

# 15

## Building the Futures of Local Government Politics and Administration

*Chester A. Newland*  
*University of Southern California*

Three frameworks within which building of futures of American local government politics and administration is occurring are briefly summarized in the introduction to this analysis. These are: (1) the facilitative state, (2) paradoxes related to public administration, and (3) diversity, including a constructive paradox of a shared culture of multiculturalism. The analysis that follows is divided among three interrelated approaches: building futures through the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) and related institutions and networks (the most extensive part of this assessment); building futures through professionalism and expertise, sustaining assets, and managing dynamic performance; and building futures through civic values and disciplines of constitutional democracy. Combined, these three approaches promise futures built on tested foundations: institutional collaboration, professional integrity, and disciplined democracy.

*Facilitative governance* is today's preferred term for building futures within the frameworks presented in the introduction and through the three approaches that are analyzed in this assessment. Such governance largely characterizes leading practices among professionals in local government administration. In the presence of complex obstacles, challenges for the future are to sustain, further develop, and extend such professional practices and responsible politics in service of facilitative governance.

### **Introduction: Frameworks for Building Futures**

Interrelated frameworks for building futures are referred to throughout this analysis. The three principal sets of contextual thinking and practices noted above are summarized here.

#### **The Facilitative State**

Facilitative state ideas and practices developed in the wake of those of the administrative state era of the middle of the twentieth century. Those preceding decades idealized big, bureaucratic government. In nations that embraced democratic socialism and in others that had authoritarian fascism or communism thrust upon them, command-and-control government more or less dominated economies and greatly influenced social institutions, where they did not control them. Even in America, where ideas of the nation-state were barely entertained, people embraced powerful national government that became characterized by Dwight Waldo<sup>1</sup> and others in administrative state terms. The era started robustly toward the end of the nineteenth century in support of regulation of commerce to facilitate a workable private economy that was becoming complicated by conflicts among agrarian, industrial, and capital interests in changing markets. Welfare-state developments followed, quickening the expansion of government. By the Brownlow Committee years of the 1930s New Deal, idealized bureaucracy under hierarchical control of the chief executive became public administration orthodoxy. Garrison state years

followed during World War II and mushroomed throughout the four following decades of the Cold War.

Facilitative state notions, conceptually connected in part in America to pre-administrative state ideals and practices, such as those noted by de Tocqueville, remained fundamental in many local communities throughout decades of idealization of big national government. By the middle 1970s and early 1980s, facilitative state theories and practices were emerging among nations that had formerly embraced democratic socialism and that were seeking to disassemble command-and-control government without simultaneously self-destructing their economies and social institutions. What was becoming new public management (NPM), including ideas exported from America to Australia and elsewhere, emerged among Commonwealth nations and soon spread,<sup>2</sup> finally boomeranging back, embraced by both amateurs and others in public affairs. Related notions of privatization (highlighted earlier in the Johnson administration by issuance of regulation A-76 by the Bureau of the Budget) and cut-back government also swept America by the Carter years. In his initial inaugural address, Reagan proclaimed that government was not the solution but the problem behind national discontent. Upon the collapse of the Soviet Union, radicalized versions of these ideas were applied internationally with disastrous results. During these years of searching for new directions, the nation-state reemerged as a focus of international concerns, and notions of the facilitative state, disciplined by reflection upon practical experience and tested theory of constitutional democracy, were developed internationally throughout the 1990s.<sup>3</sup> Coincidentally, facilitative governance became an important theme among leaders of professional theory and practices in American local government.<sup>4</sup>

Three sets of interrelated ideas and practices now characterize international thinking<sup>5</sup> about the framework of governance of the facilitative state: social self-governance, emphasizing the importance of social capital and popular disciplines of democracy, most particularly civic duty; global market economy, in which business and public organizations are increasingly mutually embedded; and facilitative government, *limited but robust* in terms of constitutional democracy—*small but strong* in a common vernacular of international development.

### Challenging Paradoxes

The paradox that most troubled public administration professionals during the administrative state era was *democracy and bureaucracy*, how to reconcile values and disciplines of constitutional democracy, particularly “government of, by, and for the people,” with realities of public administration largely by professional experts. That old paradox endures as a challenge that today’s facilitative governance notions tackle head on, as in John Nalbandian’s studies of managerial roles, cited earlier, and George Frederickson’s<sup>6</sup> practical theory of *conjunction*, discussed later. In the 1980s, as facilitative state thinking was evolving, this paradox was often recast in transactional economics terms of *customers and public choice (democracy?) versus professional experts (bureaucracy!)*. Long-tested guidelines of responsiveness and reasonableness became facilitative guidelines among managers, both for their tactical reconciliation (and conflict resolution) and for strategic linking back to basics of democracy of community residents and their political leaders. Efforts were to facilitate shifts in people’s orientations away from simply *what’s in it for me* (behaving as demanding customers) toward *acceptance of civic responsibility* (embracing responsible democracy).

A most troubling paradox today, directly related to building the future of local government, is *political fragmentation and seamlessness of politics, business, and government*. Fragmentation arises in part from the separation of powers framework of the United States Constitution, of state governments, and of the mayor-council form of government. Council-manager government, by contrast, was designed along the parliamentary model of undivided policy authority, but, as analyzed in other studies in this symposium, tendencies today include an increasing embrace of partisan mayoral leadership and separated powers. At the national level, Jefferson hoped that *responsible parties* (in the parliamentary sense) would make separation of powers work. However,

American parties splintered early on. Subsequent interest-groups' and financial patrons' domination of parties, combined with imperatives of funding elections and complexities of state, regional, and local differences, have resulted in frequent fragmentation of politics. This, in turn, has generated support for enhanced powers of partisan political chief executives to provide leadership to deal with political complexities and, ideally, to bring about workable political connectedness for *community* at varied levels of society. The flip side of this paradox is frequent *seamlessness* of politics, business, and government. The first Mayor Daley of Chicago (1955–1976) frequently used that term, repeating it to visiting Federal Executive Institute participants in workshops in *his* city, noting that politics and government were seamless under his uniting leadership. The second Mayor Daley (1989–present), through politics of privatization and procurements, now demonstrates devotion to seamlessness among politics, business, and government.<sup>7</sup> Some aspects of this reality have been extensively studied with respect to facilitation by local governments of economic development,<sup>8</sup> and this important reality is noted again in the final part of this analysis.

