TRENDS IN MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION AND IMPACT ON DEMOCRATIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES

UDC: 352

Jim Seroka

Center for Public Leadership, University of North Florida
Jacksonville, FL 32224 USA
Tel: 904-620-2463, Fax: 904-620-2979, E-mail: jseroka@gw.unf.edu

Abstract. *One of the most significant phenomena affecting political dynamics in the United States has been the virtual revolution which has occurred in how local governments perform their functions, how citizens relate to local government, how citizens have changed their expectations of local government, and how the citizens have changed their relationship to the city and urban community in positive and democratic ways. In general, these changes have resulted in enhanced citizen control, increased citizen responsibility, and heightened citizen awareness of community and sense of belonging in the urban community.*

In my remarks, I briefly review the major social forces acting upon the fundamental restructuring of the character of local government in the United States, and how municipal government can now interact productively with its citizens. I also discuss some of the features in the US political landscape that underscore and give additional emphasis to these changes. Finally, I briefly describe some of the major techniques used to assist local governments meet the new expectations of democratic governance and the success which local governments have had with these approaches. They include: strategic planning, community development corporations, departments of neighborhood, total quality management, reinventing government, privatization, partnerships with NGOs, performance measurement, benchmarking, and customer service programs.

Some of the techniques used by citizens and municipal governments in the United States to forge a new democratic spirit may have applications outside the United States, including Yugoslavia. It is imperative, however, that the philosophical and behavioral underpinnings of these efforts be understood fully before any transference of techniques are attempted.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most significant phenomena affecting political dynamics in the United States has been the virtual revolution that has occurred in how local governments perform their functions, how citizens relate to local government, how citizens have changed their expectations of local government, and how the citizens have changed their relationship to the city and urban community in positive and democratic ways. In general, these changes have resulted in enhanced citizen control, increased citizen responsibility, a heightened citizen awareness of community, and a sense of belonging in the urban community within the United States.

Although changes in the behavior and organization of the Federal government in the United States have been the focus of attention by most scholars and the national media, those changes which have occurred on the local level may deliver more fundamental and positive change for betterment of the quality of civic culture and democratization in the United States and may prove more significant than any other U.S. political institutional changes which have occurred in the latter part of the 20th century.

This paper briefly reviews the major social forces acting upon the fundamental restructuring of the character of local government in the United States, and how municipal government can now interact productively with its citizens. It discusses some of the features in the US political landscape that underscore and give additional emphasis to these changes. It also briefly describes some of the major techniques used to assist local governments to meet the new expectations of democratic governance in American cities. Finally, It gives an appraisal of the future direction of change for local governments in the United States in the 21st century.

FUNDAMENTAL FORCES IMPACTING LOCAL DEMOCRATIZATION IN THE UNITED STATES

During the last two decades, scholars and political figures have focused their attention almost exclusively on issues related to globalization and national centralization. They have spoken poetically about the virtues of the global community, the advantages of the "common European home", or the impending struggles associated with the clash of civilizations. They have postulated about the sweeping success of democracy in the world, but in this process they have given far too little attention to the pivotal transformations occurring on the local level - the level where democracy is most meaningful and most visible.

The fascination with macro democratization is unfortunate because democratization at the national or global level is meaningless if democratization is not conscientiously practiced at the most basic levels of the local community. Rather than focus exclusively on national or global trends, we need to pay more attention to the building blocks and foundation of democracy - the practice of democracy at the grass roots level. To the extent that democracy is denied at the level of the local community, it has no chance for success at other levels of government. To the extent that citizens abandon their local

institutions, their national institutions will whither and collapse from within.

If nothing else, the sudden collapse of the Marxist-Leninist regimes in east and central Europe demonstrated that the strongest military, political and administrative apparatuses are no match for an alienated and disaffected local populace. While the proverb may suggest that corruption at the top of society is most egregious[1], it is at the local levels where the rot and corruption of a society begins.

While much attention has been focused on global trends, Western democratic nations have undertaken a substantial transformation in the way that local affairs have been managed and how local governments interact with their citizens. The transformation has been most pronounced in the United States, where surprisingly it has garnered almost no public media or scholarly attention. The shift is associated with such trends and phenomena as *citizen empowerment*, *enhancement of civic culture*, *shared power decision-making*, *democratic governance*, and *communitarianism*. All of these trends, however, have been characterized and accompanied by a major change in philosophical outlook; namely, that local government belongs to the people and that the people own and control their local affairs; and that it is the responsibility of both to facilitate democratic action. The new urban democracy in the United States is an outgrowth of the need for the urban community to achieve a sense of security and belonging, as well as the imperative for the local institutions to rebuild their base of local support and local commitment in a chaotic environment.

