

How are you?
Mine
Hi!
See you later
Good
Thank you!
Any questions?
OK! Yes, I am
Thank you!
I'll come in
Thanks. And please
OK! Fine!
Fine!
Good
Sorry!
What's this?
Hello!
Good
Fine
Thank you!

—北京—

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

公共管理专业英语 / 刘永林主编. —北京: 知识产权出版社, 2019.10
ISBN 978-7-5130-6526-9

I. ①公… II. ①刘… III. ①公共管理—英语 IV. ① D035-0

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2019) 第 222955 号

内容提要

本书面向行政管理专业本科生, 旨在提高行政管理学生阅读和翻译专业文献的能力, 以及进行专业领域的学术交流和进行专业写作的能力。主要内容包括从知名学者的专业论文和经典学术著作中选取的长篇素材和中篇文章, 体例包括阅读正文、单词英文解释、长难句。另附 100 个具有代表性的长难句, 学生可以自主选择学习。

责任编辑: 张水华

封面设计: 臧磊

责任校对: 谷洋

责任印制: 孙婷婷

公共管理专业英语

刘永林 主编

出版发行: 知识产权出版社有限责任公司

社址: 北京市海淀区气象路 50 号院

责任编辑: 010-82000860 转 8389

发行电话: 010-82000860 转 8101/8102

印刷: 北京建宏印刷有限公司

开本: 720mm × 1000mm 1/16

版次: 2019 年 10 月第 1 版

字数: 280 千字

ISBN 978-7-5130-6526-9

网 址: <http://www.ipph.cn>

邮 编: 100081

责编邮箱: miss.shuihua99@163.com

发行传真: 010-82000893/82005070/82000270

经 销: 各大网上书店、新华书店及相关专业书店

印 张: 13.5

印 次: 2019 年 10 月第 1 次印刷

定 价: 59.00 元

出版权专有 侵权必究

如有印装质量问题, 本社负责调换。

前言

《公共管理专业英语》主要面向公共管理专业的本科生、硕士生，旨在通过阅读、研究、分析公共管理专业的经典英文文献，培养公共管理专业学生必备的基本素质。一方面，通过掌握专业领域的重点词汇、长难句解析及英译汉技巧，培养学生英语表达的思维方式，提高学生阅读、理解公共管理专业英文文献的能力；另一方面，通过学习国外公共管理专业的发展脉络和前沿问题，加强学生对公共管理专业基本概念、术语、理论等专业知识的深层次理解，提升公共管理专业学生对外交往和学术交流的能力。

基于培养学生专业英文文献阅读和运用能力，本书主要选取了公共管理专业相关的原版经典英文文献。本书主要内容包括三个部分：

第一部分，从经典专业论文和学术著作中选取 8 篇长篇文献，主要内容包括公共管理领域的前沿问题、政府角色、政府工具、公共政策、治理与法律、行政文化、可持续发展等。本部分的体例包括阅读正文、单词英文解释和长难句。

第二部分，从经典学术著作中选取 10 篇中等篇幅的文献，主要内容包括官僚制、公共财政管理、人力资源管理、创新型政府、反腐中公共数据的使用和法治等。本部分的体例包括阅读正文、单词英文解释和长难句。

第三部分，从经典著作中选取了 100 个具有代表性的长难句，可以作为课堂长难句讲解的教材，或者学生自主选择学习的资料。

全书涵盖公共管理的主要领域，主题广泛、内容新颖、篇幅适宜、难易结合，便于师生教学与学习。教材的整体篇幅较大，授课学时有限，教师可以选择重点文献进行详细讲解，剩余内容作为学生课后作业或课外学

习材料。

编写过程中，编者参阅了大量的国内外专业文献资料，在此谨向相关作者和网站表示感谢。同时，还要特别感谢徐文玉、施小倩、张敏、石庆叶、曹春萍、丁万高、孔健结、车佳桥、邬清桦、洪通、张天铸、王亚卓、胡爽等参与资料搜集和校对整理工作的同学们。书中不足之处敬请读者批评指正。

编者

2019年5月

CONTENTS

PART A

1. The Role of Government.....	2
2. The Nature of Public Policy.....	13
3. The Role of Law	29
4. Instruments of Government.....	53
5. Governance and the Law.....	66
6. A New Administrative Culture	90
7. Policies for Sustained and Inclusive Growth	109
8. A New Development Strategy for 2030.....	120

PART B

1. Bureaucrats: Image and Reality.....	140
2. The Importance of Public Financial Management.....	145
3. The Four Traditional Public HRM Systems.....	151
4. Behavioural Insights and Public Policy	159
5. Building A Quality Justice System.....	163