A third relevant paradox of today arises from coincident concerns with *place and planet* or *localization and globalization*. Place values are of particular concern to local communities. The terminology is broadly translated internationally to include ethnic, religious, geographical, and other distinct foundations of community. Following the breakup of Soviet power, fragmentation occurred not only in the Balkans but, earlier, in far-flung places where groups had been forcefully submerged. Somewhat similarly, following court rulings of the 1950s, African-Americans who had been politically submerged made gains through civil rights legislation during the Johnson administration and moved in subsequent decades to restructure politics from local to national levels. Globalization, the flip side of this paradox, is an equally powerful or even stronger force, as reflected in instantaneous worldwide communications, international commerce, and mobility/migrations of people.

Other paradoxes that are relevant to contingent futures include the following: (1) massive access to information *and* reduced time to reflect upon and responsibly use it; (2) needs to strengthen strategic policy and administration *and* short-term political imperatives; and (3) *shared culture of multiculturalism*, which is of such importance that it is a third contextual fundamental, highlighted briefly in this introduction.

### **Diversity: Shared Culture of Multiculturalism**

Diversity—and facilitation of a shared culture of multiculturalism—is a growing contextual reality in America that presents both challenges and opportunities in building futures. It arose in part from developments noted above: (1) elimination of state-enforced racial segregation and facilitation of integration and (2) global migrations, especially immigration into the United States from Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. Also, since the 1950s gender roles and workforces have undergone revolutions that have impacted cultures of places and the nation in varied ways.

From these developments and others, *facilitation of shared culture* in and among multicultural communities is expected to endure into the foreseeable future as a challenging opportunity of American politics and administration. Contrary to contemporary American idealism of shared community, however, conflicts between groups and among cultures constitute rough realities that impact the building of futures of local governments.

This contextual framework and the two preceding ones demonstrate that, as from its beginnings, *America continues as a work in progress*, and *futures building is among its most basic disciplines*.

### **Building Futures Through ICMA and Related Institutions and Networks**

ICMA has largely managed its leadership responsibilities and its internal affairs *from the future* virtually since it formed the Committee on Future Horizons in 1978. Even before

that, strategic thinking and actions characterized the Association, and, in the quarter century following the Horizons assessment, three sets of futures thinking have dominated practices of professional managers and their Association: *managing from the future* in the present; *embracing essential, shared community* as a framework of reasonable diversity; and *facilitating responsible change*, reconciled with *conditions for sustainable culture of democratic values and disciplines*. Because of this remarkable record and the institutional asset for building futures that ICMA has become, its performance of these roles constitutes the first and largest subject of this analysis. In this first part, two related sets of resources for building futures are also noted: (1) networking/collaboration among governments and their instrumentalities and (2) building with other related institutions, including universities and professional associations.

### **ICMA: Managing from the Future**

A defining and sustaining premise that has been evident in ICMA since the late 1970s has been that *futures are in significant part conditional*: their ends and means can be created to some crucial extent by deliberate actions of people and their institutions—and, therefore, constructive alternative futures should be imagined, designed, and facilitated. This *culture of contingent futures* became important in ICMA through the work of the Future Horizons Committee, launched in 1978. Note that ICMA chose the plural, *horizons*, not a singular future. Ten years later, building on its expanding futures expertise and resulting professional developments, the Association formed the Future Visions Consortium, again deliberately emphasizing plural futures. This 1988 initiative, in turn, propelled ICMA and its membership yet further into *habits of managing from the future*, embracing the Future Horizons Committee's vision of *professionally expert managers as futurists*. Outcomes were reflected in the Association's 2000 Strategic Plan, its implementation into 2002, and continuing momentum to create sustainable, constructive futures.

The Future Horizons Committee's work was rooted in informed understanding of past experience. For purposes of futures assessment in 1978, the preceding history of professional management in local government was defined in terms of the first three of the following four periods, with conditions of the fourth identified as creating the necessity for ICMA's inquiry into and beyond Future Horizons:<sup>9</sup>

1. *Political reform*—the Progressive Era into the 1940s.
2. *Structural orthodoxy*—the 1940s into the 1960s.
3. *Social activism*—the 1960s through the 1970s.
4. *Diversity and dynamics*—the late 1970s Future Horizons study and beyond.

By the 1970s, orthodoxy had ceased to be *the* workable prescription among many professionally expert managers to deal with practical challenges of the field. The Future Horizons work, which stretched through two years, engaged numerous Association members beyond those who served directly on the committee. Working together in that period, professionals in ICMA sought to commit their field to disciplines of lifelong learning and integrity in actions, defined to highlight the following:<sup>10</sup>

- study of the known and the unknown—to attain a mature balance of confidence and humility in the face of changes;
- awareness of situations and diversity—to appreciate insights from empirical, interpretive, and critical inquiries and the realities of contingency management;
- practice of values and processes of constitutional democracy—to facilitate popular self-governance and constitutional rule of law.

From the foregoing orientations, it is clear that both *diversity* and *essential community* were dominant concerns from when ICMA in 1978 deliberately embraced managing from the future. It was eminently clear from the openly shared processes and contents of the Future Horizons Committee's work and related developments that multiple means of building diverse futures (not a future) through connectedness of politics

and administration (not insulated, separate administration) were understood as fundamental to professionally expert local government as a field.

