IPSA World Congress

Paris, 15-20 july 1985.

Some remarks on Prof. Polsby's

paper on bureaucracy.

Problems of Approach

I should begin by the end of Prof. Polsby's paper, namely the statement on page 22:

"My — my objective .... regardless of their intrinsically shaped specificity."

In my opinion this is the key of the problem of knowledge and of the relationship between knowledge and the legislative process.

I don't believe in the functionality of an abstract approach to the problem. All knowledge are exact, specific, and intrinsically shaped.

All state structures show a exact degree of continuity, even throughout the deepest political changes. Indeed the problem of continuity — and discontinuity in of State Apparatus and institutions is a most crucial item in the political analysis.

But it might us to political history. And political history this

[redacted] to extend arguments in the relation of [redacted] institutions and bureaucracy. [redacted]

[redacted]

To put it in a provocative way: the function of a general theory of the state should be that the state cannot exist.

[redacted] & the reality that we call state is a temporary [redacted] overlapping of [redacted] institutions, historically related and developed in a non-linear way.

[redacted] Any concrete state forms a specific variety of institutions [redacted] old and new, [redacted] related in different political situations but with a [redacted] long trend to continuity. Frequently new insti-

tutions ~~[illegible]~~, ~~[illegible]~~ don't replace real ~~[illegible]~~ ones but overlap them and the educative nature is the final result of an ~~[illegible]~~ institutional melting.

~~[illegible]~~ Not all the institutions have the same strength and significance. ~~[illegible]~~ Some have a decisive role. But the real significance of this role depends on the particular historical development of each step.

~~[illegible]~~ In my opinion it is very important to realize this fact, ~~[illegible]~~ they are closely linked to the problem of bureaucracy, ideology. I'm not so sure of the analytical functionality of categories like "bodily" and "peasant" bureaucracy. All

bureaucracy are "bodily" and "present" at the same time. not only because bureaucracy performs different roles in the same context but daily because bureaucracy is an heterogeneous reality. so is bureaucratic ideology. it seems to me that bureaucratic ideology about ~~[illegible]~~ of ~~[illegible]~~ place itself only through the reflexivity, but also image of daily through the heterogeneity of bureaucratic roles and situations and of the ~~[illegible]~~ values developed inside the bureaucratic apparatus throughout history.

Heterogeneity means complicity of divergent situations. Aiding civil servants and officials I see not the same values

and the same role as the lower ~~one~~ ones.
Every one of them forms a specific elite, a corps - with an esprit de corps - ~~[redacted]~~ reflective though corporatism.

He regards ideology. I want to point out the role of value formed as a part of the esprit de corps i - Spain, U.P. S [redacted] peripheral nationalisms developed in Catalonia and the Basque Country the concept of the true sense of the Spanish nation became a main problem of Spanish political life.

Due to the weakness and instability of the political parties and parliament the [redacted] opponents [redacted] of peripheral nationalisms were the Army and the [redacted] bureaucracy. So they became the main trustees and

interpreters of the true sense of the Spanish nation. And this was and is a tragic problem, even today.

I point out these events because I think that they are closely linked with the topic we are discussing, namely: the relationship between language and civilization.

In my experience of learning in the Spanish new dialect, the topic of state of bureaucratic activity was extremely important. (Recall transition: main issues).

New legislation was to be interpreted taught an administrative and a judicial system that was largely that

of the French period, which was the accumulated result of a historical process of collaboration and bureaucratization just as an extreme degree by dictatorship.

Properly speaking, Parliament was not maintained on institutions of its legislative production, but daily it lacked of any efficient means of intervention it depended on a administrative and judicial system [redacted] oriented according to other principles and aims and faithful to other political values.

But the point was not only intervention. The weight of the [redacted] inherited bureaucracy was no stop. All all reform attempts were frustrated.

power of parliament were to wrest in lieu of and state expenditures that remained unchanged.

Democracy was not an active agent of legislation, even because of this ~~[illegible]~~ political separation between itself and the government. Instead, it was a very important passive agent, as though inertia or active resistance to government and parliament politely it directed legislative production in a very specific sense.

There are no weeks comp not only from isolated c-dying but also from personal political experience.

Lastly I want to say that I agree with none other statements in Prof Blackin's paper mainly with his political

remarks with Max Weber's writ-
ings on bureaucracy.

The multiplicity of Parliament.

I think that it is a relevant feature, doubtless crucial for our analysis.

Parliament is become an institution of formal legitimation of legislative decisions that are taken outside of it. Even as an institution it is repositories its role is totally decreased as repository ~~[illegible]~~ is the work of political parties present in Parliament

Only as an institution of control by the parliament now parallels of development, ~~but it is also limited~~

~~2 = 7 to~~

Schmitt (2) Implementation: there is no (p. 11-12) reference to control implementation.

(1) High centralization of bargaining and decisions, through political parties, in Spain (Schmitt, p. 5-8).

Two theoretical points:

1. The role of bureaucracy. / initiative (interest groups)
2. The role of Parliament / implementation.