6. Embracing Innovation in Government: Global Trends..... 168

7. The Use of Open Data for Anti-Corruption..... 177

8. Two Emergent Systems: Privatization and Partnerships..... 182

9. Strengthening the Rule of Law 186

10. Promote Sustainable Development 190

PART C

Difficult Sentences(100)..... 196

PART A

贵州师范学院内部使用

1. The Role of Government

The role of government in society should be of great interest to public managers. In mixed economies there must be some demarcation between, and a rationale for, those activities that fall into either the public or the private sector. The dividing line changes in different nations at various times: in some periods, government scope and scale increase; in others it decreases. In recent decades, the line has moved away from the public towards the private sector. This transfer of resources and functions to the private sector has affected those who work in the public sector or rely on it in some way. If a public activity is less valued by the community, if activities historically provided by governments are being marketized, the rationales for doing these things are of obvious interest to public managers.

Starting in the early 1980s, many Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) nations undertook a reassessment of the role of their public sectors. Those who believed in the model of the free market as the basis for a more dynamic economy asserted that governments were involved in inappropriate activities, and that their size and roles should be cut back drastically. Should governments provide the goods and services they do, or should some be handed to the private sector? Should governments subsidize or regulate to the extent they do? Such questions also raise the very political matter of how various members of the community perceive and value the things that governments do, as well as draw from and inform their ideological views as to the appropriate role of governments in society.

The extent of government in the economy—its scale and scope—has traditionally been the fundamental dividing line between the Right and the Left in ideological terms. In very broad terms, the Left favours greater government spending and control of economic activity, while the Right favours less of both. Unsurprisingly, the 1980s debate over the public sector became, at times, an intense ideological struggle in some countries, one in which the last vestiges of socialism were to be rooted out by new Right governments (Isaac-Henry, et al., 1997). Opposition to change was no less intense as public sector workers, unions and supporters tried to maintain government activities at their previous levels. Initially, public sector reform was seen as part of this great ideological debate about the role of governments. Certainly, the Reagan and Thatcher governments led sustained theoretical and practical attacks on the command or bureaucratic part of society in favour of the market principle. In the early stages, the trend towards a market-based public sector reflected concerns about the role of government, as well as worries about the efficiency and effectiveness of the bureaucratic model. However, as the reforms continued through changes of government, it became clear that party-political considerations, even fairly ideological ones, were only a minor part of public sector reform.

In the first decade of the twenty-first century, the idea of government did make something of a comeback. In the wake of the terrorist attack on New York in September 2001, the prestige of the United States government rose, as it was the only institution that could deal with such a crisis. Corporate failures such as Worldcom or Enron reduced confidence in the private sector and increased demands for government regulation of the activities of business. The global financial crisis which began in 2008 showed what could happen when regulation of the financial sector was inadequate, and again, governments were turned to for a solution. In a return to Keynesian theory, seemingly discredited in the 1970s, stimulus packages of government spending attempted to ameliorate the effects of the crisis. And, despite a 25-year history of privatization, the British government found itself the owner

of financial institutions, while the United States government became the effective owner of GM, once the world's biggest car maker and a bastion of the free enterprise system. But, even as governments regained more of a role, there seemed to be little thought about this being a fundamental turn to socialism, rather it was seen as a temporary expedient to cope with an immediate problem.

Attacks on the scale, scope and methods of the public sector in the 1980s did give credence to measures to reduce government operations and change its management. Governments wishing to cut the public sector found little impediment in a community seemingly disillusioned with bureaucracy, even if it wanted no cuts in services. Moreover, the lack of support for bureaucracies and public servants meant that these became useful and defenceless scapegoats for government problems. It does seem paradoxical that the main reason for the increase in the size of government is public demand for more services, such as health care and welfare for ageing populations, but at the same time there is great hostility to the levels of taxation required to pay for them.

Societies do need to better appreciate the positive roles of what are their own governments. It is no exaggeration to say the public sector affects the entire economy and society. Without a legal framework to enforce contracts, private business activity would not work. Regulations, taxes, permits, infrastructures, standards, and conditions of employment all affect decisions made in private markets. The public sector is a large purchaser of goods and services from the private sector. Government redistributes income from better-off members of the society to those less wealthy. The public sector has a crucial role to play in determining real living standards, which depend for most people on government services—the quality of schools, hospitals, community care, the environment, public transport, law and order, town planning and welfare services—at least as much as the quality of consumer goods and services.

As will be seen, there are various theories put forward to decide which functions should be provided by governments. Some argue that only goods or services that cannot be provided by markets should be provided by governments. Others contend,

however, that as government is the embodiment of the will of the people expressed through the political process, there should be no limits to its scope.

