

公共管理影印教材系列

Mark H. Moore  
(美) 马克·莫尔 著

**CREATING  
PUBLIC VALUE**  
**STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT  
IN GOVERNMENT**

**创造公共价值**  
**政府战略管理**

清华大学出版社

**CREATING  
PUBLIC VALUE  
STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT  
IN GOVERNMENT**

---

**创造公共价值  
政府战略管理**

Mark H. Moore

(美) 马克·莫尔 著

清华大学出版社

北京

## 内 容 简 介

本书作者马克·莫尔是美国哈佛大学肯尼迪政府学院的资深教授,也是肯尼迪政府学院高级管理人员培训项目的创始人,并担任该项目的主席达十几年之久,因而拥有公共管理实务方面的大量第一手资料。本书并不像一般的政府管理教材那样集中于对政府管理细节问题的探讨,而是直接将分析重点指向公共管理的终极目的——创造公共价值这一根本性问题。本书在传授以公共价值为核心的全新管理理念时,引用了若干个经典的美国公共管理案例,并对案例进行了系统而深入的分析,使读者能够更好地理解和认同本书的管理理念。本书的读者对象为政府管理者、非营利组织工作人员、相关研究机构人员、MPA学员以及其他对公共管理感兴趣的读者。

Creating Public Value/Mark H. Moore/Originally Published by Harvard University Press in 1995.

EISBN 0-674-17558-1

Copyright©1995 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Reprinted by arrangement with Harvard University Press.

**Harvard University Press** 授权清华大学出版社在中国境内独家出版、发行本书英文影印版。未经出版者书面许可,不得以任何方式抄袭、节录或翻印本书任何部分。

本书封面贴有清华大学出版社激光防伪标签,无标签者不得销售。

北京市版权局著作权合同登记号 图字:01-2003-1662

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

创造公共价值:政府战略管理=Creating Public Value:Strategic Management in Government/(美)莫尔(Moore,M.H.)著.一影印本.一北京:清华大学出版社,2003

(公共管理影印教材系列)

ISBN 7-302-07496-8

I.创… II.莫… III.国家-行政管理-教材-英文 IV.D035

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(2003)第 097474 号

出版者:清华大学出版社

<http://www.tup.com.cn>

社总机:010-62770175

地址:北京清华大学学研大厦

邮编:100084

客户服务:010-62776969

责任编辑:孙文凯

封面设计:李莹

印刷者:北京佳信达艺术印刷有限公司

装订者:三河市李旗庄少明装订厂

发行者:新华书店总店北京发行所

开本:155×230 印张:27.25

版次:2003年12月第1版 2003年12月第1次印刷

书号:ISBN 7-302-07496-8/G·358

印数:1~3000

定价:42.00元

公共管理影印教材系列  
编委会

编委会主任:

薛澜 程文浩

编委:(排名不分先后)

薛澜 王名 王有强 巫永平

程文浩

主编:

程文浩

# 公共管理影印教材系列

## 总 序

近年来,我国的社会主义市场经济不断完善,“第三部门”蓬勃兴起,中国顺利地加入了世界贸易组织。这些因素都使得国内对于高水平公共管理人才的需求空前增长。随着党的“十六大”关于深化行政管理体制改革,推进决策科学化与民主化的论述的提出,我国的各级政府开始了新一轮的改革政府决策体系和管理机制的实践。电子政务、公共服务社会化、政府管理创新等新的公共管理概念不断出现。这也使得社会对于公共管理者素质和能力的要求不断提高。

新时代的公共管理者不但要具备丰富的公共管理知识以及解决复杂问题的能力,而且还要有广阔的国际视野。这就对我国的公共管理教育提出了更高的要求。

一流的公共管理教材,是一流的公共管理教育的基础条件。教材的优劣,在很大程度上决定了大家能否接触到国际最前沿的理论,奠定坚实的理论基础,以及能否灵活地运用理论知识,有效地解决现实社会中存在的各类公共管理问题。所以,编辑和出版高质量的教材,是公共管理教育一项重要的基础性工作。

