le produit, et nous donner ainsi à voir certaines réorganisations au concret¹¹. D'autres études, en particulier lorsqu'elles

¹ Pour le cas du SGCI par exemple, voir Yves Buchet de Neuilly, *L'Europe de la politique étrangère* Paris, Économica, 2005.

² Alexis Spire, *Étrangers à la carte. L'administration de l'immigration en France (1945-1975)*, Paris, Grasset, 2005 ; V. Dubois, *La vie au guichet : relation administrative et traitement de la misère*, Paris, Économica, 1999.

³ D. Sabbagh, *L'Égalité par le droit : les paradoxes de la discrimination positive aux États-Unis*, Paris, Économica, collection "Études politiques", 2003.

⁴ Pierre Mathiot, *Acteurs et politiques de l'emploi en France (1981-1993)*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 2000.

⁵ Françoise de Barros, *l'État au prisme des municipalités. Une comparaison historique des catégorisations des étrangers en France (1919-1984)*, Thèse de science politique, Université Paris I, décembre 2004.

⁶ Sylvain Laurens, *Hauts fonctionnaires et immigration en France (1962-1982) Socio-histoire d'une domination à distance*, Thèse pour le doctorat de l'École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 2006.

⁷ Sur la méthodologie de la réforme, les représentations que s'en font les acteurs et les discours de légitimation accompagnant les réformes, voir Philippe Bezès, *Gouverner l'administration : une sociologie des politiques de la réforme administrative en France, 1962-1997*, Thèse de science politique, IEP de Paris, 2002. Voir également L. Chaty, *L'administration face au management. Projets de service et centres de responsabilité dans l'administration française*, Paris, L'Harmattan, 1997.

⁸ Françoise Dreyfus, Jean-Michel Eymeri, dir., *Science politique de l'administration. Une approche comparative*, Paris, Économica, 2006.

⁹ Voir Jacques Chevallier, « La création d'un ministère », dans Lascoumes (Pierre), dir., *Instituer l'Environnement, vingt-cinq ans d'administration de l'environnement*, L'Harmattan, Paris, 1999, pp. 21-48.

¹⁰ On retiendra en particulier, au delà des auteurs précédemment évoqués, à propos de la politique de la recherche : P. Bezès, M. Chauvière, J. Chevallier, N. de Montricher, F. Ocqueteau, dir. *L'État à l'épreuve des sciences sociales. La fonction recherche dans les administrations sous la Ve république*, Paris, La Découverte, 2005 ; et en ce qui concerne la politique culturelle et le ministère de la culture V. Dubois, *La politique culturelle, genèse d'une catégorie d'intervention publique*, Paris, Belin, 1999 ; M.-A. Rauch, *Le bonheur d'entreprendre, les administrateurs coloniaux de la France d'outre mer et la création du ministère des affaires culturelles*, Comité d'histoire du ministère de la Culture, Paris, La documentation française, 1998.

¹¹ Le rôle des « comités d'histoire » de ces ministères, lorsqu'ils existent, est souvent central dans l'écriture de cette histoire. Voir par exemple pour le ministère du Travail, Boris Dänzer-Kantof, Véronique Lefebvre, Félix Torres, dir., *Un siècle de réformes sociales - Une histoire du ministère du Travail 1906-2006*, Paris, La

se focalisent sur le thème de la réforme de l'État, ont pu apporter des précisions sur le discours de légitimation « modernisateur » qui entoure les fusions¹², ou sur cette forme moderne de restructuration que représente l'agencification¹³. Mais l'on peine à trouver des points de convergence théoriques et pratiques dans cet ensemble non exhaustif de travaux, et encore moins à y découvrir des perspectives dépassant le strict cadre national.

