

THE  
OXFORD  
HANDBOOKS  
OF  
POLITICAL  
SCIENCE

GENERAL EDITOR  
ROBERT E. GOODIN

EDITED BY  
MICHAEL  
MORAN  
MARTIN  
REIN  
ROBERT E.  
GOODIN

≡ The Oxford Handbook of  
**PUBLIC POLICY**

The more general way in which these insights have been picked up among policy makers is in the slogan, “privatization entails regulation.” A naive reading of the “downsizing government” program of Reagan and Thatcher and their copyists worldwide might lead one to suppose that it would have resulted in “less government:” specifically, among other things, “less regulation” (after all, “deregulation” was one of its first aims). But in truth privatization, outsourcing, and the like actually requires more regulation, not less (Majone 1994; Moran 2003). At a minimum, it requires detailed specification of the terms of the contract and careful monitoring of contract compliance. Thus, we should not be surprised that the sheer number of regulations emanating from privatized polities is an order of magnitude larger (Levi-Faur 2003; Moran 2003).

The paradoxes of privatization and regulation thus just bring us back to the beginning of the growth of government in the nineteenth century. That came as a pragmatic response to practical circumstances, if anything against the ideological current of the day. No political forces were pressing for an expansion of government, particularly. It was just a matter of one disaster after another making obvious the need, across a range of sectors, for tighter public regulation and an inspectorate to enforce it (MacDonagh 1958, 1961; Atiyah 1979). Over the course of the next century, some of those sectors were taken into public hands, only then to be reprivatized. It should come as no surprise, however, that the same sort of regulatory control should be needed over those activities, once reprivatized, as proved necessary before they had been nationalized. There was a “pattern” to government growth identified by MacDonagh (1958, 1961); and there is likely a pattern of regulatory growth under privatization.

## 5. POLICY, PRACTICE, AND PERSUASION

---

To do something “as a matter of policy” is to do it as a general rule. That is the distinction between “policy” and “administration” (Wilson 1887), between “legislating” policy and “executing” it (Locke 1690, ch. 12). Policy makers of the most ambitious sort aspire to “make policy” in that general rule-setting way, envisioning administrators applying those general rules to particular cases in a minimally discretionary fashion (Calvert, McCubbins, and Weingast 1989). That and cognate aspirations toward taut control from the center combine to constitute a central trope of political high modernism

One aspect of that is the aspiration, or rather illusion, of total central control. All the great management tools of the last century were marshaled in support of that project: linear programming, operations research, cost–benefit analysis, management by objectives, case-controlled random experiments, and so on (Rivlin 1971; Self 1975; Stokey and Zeckhauser 1978).

One non-negligible problem with models of central control is that there is never any single, stable central authority that can be in complete control. For would-be totalitarians that is a sad fact; for democratic pluralists it is something to celebrate. But whatever one's attitude toward the fact, it remains a hard fact of political life that the notional "center" is always actually occupied by many competing authorities. A Congressional Budget Office will always spring up to challenge the monolithic power of an Executive Branch General Accounting Office, just as double sets of books will always be kept in all the line departments of the most tightly planned economy.

In any case, total central control is always a fraud or a fiction. In the terms of the old Soviet joke, "They pretend to set quotas, and we pretend to meet them." The illusion of planning was preserved, even when producers wildly exceeded their targets: which surely must, in truth, have indicated a failure of planning, just as much as missing their targets in the other direction would have been (Wildavsky 1973). Every bureaucrat, whether on the street or in some branch office, knows well the important gap between "what they think we're doing, back in central office" and "what actually happens around here." And any new recruit incapable of mastering that distinction will not be long for that bureau's world—just as any landless peasant who supposes that some entitlement will be enforced merely because it is written down somewhere in a statute book will soon be sadly disappointed (Galanter 1974).