由于我国的公共管理教育刚刚起步,教材体系的建立和完善尚需时日。在这种情况下,直接引进国外高水平的公共管理教材,就成为解决现阶段教材匮乏问题的重要途径。清华大学公共管理学院和清华大学出版社联合策划的这套公共管理影印教材丛书,旨在通过引进一流的外文原版教材,直接推动我国公共管理教育的发展。清华大学出版社近年来显著加大了对文科类图书的出版力度,这次为了使国内读者能够接触到国外一流的公共管理教材,更是不惜重金购买版权,充分反映了出版社领导和编辑同志们的远见卓识。

近几年来,已经有相当数量的西方公共管理著作经过翻译被介绍到我国。这些著作涵盖的题材十分广泛。但是,我们认为,引进外文原版教材仍然十分必要,因为这样能够更快更及时地把国外最新的公共管理理念、方法和工具介绍到国内来。而且,中国新一代的公共管理者应当能够熟练地掌握外语工具。在学习过程中直接阅读外文原版教材,不但能够显著提高他们的外语水平,而且还有助于更准确地领会作者的思想和本意,从而加深对现代公共管理理念的理解。



我们在丛书结构方面的基本设想，是围绕公共管理、公共政策、政治学等国家确定的 MPA 核心课程，每门课程计划出版若干种外文原版教材。在这个基础之上，再争取为公共管理的主要方向性必修课配备相应的教材。

西方的公共管理著作浩如烟海，新的著作层出不穷。在甄选教材的时候，我们始终持十分审慎的态度，并严格坚持下列标准：

首先，著作本身要有较高的学术水平，一般应能够反映其所处专业领域的最新发展。我们优先选择那些已经得到国际学术界认可，并且已被应用于公共管理教学的经典著作。

其次，著作的内容要系统和全面，能够基本涵盖所处专业领域的主要内容。

第三，著作的内容最好能够围绕不同专题展开，各章在逻辑上一脉相承，在内容上则自成体系，以适应教学的实际需要。

第四，著作要体现理论和实际的紧密结合。公共管理是一门实践性和操作性很强的学科，这就要求公共管理教材不但要有理论上的深度和广度，而且还必须密切联系实际，能够为公共管理实践提供直接的指导和参考。因此，我们优先选择那些含有系统深入的案例分析的著作。

本丛书主要面向 MPA 学员，对于所有渴望学习公共管理知识的人士来说，也是极为有益的参考资料。我们希望通过这套教材，使国内人士不但能够学到国际最前沿的公共管理理论知识，而且知道如何在实践中灵活地运用这些知识。

虽然我们尽量选取那些最符合我国实际需要的国外教材，但不可否认的是，这些教材所传达的某些价值观和伦理观，不可避免地带有作者自身的倾向。这点希望广大读者在阅读时加以注意。

编辑和出版原版公共管理教材丛书是一项艰巨的工作，需要长期不懈的努力。衷心希望这项工作能够得到社会各界的大力支持，同时也欢迎大家向我们踊跃推荐高水平的西方公共管理著作！

丛书编委会  
2003年5月

## 导 读

本书是美国哈佛大学肯尼迪政府学院马克·莫尔教授的呕心沥血之作，1995年由哈佛大学出版社出版之后，获得学术界的高度评价，并被美国许多公共管理课程选为教材。在本书即将出版之际，马克·莫尔教授特为中国读者写了序言。

### 主要特点

本书的三大特色，奠定了其在学术界的地位。首先，作者本人有着极强的学术背景。马克·莫尔是肯尼迪政府学院的资深教授，并担任哈佛大学豪塞非营利组织研究中心（Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations）的主任。他还创立了肯尼迪政府学院的高级管理人员培训项目，并担任该项目的主席达十几年之久。在此期间，他领导或参与了肯尼迪学院几乎所有高级培训项目的教学，包括政府高级管理者项目、州和地方政府管理者项目、国防政策讲座等。这些培训使得莫尔教授有机会与来自各领域的高级公共管理者进行深入的交流，从而获得了有关公共管理实务的大量信息。本书的写作，就在很大程度上得益于作者所掌握的丰富的第一手资料。

莫尔教授多年来开展了卓有成就的研究工作。他研究的一个重点方向，就是公共组织领导人如何与外部环境实现良性互动，从而提高组织自身的合法性，并获得外部的支持。近年来，他又致力于研究非营利组织在促进各国的社会发展方面的作用。基于这种兴趣，他创立了哈佛大学豪塞非营利组织研究中心。