C'est avec pour ambition de commencer à combler ce vide, et ceci dans une perspective comparée, que le groupe SPCA de l'AFSP se propose, conformément aux principes guidant sa création, de consacrer sa première journée d'études à explorer les questions suivantes :

- Les réorganisations administratives se limitent-elles à des jeux d'organigrammes ?
- Sous quelles « conditions de félicité » ont-elles ou n'ont-elles pas d'effets de recomposition durable de l'appareil d'Etat ?
- Ces réorganisations tendent-elles toujours et partout à une forme d'externalisation des missions de l'État par « agencification » ?
- En quoi les jeux d'échelle et la dimension multi-niveaux (en particulier dans les Etats fédéraux ou autonomiques comme l'Allemagne, le Royaume-Uni et l'Espagne) influent-elles sur les modalités et la portée de ces réformes ?
- Etc.

Programme de la journée d'étude

La journée se déroulera ***en langues anglaise et française***, selon le schéma suivant :

Première séance: Au niveau des Etats centraux (Président-discutant, Alistair Cole, Université de Cardiff, Professeur invité à l'IEP de Toulouse)

- 9 h 30-10 h : Introduction problématique (J.-M. Eymeri-Douzans, LaSSP-IEP).
- 10 h- 10 h 45 : The Whitehall Model: between *Core Executive* and agencification (Edward Page, London School of Economics)
- 10 h 45-11 h 15 : Discussion (Alistair Cole).
- 11 h 15-11 h 30 : Coffee break.
- 11 h 30-12 h 15 : Les recompositions d'administrations centrales en France (Julien Meimon, chercheur associé au LaSSP).
- 12 h 15-12 h 45 : Discussion (Alistair Cole)
- 12 h 45-13 h : Question-time.

Documentation française, 2006. Pour le ministère de l'Économie et des Finances, et deux de ses directions en particulier, voir par exemple, se reporter à Laure Quennouëlle-Corre, *La direction du Trésor, 1947-1967 - L'État banquier et la croissance*, Éditions du Comité d'histoire économique et financière de la France, Paris, 2000 ; Frédéric Tristram, *Une fiscalité pour la croissance*, La direction générale des Impôts et la politique fiscale en France de 1948 à la fin des années 1960, Éditions du Comité d'histoire économique et financière de la France, Paris, 2000 . On pourra également naviguer sur leur sites internet respectifs : <http://www.travail-solidarite.gouv.fr/ministere/comite-histoire/430.html> ; <http://www.comite-histoire.minefi.gouv.fr>

¹² Sur le NPM, voir C. Pollit, *Managerialism and the Public Services*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1990 ; C. Clifford, V. Wright, « la politisation de l'administration britannique : ambitions, limites et problèmes conceptuels », *Revue française d'administration publique*, n°86, 1998, pp. 267-280 ; Philippe Bezès, dir., « Réformes de l'État et transformations démocratiques : le poids des héritages », *Critique internationale*, N°35, Avril 2007

¹³ Sur le processus d'agencification dans le secteur sanitaire, voir par exemple Daniel Benamouzig, *La santé au miroir de l'économie*, Paris, Presses Universitaire de France, collection sociologies, 2005.

Seconde séance : Dans les Etats fédéraux ou autonomiques (Président-discutant, Edward Page, LSE)

- 14 h 30-15 h 15 : Administrative re-organisations in an ancient federal state : the case of Germany (Werner Jann, Université de Potsdam)
- 15 h 15-15 h 45 : Discussion (Edward Page).
- 15 h 45-16 h 30 : Le cas des entités « nationales » du Royaume-Uni : l'Ecosse et le Pays de Galles (Alistair Cole).
- 16 h 30-17 h : Discussion (Edward Page).
- 17 h-17 h 15 : Pause café.
- 17 h 15-17 h 30 : Question time.
- 17 h 30-17 h 45 : Rapport de synthèse et perspectives de recherches comparatives en Europe (Edward Page).

*
* *

2. Deuxième activité :



58th Political Studies Association Annual Conference « Democracy, Governance and Conflict : Dilemmas of Theory and Practice » Swansea University, April 2008.