One solution is of course to abandon central planning altogether and marketize everything (Self 1993). The "shock treatment" to which the formerly planned economies of central Europe were subjected at the end of the cold war often seemed to amount to something like that (Sacks 1995; World Bank 1996). But as we have seen above, even the more moderate ambitions of privatization and creating managed markets in the established capitalist democracies, led to anything but a more decentralized world: they created their own powerful incentives to monitor and control.

More modestly, there are new modes of more decentralized planning and control that are more sensitive to those realities. "Indicative planning" loosens up the planning process: instead of setting taut and unchanging targets, it merely points in certain desired directions and recalibrates future targets in light of what past practice has shown to be realistic aspirations (Meade 1970).

More generally, policy makers can rely more heavily on "loose" laws and regulations. Instead of tightly specifying exact performance requirements (in ways that are bound to leave some things unspecified), the laws and regulations can be written in more general and vaguely aspirational terms (Goodin 1982, 59–72). Hard-headed political realists might think the latter pure folly, trusting too much to people's goodwill (or, alternatively, putting too much power in the hands of administrators charged with interpreting and applying loose laws and regulations). But it has been shown that, for example, nursing homes achieve higher levels of performance in countries regulating them in that "looser" way than in countries that try to write the regulations in a more detailed way (Braithwaite et al. 1993).

An interesting variation on these themes is the Open Method of Coordination practiced within the European Union. That consists essentially in “benchmarking.” In the first instance, there is merely a process of collecting information on policy performance from all member states on some systematic, comparable basis. But once that has been done, the performance of better-performing states will almost automatically come to serve as a “benchmark” for the others to aspire to—voluntarily initially, but with increasing amounts of informal and formal pressure as time goes by (Atkinson et al. 2002; Offe 2003).

Another aspect of “political high modernism” is the illusion of instrumental rationality completely governing the policy process. That is the illusion that policy makers begin with a full set of ends (values, goals) that are to be pursued, full information about the means available for pursuing them, and full information about the constraints (material, social, and political resources) available for pursuing them.

“Full information” is always an illusion. Policy, like all human action, is undertaken partly in ignorance; and to a large extent is a matter of “learning-by-doing” (Arrow 1962; Betts 1978). In practice, we never really have all the information we need to “optimize.” At best, we “satisfice”—set some standard of what is “good enough,” and content ourselves with reaching that (Simon 1955). In the absence of full information about the “best possible,” we never really know for certain whether our standard of “good enough” is too ambitious or not ambitious enough. If we set educational standards too high, too many children will be “left behind” as failures; if too low, passing does them little pedagogic good.

The failure of instrumental reason in the “full information” domain is unsurprising. Its failure in the other two domains is perhaps more so. Policy makers can never be sure exactly what resources are, or will be, available for pursuing any set of aims. It is not only Soviet-style planners who faced “soft budget constraints” (Kornai, Maskin, and Roland 2003). So do policy makers worldwide. In the literal sense of financial budgets, they often do not know how much they have to spend or how much they are actually committing themselves to spending. Legislating an “entitlement” program is to write a blank check, giving rise to spending that is “uncontrollable” (Derthick 1975)—uncontrollable, anyway, without a subsequent change in the legislation, for which political resources might be lacking, given the political interests coalesced around entitlements thus created (Pierson 1994). In a more diffuse sense of social support, policy makers again often do not know how much they have or need for any given policy. Sometimes they manage to garner more support for programs once under way than could ever have been imagined, initially; and conversely, programs that began with vast public support sometimes lose it precipitously and unpredictably. In short: perfect means–ends fitters, in “high modernist” mode, would maximize goal satisfaction within the constraints of the resources available to them; but public policy makers, in practice, often do not have much of a clue what resources really will ultimately be available.

Policy makers also often do not have a clear sense of the full range of instruments available to them. Policies are intentions, the product of creative human imagination.

