

The Academy of Political Science

475 Riverside Drive · Suite 1274 · New York, New York 10115-1274
(212) 870-2500 · FAX: (212) 870-2202 · aps@psqonline.org · <http://www.psqonline.org>

POLITICAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY

Volume 117 · Number 4 · Winter 2002-2003

No part of this article may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except:

- one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or
- with prior written permission of The Academy of Political Science.

Political Science Quarterly is published by The Academy of Political Science. Contact the Academy for further permission regarding the use of this work.

Political Science Quarterly

Copyright © 2002 by The Academy of Political Science. All rights reserved.

of a summary of existing work than an original contribution. This said, Luigi Graziano has a number of important and worthwhile things to say about interest groups in America, and one can only hope that he follows through with his promise (found in the Conclusion) to develop further his analytical framework and to apply it more broadly to more cases and more countries.

ANTHONY J. NOWNES
University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Civil Servants and Their Constitutions by John Rohr. Lawrence, University Press of Kansas, 2002. 222 pp. Cloth, \$35.00; paper, \$16.95.

For the past three decades, John Rohr has been our national treasure in thinking through the relationships that exist between the U.S. Constitution and the duties of public servants. His books explore the constitutional values and legal principles that should undergird public administration. In this book he turns his expertise to four countries, three of them abroad (France, the United Kingdom, and Canada) and one at home (the United States).

Although the book has a four-country breadth, it is primarily directed as “a gentle corrective to certain excesses and deficiencies in the New Public Management (NPM) movement” (p. ix). By NPM he means the principles announced in David Osborne and Ted Gaebler’s *Reinventing Government*, the National Performance Review that Vice President Al Gore directed at the beginning of the Clinton administration, and the flood of literature that appeared in business and public administration journals. NPM popularized such phrases as downsizing, deregulation, decentralization, layering, right-sizing, and re-engineering. Performance was to replace red tape and bureaucracy; and a private, commercial market culture would substitute for administrative, hierarchical, and professional cultures. Rohr criticizes NPM’s tendency to erase distinctions between the public and the private and ignore the U.S. Constitution. The result is to take management away from governance and give a somewhat “cavalier treatment” to the rule of law, “especially its free and easy slogans about eliminating red tape and letting managers manage” (p. xi). To Rohr, “Nothing is more fundamental to governance than a constitution” (p. xii).

Rohr traces some of these themes in constitutions abroad. Most of the book, however, concentrates on the U. S. Constitution and its separation of powers, delegation, federalism, and the rights and powers of civil servants. To study the relationship of separation of powers to administrative theory, he focuses on the Government and Performance and Results (GPRA), enacted in Clinton’s first year in office. GPRA, incorporating much of the NPM movement, requires federal agencies to develop “strategic plans,” “annual performance plans,” and “annual performance results.” Rohr expresses concern about “the cloud on the GPRA horizon,” which is that the individuals most involved

in the process “seem oblivious of the constitutional dimensions of what they are about” (p. 85). In looking through a symposium on GPRA, he finds insightful articles from experts in various federal agencies, but he never saw the word “Constitution” or the expression “separation of powers.” The overriding attention is to process and results, not law.

Other groups ignored GPRA’s constitutional dimension. The National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) completed a comprehensive study of the statute, but only one reference was made to the Constitution in the 38-page report and 6-page executive summary. Rohr says the report would have been strengthened had it grounded its references to inspectors general and the General Accounting Office to the constitutional history of those institutions. The principle of separation of powers loomed large in each.

Rohr notes that the NAPA report warns Congress “to respect the constitutional boundaries between it and the executive agencies” (p. 85). Yet this reference to legislative micromanagement could have been presented in more evenhanded fashion had the report reminded executive officers that explicit provisions in the Constitution direct Congress to play a vigorous role in overseeing the agencies (p. 85). Federal officers can only be created by law, the Senate is involved in the appointment of executive officials, and both chambers of Congress enact the authorization and appropriation bills that create and fund agency programs. Rohr reminds us throughout his writings that what we call “good government” cannot be good unless it is grounded in law and the Constitution.

LOUIS FISHER
Congressional Research Service

Moving from the Margins: A Chicana Voice on Public Policy by Adela de la Torre. Tucson, University of Arizona Press, 2002. 150 pp. Paper, \$16.95.

Public Hispanic intellectuals are scarce. In part, this is because, as is true of Anglos, few Latinos have the breadth and depth to play this role. Additionally, many of the issues that most interest Hispanic thinkers and on which their insights might be especially informative concern a population in which mainstream media and publishers have historically been only marginally interested. There is a need for Latino voices.

Viewed within this context, this volume is of dubious value. It consists of the author’s attempt via editorials published in the *Los Angeles Times* to engage the general public on six themes—immigration; education divided into bilingual, K-12, and higher education; affirmative action; health care; welfare reform and the underclass; and contemporary politics in Los Angeles. All of these are especially relevant to Latinos, and if they contributed to the respective relevant and often heated debates when they were originally published, they would