本书的第二个特色，是它并不像一般的政府管理教材那样集中于对政府管理细节问题的探讨，而是把分析重点放在政府的战略管理这一宏观层面，并直接指向公共管理的终极目的这一根本性问题。因此，这本书传授的并不是具体的管理技能，而是一种以公共价值为核心的全新的管理理念。而这正是现代公共管理者最需要的基础性训练。

本书的第三个特点，是它作为一本理论著作，实现了理论和实践的完美结合。作者在开头提出创造公共价值这一核心管理理念之后，并没有一味进行理论探讨，而是引用若干个经典的美国公共管理案例，具体说明了公共管理者究竟是如何在其特定的条件下，应对组织内外部的各

种挑战，并最终实现组织的公共价值的。本书的案例分析极为系统和深入。例如，第六章和第七章就是主要围绕两个公共管理案例而展开的。借助这些案例分析，读者能够显著加深对本书提出的管理理念的认识和理解。

### 内容简介

正如书名《创造公共价值》所示，莫尔教授认为公共管理的终极目的，是为社会创造公共价值。所以，公共管理者所面临的首要问题，是其领导的公共组织究竟要创造何种公共价值的问题。在完成对组织职能的精确定位之后，管理者继而要通过整合内外部资源和大胆进行组织创新，争取最大程度地实现组织的公共价值。

本书正文分为三个部分，分别为“展望公共价值”、“赢得支持和合法性”以及“提供公共价值”。

在引言部分，作者明确地说明本书的目的是向公共管理者提供指导，并希望本书所包含的思维方式能够帮助公共管理者成功地利用其掌握的资源，通过创造组织的公共价值来服务于社会。他认为这本书有三项具体功能：一是发展出一套新的公共管理哲学；二是提供一套分析框架，供公共管理者分析组织所处的环境，并估算其采取有效行动的可能性之用；三是介绍了公共管理者可以进行的某些特定的创新，从而有效地利用组织的内外部环境所提供的机会和潜力，创造公共价值。

第一章以一个公共管理案例开头。一位公共图书馆馆员发现每天下午三时，都会有大批学生涌入图书馆，到五点他们开始陆续离开，六点之后图书馆就恢复平静。馆员经过了解发现，造成这一奇怪现象的原因，是这些孩子把图书馆当成了放学后临时的栖身之地。

这些喧闹的孩子们的大量涌入，给图书馆带来了新的管理问题。从表面上看，他们干扰了图书馆的正常运行。然而，从另外一个角度来看，他们的涌入又给图书馆带来了实现其公共价值的新的机会。例如，图书馆可以借机申请增加经费以改善自己的服务条件，或开展专门针对这些学生的读书活动等。这个事例说明，公共管理者所认为的组织的公共价值并不是一成不变的，某些外部事件往往能够引起他们对于组织的价值、作用和功能重新定位。

在分析完这个案例之后，作者指出了传统意义上的公共管理者和他所推崇的战略管理者之间的根本性区别。他认为，传统公共管理的特点，是上级对公共组织的职能和运行方式等都已做出明确的规定，所以



管理者的职责主要是遵守这些规定，维持并改善组织的运转，而不是进行足以改变组织的角色和价值的创新。相比之下，战略管理者则像是探索者。他们能够发现、定义和创造公共价值，其责任不是确保组织的延续，而是作为创造者，根据情况的变化和他们对于公共价值的理解，改变组织的职能和行为。

在第二章，作者集中讨论了公共部门管理工作的目的问题。他认为，公共管理者应当致力于制造公共价值。由于公共价值是一个相对抽象的概念，所以作者继而探讨了应如何衡量组织的公共价值的问题。他认为，从不同角度出發，可以有不同的衡量公共价值的标准。例如，通过选举产生的监督者或“客户”对公共组织表现的满意程度，或组织是否实现了其具体的职能等。虽然这些标准彼此之间并不统一，而且各有弱点，作者仍然认为存在一些基本的衡量公共价值的标准，并对此进行了探讨。他还认为，公共管理者需要经常反思其领导的组织的公共价值问题，因为这样能使其工作更有目的性和创造性。

第三章具体探讨了公共管理者应如何确定其组织的公共价值。作者认为，公共管理者必须回答三个问题：（1）组织的工作目标是否有价值；（2）这一目标能否得到政治和法律方面的支持；（3）从组织管理和运行的角度来看，这个目的能否实现。与此相对应，公共管理者的工作主要应包括三项内容：一是判断其设想的工作目的本身的价值，二是积极争取外部的支持，使自己的工作目的具有合法性，三是提高组织的能力，以真正实现这些目的。下面的四章基本上就是围绕这个三角框架而展开的。