Practical realism was a watchword of ICMA members in the 1970s. It was a tough time. Among other circumstances, urban riots, dreadful in the 1960s, were not entirely quelled; long lines at gas stations were recent memories, compounded by other natural resources shortages and environmental threats; and cut-back management was *the* theme at all levels of government. Thus the Future Horizons Committee identified the following five assumptions that were embraced as *realistic* guides for the next several years: “. . . learn to get by modestly, regulate the demand for local government services, be skeptical of federal dollars and the dependencies they cause, emphasize decentralization over regionalization of services, look at new services needed as a result of the [changing] population.”<sup>11</sup>

While the foregoing sort of practical realism—a sharp contrast from the thinking during the 1960s—was strongly highlighted in 1979, ICMA also continued during the next decade to stress realism in the practice of ideals, especially in internal affairs of the Association. It created a strategic planning task force in 1983, leading to a revised mission statement in 1985. The next year, ICMA adopted six goals to extend the profession’s reach in local government affairs. These goals stressed professional expertise, ideals, and values (the Code of Ethics); support of professional management “in all forms of local government”; enhanced professional opportunities for women and minorities; ICMA leadership as a national and international research, consulting, and information clearing house; collaboration with other public interest groups in service as a policy resource; and support of managers’ personal, family, and professional needs. All six of these goals were already highly evident in ICMA’s actions by the time of their adoption, but they became yet stronger as both ideals and practices to build futures, leading to creation in 1988 of the ICMA Future Visions Consortium, consisting of 65 local managers.

This consortium probed what many professional managers observed as struggles over a shift in America’s local governments from representative democracy to participatory democracy. Interest-groups’ civic and self-interested involvement, particularly among formerly disenfranchised people, had resulted in the 1970s in major changes in politics and administration (as noted earlier with respect to the new public administration and concerns with civism). Contrary developments in national politics from the mid-1970s through the mid-to-late 1980s exacerbated tensions among many local governments, leading the Future Visions Consortium to explore how to make participatory democracy work. This orientation sought to redefine political realities and responsibilities of local political leaders and professional managers away from emphasis on interest-group conflicts and toward the building of essential community—the same thrust ten years earlier of the Future Horizons study. The Future Visions Consortium especially envisioned three positive constructs of participatory democracy<sup>12</sup>: to rebuild the legitimacy of government (to reverse declining popular trust in it); to provide a framework for consensus building (to deemphasize conflicts among competing interests); and to help overcome gridlock in the absence of consensus or other reasonable agreement (to develop capacities to redefine issues and situations to facilitate agreement).

In thinking of ICMA’s roles in building the future in early decades of the twenty-first century, it is instructive to reconsider additional ways (and continuities among them) in which local government professionals went about that in the ten years, 1978–1988. At the time of the Future Horizons Committee, Wayne Wedin<sup>13</sup> of Southern California and others emphasized the importance of ICMA leadership in emerging high technologies. Also, Ted Tedesco<sup>14</sup> and the City of San Jose participated in a demonstration project of what would become e-mail/electronic government; this futures venture was sponsored by the California Innovation Group’s Urban Technology System and the Urban Consortium. This emphasis on high-tech futures grew within ICMA throughout the decade, and the Future Visions Consortium established information and technology as a lead task force among five created to probe external futures concerns and two created to focus on internal matters of the profession. The other four external task forces dealt with governance (with ICMA leading the way in America in use of that term); service delivery

(dealing with continuities and changes in ends and means); economics and finance (reflecting enduring stringencies among local governments); and human resources (the continuing big-cost component and increasingly politicized aspect of local governments). The internal task forces examined changing managerial roles and skills to manage public organizations.

Deliberations surrounding the Future Visions Consortium provided support for ICMA's Council-Manager Plan Task Force, organized in 1992 to undertake sensitive inquiry into the Plan. Practical changes in practices among local governments compelled ICMA's professionals to undertake this controversial project as a design-science inquiry on futures of local governments and their management.

Incremental deviations from orthodoxy of the Plan had commenced officially 23 years earlier, in 1969, when ICMA membership categories were changed to allow county managers/administrators and city administrators to become full members. That was followed in 1988 by adoption of the fourth name in ICMA's history—the hotly debated change to International City/County Management Association. Creation four years later of the Plan Task Force elevated past debates about fundamental structural changes in local governments to serious inquiries via academic research and extensive deliberations among professionals and politicians. Among leading examples early in the 1992–2002 decade of discussions of design changes was a feature article in the July 1993 local year-book issue of *Governing, The Magazine of States and Localities*.<sup>15</sup> Titled “The Lure of the Strong Mayor,” this assessment of developments presented the popular perspective on issues: “Cities have been turning to professional managers for the past 80 years to try to get the politics out of local government. Now a few of them are wondering whether it is time to put some politics back in.”<sup>16</sup>

Because other studies in this symposium deal in detail with the decade-long design inquiries following creation of the Plan Task Force, only major ICMA futures actions toward the end of these years are noted in the conclusion of this section, continuing the emphasis on building futures through ICMA. Six years after creation of the Plan Task Force, ICMA's executive director, Bill Hansell, gave impetus in 1998 to broad dialogue among the Association's membership about their future posture on structural design alternatives. Two years later, ICMA's Strategic Plan 2000 specifically addressed the subject. The Strategic Plan Committee combined two perspectives into a futures platform for ICMA: “the council-manager form of government is the foundation of the local government management profession in general and of ICMA in particular” and “it would be shortsighted to consider one form of government as the only way to provide professional management services to a community in need.”<sup>17</sup> This statement, both modest and revolutionary, was followed in May 2001 by a policy statement by the ICMA executive board that defined professional management as “the overall management of a community's resources by an individual appointed by an elected official or officials on the basis of his or her education and experience as being appropriate for the position and demonstrating commitment to the ICMA Code of Ethics in developing and maintaining a specific professional competency required to manage today's cities.”<sup>18</sup>

ICMA's quarter century of sustained efforts to build futures of the profession of local-government management equips it as the principal source of relevant expertise and as the leader among professionals on developments and issues they involve. The Association's experience demonstrates the importance of understanding the past while managing in the present from the future. That facilitative culture now characterizes ICMA, and it is influential also in collaborative relationships of the Association and its members among governments and their instrumentalities, the subject of the next subsection.