This paradigmatic change in the outlook of US local government was not planned, nor does it mirror a predetermined philosophical approach created for this purpose. The new American urban democracy, to the extent that it has any philosophical roots, traces its lineage to Jefferson and his idealization of the local government and the yeoman farmer. Its imagery is conservative, not revolutionary. Its justification is based on characteristic American pragmatism, not social engineering. Its raison d'etre is survival not human perfection. Its primary goals were to find a way to stem the alienation of the citizen from the community and to recommit the citizen to grass roots democratic governance.

THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

In the 19th century, Alexis de'Tocqueville and others had glowingly commented on how American democracy appeared vibrant and strong, and that American democracy depended upon the maturation of local democratic institutions, and the willingness of the citizen to engage in local action and volunteerism in service to the local community. Town hall meetings with direct democracy, local control of schools, and the proliferation of numerous volunteer institutions such as fire protection, parks and public works all demonstrated and reinforced the vitality in American democracy and served as an incubator for democratic action on the state and national levels.

Throughout this period, much of the American West was settled and organized according to the democratic and self-rule principles of the Northwest Ordinance. This fundamental act mandated local democratic government and citizen control over the

---

[1] The expression which comes to mind is *Riba smrdi od glave*.

provision of local social services, and one spillover effect of this law was that the state legislatures and the US Congress exhibited a strong distrust of the central government and particularly of the large urban metropolises with their teeming and poverty-stricken masses. In the US political lexicon, therefore, small became equated with democratic, and large became synonymous with corruption and despotic rule. Populist Jeffersonian and Jacksonian lore identified the core of democratic society with the yeoman farmer, while the threat to democracy was always found in the large cities.

In the latter part of the 20th century, local governments throughout the United States faced numerous challenges. Cities and metropolitan areas became the norm; polarization within cities by class, ethnicity and race became endemic; and class and racial conflict spilled into the streets and required police and occasionally military suppression to restore public order. By the1970's, the wealthy and much of the middle class had abandoned the cities and formed increasingly more homogeneous and isolated suburban borderlands that were further and further removed from the cares and concerns of the city. Cities found themselves to be populated by the poor, by racial minorities, and by the elderly who could not afford to leave. Older suburbs found themselves to be assaulted with the outwardly spreading urban blight; and a sense of frustration, anger and chaos took hold in many American cities and towns.

In the 1970's and 1980's, local government officials in the United States had responded to these challenges by calling for more outside assistance from the state and national governments, by instituting more centralized authority, and, inadvertently, by further weakening of the ties of the community to their political structures. Local public schools continued their rush to ever larger consolidated bodies, and creation of management structures beyond local control. Zoning decisions often became the province of metropolitan and regional authorities who engaged in predatory practices against other cities to attract and retain economic opportunity. Transportation decision-making became revenues. The "not in my backyard" (NIMBY) syndrome meant that simple issues such as road improvements, location of public facilities, and simple service distribution questions were held hostage by conflicting groups who distrusted one another and refused to engage in the time-honored give and take of politics. Decision-making in most cities slowed to a crawl; and in some cities, it came to a complete halt. Perhaps, one of the most poignant indications of the NIMBY phenomenon was the televised odyssey of the floating garbage barge from Long Island, New York, which was refused entry by fearful officials in every port on the East and Gulf coasts of the United States, and which futilely traveled up and down the coast for several months.

Attempts by local officials to strengthen central control and employ quasiauthoritarian technocratic decision making as a method to break the decision-making log jam were not successful. In fact, in many cases, the exercise of such "strong leadership" backfired and the political leaders were turned out of office. Citizens wanted officials who would listen, not officials who "knew best".