第四章和第五章具体探讨了公共组织的政治管理的功能和技巧。其中，在第四章，作者详细解释了为什么政治管理是公共管理者的一项重要工作，以及他们应如何分析组织所处的政治环境并进行资源动员，以争取外部的支持。在第五章，作者介绍了五种具体的政治管理方式，即倡议、政策制定管理、谈判、公开讨论与领导艺术，以及公共部门推广。由于某些政治管理方式可能会对民主政治构成威胁，所以作者还专门讨论了哪些政治管理方式不但有效，而且本身也比较合适这一问题。

第六章和第七章深入到公共组织内部，集中探讨了战略管理所涉及的组织的内部管理和创新的问题。其中，作者在第六章提出了一个框架，用于分析公共组织的产品、生产过程以及组织的行政管理系统对于生产过程的塑造作用。由于战略管理这一概念本身包含了组织所处的政治环境复杂多变这一假定，所以作者特别强调了公共管理者可以利用一

些技巧来推动组织的创新、适应环境的变化。第七章接着介绍了管理者可以用来进行具有战略意义的组织创新的技巧。

在全书的结论部分，作者又回到了本书开头所提出的一个问题，即公共管理者要想有效和民主地进行管理，必须具备哪些意识和素质？他认为，要想成为成功的公共管理者，必须要有合乎道义的目标，勇于承担责任，同时还要具备一些特定的心理素质。

作为一部集中研究政府的战略管理问题的著作，本书对于公共管理者的真正影响，不在于它传授了一些具体的管理和操作方法，而在于其注入了崭新的管理理念。理念作为一种思维方式，一旦与高明的管理策略和方法相结合，必将产生创新性的战略管理实践。这可能是本书最大的贡献之所在。

# Creating Public Value

## Forward to Chinese Readers

Mark H. Moore

With

Dongxiao Liu

Benjamin Read

Lily Tsai

May 26, 2003

It is a great honor to have my book, *Creating Public Value*, published in China. Naturally, I hope the ideas in the book will prove useful to those who seek to develop and lead a democratic Chinese state. Unfortunately, I know little about China's culture, institutions, or present condition. I hope to learn more about this great country in the future. For now, however, I have asked three students with extensive knowledge of China for assistance in orienting Chinese readers to this work. Together, we have produced this short essay. We hope that it will help animate and guide discussion about the ideas of *Creating Public Value* in China.

### To Whom The Book is Addressed

Let's start with the audience to whom the book is addressed. The book was written primarily to advise those who hold offices in government—those individuals who have the right and the duty to use the authority and material resources of the state to achieve collectively defined purposes. In the Chinese context then, the book addresses itself principally to those who have been called cadres, leaders, administrators, civil servants, and bureaucrats. It seeks to give them advice about how they might best use the offices they hold to help define and achieve the public good—or, as the book suggests, to *create public value*.

In a democracy, however, one cannot address those who are expected to do the public's work without simultaneously speaking to those in whose name the officials act—namely, the people and their representatives. The reason is that citizens and representatives (who have the fundamental right to define the

ends and means of the state) feel entitled to set rules for the conduct of those who carry out the purposes of the state as part of their general oversight of state action. In that sense, this book has to be addressed to, and find favor with, citizens and their elected representatives as well as the administrative officials themselves. Thus, in the Chinese context, the book addresses the broader public and those who are called the peoples' representatives as well as the officials. It asks the public to grant their appointed officials a certain amount of initiative in acting to create public value in exchange for those same officials committing themselves to be held accountable for their actions. Such officials must be accountable both to elected representatives who can articulate the collective aspirations of the society, and to the individual citizens with whom government agencies interact as they do their work of distributing privileges and benefits, and (sometimes) imposing obligations on individual citizens.

**A Key Idea: Making Government More Responsive Both to Collective and Individual Aspirations**

Indeed, an important part of this book focuses precisely on how those who hold offices in the state apparatus should interact with those who authorize them to take action as well as those whom they encounter as clients of the agency in individual encounters. The basic idea is that structuring frequent consultative interactions among civil servants, those who oversee their activities on behalf of the people, and those whom the civil servants encounter as individual clients will accomplish three important goals:

- 1) increase the accountability of the government to the people and ensure that officials serve public rather than private purposes;
- 2) strengthen the capacity of the people to demand performance from government; and
- 3) improve the responsiveness and performance of government by turning bureaucrats into true civil servants.