Panel on « State Reform and State Capacity Building in France? » Convenor : Prof. Alistair Cole

Presentation :

Alistair Cole (Cardiff University) and Jean-Michel Eymeri-Douzans (Institute of Political Studies, Toulouse) are co-coordinators of the Comparative Study of Public Administration group in the French Political Science Association (AFSP). The panel is supported by the French Politics and Policy group of PSA. Cole and Eymeri-Douzans will be joined by Glyn Jones, a recent graduate now working in university administration at Kingston University and by Paul Stephenson, from the Politics department at Maastricht University.

Taking as its starting point contemporary debates about governance, the panel seeks to confront general statements about the direction of European societies with the difficult case of France, whose key institutions, interests, and ideas can appear resistant to change. The papers discuss the hypothesis that a form of contingent or 'bounded' governance best describes the French case. Bounded governance is governance, defined in terms of six overarching variables (new regulatory arenas, multi-actorness, multi-level interactions, state capacity building, sectoral dynamics and new forms of participation). But French governance is

bounded by existing institutions, ideas and interests, which serve to translate these general trends into context appropriate ones.

Papers :

- Alistair Cole, 'Governing and Governance in France'.
- Glynn Jones, 'New Public Management and new Institutionalism in the study of French administration'.
- Jean-Michel Eymeri-Douzans, 'The French State under permanent reform : in search of evaluation lost ?'
- Paul Stephenson, 'Hot under the collar: lessons in leadership and political management from the French heatwave of 2003 and beyond'.

*
* *

3. Troisième activité :



[recherche / enseignement]



[recherche / enseignement]

RENNES 2008 JOINT SESSIONS OF WORKSHOPS

Workshop n° 11:

Administrative Reform, Democratic Governance, and the Quality of Government

Convenors: J.-M. Eymeri-Douzans & Jon Pierre.

The workshop theme

The past two decades have witnessed fundamental extensive reforms in the public sector. With significant national variations which have to be explored cautiously, the emphasis has been on bringing in the market-like processes into the public sector; to separate policy-making from operative elements and service-delivery; to introduce “generic management” into public administration; to provide customer choice; to produce public services in collaboration with NGOs and civil society; to “contract out” or privatize wherever possible; and to curb the expansion of the public sector. This model of administrative reform, usually referred to as New Public Management (NPM), has often (but not always) been an integrated part of a neo-liberal ideological campaign against traditional models of public service provision, aiming at downplaying the specificity of the public (political and administrative) nature of the public sector. NPM, which was born in the neo-liberal “think tanks” in the USA, Canada and the UK (see e.g. Kettl, 2000 ; Pollitt, 1993; Savoie, 1994), has influenced public sector reforms across Western Europe (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004), including Scandinavian countries (Ejersbo and Greve, 2005; Premfors, 1999) and countries initially reluctant such as France (Bezes, 2005), as well as Southeast Asia (Turner, 2002) and the Antipodes (Gregory, 2000).

There is thus a host of literature on administrative reforms in different national contexts. We also have some knowledge about how these reforms have impacted traditional political and administrative roles (Peters and Pierre, 2001; Page and Wright, 2007). But very little has been done in terms of assessing the impact of NPM on the public sector in a larger perspective. The key problem is that NPM is a strategy of reform which does not recognize that the public administration of a country is a political creature and an essential element of democratic governance (Suleiman, 2003). The public administration is the key interface between citizens and their elected officials and, as such, has to take broader considerations in institutional design and *modus operandi* than NPM reform objectives do. Also, we know surprisingly little about what explains the variations among different countries with regard to the extent with which they have conducted neo-managerialist reforms, and the peculiar forms of these reforms in each and every country. Why is it that the Anglo-American democracies have been most inclined to adopt NPM reform whereas countries such as Germany, Japan and some of the Scandinavian countries have been more tentative about NPM as a proper reform strategy (Peters, 2001)? Most importantly, perhaps, we have seen very few studies raising the essential question of whether the real outcomes of NPM reforms can be assessed and whether they consist in an improvement of the quality of public services and of the quality of government more broadly – or not. Can it be that NPM brings economy and efficiency but not necessarily effectiveness? Can it be that NPM brings more administrative productivity and customer satisfaction at the expense of citizen engagement, transparency and legal security? Or is NPM truly the “one-best-way” strategy to empower citizens and reduce the tax burden on the citizens?