REVITALIZATION OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

In the United States, the concept and practice of local government derives from a rich tradition of local self-rule and self-reliance. The Northwest Ordinance, for example,

required the formation of local units of self-government called *townships* that had broad powers of self-administration and requirements to provide universal basic education. Towns and cities traditionally provided such services as roads, parks, drainage, utilities, fire and police protection, education and a local court system. Towns exercised a state or even federal responsibility, far removed from local and neighborhood concerns. Parks, particularly in the cities, became perceived as refuges for criminals, not community-based recreation areas. Even the core symbol of local autonomy, the local police forces, were often viewed as hostile powers who had only disdain or disrespect for the citizens they supposedly served. Among many citizens, local taxes were viewed as out of control, and revenues were perceived as being spent on functions and services that did not work and were not wanted. Public opinion surveys, for example, consistently recorded that overwhelming majorities of taxpayers believed that 85% or more of local tax revenue was wasted; that schools were unsafe and out of control; that the police were corrupt and incapable of maintaining order; and that government's sole interest was self-preservation of its bureaucracy.

Initially, in order to slow down this downward spiral in citizen confidence and reductions in revenue, local government engaged in a cut- throat, zero-sum competition to lure clean, high wage businesses into their communities. The result of the competition, however, was that the large business and commercial interests were able to extract concessions from local governments that resulted in local subsidies for the most able and competitively strong enterprises, but increased hardships for those pre-existing and locally owned business and industries. For a commercial enterprise, disloyalty to a community paid handsome dividends, and it paid to shop around.

By the end of the 1980's, relations between local government officials, political leaders and the community deteriorated to the point of open conflict. Necessary public improvements were held hostage by citizen groups who refused to approve necessary tax considerable influence in the promotion of economic and commercial development and public transit. In fact, in order to hold administrative and operating costs down and to maximize citizen control, boards were created which were staffed primarily by unpaid volunteers to organize and implement these activities. Such a system, while democratic, was also fragmented, cumbersome, resistive to change, and not particularly efficient.

A second notable feature about U.S, local government is its heavy reliance on volunteer activity. For example, within school systems, extra-curricular educational and sport activities are almost universally staffed by volunteers and financed by volunteer community fund raising. Fire protection in many communities was, and often still is, provided by volunteer fire fighters. Even many public improvements such as parks, sidewalks and roads depend heavily upon self-initiated fee collection and volunteer efforts.

The reliance upon local efforts and volunteer activities could, and often did, suffer from some negative consequences. The loss of economies of scale often meant that local services cost more and were not delivered as efficiently as possible. Relatively wealthy communities were able to provide a much higher quality of life than poorer communities, and the extraordinarily high degree of population mobility often meant that households

would decide to move to another community rather than stay and work for improvements[2].

In summary, by the conclusion of the 1980's, the basic problems confronting local governments were the weakening of local democracy and the alienation of citizens from their communities. Residents, local officials and administrations in many cities and towns were often engaged in a conflictual stalemate leading to decision-making paralysis. Many residents distrusted their government and were more willing to move to new locales than to work within the system. As local tax efforts climbed, dissatisfaction with the quality and delivery of local services also climbed. The states and federal government also largely abandoned the cities and towns to their own devices, and it became obvious that centralization and technocratic approaches to solving urban problems were not working. If urban democracy and confidence were to be restored, the answer had to originate in the local community.

IN SEARCH FOR A SOLUTION

In the United States, local government officials have generally not been professionally trained administrators. Most, however, have had career experience in the private sector and tended to naturally look to the business and commercial sectors for solutions to problems. A common refrain that was often heard in city halls and county courthouses was to "run government like a business." Although such a slogan was overly simplistic and potentially dangerous, the concept did open up local government to much needed innovation and experimentation.

One of the most obvious areas for innovation in the delivery of local government services was widespread privatization of public functions and its attendant dismissal of public employees. Privatization affected services ranging from sold waste collection to hospital administration, and public acceptance and enthusiasm for privatization were widespread. Among local officials, privatization proved to be particularly attractive because salaries and benefits of employees constituted 80% or more of local expenditures, and public employment often saddled governments with long-term contractual and pension commitments. Public officials and many citizens also disliked civil service protection rules which were often perceived by these groups as thinly disguised featherbedding schemes in which the paid employees could exercise strong control over the execution of government but remain free from discipline and control. Finally, privatization was welcomed by public officials because personnel issues consumed large amounts of time and involved considerable legal liabilities and risk. Privatization transferred those responsibilities to a private contractor.