China has long benefited from a tradition of innovative civil servants. The challenge now is to ensure that the creativity and the innovation of the officials is guided by the will of the people, and that the people strengthen their capacity to direct and control government action not only at the national but also at the

local and “grassroots” levels.

## **The Problematic Connection Between Politics and Administration**

In order to make government agencies more responsive to the aspirations of citizens, citizens must have the institutional means to articulate their collective aspirations, and for ensuring that state officials act in accord with these desires. This book is more about how individual public managers ought to behave given a particular set of political and governmental institutions than it is about the design of those institutions. But it is worth pausing a moment to consider how the design of the political and governmental institutions in the United States might differ from those in China, and what the implications of these differences might be for the practices of public officials.

It is common in the United States to draw a distinction between two different parts of the governmental process: the making of public policy on one hand, and its implementation on the other. With respect to the *making* of public policy, the democratic traditions of the United States stress the importance of widespread and equal participation of individuals and voluntary associations. The basic normative idea is that, in a democracy, all individuals share ownership of the powers of the state. Therefore, all ought to be able to participate in the decision-making about how those state powers will be used.

In contrast, when the subject turns to the issue of implementation, the emphasis seems to shift from concerns about the effective representation of interests to concerns about efficiency and effectiveness in the use of state powers to achieve the purposes that were authorized in the policy-making process. The focus also shifts to worrying about the quality of the individual encounters between government agencies and those citizens with whom the government agencies interact in “one-on-one” transactions.

It is also common in the United States to assume that specialized institutions exist for dealing with different parts of this process. On one hand, with respect to the making of public policy, we rely on legislatures in which elected representatives of the people debate with one another in open forms about the purposes that are important enough to mobilize the powers of the state to achieve, and the means that the state will use to achieve these purposes. On the

other, with respect to the implementation of public policy, we have executive branch agencies, which are responsible for carrying out the ideas that the legislature has endorsed through legislation.

Again, because of its democratic traditions, the United States has also constructed representative institutions and processes that give citizens (as individuals or organized groups, or even unorganized masses) many opportunities to influence government action. Indeed, they can be influential not only at the deliberative stage when public policies are being considered, but also at the implementation stage when the policies are being executed. At the most fundamental level, citizens retain control over the actions of the state through the popular election of those who hold state offices. In the United States, the people elect not only those who will represent them in legislatures, but also those who will hold the top posts in the executive branches of government. The fact that elected officials in deliberative bodies and executive branch agencies need to stand for re-election on a regular basis ensures that these officials will be responsive citizens' aspirations.

But individual citizens and interest groups can gain access to and influence over the policy-making and implementing processes through means other than the election of candidates. They can petition the legislature to take action, and appear before the legislature to give advice about the form that action should take. Similarly, they can make complaints against the administrative actions taken by executive branch agencies, and appear before them in administrative hearings. If worse comes to worse, individual citizens can ultimately file a suit in a court that calls the government to account for its failure to deliver to the individual some right or privilege to which they were entitled under the laws of the state.

Because citizens have so many ways of trying to influence state action, we can say that politics (understood as efforts made by individuals and groups to shape public policy and its implementation) is pervasive in the American system. It cannot be easily limited to the part of the process when we are deliberating about what is to be done, because we no sooner make that decision than we begin to accumulate experience that tells us the decision might have been wrong in some details, and that it would be important to fix in implementation. We cannot limit politics to elections and legislatures because citizens show up

in administrative agencies and courthouses to complain about the consequences of choices made in the legislature.

How this set of issues plays out in the Chinese context is somewhat different. China has long had a philosophical commitment to a close engagement between the people of China and the state apparatus. The key Maoist idea of the "mass line" incorporates a strong commitment to a democratic process in which cadres are to collect ideas from the masses, formulate them into policy, take the ideas back to the masses to get feedback and popularize them, and then execute them. Indeed, in many ways, the commitment to blend popular participation with state action is even stronger in China than in the United States, for there is a much stronger sense of the collective in China than in the United States.