After twenty years of implementation of such reform strategies, it is time to try and assess NPM-inspired reforms – in their various forms – in a comparative perspective (for preliminary thoughts, see Eymeri-Douzans, 2006). Given the breadth and scope in which European states have embraced NPM reform, an ECPR workshop appears to be the ideal forum for such a comparative assessment. Three different aspects will be of particular interest for the workshop.

One theme for the workshop will focus on **explaining the significant variation in the objectives and “trajectories” of reform among the West European countries** (see Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004). One group of countries, with the UK as the leading example, has launched and implemented throughout various political shifts a wide range of NPM-style administrative reforms. Several other countries, such as for instance Germany and the Scandinavian countries, have been quite tentative about this model of administrative reform and have been slower in implementing NPM, or have followed other strategies of administrative modernization. Research done on administrative reform in Europe has demonstrated this significant variation among the European states in how they choose reform strategies, and how they adopt the relevant neo-managerialist tools and policy instruments, but we know very little about what explains those choices (for some hypotheses, see Dreyfus and Eymeri, 2006). Thus, we invite papers that address issues of administrative reform choice. Which options were considered by the political and administrative elites when planning the reform? What was the role of international policy forums like the EU and the OECD in the processes of policy transfer across borders (in the sense of Dolowitz and Marsh, 2000)? What was the respective significance of national “administrative cultures” and globalizing forces? Can we observe some convergence among public administration and civil service systems across the world, or do “path-dependent” national trajectories, deeply rooted into peculiar

administrative cultures, still prevail? Ideally, these papers should be comparative in design although we welcome in-depth, single-case studies as well.

A second theme of the workshop relates to **administrative reform and democratic governance**. NPM reform programs have now been implemented for two decades in a large number of countries. It is thus time to assess the extent to which these programs have affected the institutions of government – the politico-administrative web of activities – and the governing processes of these states. If, as we suggest, the public administration is a cornerstone of democratic governance, how have the NPM programs with their focus on managerialist objectives and instruments challenged the political and democratic nature of the public administration? To what extent has customer choice become seen as an alternative to engaging in the political process? Has the focus on empowering customers downplayed the political role of the citizen?

The third theme of the workshop is focused on **administrative reform and the quality of government**. There is a rapidly increasing interest in research on the political, economic and institutional sources of the so-called “good governance” and a high quality of government. NPM raises a series of intriguing questions about the relationship between administrative reform and the quality of government. On the one hand, NPM offers public services which are more attuned to individual’s needs and allow “customers” to choose among different service providers. On the other hand, NPM separates the public administration from the political echelons of government and may potentially jeopardize accountability, equal treatment and transparency. How can we assess the impact of NPM in terms of the quality of the concrete outcomes of governing processes, and what cross-national patterns can be identified in this respect? Moreover, are neo-managerialist reforms an effective strategy in fighting public-sector corruption, or, conversely, are there elements in market-based new policy instruments which increase the risk of corruption?

The workshop will thus address issues related to administrative reforms and how they have impacted on traditional political institutions. We are less interested in the technical aspects of public management reform and more interested in the political and democratic ramifications of that reform. Have NPM reforms complicated political responsiveness, accountability and transparency — or have they instead created new channels for citizens’ engagement and input? To what extent have political institutions redefined their role given administrative reform? To what extent has administrative reform driven an evolution in the definition of democracy, for instance in the form of users’ direct influence on public service delivery? If we conceive of these developments as “dependent variables”, there is substantive variation in the range, scope and forms of administrative reforms in different countries as “independent variables”.