The need for a public sector

By convention, the economy is divided between the private and public sectors. The public sector is defined by one author as engaged in providing services (and in some cases goods) whose scope and variety are determined not by the direct wishes of the consumers, but by the decisions of government bodies, that is, in a democracy, by the representatives of the citizens (Hicks, 1985: 1). This definition does not capture the full scope of public sector activity, but it does contain the key point that the public sector is the result of public, political decision-making, rather than involving market processes. Another view is that the prevalence of government may reflect the presence of political and social ideologies which depart from the premises of consumer choice and decentralised decision making (Musgrave and Musgrave, 1989, pp. 5-6). If the normal mechanism of exchange is through the market, what are the possible functions of government?

Governments are command-based—they can force people to comply—whereas markets are voluntary. Also, every person in a society is subject to the state. Both these points—universal membership and compulsion—make governments fundamentally different from the private sector. Membership of a state is not usually a matter of choice, and the fact that membership is compulsory gives the State a power of compulsion which other organizations do not have (Stiglitz, 1989: 21). Other transactions are voluntary. The private sector does have ways of forcing—with contracts, for example—but in legal activities the only allowable force to compel compliance is through the system of laws provided by government and backed, ultimately, by the police and the army. Even privately provided mediation or arbitration relies, in the end, on the legal system provided by government.

Though the private and public sectors are usually seen as being quite separate, the division of the economy into two mutually exclusive sectors may be artificial

(McCraw, 1986). There is so much interaction between the two that setting up a strict dichotomy is rather misleading. It could be argued that the modern capitalist economy is a thoroughly mixed system in which public and private sector forces interact in an integral fashion and the economic system is neither public nor private, but involves a mix of both sectors (Musgrave and Musgrave, 1989: 4). The private sector relies on governments for infrastructure and the system of laws, notably the key requirements of property rights and the enforcement of laws, both being necessary for markets to work (Stiglitz, 2001). Governments rely on the private sector for the production and supply of goods and services, and for tax revenue. The interaction between sectors is more subtle than simply seeing them as separate and necessarily antagonistic.

There are some things that governments should or should not do; some that it does well and some that it does badly. Even during the time of *laissez-faire* economics, in the nineteenth century, there was some role for government. The most fervent market economist today still sees some use for government even beyond Adam Smith's three roles for the sovereign discussed later in this chapter.

The World Bank has stated that there are five fundamental tasks that lie at the core of every government's mission. There are: (i) establishing a foundation of law; (ii) maintaining a non-distortionary policy environment, including macroeconomic stability; (iii) investing in basic social services and infrastructure; (iv) protecting the vulnerable; and (v) protecting the environment (World Bank, 1997: 42).

Anderson (1989: 19-22), lists seven basic functions of government, which he claims are generally applicable:

•Providing economic infrastructure

Governments provide the basic institutions, rules and arrangements necessary for the satisfactory operation of a modern capitalist system. These include the definition and protection of property rights, the enforcement of contracts, the provision of a standard currency, weights and measures, corporate charters, bankruptcy, patents, copyright, the maintenance of law and order, and the tariff

system. Modern economic societies are also political; it would not be possible for the economic system to operate without the rules of the game and the framework for economic life being provided by the political system. Contracts are legally binding because of the laws established by the state and backed, in the last resort, by state sanctions.

•**Provision of various collective goods and services.** There are some public goods which, while being valuable to the whole society, are difficult for individuals to pay for according to the amount of good used. Once they have been provided for one person, they are available for all. These include such items as national defence, roads and bridges, aids to navigation, flood control, sewage disposal, traffic control systems and other infrastructure. Many are characterized by their broad use, indivisibility and non-excludability and are, therefore, public goods.

•**The resolution and adjustment of group conflicts.** A basic reason for the existence of government is the need to resolve or ameliorate conflict in a society in pursuance of justice, order and stability. This may include actions to protect the economically weak against the economically strong. Governments may seek to replace exploitation with equity through child labour laws, minimum wage legislation, or workers' compensation programmes.

•**The maintenance of competition.** Competition does not always maintain itself in the private sector, and government action is often required to ensure that businesses do compete. Without government monitoring, the benefits of the free enterprise system would not necessarily be apparent. In the absence of suitable regulation, companies would be able to form cartels, restrict access to their products and fix prices.

•**Protection of natural resources.** Competitive forces cannot be relied on to prevent the wasteful use of natural resources, to protect against degradation of the natural environment, or to care for the interests of future generations. Damage to the environment from market activity is a textbook example of externality and market failure. Action by governments is the main way to alleviate environmental damage.