Policy making can proceed in a more or less inventive way: by deliberately engaging in brainstorming and free association, rather than just rummaging around to see what “solutions looking for problems” are lying at the bottom of the existing “garbage can” of the policy universe (Olsen 1972*a*; March 1976; March and Olsen 1976). But creative though they may be, policy makers will always inevitably fail the high modernist ambition to some greater or lesser degree because of their inevitably limited knowledge of all the possible means by which goals might be pursued in policy.

Perhaps most surprising of all, policy makers fail the “high modernist” ambition of perfect instrumental rationality in not even having any clear, settled idea what all the ends (values, goals) of policy are. Much is inevitably part of the taken-for-granted background in all intentional action. It might never occur to us to specify that we value some outcome that we always enjoyed until some new policy intervention suddenly threatens it: wilderness and species diversity, or the climate, or stable families, or whatever. We often do not know what we want until we see what we get, not because our preferences are irrationally adaptive (or perhaps counter-adaptive) but merely because our capacities to imagine and catalog all good things are themselves strictly limited (March 1976).

The limits to instrumental rationality strengthen the case made in this chapter for policy studies as a persuasive vocation, for they strengthen the case that policy is best made, and developed, as a kind of journey of self-discovery, in which we have experientially to learn what we actually want. And what we learn to want is in part a product of what we already have and know—which is to say, is in part a product of what policy has been hitherto. Recognizing the limits to instrumental rationality also strengthens the case for a self-conscious eclecticism in choice of the “tools of government” (Hood 1983; Salamon 2002). These “tools” are social technologies, and thus their use and effectiveness are highly contingent on the setting in which they are employed. That setting is also in part a product of what has gone before. In other words, policy legacies are a key factor in policy choice—and to these we now turn.

## 6. POLICY AS ITS OWN CAUSE

---

It may truly be the case that “policy is its own cause.” That is the case not just in the unfortunate sense in which cynics like Wildavsky (1979, ch. 3) originally intended the term: that every attempt to fix one problem creates several more; that every “purposive social action” always carries with it certain “unintended consequences” (Merton 1936). Nor is it simply a matter of issues cycling in and out of fashion, with the costs of solving some problem becoming more visible than the benefits (Downs 1972; Hirschman 1982). It can also be true in more positive senses.

As we experiment with some policy interventions, we get new ideas of better ways to pursue old goals and a clearer view of what new goals we collectively also value.

From an organizational point of view, solving problems can be as problematic as not solving them. The March of Dimes had to redefine its mission or close up shop, after its original goal—conquering polio—had been achieved. What Lasswell (1941) called the US “Garrison State” had to find some new *raison d’être* once the cold war had been won. Policy is its own cause in cases of successes as well as failures: in both cases, some new policy has to be found, and found fast, if the organization is to endure.

Policy successes can cause problems in a substantive rather than merely organizational sense. Longevity, increasing disability-free life years, is a central goal of health policy and one of the great accomplishments of the modern era. But good though it is in other respects, increasing longevity compromises the assumptions upon which “pay-as-you-go” pension systems were predicated, giving rise to the “old-age crisis” that has so exercised pension reformers worldwide (World Bank 1994).

Policy can be its own cause both directly and indirectly. A policy might successfully change the social world in precisely the ways intended, and then those changes might themselves either prevent or enable certain further policy developments along similar lines. This is the familiar story of “path dependency:” the subsequent moves available to you being a function of previous moves you have taken. Sometimes path dependency works to the advantage of policy makers: once village post offices are set up to deliver the Royal Mail across the realm, the same infrastructure is suddenly available also to pay all sorts of social benefits (pensions, family allowances, and such like) over the counter through them; there, the latter policy is easier to implement because of the first (Pierson 2000). Sometimes path dependency works the other way, making subsequent policy developments harder. An example of that is the way in which pensions being paid to Civil War veterans undercut the potential political constituency for universal old-age pensions in the USA for fully a generation or two after the rest of the developed world had adopted them (Skocpol 1992). Policy is its own cause due to such path dependencies, as well.