Advantages from privatization were obvious., and privatization was perceived as a win-win issue for elected officials and the communities. Services could be let for competitive bids. Taxes could be reduced, although fees for services would go up. The city administration could excuse itself from the headaches and liabilities of the public

---

[2] The US Internal Revenue Service estimates that l0 percent or more of the households in the United States in a given year move to a new locate more than 25 miles (40 kilometers) from their prior location.

sector work force. Issues relating to quality of services delivery could be transferred to the private sector, and ideologically, citizens felt much better about transferring government sector services to the free market. Finally, political leaders could take credit for reducing the size of government, reducing taxes, and getting government out of the people's lives.

In the United States, the momentum for privatization was not mandated by the national or state government, and local communities often experimented with the most appropriate private-public mix for their communities. A few communities contracted out even vital services such as police functions, but with generally poor results. Many privatized solid waste pickup and disposal, hospital administration, urban transit, ambulance services, school transportation, and other functions. Some communities even privatized regulatory functions such as engineering services, or signed inter-local agreements which obligated municipalities to enter into contracts for services.

While privatization is not a direct democratization process, it did significantly impact on how government was conducted at the local level. It helped reduce the scope of intra-community conflict. It moved political leaders out of direct administration; and it changed the locus of attention for political officials to policy-making. Most of all, privatization eliminated a major impediment to decision-making, and it provided the weapon to cut the Gordian knot that paralyzed local decision-making.

APPLICATION OF BUSINESS MODELS FOR DECISION-MAKING:

In the 1970's and 1980's local government tended to behave within the Anglo-Saxon legal approach to decision-making. The model was highly conflictual, and its fundamental principal was the adversarial approach to problem-solving. In some cities, the city councils increasingly tended to view their role as quasi-judicial, but they lacked the authority of a judge or courtroom. In other instances, city officials were placed in the position of a defendant, but without clear rules of evidence and due process protection. Increasingly and unfortunately, it became common that city assembly decisions were temporary and subject to review. Threats of non-compliance by those opposed to a decision often influenced results, and helped to generate a spiral of increased conflict and paralyzed decision-making.

U.S. business had generally not fallen into the same adversarial trap as had local governments, but the enormous dislocations in the competitive world environment had convinced many in the business sector that a new order of business was necessary as well. This new order needed to encourage innovation, commit the firm to long-term planning, and transfer the primary interest of the firm from quantity of production to enhanced quality of production.

The needs of U.S. business in the 1980's were parallel to the needs of local governments, and local officials keenly followed business practices which impacted on these needs. The three needs generated three responses, generally referred to as the *re-engineered corporation*, *strategic planning* and *total quality management*. Intriguingly, each of the approaches was essentially democratic in its essence, and each depended upon employee support for its successful implementation. The strict hierarchical model had been discarded as a dinosaur in today's business world, and the concomitant success of US business in the 1980's offered a desirably emulative example for U.S. local government.

RE-INVENTING GOVERNMENT

The essence of the movement towards re-inventing government was pure pragmatism; namely, identify the problem, find the institutional and procedural impediments to solving the problem, remove the impediments, and then solve the problem. Re-inventing government demanded commitment on the part of the policy-makers and risk-taking on the part of the administration. Local decision-makers also needed to be granted the authority and trust to solve the problems; citizens had to be included in the decision-making matrix; and rewards for successful problem solving had to be assured.

Re-inventing government approaches found ready acceptance at the local community level. This occurred primarily because local governments had no other alternatives - trust was low; rescue by the state or federal government was unlikely; and many community groups threatened to take power in their own hands if a solution was not made available. Also in support of this movement was the perception that re-inventing government was intrinsically American and pragmatic. It required no specific or pre-ordained solution, and its ethos was fundamentally supportive of change and flexibility. Most significantly, the re-inventing government approach involved citizens and the community who nurtured a sense of pride and satisfaction in government that had been lacking for too long.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

A second business tool that found ready acceptance was strategic planning. In the U.S. business sector, heightened global competition, particularly from the Japanese, underscored the weaknesses in day-by-day competitive practices oriented towards maximization of the quarterly dividend. In the 1980's, it became clear that business success in the global economy depended upon long-term planning, a clear and consistent vision and set of goals, identification and servicing of the customer, clear specification of organizational responsibility, and widespread employee commitment to the vision and goals. The prevalent new business model highlighted creativity and embraced a participatory, bottom-up decision-making culture.