But just as the United States has long had difficulty in realizing its democratic ideals in the practice of its politics, so China has had difficulty in making the state responsive to the aims and aspirations of individual Chinese about how they would like to live and work, and what the state can and should do to help them. After all, in China as well as in the United States there are institutions and processes that give the appearance of creating democratic legitimacy through accountability and responsiveness, but do not necessarily produce the reality.

A different kind of consultation that occurs frequently in China is the informal (often one-on-one consultation) that grassroots officials undertake with citizens. Local officials often carry out directives to consult citizens by visiting individual households or asking officials below them to organize "focus groups." This holds the potential for being an important form of consultation. But once again, its value as a consultative mechanism can be compromised by the fact that those selected for consultation may have been selected precisely because they support the existing party line. And even if they did not, if they do not have a chance to talk with other peers away from the pressure of public officials, they might never find the courage to express views in opposition to the party line.

The kind of consultation about administration that is urged in *Creating Public Value* (and turns out to be difficult for the United States Government as well) is a kind of consultation that goes beyond ritualistic consultations whose

aim is to ratify choices already made rather than to re-consider important decisions in light of others' views about what is valuable or doable. The kind of consultation urged in this book is one that involves *open, public* rather than *closed, private* discussions; that operates against the backdrop of rules that guarantee *rights to speak and associate* even in the absence of a government invitation to do so; that operates both *before* and *after* policy decisions are made; and that is *formalized in written rules and procedures* that create the forums within which consultations about government policies can occur. In the United States, institutions are structured to provide for all of this. Partly as a cause, and partly as a consequence, a political culture and set of practices have grown up that allows individuals and group to use these institutions to pursue their different ideas of both the private and the public good. Yet, the practices of American governmental officials have not fully exploited the potential that these institutions hold for shaping government policy. An important part of the reason for the stunted development is that we have mistakenly tried to restrict politics to the realm of high policy-making rather than embrace politics in the practice of public policy implementation and administration as well.

### **Changing Political Institutions or Changing Official Practices?**

Indeed, an important part of *Creating Public Value* focuses precisely on how public officials charged with *administering* public policies should engage with those who are charged with *making* public policies. This function is called "political management." It is considered crucially important for at least three reasons. First, when public official learn to consult with those who authorize them to take action, the responsiveness of government should increase, and those who are now bureaucrats could become true civil servants. Second, frequent discussion with those who authorize action naturally tends to increase the external accountability of public agencies, and to increase the likelihood that those who lead the agencies will serve public rather than private purposes. Third, and perhaps most importantly, by inviting a serious public consultation, the public not only has a chance to express its views, but also to *develop* them as collective aspirations. By asking people, public officials can create occasions where a collective discussion can arise, and that collective



discussion can actually serve to strengthen the democratic process of decision-making. Citizens can learn that they have the right to influence choices. They can learn that their views have to be considered alongside the views of others. And they may gradually learn the arts of negotiation and compromise that allow a collective choice to arise from individuals with genuinely ideas not only about what would be good for them as individuals, but also what would be good for the group....

Exactly how to produce consultations that can produce these results remains somewhat unclear. In *Creating Public Value*, I have addressed myself primarily to the practices of individuals who occupy administrative positions. And, insofar as individual practitioners have discretion, courage, and imagination, they can take advantage of these ideas in the doing of their work. China has long had a tradition of innovative and imaginative civil servants entrusted with a great deal of discretion. So, it seems entirely appropriate to address them as individuals who can act on the basis of their own judgment. The advice that is given, however, is that they should use their discretion not only to act purposefully to achieve results, but also to *set up processes of consultation that maximize the chance that the purposes pursued will be the right ones from the point of view of the population, and that the population will aid in the pursuit of the goals rather than resist them.*

By offering advice to those who manage governmental activities in China instead of proposing to re-design institutions I do not mean to distract attention from the importance of institutional reforms. Major institutional reforms are often very important in producing significant improvements in governmental operations. For example, as noted above, true democratic consultations could require such important institutional changes as establishing strong rights to speech and association, or the routine use of popular elections to decide who will represent the interests of the people, or the creation of formal procedures that alert citizens to times when the government is about to make an important decision, and opportunities for them to give their advice to the government.

Despite the importance of institutional reforms, I have chosen to focus on managerial behavior for two important reasons. First, in the end, the concrete results of all institutional reforms depend on what individual officials choose to do with the new rights and responsibilities given to them by the institutional