## 7. CONSTRAINTS

---

Policy making is always a matter of choice under constraint. But not all the constraints are material. Some are social and political, having to do with the willingness of people to do what your policy asks of them or with the willingness of electors to endorse the policies that would-be policy makers espouse.

Another large source of constraints on policy making, however, is ideational. Technology is at its most fundamental a set of ideas for how to use a set of resources to achieve certain desired outcomes. The same is true of the “technology of policy” as it is of the more familiar sorts of “technology of production.” Ideas of how to pursue important social goals are forever in short supply (Reich 1988).

Occasionally new policy ideas originate with creative policy analysts. Take two examples from the realm of criminology. One idea about why the long, anonymous corridors of public housing complexes were such dangerous places was that common space was everybody’s and nobody’s: it was nobody’s business to monitor, protect, and defend that space. If public housing were designed instead in such a way as to create enclaves of “defensible space,” crime might be reduced (Newman 1972). Another idea is that “broken windows” might signal that “nobody cares” about this neighborhood, thus relaxing inhibitions on further vandalism and crime. Cracking down on petty misdemeanors might reduce crime by sending the opposite signal (Wilson and Kelling 1982).

More often, however, policy making is informed by “off the shelf” ideas. Sometimes these are borrowed from other jurisdictions. In times gone by—the times of mimeographed legislative proposals being dropped into the legislative hopper—policy borrowing could be traced by tracking the typographical errors in legislative proposals in one jurisdiction being replicated in the next (Walker 1969). In other cases, the borrowing is from casebooks and classrooms of Public Policy Schools, or under pressure from the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (Stiglitz 2002).

March and Olsen (1976; Olsen 1972*a*) famously capture this proposition with their “garbage can model” of public policy making. Policy choice is there characterized as the confluence of three streams: problems looking for solutions; solutions looking for problems; and people looking for things to do. The first stream, but only that one, lines up with the hyper-rationalism of political high modernism. The latter stream represents the desperation of post-polio March of Dimers and the post-cold war Garrison State, looking for things to do once their original missions had been accomplished. The middle stream—solutions looking for problems—captures the paucity of policy ideas that serves as a major constraint on high modernist policy making.

High modernist policy making is supposed to be a matter of instrumentally rationally fitting means to ends. But often the means come first, and they get applied (inevitably imperfectly) to whatever end comes along which they might remotely fit. Take the case of the cruise missile. That technology originally developed as an unarmed decoy to be launched by bombers to confuse enemy radar as they penetrated enemy airspace; but when the Senate insisted that surely some of those missiles should be armed, the air force dropped the scheme rather than acquiesce in the development of unmanned weapons systems. There was a subsequent attempt to adapt the technology jointly by the air force for use on “stand-off bombers” (firing the missiles while still in friendly airspace) and by the navy for use on submarines; but given the differences between launching through an airplane’s “short range attack missile” launcher and a submarine’s torpedo tube, that joint venture came to naught.

So the original plan was shelved. But the idea was kept on the shelf; and several years later, in a window of strategic opportunity opened up by the SALT I agreements, the cruise missile was suddenly resurrected, this time as a ground-based missile system installed on the edge of the Evil Empire (Levine 1977).

Equally often, certain sorts of means constitute a “good fit” to certain sorts of ends, only under certain conditions which themselves are subject to change. Those often unspoken “background conditions” constitute further constraints to policy making. Consider, for example, the peculiarly Australian style of “worker’s welfare state,” which made good sense under the conditions of its introduction at the beginning of the twentieth century but no sense under the conditions prevailing by that century’s end: if you have, as Australia initially had, full employment and an industrial arbitration system that ensured that everyone in employment earned enough to support a family, then you need no elaborate scheme of transfer payments to compensate people for inadequacies in their market income; but once you have (as under Thatcherite Labor and even more right-wing coalition governments) eviscerated both full employment and industrial arbitration schemes, and with them any guarantee of a “living wage” from market sources, the traditional absence of any transfer scheme to compensate for inadequacies in market income bites hard (Castles 1985, 2001).