Cities, much more so than businesses, suffered from a lack of focus and direction. Policies would change after each election and often more rapidly in response to the shifts in public opinion. These problems were especially evident in the decade of the 1980's, and strategic planning offered a way that a number of basic political needs would be filled.

First, strategic planning was participatory and democratic. Everyone could participate, and, theoretically, everyone's impact could make a difference. Second, strategic planning mandated the creation of a specific vision and goals with attendant specification of responsibilities. This feature, in particular, appealed to the pragmatic nature of American political culture. Third, strategic planning was competitive and signaled a new beginning. As a result, the community could discard the heritage of conflict, and compete to become the "best" community in realization of its values. At a minimum, the visionary process could lead to the cessation of conflict and provide some essential breathing room and an ability for all sides to speak and hear one another.

TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT

U.S. businesses were hurt very badly and publicly by the perception that US goods and manufactures were shoddy and lacked the quality found in the Japanese and in other competitors. It became obvious that customers cared about quality, and that in most products and services the customer would pay more to achieve quality. The approach that many of the most visible U.S. businesses employed was to micro-examine the manufacturing process, solicit detailed feedback from customers, closely monitor the competition, and eliminate all errors from the production process. Those businesses which ignored total quality management found themselves losing market share and customer support. Those businesses which endorsed and implemented TQM found that the obsession with quality transformed and modernized their organization in unplanned ways, particularly in the introduction of a participatory decision-making culture within the firm.

For cities, total quality management tended to be a more citizen driven methodology. Quality measures were often centered on reduction of citizen complaints and enhancement of citizen satisfaction. In comparison to business, however, cities lacked a clearly identifiable product, and TQM approaches were difficult to apply in the urban political culture. The major positive impact of TQM on local government operations, however, were its emphases on citizen and community input and its strong commitment to partnership among the political officials, community and administrative structures.

PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT

Unlike the private sector which bases success on profit and market share, cities and towns operate in a much different environment in which it is much more difficult to identify and measure success. Again, a technique modified from the business and commercial communities, primarily marketing, was adapted for use by local governments. This technique was *benchmark measurement*.

Benchmarking involved identifying the best practices found in comparable cities and contrasting your city's performance against the practical ideal. If, for example, the best practice of a comparable city involved spending x dollars with y man-hours to successfully pave a pre-determined length of street, then your goal was to contrast your performance measures against those benchmarks and develop a plan to narrow the gap. In law enforcement, for example, there are benchmarks on response rates, citizen complaint levels, successful prosecutions and arrest rates. A police department would establish annual goals and measure progress towards those goals.

The advantages from benchmarking are clear. They include the ability to link pay to performance for public workers, justification for budget requests, and the provision of meaningful comparative data for community evaluation.

COMMUNICATING BETTER AND MORE PRECISELY

As discussed earlier, a major failure in U.S. local government was the collapse of two-way communication and trust among community members, elected officials, administrators, and public employees. Each tended to view the others as misinformed

and/or consumed with bad intentions toward them. For example, many community members perceived elected officials as self-regarding and self-interested; administrators were perceived as unresponsive and disdainful towards community concerns; and public employees were perceived as incompetent and lazy dolts. Two approaches to deal with the issue that emerged were substantive decentralization and support for a citizen-centered communication plan.

DECENTRALIZATION

As cities grew in size and complexity, community members had correspondingly lost that sense of control and awareness of what was being done as well as their sense of community obligations. For example, decisions made to reform police officers from walking a beat and placing the officer in an automobile filled with high technology, increased the effectiveness of police officers to deal with crime. At the same time, however, the decision also eliminated the personal contact between the officer and the immediate community being served. Consolidation of street repair facilities, utilities and public work operations increased efficiency and economies of scale, but it also put several layers of hierarchy between the city resident requesting a solution and the responsible department carrying out the repair. Specialization of task by employees to ensure equity and professionalism in areas such as permitting also created as sense of unresponsiveness and futility by the citizen as he is channeled from office to office in pursuit of a simple permission request.

Local governments have responded to the need for decentralization in a number of ways, but almost every city has begun to respond. Some cities established neighborhood based city halls; some have initiated one-stop neighborhood service centers. Some have experimented with "city halls in the malls"[3], or with ATM-type machines to provide basic information on services or permit payment capacity. Some cities have established departments of neighborhoods whose function is to facilitate communication between the city and the neighborhood.