### **Networking: Collaboration among Governments and Their Instrumentalities**

Building futures of local governments requires attention to situational differences among communities, metropolitan regions, rural areas, and their governments. Futures enterprise also depends on networking and collaboration among governments and their instrumentalities. These two vital factors for effectiveness in futures building are highlighted here by brief examination of three sets of challenges/opportunities that have char-

acterized the field for decades and that command heightened attention in twenty-first century struggles to deal with the paradox of localization and globalization—place and planet. These three subjects are metropolitanization and regionalization; local governments' regional instrumentalities; and national organizations of local governments.

**Metropolitanization/Regionalization** Thinking and practices related to metropolitanization and regionalization underwent some important shifts during the massive growth of urban landscapes among advanced nations during the last half of the twentieth century. Until a few years before ICMA's Future Horizons Committee, metropolitan government had been somewhat fashionable among futurists, although that caught on in only a few North American metro regions. The Future Horizons recommendations came down strongly against metro government, favoring decentralization and the essential community—differentiated place values—as the preferred foundation for building futures. That prescription has been widely criticized as leading to unbridled sprawl: outward migration to suburban locations and incorporations of ring after ring of new cities and gated communities in ever-expanding regions continues to characterize not only North America but other continents. Also, in America, a tendency of inner-city deconcentration is observed in both metropolitan regions and in surviving rural cities. Following terrorist attacks on the American homeland in September 2001, these decentralization tendencies were reinforced as foundations for building futures.

Metro government purposes and means, no longer in high fashion in many places, have been displaced in part by regionalization and community alternatives, both governmental collaboration and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). In short, both *governments* (in contrast with single, hierarchical, metro government) and *governance* (oriented to horizontal and situationally sensitive collaboration among governments and with and among self-governing residents and organizations), as espoused by ICMA's Future Horizons Project, are now favored as "broad rubrics of local organization."<sup>19</sup> Plural governments versus metro government is, thus, largely a debate topic of the past. But consolidated cities and counties (as in Indianapolis and Marion County, Indiana)<sup>20</sup> continue to be important. Yet a more common foundation today for building futures is unconsolidated, collaborative governance (as in Charlotte and Mecklenburg County, North Carolina).<sup>21</sup>

Consider metropolitan Los Angeles as a caution against complacency and self-satisfaction with ICMA's 1978 decentralization prescriptions that continue to dominate American futures thinking. In Southern California, sprawl has hit the wall.<sup>22</sup> In 2001, metro L.A. consisted of 177 cities (largely council-manager governments) in five counties (with extensive professional management) covering an area of around 14,000 square miles, with a regional population of around 16,750,000. Historic trends of ever-widening suburbanization, based on traditional middle-class, single-family home and garden aspirations, now continue on the sprawling edge of metro L.A. But the decades since 1980, with population growth of 200,000 to 300,000 per year, have witnessed major changes in demography. Growth of over two million residents, about 40 percent of the total, has occurred in older parts of the metropolitan region that lack raw land for sprawling development. Los Angeles County has added 2.3 million people, half of the region's growth. The Future Horizons Committee's projections of increased diversity have occurred in spades. In 1980, metro L.A. had seven million Anglo and four million other residents; in 2001, it still had seven million Anglos among over nine million residents of other racial and ethnic compositions.

Local governance and government futurists in 2001 envisioned four guiding principles to cope with metro L.A.'s challenges:<sup>23</sup> Grow smarter (with respect to the state's fiscal system and other factors that impact housing, land use, and natural resources); grow together (link growing ranks of the working poor with jobs, invest in older communities and neighborhoods, and close growing income divides); grow greener (ecological restoration, stabilization of use of water, energy, and other natural resources, and access by all communities to environmental qualities of health and open space); and grow more civic minded (improve regional information, create and track benchmarking goals, and improve civic infrastructure and regional dialogue). Note that metro government is not

included among those guides for building futures. Metro governance is prescribed, seeking to reconcile shared regional strategies with metro L.A.'s historic attachment to place values of varied ends and means.

**Local Government Regional Instrumentalities** Governments have created several collaborative institutions for regional governance and other purposes that continue to grow in importance in building futures. Councils of governments (COGs), among the most important, are too well known to dwell upon here. But since examples are best precepts for building futures, consider three that are well known. The grandfather COG, the first, was created to deal with metro Washington, D.C., Maryland, Virginia, and ultimately broader Chesapeake regional needs, and it has established a strong record of facilitating building of futures, ranging from metro transit to sustainable environmental resources. Walter Scheiber, director of that first COG and ICMA's president in 1991, stamped these instrumentalities with a culture of professional expertise in facilitation of sustainable, constructive futures. Consider another early COG, brought to life in the 1960s in the Dallas/Fort Worth/North Texas region to cope with water scarcity and mushrooming development to facilitate expertly guided collaboration among the region's mostly professionally managed governments. ICMA life member, William Pitstick, served as executive director of that North Texas COG. Finally, given the metro L.A. example noted above, consider the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), which includes Imperial County and cities, along with those in metro L.A.<sup>24</sup> In 1994, SCAG adopted both a regional comprehensive plan and guide and a long-term transportation plan for building futures into the twenty-first century. Obstacles to implementation of these plans are numerous, including traditional adherence to home rule within cities and images of the COG as governments working together to intrude into the affairs of businesses and private residents—both citizens and many others. But despite these challenges, with ICMA member Mark Pisano as executive director, SCAG is respected as the regional leader in facilitating constructive networking among public and private interests and institutions for building sustainable futures.