The largest constraint under which public policy operates, of course, is the sheer selfishness of entrenched interests possessed of sufficient power to promote those interests in the most indefensible of ways. Politics, Shapiro (1999) usefully reminds us, is ultimately all about “interests and power.” Anyone who has watched the farm lobby at work, anywhere in the world, would not doubt that for a moment (Self and Storing 1962; Smith 1990; Grant 1997). Neither would anyone conversant with the early history of the British National Health Service and the deeply cynical maneuvering of physicians to avoid becoming employees of the state (Marmor and Thomas 1972; Klein 2001).

Moralists hope for more, as do conscientious policy analysts. But at the end of the day, politics may well end up being purely about “who gets what, when, how” as the first self-styled policy scientist long ago taught us (Lasswell 1950).

Even those most political of constraints might be of indeterminate strength, though. Consider for example the growth of “alternative medicine” in the USA. Professional medicine, especially in the USA, is a powerfully organized interest (Marmor 1994). Ordinarily we expect its practitioners to be able to see off any challengers with ease. Certainly they successfully froze chiropractors out, when they tried to horn in on the business of osteopaths, for example. Somehow, however, “alternative medicine” has managed to become sufficiently established—despite the political power of conventional medical practitioners—to appear now as an option in Americans’ Health Maintenance Organizations and to be eligible for reimbursement by health insurance schemes. It may just be a case of the political power of the insurance industry, weary of ever-escalating medical costs, having been mobilized against the political power of physicians, with practitioners of alternative medicine being the incidental beneficiaries. But, *ex ante*, that would have been a surprising and



unexpected source of political support for the alternative medicine movement: *ex ante*, one could scarcely have guessed that the power of organized medicine was as fragile as it turned out to be in this respect.

Of course, “constraints” are not immutable. Indeed, one person’s constraint may be another person’s opportunity. From Kingdon’s windows of opportunity (1984) to Hall’s political power of economic ideas (1989) we see how the story is more than one about constraints: it is also about opportunities for change. These we now examine.

## 8. CHANGE, CONSTRAINT, AND DEMOCRATIC POLITICS

---

The story of policy is in part a story about constraints. But it is also a story about change, and that is what we now examine. Policies change for all sorts of reasons. The problems change; the environments change; technologies improve; alliances alter; key staff come and go; powerful interests weigh in. For those sadly in the know, all those are familiar facts of the policy world.

But for those still inspired by democratic ideals, there is at least sometimes another side to the story: policies can sometimes change because the people subject to those policies want them to change. There is a mass mobilization of groups pressing for reform—workers pressing for legislation on hours and wages, racial or religious minorities pressing for civil rights, women pressing for gender equity. What is more, there is powerful comparative evidence that social and cultural developments are promoting the spread of these mass groups (Cain, Dalton, and Scarrow 2003).

Advocacy groups are always an important force, even in routine policy making (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993). And they are becoming more so, in networked transnational society (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink 1999). But they are often treated as “just another interested party”—like physicians vis-à-vis the NHS—speaking for narrow sectoral interests alone, however much they might pretend otherwise. Even (or perhaps especially) self-styled “public interest lobbies” like Common Cause are often said to lack any authority to speak with any authority about what is “in the public interest.” “self-styled” is importantly different from “duly elected,” as members of Congress regularly remind Common Cause lobbyists (McFarland 1976; Berry 1977).

Social movements are advocacy coalitions writ large. They bring pressure to bear where politically it matters, in terms of democratic theory: on elected officials. Sometimes the pressure succeeds, and Voting Rights Acts are legislated. Other times it fails, and the Equal Rights Amendment gets past Congress but is stymied by political countermobilization in statehouses (Mansbridge 1986). Sometimes there is no very precise set of legislative demands in view, as with the “poor people’s

movement” of the early 1970s (Piven and Cloward 1979), and the aim is mostly just to alter the tone of the national debate.