The intent behind all these activities is to increase the amount, accuracy and ease of two-way communications. Some unexpected, but welcome, results included a renewed sense of identification and pride within neighborhoods, enhanced willingness of businesses to loan expertise to the neighborhood in return for favorable public relations, productive inter-neighborhood competitions, and greater willingness of citizens to volunteer and become involved in neighborhood or city activities.

CITIZEN SERVICE ETHOS BUILDING

Paralleling business efforts to identify and serve their customers, cities across the United States have instituted citizen service orientation programs. The goal is to increase

---

[3] Malls are major shopping centers where large numbers of people congregate. The temporary city halls involve the placement of one or more city employees within the mall at high peak time periods (e.g. prior to tax payment days) to assist community members with their local government business.

satisfaction by citizens with local government performance by training public employees in understanding and empathizing with citizen concerns and perspectives. Satisfaction surveys, city newsletters, employee training programs, 360 degree reviews of performance, and other techniques are often used. Incentives to public employees for exceptional performance or special recognition to employees or departments may also be used. The bottom line in all cases is to create a consciousness among employees that community members are the customer, and that the customer is king.

SUMMARY

During the last half decade, local governments throughout the United States have undergone a quiet revolution. While it is too early to judge if the revolution will take permanent hold, enough time and experience has passed to verify that there is an accepted understanding that citizens are the central element of any local government. Professionalism without democratic control will not be accepted. Government by proxy will not longer be tolerated. Operations without vision and outside responsiveness to citizen concern will not be funded or permitted.

Democratic control has become the essence of local government reform in the United States. Citizens must be involved; they must provide explicit authorization for what the government does, and the citizen must always remain the center of local government concern. With respect to governmental size, smaller is better because smaller is more likely to remain democratic. Experimentation will be permitted; flexibility will be expected; but, most importantly, local government must remain local and must respond to local circumstances, local needs and local desires.

In America, citizens have clearly communicated the message that their democracy means less if there is no democracy in their neighborhoods and towns. Whether the new commitment and assumption of responsibility of the citizen will continue to grow, however, is a question whose answer is not yet clear. Apparently, it is the case that each new generation must relearn the lessons that democracy is a right which must be earned, and that democracy is a right which will be lost if it is not fully and continually exercised.

REFERENCES

1. Ammons, David, Municipal Benchmarks: Assessing Local Performance and Establishing Community Standards, Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA (1996).
2. Bens, Charles K., "Effective Citizen Involvement: How to Make it Happen, National Civic Review, vol. 83, no. I (Winter, 1994): 32-39.
3. Berry, Jeffrey, Kent Portney and Ken Thomson, The Rebirth of Urban Democracy, Brookings Institution: Washington, DC (1993).
4. Blakely, Edward, Planning Local Economic Development, Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA (1994).
5. Bookchin, Murray, From Urbanization to Cities: Toward a New Politics of Citizenship, Cassell: London (1995).
6. Bryant, Scott, "Strategic Management: Developing and Realigning a Strategic Vision," Public Management, vol. 79, no. l0 (October, 1997): 28-33.
7. Bryson, John and Barbara Crosby, Leadership for the Common Good: Tackling Problems in a Shared Power World, Jossey Bass: San Francisco (1992).
8. Bryson, John, Strategic Planning for Public and Nonprofit Organizations, Jossey Bass: San Francisco (1995).