In 1999, George Frederickson highlighted well-established practices of professionally expert collaboration and other networking among governments that now support a tag of respected theory—what he called *conjunction*. Realities are that many major responsibilities of governmental jurisdictions—water, wastes, transportation, criminal justice, and so forth—require increasingly cross-border public enterprise, both policy decision making and implementation. Thus where jurisdictional geography is made largely irrelevant by complex social, economic, and political realities, professionals and others from impacted local governments and other organizations get together to deal with them. Public works directors, transportation experts, public-safety leaders, and other groups from throughout a metro region collaborate to reach decisions and to implement them. These practices are sometimes associated with COGs, but collaboration predated those formal structures, and many metro actions often occur outside their purview. It is important to observe that Frederickson's research in metro Kansas City found "that politics—campaigns, elections, offices, titles—are jurisdiction, autonomous, and only slightly interdependent. Administration is, by comparison, highly interdependent. This interdependence has resulted in extensive conjunction and remarkably organized patterns of self-cooperation."<sup>25</sup>

**National Organizations of Local Governments** Building futures often requires extensive intergovernmental collaboration within the American constitutional framework of federalism. Most prominent among national organizations formed by local and state governments to facilitate intergovernmental efforts are the Big Seven Public Interest Groups (PIGs is not a favored term; Big Seven is).<sup>26</sup> During Mark Keane's service as ICMA executive director, the Association provided principal leadership on behalf of collaboration of the Big Seven, along with many less visible public interest organizations (Piglets is also not favored; P I Associations is). Besides ICMA, the Big Seven includes the National League of Cities (NLC), the National Association of Counties (NACO), the United States Conference of Mayors (USCM), the Council of State Governments (CSG),

the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL), and the National Governors Association (NGA). Besides these seven, others that are leaders in futures building include the American Planning Association (APA), the International Personnel Management Association (IPMA), the National Civic League (NCL), and Public Technology, Inc. (PTI). Such public interest organizations often collaborated in futures building during years of their reform origins and the co-location of many of them in Chicago during years of the Public Administration Clearing House (PACH) and 1313 East 60th Street. However, they often became rugged competitors in seeking federal grants and contracts in the 1960s and subsequently, undermining capacities for collaborative futures building. Most moved offices to Washington, D.C., not only to jostle one another to milk the federal cow but also to try to exert influence on congressional, executive, and judicial matters of importance to local governments. The Academy for State and Local Government (ASLG) was created in 1982 as a vehicle to synthesize some contemporary and futures interests of the Big Seven. The ASLG replaced the Big Seven's financially failing Academy of Contemporary Problems, located in Ohio, and engaged in hands-on, consulting-type services in the field. The restructured Academy was charged to serve the Big Seven as a vehicle of both instrumental and constitutive collaboration, dealing with transactional issues of the moment and, hopefully, transformational opportunities to build futures. In 1983, a state and local legal center was organized as a tiny component of the Academy. Competition to get at the federal cow continued most often to dominate among and to divide the Big Seven, but on big legal and structural issues of federalism and local governments, constitutive responsibilities were elevated to visibility and some collaboration was encouraged by the Academy's director, Enid Beaumont. Today, in both their persistent competition and their frequent collaboration, the Big Seven constitute important resources for building futures of American local governments.

### **Building Futures with Universities and Related Professional Associations**

Professional local government leadership has a sustained history of connectedness with universities and related professional associations. University relationships reflect both a strong intergenerational culture and foundations of expertise that are fundamental to building futures. Linkages among professional associations reflect the most sustaining quality of professional public management, which is discussed later in this analysis—*professional integrity*.

Intergenerational connectedness is a hallmark of professional expertise in local government management. No stronger force for building futures in this field exists than the close linkages that are cultivated among practicing managers; their seniors in retirement, consulting, range-rider services, and civic organizations; assistant managers and others in rising responsibilities as expert professionals; and students in course work, research, and internships, bringing ever-renewing idealism and new disciplines of substantive and procedural knowledge to the enterprise of responsible local government.

Universities and local governments have worked together for generations, nearly throughout America, to facilitate such a culture. Co-location in 1922 of the City Managers Association with the League of Kansas Municipalities at Lawrence, Kansas, established a relationship at the University of Kansas (KU) that survived the later move of the Association to Chicago. That relationship continues to provide extensive leadership for building futures of local government politics and administration. Among relevant academic leadership, KU's George Frederickson founded and serves as editor of the important *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory (J-PART)*. A few other universities, such as Syracuse, entered the field early and remain; some that were around early have left; numerous others now work closely with local governments and their professional and political leaders to deal with current matters and to develop and sustain capacities for effective futures. An example is the University of Georgia, where the Carl Vinson Institute of Government publishes the *State and Local Government Review*, a major professional journal for building futures.

Many local government professionals and ICMA as an institution work through related professional associations that are dedicated to responsible public affairs. Of

central importance for such networking are the American Society for Public Administration (ASPA), the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA), and the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA). For example, NAPA's chief executive officer is Robert O'Neill, a long-time professional local government manager in Virginia. A long-term executive director of ASPA was Keith Mulrooney, a professional city manager. In 2001–2002, David E. Janssen, the L.A. County CEO, served as president of the L.A. Metro Chapter of ASPA, typical of that county's linkages through that Association. For over 60 years, ASPA's *Public Administration Review* has been an important source of articles on local government administration and futures challenges, including many by professional managers.

### **Building Futures Through Professionalism and Expertise**

Two dimensions of building futures through professionalism and expertise are briefly touched upon in this section: professional expertise and getting community work done (managing implementation and building futures).

#### **Professional Expertise: Foundation for Building Futures**

Today, the two distinguishing hallmarks of professional local government management are *disciplined expertise* and *sustained integrity*. In short, expertly professional performance of instrumental and constitutive responsibilities of public service defines today's expectations of managers, not structural adherence of their governments to the plan of council-manager government,<sup>27</sup> although that remains important for many.

As was reviewed in the preceding analysis of ICMA developments, for over three decades it has been increasingly impossible to identify managers as *professionals* or *not* based on structures of the governments in which they serve. ICMA's name change in 1969 recognized that, moving from manager to management. The 1991 change from city to city/county dealt further with realities of the field—and what defines it as professional, governmental structure, or a combination of *expertise* attained through education and training and of *professionalism* demonstrated by devotion to standards of integrity, most notably adherence to the ICMA Code of Ethics. This stance was reinforced in 1999 by the Task Force on ICMA Recognition.