The Workshop participants and communications :

-J.-M. Eymeri-Douzans, Jon Pierre, „Introduction“.

- Carl Dahlström and Victor Lapuente, “Explaining Cross-National Differences *in the Adoption of NPM*”.

- Jon Pierre, Bo Rothstein, (title to be précised).

- Jean-Michel Eymeri-Douzans, “NPM-inspired reforms as a repertoire of legitimization”.

- Robert Gregory and Judy Whitcombe, “From Positivism to Pragmatism: Some Theoretical and Practical Lessons From the New Zealand Experience of State Sector ‘Reform’, 1988 – 2007” (to be confirmed).
- Tom Christensen and Per Lagreid, “New Public Management and Competences in Central Government Organizations”.
- Niamh Hardiman, M. O’Rourke, “‘The Segmented State’. Outsiders On The Inside: Implications of Partnerships in Local Government and Local Development in Ireland.
- Alistair Cole, “Reforming the French State: New Public Management and its limits”.
- Julie Gervais, “Administrative Legacies and New Public Management Reforms: How NPM is filtered in the light of national administrative culture”.
- Aurélien Buffat and Blaise Larpin, “The Impact of Administrative Reforms on democratic governance in Switzerland”.
- Cécile Vigour, “Quality of Justice and Democratic Governance”.
- Isabelle Fortier, “Quality Lies in the eye of the beholder: impact of NPM reforms on the roles and practices of the Ombudsman”.
- Tero Erkkilä, “Privatising Public Information. New Public Management and the Marketisation of Public Information in Finland”.
- Simona Kustec and Polona Kovac, “Quality of Governance through the lenses of administrative reform in the post-socialist circumstances”.
- Vitalis Nakrosis, “The reform of performance management in Lithuania”.
- Gül Sosay, “Transforming Public Administration in Newly Industrialized Countries”.
- Anne C. M. Meuwese and Claudio M. Radaelli, “Between management and regulation: the emergence of Better Regulation policies in Europe”.
- Anchrit Wille, “Beyond the Reform: The Changing Role of Senior Managers in the European Commission”.
- Frans van Waarden and Anne Poorta, “Democracy Without Bureaucracy, A Utopia?”
- B. Guy Peters, “Bureaucracy and Democracy”.

*
* *

4. Quatrième activité :

« Wales in Europe » (Le Pays de Galles en Europe)
Convenor : Prof. Alistair Cole
Ty Cymru/Wales House, Brussels 3rd-4th July 2008

Conference themes

The proposed conference addresses a number of key themes that arise from this calibration of Wales and Europe.

The conference will elucidate questions linked to the **role of Wales in the EU**. The conference will examine the European strategy of the Welsh Assembly Government since devolution in 1999, assessing which interests and resources have been central to strategic choices adopted. Has the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) shaped itself into a regional player on the European scene or is it off the radar of EU policy-makers as well as map-makers? What are the interests of the devolved authority, and the resources available to it to influence policy? How does post-devolution Wales determine the strategies it employs in attempting to engage with, and influence, European policy-making processes? What formal and informal intra-Member State channels are favoured?

The conference will explore the importance of the EU and of **comparable European experiences** in shaping Wales's vision of itself as a small country with a socially just and inclusive form of governance. In a more constructed frame, what role do policy-makers in post-devolution Wales see for themselves in the enlarged Europe? How do they socially construct Wales and Europe? How important is trans-national relationship building as part of this process of the social construction of Wales as a small European nation? The conference will examine the function of culture in defining people and place, as well as the roles to be played by non-governmental and community-based organisations in promoting cultural exchange.

The conference sets out to learn from other European member-states and engages with themes of **territorial regulation and governance**. Using examples from a range of western and eastern European countries, the conference will explore themes of relations with central governments and conflict resolution and relations with local government. The role of local government and city-based networks will be the object of particular attention, with a platform provided for disseminating and discussing findings from the British Council's City of the Future project.