•**Minimum access by individuals to the goods and services of the economy.**

The operation of the market sometimes produces results that are cruel or socially unacceptable in their impact on people—causing poverty, unemployment or malnutrition, for example. Others, because of illness, old age, illiteracy or whatever, may simply exist outside the market economy. There is often disagreement over the level of assistance needed, the aggregate cost, and particular programmes that might have some social costs.

•**Stabilization of the economy.** There have always been fluctuations in the business cycle of the economy, with boom conditions being followed by recessions. Government action may be able to alleviate these through the budget, monetary policy, or control over wages or prices. While government action is often imperfect and sometimes wrong, the community regards its government as being responsible for the state of the economy, and there is a public expectation that governments should act to try to solve any problem.

Anderson (1989: 22-23) points out that the functions outlined here are pretty much universal and are, in fact, a fairly standard set of government functions applicable to most countries. Some are market failures—the provision of public goods, or environmental damage, for example—but others are not. Rather than reflecting any particular theory, the list reflects how things are in reality. What is missing, however, is exactly how the government is to act in a given case. Even if the government is justifiably concerned with, for example, the water supply for public health reasons this does not necessarily mean it should be the sole supplier. It could allow for private suppliers with government regulation. The precise instrument to be used and the design of public policy are not trivial matters even where intervention is justified.

(Source: Owen E. Hughes Public Management and Administration: An Introduction (Fourth Edition).)

New Words

demarcation n. a border or line that separates two things, such types of work, groups of people or areas of land, e.g. It was hard to draw clear lines of demarcation between work and leisure.

rationale n. the principles or reasons which explain a particular decision, course of action, belief, etc., e.g. What is the rationale behind these new exams?

subsidize n. a business company that is owned or controlled by another larger company. v. to give money to sb or an organization to help pay for sth; to give a subsidy, e.g. The housing projects are subsidized by the government.

ideologue n. a person whose actions are influenced by belief in a set of principles (=by an ideology).

vestige n. (1) a small part of sth that still exists after the rest of it has stopped existing; (2) usually used in negative sentences, to say that not even a small amount of sth exists, e.g. There's not a vestige of truth in the rumour.

ameliorate v. to make sth better, e.g. Steps have been taken to ameliorate the situation.

bastion n. (1) a group of people or a system that protects a way of life or a belief when it seems that it may disappear; (2) a place that military forces are defending.

credence n. (1) a quality that an idea or a story has that makes you believe it is true; (2) belief in sth as true, e.g. They could give no credence to the findings of the survey.

disillusion v. to destroy sb's belief in or good opinion of sb/sth, e.g. I hate to disillusion you, but not everyone is as honest as you.

paradox n. (1) a person, thing or situation that has two opposite features and therefore seems strange; (2) a statement containing two opposite ideas that make it seem impossible or unlikely, although it is probably true; the use of this in writing.

hostility n. (1) unfriendly or aggressive feelings or behaviour, e.g. There was

open hostility between the two schools; (2) strong and angry opposition towards an idea, a plan or a situation.

convention n. (1) the way in which sth is done that most people in a society expect and consider to be polite or the right way to do it; (2) a large meeting of the members of a profession, a political party, etc; (3) an official agreement between countries or leaders; (4) a traditional method or style in literature, art or the theatre.

prevalence adj. that exists or is very common at a particular time or in a particular place, e.g. These prejudices are particularly prevalent among people living in the North.

premise n. a statement or an idea that forms the basis for a reasonable line of argument, e.g. His reasoning is based on the premise that all people are equally capable of good and evil.

compliance n. the practice of obeying rules or rules or requests made by people in authority, e.g. Safety measures were carried out in compliance with paragraph 6 of the building regulations.

mediation n. (1) to try to end a disagreement between two or more people or groups by talking to them and trying to find things that everyone can agree on; (2) to succeed in finding a solution to a disagreement between people or groups; (3) to influence sth and/or make it possible for it to happen.

fervent adj. having or showing very strong and sincere feelings about sth.

sovereign n. (1) a king or queen; (2) an old British gold coin worth one pound. adj. (1) free govern itself; completely independent; (2) having complete power or the greatest power in the country.

sanction n. (1) an official order that limits trade, contact, etc. with a particular country, in order to make it do sth, such as obeying international law; (2) official permission or approval for an action or a change; (3) a course of action that can be used, if necessary, to make people obey a law or behave in a particular way. v. (1) to give permission for sth to take place; (2) to punish sb/sth; to impose a sanction sth.

navigation n. (1) the skill or the process of planning a route for a ship or