Sustaining expertise through life-long learning has characterized professional local government management virtually from its beginnings. Annual conferences started this learning culture and continue to sustain it at national, state, and regional levels, along with ICMA's ever-expanding publications and training programs. Following Strategic Planning Committee recommendations, in 2001 the ICMA developed plans for a voluntary credentialing program for board approval in January 2002, with initial board identification of credentialed managers scheduled for May 2002 in Washington, D.C. More deeply rooted relationships in support of life-long learning and futures competencies have existed for decades among many managers and their universities. Some of these continue as crucial to building futures.

#### **Getting Community Work Done: Managing Implementation and Building Futures**

Managing in the present from the future is key to both building futures and performance of current responsibilities to assure sustainable local governments. That has been well understood at least since the Future Horizons studies. A related question has been troubling ever since the 1970s. What are the shared and different roles of councils, mayors, and managers in performing community work, given that current implementation and building futures are inextricably and complexly connected? Under the Plan, complications of separation of powers were largely avoided, but sometimes-rigid functional separations of politics/policy and administration/implementation presented other complications that have been researched and debated too extensively to warrant repetition here, except to note today's understandings for handling these practical complexities.

Role distinctions are made today to guide political officials and professional managers in performance of their increasingly shared responsibilities for effective politics and administration. In short, whether in local, state, or national governments, top professionals are inevitably involved importantly in politics, but *always as professional experts, not as partisans*; political officials are inevitably involved in administration, but *ideally as facilitators of responsible community accomplishment*.

ICMA's flagship book, *The Effective Local Government Manager* (1983, 1st ed.; 1993, 2nd ed.) highlighted this shift in practices shortly after completion of the Future Horizons work. Four shared leadership roles were stressed, two for which the professional administrator has primary responsibility (but not excluding *responsible* involvement of political officials) and two for which political leaders have major responsibilities, with their accomplishment facilitated by professional expertise. In present-day terms of both the effective manager and responsible officials, these four sets of leadership roles continue to be important:

- policy/program implementation and results evaluation;
- organizational maintenance and development;
- policy, program, and organizational innovation, subject to law and responsible political leadership; and
- conceptual leadership, creating/facilitating a climate/culture for responsible politics and professionally expert management for sustainable constitutional democracy.

By the time of the Future Horizons project, it was well understood that serving the essential community requires shared political and professional expertise and actions to build assets for sustainable futures in several dimensions of local government. Financial and budgetary challenges require shared expertise and leadership to deal with operating and capital budgets, capital markets and debt management, and revenue sources and funds management. Administrative and line operations require building human capital assets, information systems and knowledge capital, and physical and systems infrastructures to meet futures needs. Sustainable environments of natural resources require extensive sharing of political and professional responsibilities.

During the decades since the Future Horizons studies, processes for accomplishing the foregoing responsibilities have continued to change dramatically, as was predicted in 1978. Professional managers have increasingly become *facilitators* (brokers was the term stressed in 1978). Local governments network among both public and private organizations and institutions for required information, expertise, and performance of varied functions. Contracting and procurement, always major responsibilities of local governments with respect to construction, equipment, and supplies, have become important also for private performance of some publicly provided services. Furthermore, processes have changed through high-tech systems and, increasingly, departures from arms-length and competitive processes. Importantly, relationships of government(s) and business(es) have become seamless, and politics are woven into that fabric also. Those complications are a part of the subject of the final section of this analysis.

### **Building Futures Through Civic Values and Disciplines**

Facilitative government, as was noted at the outset of this analysis, is one of three features of today's facilitative governance notions of constitutional democracy. This contemporary framework rejects the 1980s ideology that government is the problem and is to be devalued—to do little. With respect to local government, today's social self-governance (commonly listed first among today's notions) and related social capital concerns are evident in part in deliberate changes made by ICMA and supported by its leaders in the 1960s and 1970s (although administrative state doctrines of that time, that government should do just about everything, are not embraced today). Local government futures thinking of the turbulent 1960s and 1970s is instructive for building futures in the current century, given the similarities and the differences of the periods. One of the most influential symposia about the American city manager was published

in the *Public Administration Review* in 1971. Note a characteristic perspective of that time, expressed by Tom Fletcher, then San Jose city manager: "A serious reappraisal of the entire system is needed and an effective action program must be started to include strengthened political leadership by elected officials, retraining of managers, change of attitudes and methods, and above all the revitalization of the urban administrator into a relevant, active, socially oriented member of his total community."<sup>28</sup> Also reflect upon the following perspective of Frank Sherwood, reported by Keith Mulrooney (then Claremont city manager) from Sherwood's 1970 research into the field: "In its classical form, at least, the plan is not responsive. You have just one full-time person brokering the relationship with the environment. People who want to change the system can't mobilize the resources. The manager has access to more information and all the levers."<sup>29</sup> It was in this period of racial and Vietnam War conflicts that ICMA started the major restructuring that has led to some of today's governance perspectives, most particularly robust government that facilitates social self-governance in a complex, multicultural society. It has been much harder (nearly impossible?) for local governments to cope with the remaining governance concept of the three that is now dominant: responsible economic enterprise within today's global market contexts. Yet local governments are expected to facilitate building both of social capital and of economic assets for sustainable futures of constitutional democracy.

With that brief reminder of today's framework notions and of roots of their dimensions, politics and administration come together at this point in this analysis of facilitative governance. Three interrelated topics are briefly highlighted: building civic culture and social capital, building responsible politics and administration, and building leadership networks and shared authority and responsibility.

### **Building Civic Culture and Social Capital**

Two sets of disciplines are required to build civic culture and social capital for sustainable futures: *disciplines of democracy* (civic duty and public service) and *disciplines of place* (local community) *and planet* (community beyond place values, including globalization realities).