The **comparative European context** is central to our enterprise in terms of political and policy learning. The conference will bring practitioners and academics to present and evaluate evidence from empirical experiences in different types of member-state. How does state form influence the process of regional capacity building? How do strong identity regions fare according to state form (unitary state, union state, federal state)? Questions will be asked about Wales and cognate 'national-regions' across Europe. Contributions will be solicited from colleagues in select European states: Spain (Galicia, Seville); Germany (Saxony); France (Brittany), Poland (Upper Silesia) and Latvia.

We will also explore some of the key themes in **regulation, public services, and governance**. Regulation is driven by both supra national and sub national forces; public services are typically the subject of internal national devolution. Devolved governance therefore straddles and also shapes the complex and cross cutting forces which inform the regulation of public services. The form and content of the regulation of public services and of their objectives vary between regional and devolved administrations, and offer potentially a natural laboratory of difference for comparative analysis.

Conference programme

July 3rd 2007

12.00-13.15 Lunch and Registration

13.15 Welcome Address: Paul Harris, Head of the Wales Higher Education Bureau

13.30-14.45 : Panel One ‘The EU and territorial governance: the State as Gatekeeper?’

- ‘The United Kingdom’ Martin Burch, Manchester University
- ‘Germany’ Charlie Jeffery, Edinburgh University

Chair: David Miers, Cardiff University

14.45-15.15 Coffee

15.15-16.45 : Panel Two ‘European integration and territorial capacity building’

- ‘Spain: the case of Galicia’ Ramon Maiz, Santiago de Compostello University
- ‘France: the case of Brittany’ Romain Pasquier, Institute of Political Studies, Rennes, France

Chair Rosanne Palmer, Cardiff University

Discussant: Alistair Cole, Cardiff University

16.45-18.15 : Panel Three ‘Regulation, Public Services and (urban) Governance’

- ‘Regulation and Public Services: Wales, the UK, and Beyond’ Steve Martin, Cardiff University and Jeremy Smith, Council for European Municipalities and the Regions
- ‘Principles of good governance in the Regional Capitals of the future’ Paul Orders, Head of Policy and Economic Development, and Rachel Jones, Head of Strategic Planning and Regeneration, Cardiff County Council

Chair: Clive Grace, Centre for Local and Regional Governance, Cardiff University

18.15 Reception

19.45 Dinner

After Dinner speaker: Neil Kinnock

July 4th

09.30-11.00 : Panel Four ‘Regional capacity building in the enlarged European Union’

- Carolyn Moore, Birmingham University ‘The Regional Offices of the accession states in Brussels’.
- Speakers from the Permanent Representations of Latvia and Poland (Upper Silesia)

Chair: Paul Furlong Cardiff University

Discussant: Kenneth Dyson, Cardiff University

11.00-11.30 Coffee

11.30-13.00 : Panel Five ‘Wales and the European Union. The Mechanics of making things happen’.

Roundtable table discussion including representatives from the Welsh Assembly Government, the WLGA, the UK Permanent Representation and the European Commission.

Chair: John Loughlin, Cardiff University

Discussant: Jean-Michel Eymeri Douzans, Institute of Political Studies, Toulouse, France

*

* *

5. Cinquième activité :

American Political Science Association 104th Annual Meeting

Boston (USA), August-September 2008

Group “French Politics”

Proposal of Panel

“GOVERNING AND ADMINISTRATING”.

THE FRENCH CASE IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Co-organizers: Alistair Cole, Jean-Michel Eymeri-Douzans, Edward Page

Co-sponsored by French Politics Group & Public Administration Group

1. Rationale

The French National Agency for Research (ANR), a newly created funding agency - inspired by the US or British models - which operates through thematic call for tenders, has decided to give priority under its 2008 Call to three main themes in social sciences, among which is « *Gouverner et administrer* » (Governing and administrating). The choice of such a theme is a clear indication of, and a willing to emphasize the renewed interest of French political and social scientists in the institutions and processes of government – defined in very broad terms as the web of actors and activities that contribute, at different layers, to the governing of a society.