9. Cohen, Steven and Ronald Brand, Total Quality Management in Government, Jossey Bass: San Francisco (1993).
10. Daly, Markate, Communitarianism: A New Public Ethic, Wadsworth: Belmont, CA, 1994.
11. Dodge, William R., "Strategic lntercommunity Governance Networks" National Civic Review, vol. 81, no 1 (Fall-Winter, 1992): 403-417.
12. Epstein, Paul D., Using Performance Measurement in Local Government, National Civic League Press: New York, NY (1988).
13. Gibbs, Christine, "How to Make Customer Service Work" Public Management, vol. 77, no. 8 (August, 1995): 14-17.
14. Giles, Michael, "The Atlanta Project: A Community-Based Approach to Solving Urban Problems" National Civic Review, vol. 82, no. 4 (Fall, 1993): 354-362.
15. Gurwitt, Rob, "The Entrepreneurial Gamble," Governing, vol. 7, no. 8 (May, 1994): 34-43.
16. Harris, Patricia, Total Quality Management: Strategies for Local Government, International City Management Association: Washington, DC (1993).
17. Henderson, Lenneal, "Baltimore: Managing the Civics of a Turnaround Community," National Civic Review, vol. 82, no 4 (Fall, 1993): 329-339.
18. Matthews, David, "Putting the Public back into Politics," National Civic Review, vol. 80, no. 4 (Fall, 1991): 343-351.
19. Moore, Carl, "Community is where Community Happens" National Civic Review, vol. 80, no. 4 (Fall, 1991): 352-357.
20. Parr, John, "Civic Infrastructure: A New Approach to Improving Community Life" National Civic Review, vol. 82, no. 2 (Spring, 1993): 93-101.
21. Purdy, James, "Revitalizing Cleveland: Organizing Citizens to Respond to the Challenge", National Civic Review, vol. 82, no. 4 (Fall, 1993): 340-347.
22. Putnam, Robert D. "What Makes Democracy Work," National Civic Review, vol. 82, no 2 (Spring, 1993): 101-108.
23. Rohe, William and Lauren Gates, Planning with Neighborhoods, University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, NC (1985).
24. Osborne, David and Ted A. Gaebler, "Bringing Government Back to Life" Governing, vol. 5, no. 5 (February, 1992): 46-60.
25. _____, Reinventing Government, Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA, 1992.
26. Resler, Tamara J. and Roger E. Kanet, "Democratization: The National-Subnational Linkage" In Depth, vol. 3, no, I (Winter, 1993): 5-22.
27. View, Jenice L. and Carol E. Wayman, Neighbors Building Community: A Report of the Neighborhood Assistance Act Project, Union Institute: Washington, DC (1995).
28. Walters, Johnathan, "The Cult of TQM" Governing, vol. 5, no. 6 (May1992): 38-44.
29. Wray, Lyle D. and Jody Hauer, "Best Practices Reviews for Local Government" Public Management, vol. 78, no. 1 (January, 1996): 7-11.
30. _____, "Performance Measurement to Achieve Quality of Life: Adding Value Through Citizens" Public Management, vol. 79, no. 8 (August, 1997): 4-8

TRENDOVI U GRADSKOJ UPRAVI I UTICAJ NA DEMOKRATIZACIJU U SJEDINJENIM DRŽAVAMA

Jim Seroka

Jedna od najznačajnijih pojava koja utiče na političku dinamiku u Sjedinjenim Državama bila je stvarna revolucija do koje je došlo u pogledu toga kako lokalne vlasti obavljaju svoje funkcije, kako se građani odnose prema lokalnoj vlasti, kako su građani promenili svoja očekivanja u odnosu na lokalnu vlast i kako su građani na pozitivan i demokaratski način promenili svoj odnos prema gradu i urbanoj zajednici.

Svojim zapažanjima autor se ukratko osvrće na glavne društvene snage koje su od uticaja na osnovno prestruktuiranje karaktera lokalne vlasti u Sjedinjenim Državama i kako gradska vlast

može sada da bude u pozitivnoj interakciji sa svojim građanima. Takođe razmatra i neke karakteristike u političkom pejzažu Sjedinjenih Država koje ističu i posebno naglašavaju ove promene. Na kraju, pruža kratak prikaz nekih glavnih tehnika koje se koriste da pripomognu lokalnim vlastima da ispune očekivanja demokratskog upravljanja i uspeha koji su lokalne vlasti postigle ovim pristupima. A to su: strateško planiranje, korporacije za razvoj zajednice, susedske zajednice, upravljanje totalnim kvalitetom, ponovno otkrivanje vlasti, privatizacija, partnerstvo sa NGOs, merenje rada, uporedno ispitivanje i programi za usluge korisnicima.

    Neke od tehnika koje koriste građani i gradske vlasti u Sjedinjenim državama da bi stvorili novi demokratski duh mogu se primeniti i izvan Sjedinjenih Država, uključujući i Jugoslaviju. Međutim, imperativno je da se filozofski i behavioristički osloni ovih napora u potpunosti shvate pre nego što se i pokuša bilo kakvo prenošenje tehnika.

Ključne reči: *Sjedinjene Države, gradska uprava, demokratizacija, strateško planiranje, korporacije za razvoj zajednica*