Disciplines of democracy in America have historically been linked most intimately to civics in the sense of local community responsibilities, particularly self-governance (behaving responsibly and taking care of oneself and others) and devotion to shared civic culture (performing public responsibilities, including helping governmental institutions to do their work). Historically and in theory, civic duty has been closely connected with values and practices of public service. Clearest examples are their connections in military service and jury duty, but civil service was equally linked with civic duty before it became converted in the 1960s and 1970s in many governments into a mostly transactional economic and political employment relationship, as under provisions of the U.S. Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 and under collective bargaining provisions for labor-management relations in state and local governments.

Although civic duty is importantly local, it is also identified with regional, state, and national levels of constitutional democracy. Notably, following terrorist attacks on America's homeland in September 2001, connected disciplines of civic duty and public service were demonstrated in communities nationwide *and* as a national community. People came together in shared experience of grief, patriotic resolution, and commitment to democratic values of human dignity and devotion to standards of reasonableness under ennobling law. Before that shared outpouring of civism, Robert Putnam and many other researchers and observers had popularized the notion that social capital in America was in deep decline. Solid research and widespread experience in communities throughout America supported that conclusion. It now appears that values of civic duty and public service were more or less in deep hibernation, awaiting a call to action.

Place values and disciplines—especially family, school, and local community connections—commonly nourish deep roots of civic duty. Building futures enduringly depends on such rootedness. Increasingly, however, today's paradox of place and planet both closes in and opens up circumstances, compelling and facilitating broader commu-

nity that, in turn, makes multiplicity of communities workable. Increasingly, disciplines of community, of shared humanity, are exercised among people where they find themselves, called out of hibernation to constitute *communities of the moment*. Consider the now historic example of 11 September 2001, where passengers aboard United Airlines Flight 93 exercised civic duty to stop their captors' terrorist actions. Their disciplined self-governance memorialized them, not simply as victims of evil but as a community of patriots. They are *the example* of social capital. Such capital assets are not bound to place and are available to form communities of the moment in varied situations, most commonly pleasantly happy ones, not tragedies. For most people, however, disciplines associated with social capital are learned and developed where they experience shared humanity in relatively enduring community and communities. Local governments and principal roles of their political and administrative leaders are now understood to be facilitation of such communities and the disciplines of democracy they nourish. In turn, they facilitate building futures in the process.

### **Building Responsible Politics and Administration**

In the introduction to this analysis, a most troubling paradox of today was highlighted: political fragmentation on the one hand and frequent seamlessness of politics, business, and government on the other. This paradox and related challenges of transactional and transformational politics are noted here.

Political fragmentation results from varied forces, most notably conflicting interest groups' actions, geographical balkanization of communities, political party factionalism, public lethargy and ignorance, and media's negative focus on conflicts and controversies. The developments between 1960 and 1970 that have been noted above accounted for the dramatic movement away from the Plan's political assumptions of shared community to efforts by ICMA's leaders to deal with dynamics of political fragmentation. Single-member districts ordered by courts, partisan political elections, and separated powers of mayors all have responded to the changed realities and have accentuated them. During the 40 years following the start of those changes, many fundamentals of politics changed, most particularly media-dominated elections, polling and structuring of wedge issues and platforms, financing of campaigns and candidates, political-executive factionalism within parties, and partisan vertical integration efforts from national down through local levels.

Consider the well-known example cited earlier of such changes in Chicago's politics—and its illustration of the added development of growing seamlessness of politics, business, and government. Under the first Daley, who coined the term *seamless*, Chicago's large ranks of human resources were divided: about half under merit civil service as professional experts to get things done right and about half patronage personnel to get the partisanly political right things done. By contrast, as was noted at the outset of this analysis, the younger Mayor Daley has embraced privatization, facilitating new conditions of seamlessness of politics, business, and government, including the long-established expectation of local government: promotion of economic vitality of Chicago's business community and, vice versa, generating support for the mayor's leadership as the facilitator. By what standards are these facilitative activities evaluated: professional or partisan?

*Transactional* politics and economics (as in market exchanges) are common at all levels of government. These processes may be constructive or destructive of community interests. The reform movement that produced council-manager government did not seek to escape politics; the intention was to rid necessary politics and local governments of corruption and incompetence. The purpose was to facilitate *transformational* politics of community-oriented purposes and processes, rather than narrow self-interest and demolition politics. Given growing departures from the Plan since the early 1970s, a challenge in building futures is to create institutional cultures of integrity and transformational governance in local government politics to parallel the standards of professionalism expected among expert managers.

That is a large challenge. In a 1963 book, *The Deadlock of Democracy, Four-Party Politics in America*, James MacGregor Burns concluded that fragmentation of national politics in America and separation of powers were undermining responsible executive power, which he favored to facilitate *union*—essential national community. In 1969, Ted Lowi concluded in his widely read book, *The End of Liberalism*, that fragmented, self-serving, interest-group politics and related election technologies and financing were destroying classical fundamentals of responsible politics of constitutional democracy in America. In 1995, in *The End of the Republican Era*, Lowi further concluded that representative government had been largely displaced by domination of special interests and financial patrons. Aggrandizement of partisan political power of the president has been resorted to increasingly at the national level, ostensibly to facilitate community as the State of the Union, but partisan patronage and executive spoils have plagued those efforts instead. These sorts of challenges are increasingly present among local governments in America also.

### **Building Leadership Networks and Shared Authority and Responsibility**

Leaders among local government professionals have sought to meet complex challenges of politics and administration by building leadership networks and frameworks of shared authority and responsibility. Recall the comment by Frank Sherwood, quoted above, in which he noted deficiencies in structuring local government around a single executive. When he made that comment in 1970, he was director of the Federal Executive Institute, where his work reflected leading thought and practices among public and private-sector executives. Experience and research already strongly favored leadership networks. During subsequent decades, experience and literature of professional local government became influenced and then dominated by notions of shared political and professional authority and responsibility for facilitative governance.

Structural means to accomplish such sharing have been the major focus of efforts to build desired futures. More is required to build successful futures of local governments and their politics and administration.