There is always an element of that, in any social movement. Even social movements ostensibly organized around specific legal texts—the proposed Great Charter or Equal Rights Amendment—were always about much more than merely enacting those texts into law. Still, for social movements to have any impact on policy, they have to have some relatively specific policy implications. Every social movement, if it is to make any material difference, has to have a determinate answer to the question, “What do we want, and when do we want it?”

A full discussion of social movements would take us deep into the territory covered by other *Handbooks* in this series. But there are some things to be said about them, purely from a policy perspective. Consider the question of why social movements seem eventually to run out of steam. Many of the reasons are rooted in their political sociology: they lose touch with their grass roots; they get outmaneuvered in the centres of power; and so on (Tarrow 1994). But another reason, surely, is that they sometimes simply “run out of ideas.” They no longer have any clear idea what they want, in policy terms. Winning the sympathies of legislators and their constituents counts for naught, if movements cannot follow up with some specific draft bill to drop into the legislative hopper.

That was at least part of the story behind the waning of the civil rights and feminist movements in the USA as sources of demand for legislative or administrative change. At some point there was a general sense, among policy makers and mass publics, that there was simply not much more that could be done through legislation and public administration to fix the undeniable problems of racial and sexual injustice that remained. The policy-making garbage can was simply empty of the crucial element of “ideas.”

Even more narrowly focused advocacy coalitions experience the same phenomenon of “running out of steam” for the lack of further ideas. Consider the case of the “safety coalition” so prominent in US policy making in the 1960s (Walker 1977). It first mobilized around the issue of coal mine safety. That was a problem that had been widely discussed both in technical professional journals and in the wider public for some time; everyone had a pretty clear understanding of the nature of the problems and of what might constitute possible solutions. Having successfully enacted coal mine safety legislation, the safety coalition—like any good denizen of the policy-making garbage can—went looking for what to do next. Auto safety emerged. There, the issue was less “ripe,” in the sense that there had been less discussion both in technical journals and in the public press. Still, auto safety legislation was enacted. What to do next? The safety coalition then seized upon “occupational health and safety,” an issue about which there had been very little public discussion and little technical scientific discussion. A law was passed, but it was a law with little general backing that in effect discredited the safety coalition and inhibited it from playing any serious role in public policy discussions for more than a decade to come. It revived, in a different guise, only after the accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear reactor.

## 9. PUZZLES, PROBLEMS, AND PERSUASION

---

Policy gets made in response to problems. But what is perceived as puzzling or problematic is not predetermined or fixed for all time. The public's policy agenda shifts as "personal troubles" shift into and out of the realm of perceived "social problems" (Mills 1959). In part, this is a matter of a gestalt shift as to "whose problem it is." And in part it is a matter of transforming sheer "puzzles" into "actionable problems:" if no solution can be envisaged, then for all *practical* purposes there simply is no problem.

The "progressive agenda" had the state assuming increasing responsibility for personal troubles (Rose-Ackerman 1992; Crenson 1998). The watch-cry of the opposite agenda is "personal responsibility," with the state washing its own hands of responsibility for "personal troubles" ranging from health to income security (Wikler 1987; Schmidtz and Goodin 1998). "Deinstitutionalization"—the decanting of asylums' inmates into cardboard boxes across America—is perhaps the saddest instance (Dear and Wolch 1987; Mechanic and Rochefort 1990). But in a way this twentieth-century morality play was just a re-enactment of the earlier processes by which seventeenth-century poor laws emerged as a solution to the public nuisance of vagrancy, only to be shifted over subsequent centuries to punitive regimes of workhouses in hopes of forcing the undeserving poor to take more responsibility for their own lives (Blaug 1963).