Political science in France won its autonomy during the 1970s against the Faculties of Law. Though allowing French political science to constitute itself as an autonomous discipline, the downside of this evolution took the form of a “continental drift”, with political scientists abandoning to law professors the study of politico-administrative institutions (with only rare exceptions such as Pierre Birnbaum). Such an evolution is somewhat surprising in a country where the prominent role of “the State” (with a capital S) and its elites has always been so obvious and has constantly been underlined by Anglophone scholars (see, e.g., Ezra Suleiman, Vincent Wright, Alistair Cole). It is only in the latest decade that a new collective research momentum has appeared in France as regards the institutions and processes of government. The reasons for that revival are complex. The international “new institutionalist” shift – whether in the form of “Bringing the State Back In” (Skocpol) or “Institutions do matter” (Hall & Taylor) – has cross-fertilized with core French intellectual traditions and schools of thought. Amongst the vectors of this cross-fertilization, we would mention three: the impact of the “sociology of organizations” of Michel Crozier in the development of expertise and consultancy for public institutions; the emergence of a French school of

cognitive policy analysis (Pierre Muller); and the influence on other scholars of the sociology of Bourdieu and Foucault.

Within the frame of ‘rediscovering governing institutions’, a renewed attention has been given to the complex relationships between elected/political executives and the higher bureaucrats who work for them, both at the central and regional/local layers of government. At least five phenomena have contributed to the transformation of the partnership between political and administrative elites in France. The first is the abandoning of the traditional “dirigisme” of the state over the economy. The second is the ongoing movement of “decentralization” in favor of regional and local authorities. Third is the Europeanization of public policies, whether understood as adaptation, adjustment, inertia or rejection. The fourth is the increasing participation of enlarged multi-actor network in less hierarchical decision-making processes. The fifth is the implementation of a long-lasting program of ‘state reform’ and the ‘managerial turn’ of French public administration.

Since quasi-similar evolutions are affecting many other countries, adopting a comparative perspective on the French case seems particularly stimulating in order to identify common cross-border trends and remaining cultural peculiarities. It is all the more so because comparative studies show that, in contrast with many other countries, in France as in the United Kingdom, “generalist” top civil servants working for the central state (the same is not true for local governments) have enjoyed, since the XIXth century and until the recent years, a high level of prestige and a large co-decision power through their role of policy-advice to ministers or other political executives: the consequences on the ways and means of governing and administering France are well documented.

To what extent and in which ways this traditional picture is being transformed by the abovementioned trends is the major question the proposed panel would like to address.

2. Composition of the panel and titles of the communications

Prof. Edward Page, London School of Economics and Political Science: “Power games between ministers and civil servants in contemporary states: framing the map”.

Prof. Françoise Dreyfus, University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne-CRPS: “Administrative reforms in France and in English-speaking states: common features and differences”.

Prof. J.-M. Eymeri-Douzans, Institute of Political Studies of Toulouse-LaSSP: “Why French civil servants remain so powerful in comparison with their European colleagues?”

Prof. Alistair Cole, Cardiff University: “Is France still centralized? A comparative assessment of the rise of French regional/local government”.

Discussants: - Prof. Ezra Suleiman, Princeton University.
- Prof. Andrew Appleton, Washington State University.

*
* *

6. Sixième activité :

**journée d'études sur les cultures administratives
(IEP de Toulouse ou IEP de Strasbourg, automne 2008)**

**7. Septième activité :
journée d'études sur à l'IEP de Lille (hiver 2008).**

**8. Huitième activité :
journée d'études au SPIRIT-IEP de Bordeaux (début 2009).**