### **Conclusion: Building Facilitative Futures Through Disciplines of Constitutional Democracy**

Shared disciplines of constitutional democracy—transformational disciplines—are essential to build futures of successful facilitative governance. Two of these disciplines, civic duty and public service, have been stressed in this analysis. Their interconnectedness has underpinned transformational changes in local government politics and professional management throughout the decades since the creation of council-manager government. Developing and maintaining that shared culture of responsible government often has been a struggle, however, and it has been a sustained challenge in recent decades. Meeting that challenge has been most nearly achieved when politics and administration have been visibly linked to democratic values—human dignity and search for reasonableness/fairness under ennobling law. Maintaining that linkage is no easy struggle.

ICMA has achieved stature in America and, increasingly, internationally as a facilitative institution in support of these values and disciplines of constitutional democracy. The Association is a professional institution. It is defined most distinctively by its members' integrity—sustained devotion to the ICMA Code of Ethics. That is crucial. It is a strong foundation for building futures of facilitative governance through disciplines of constitutional democracy and in support of its values.

### **Notes**

<sup>1</sup> Dwight Waldo, *The Administrative State* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1984).

<sup>2</sup> Allen Schick, "Micro-Budgetary Adaptations to Fiscal Stress in Industrialized Democracies," *Public Administration Review*, vol. 48 (1988), pp. 523–533.

- <sup>3</sup> Walter J. M. Kickert and Richard J. Stillman II (eds.) *The Modern State and Its Study* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing, 1999/2000).
- <sup>4</sup> John Nalbandian, *Professionalism in Local Government: Transformation in the Roles, Responsibilities and Values of City Managers* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991); John Nalbandian, "Facilitating Community, Enabling Democracy: New Roles for Local Government Managers," *Public Administration Review*, vol. 59 (1999), pp. 187-198.
- <sup>5</sup> Chester A. Newland, "Governance, Facilitative States, and Twenty-First Century Public Administration," in Krishna Tummala (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems* (Paris: UNESCO, 2002).
- <sup>6</sup> H. George Frederickson, "The Repositioning of American Public Administration," *PS, Political Science & Politics*, vol. 32 (December 1999), pp. 701-711.
- <sup>7</sup> Charles Mahtesian, "Taking Chicago Private," *Governing*, vol. 7 (April 1994), pp. 26-31.
- <sup>8</sup> Ann O'M. Bowman, "Competition for Economic Development Among Southeastern Cities," *Urban Affairs Quarterly*, vol. 23 (1988), pp. 511-527; Elaine B. Sharp, *Urban Politics and Administration: From Service Delivery to Economic Development* (New York: Longman, 1990).
- <sup>9</sup> Chester A. Newland, "Managing from the Future in Council-Manager Government," *Ideal and Practice in Council-Manager Government* (Washington, D.C.: ICMA, 1995).
- <sup>10</sup> Chester A. Newland, *ibid.*, p. 267.
- <sup>11</sup> International City Management Association, Committee on Future Horizons, *New Worlds of Service* (Washington, D.C.: ICMA, 1979).
- <sup>12</sup> Amy Cohen Paul, *Future Challenges, Future Opportunities: The Final Report of the ICMA Future Visions Consortium* (Washington, D.C.: ICMA, 1991).
- <sup>13</sup> Wayne Wedin, "Technology and the Future of Local Government," *PM, Public Management*, vol. 58 (July 1978), pp. 2-5.
- <sup>14</sup> Ted Tedesco, "The Future City Manager: Building on Good Ideas We Have Now," *PM, Public Management*, vol. 60 (July 1978), pp. 9-11.
- <sup>15</sup> Robert Gurwitt, "The Lure of the Strong Mayor," *Governing*, vol. 6 (July 1993), pp. 36-41.
- <sup>16</sup> Robert Gurwitt, *ibid.*, p. 36.
- <sup>17</sup> International City/County Management Association, *ICMA Strategic Plan 2000* (Washington, D.C.: ICMA, 2000): A-5.
- <sup>18</sup> International City/County Management Association, Executive Board, *Policy Minutes* (Washington, D.C.: ICMA, May 2001).
- <sup>19</sup> H. V. Savitch and Ronald V. Vogel, symposium eds. "New Regionalism and Its Policy Agenda," *State and Local Government Review*, vol. 32 (2000), pp. 158-168.
- <sup>20</sup> Mark S. Rosentraub, "City-County Consolidation and the Rebuilding of Image: The Fiscal Lessons from Indianapolis's UniGov Program," *State and Local Government Review*, vol. 32 (2000), pp. 180-191.
- <sup>21</sup> Timothy D. Mead, "Governing Charlotte-Mecklenburg," *State and Local Government Review*, vol. 7 (April 1994), pp. 26-31.
- <sup>22</sup> Michael Dear, et al. *Sprawl Hits the Wall: Confronting the Realities of Metropolitan Los Angeles* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 2001).
- <sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>24</sup> Jerry Jeffe, "SCAG: Can a Voluntary Association Bring a Regional Focus to an Area Concerned with Parochial Issues?" *California Journal* (May 1995), pp. 41-43.
- <sup>25</sup> H. George Frederickson, *op. cit.*, p. 708.
- <sup>26</sup> David S. Arnold and Jeremy F. Plant, *Public Official Associations and State and Local Government* (Fairfax, Va: George Mason University Press, 1993).
- <sup>27</sup> Edwin C. Daley, *Historical Perspectives and Future Horizons of Local Government Managers and the International City/County Management Association* (Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 2002), doctoral dissertation.
- <sup>28</sup> Thomas W. Fletcher, "What Is the Future for Our Cities and the City Manager?" *Public Administration Review*, vol. 31 (1971), pp. 14-20.
- <sup>29</sup> Keith F. Mulrooney, symposium ed., "The American City Manager: An Urban Administrator in a Complex and Evolving Situation," *Public Administration Review*, vol. 31 (1971), 6-14.