Policy is sometimes simply overtaken by events. Whole swathes of policy regulating obsolete technologies become redundant with technological advances. Military strategies designed to contain one opponent become redundant, or worse, when one's opponent shifts.

Policy disputes are often resolved by reframing. Lincoln's great genius, on one account, was reframing the argument over slavery: not as one over abolitionism; but rather as one over the extension of slavery to new territories, and the dangers for free white men in having to compete there against cheap slave labour (Hofstadter 1948, ch. 5).

Policy proposals gain political traction by "hitching a ride" on other policies more in tune with general social values. Described as "a free lunch," proposals for giving everyone a guaranteed basic income are politically dead in the water (Moynihan 1973). Described as "participation income," paying people for socially useful work—or better still, as a form of "workfare"—the same policies might be real runners, politically (Atkinson 1996; Goodin 2001).

Policy disputes are as often resolved by some telling new fact. The rights and wrongs of policies of nuclear deterrence had been hotly contested, both morally and strategically, for more than a quarter-century; but the unthinkable became truly unthinkable when Carl Sagan pointed out the risk that any large-scale use of nuclear weapons might initiate a "nuclear winter" destroying all life even in the country initiating the attack (Sagan 1983–4; see also Sagan and Turco 1990). Or again: the

rights and wrongs of banning smoking in public places had been hotly contested for years; but once the risks of “passive smoking” became known, it ceased being a matter of moral dispute and became a straightforward issue of preventing public assaults (Goodin 1989).

Issues cease being issues for all sorts of reasons: some good, some bad. “Benign neglect” might have been the best way of treating all sorts of issues, ranging from race to abortion (Luker 1984). Making public policy can often be a mistake. But making an issue of child abuse and neglect was almost certainly not a mistake (Nelson 1984). The difference between those cases is that in the former there was a real risk of countermobilization undoing any good done by making *de facto* policies more public, whereas in the latter there seems little risk of countermobilization by or even on behalf of child abusers.

Thinking about the way issues become, or fail to become, policy “problems” takes us right back to the heart of the argument about the persuasive vocation of policy studies. We have argued that the grounds for this persuasive conception are formidable. They include the limits of instrumental rationality; the importance of deliberation in policy formation; the overwhelming evidence of the way modern governing conditions demand a style of policy making that maximizes consultation and voluntary coordination.

“High modernism” is an anachronism. Running modern government by its dictates is like trying to assemble motor cars on a replica of one of Ford’s 1920s assembly lines—a recipe for defective production, when interacting components are not fully decomposable (Simon 1981).

But the pursuit of this persuasive vocation is a hard road to follow. It demands a unique combination of skills: the skills of “normal” social science allied to the skills of “rhetoric” in the best sense of that much misused word. And the persuasive vocation must be practised in a hostile world. There is hostility from pressed decision makers who feel impelled to make rapid decisions in the face of urgency or even crisis; hostility from the still powerful administrative doctrines associated with the high modernist project; and hostility from entrenched powers and interests threatened by more reflective and inclusive modes of decision. Intellectually anachronistic doctrines continue to flourish in the world of policy practice for a whole range of reasons, and all are applicable to the case of high modernism. Within bureaucracies and in the vastly rewarding consulting industries that have grown up around the New Public Management there is a huge investment—intellectual and financial—in the modernistic drive for measurement and hierarchical control (Power 1997). Individual crazes still sweep across policy worlds because they offer possibilities of evading democratic control: the enthusiasm for evidence-based policy making in arenas like health care is a case in point (Harrison, Moran, and Wood 2002). And in the promotion of one key variant of high modernism—globalization—key global management institutions like the World Bank and the IMF continue to promote standardized reform packages (Rodrik 1997; Stiglitz 2002; Cammack 2002).

So, in the end, the persuasive appeal comes back to power and interests. Which is to say, politics. Just as the founders of the policy sciences told us from the start.