

The paradigm of political science and public administration: their challenges in the XXI century

Julio César Olvera García

Autonomous University of the State of Mexico / julioolvera7@gmail.com

Abstract: This article aims to outline the challenges that two disciplines, fundamental to understand the political and governmental activities, face before an increasingly demanding and plural society at the beginning of the XXI century. Understanding political science and public administration in the framework of the capitalist system, where both were born and developed, inextricably interweaves the evolution of political science at different times, where the birth of the public administration, as a scientific discipline, can also be found. The purpose of this historic journey is to identify the main transformations of the political science and also those that are necessary to strengthen, both political science and public administration as useful and valuable disciplines for the new societies.

Key words: political science, public administration, State, society, capitalism and power.

Resumen: En el presente artículo se plantean los retos a los que se enfrentan dos disciplinas fundamentales para entender el quehacer político y gubernamental, ante una sociedad cada vez más plural y demandante de cara al siglo XXI. Entender a la ciencia política y a la administración pública frente al sistema capitalista en el cual ambas nacen y se desarrollan, entrelaza necesariamente la evolución de la ciencia política en distintas épocas, donde se localiza también el surgimiento de la administración pública como disciplina científica. Este recorrido histórico tiene el fin de identificar sus principales transformaciones y aquellas que son necesarias para consolidar a la ciencia política y a la administración pública como disciplinas útiles y valiosas para las nuevas sociedades.

Palabras clave: ciencia política, administración pública, Estado, sociedad, capitalismo y poder.

Introduction

The transformations that started in the XXI century have demonstrated new relations between societies and States. These transformations have been seen in the debates about the role of each one. On the one hand, the society that is independent and autonomous from the State, but whose composition is assured by it; and on the other, a State which is increasingly unable to influence society and constantly weakened by the global processes. These elements set up the future debate on this relationship and create the rebirth of the analysis of the paradigms and subjects of study of two essential areas that attempt to understand these phenomena: *political science and public administration*.

The essential objective of this paper is to propose a debate on the role and the challenges these disciplines face when they aim at understanding the political and governmental work as part of a society; this also in view of the paradigm that is part of this generation: the capitalist system. In this regard, the following question is seen as the most important: *How to understand political science and public administration before the capitalist system of the XXI century?*, considering that the paradigm for the subjects of study of these disciplines is inserted within capitalism.

It is based on this that the text starts considering scientific knowledge, both the constitution of politics and public administration, and recounting its development could shed light on their scientificity in in and uneven comparison to other areas. This could be explained in the relationship of the subject of study and the social conditions that are part of a specific context. That is, being public administration a task as old as social association and organization, it has made its own dimension be considered as a routine action, which as stated by Omar Guerrero, is “[...] a wrong interpretation of public administration which is judged as just a prosaic office routine or whose scientific status is ignored, even though its academic awards are as high as those of its sister sciences [economy, sociology and politics]” (Guerrero, 1981: 2).

That is the reason why it is necessary to recover public administration in the scientific debate, both in the governmental work, and in the relationship with society, so that the action of public administration can be understood within a democratic system, that is not only observed in political terms or

more specifically in those electoral, but in the rescue of society towards its true participation in the decision making of public affairs. Therefore, the second part of this text aims at establishing a reflection on the paradigms that will have to be recovered when these disciplines are considered knowledge that can be applied.

In the last part, some considerations are presented in order to observe the challenges that political science and public administration have in view of the transformations and the new ways set in the XXI century, that is, in view of the paradigms of the modern era which seem to be exceeded at times or in order to bear the complexity of the contemporary world in mind.

The appearance of politics as a science: How to define the political science?

From ancient Greece until the end of the XIX century the term politics was not the object of any autonomous discipline, it was, instead, part of the philosophical, historical, legal and sociological explanation. This has represented the first attack on the definition of political science, given the fact that its relationship with other disciplines and areas of knowledge responds much to the tradition it is linked to. The traditions are basically covered in the Anglo-Saxon or North American and the Continental or European, which have concentrated on the defense, limits and divisions of the scientific knowledge with regard to the political theory and philosophy.

The debate on the limits of the science and the political theory and philosophy have left behind the debate of some essential aspects, without considering the warning that Raymond Aron and Leo Strauss made, when they considered essential topics and questions made from philosophy to be part of the political debate. It is worth mentioning one question by Aron: *Can the course of history isolate that to which it tends, that to which the political man aspires (the moral man)?* (Aron, 1997: 166).

So in the way to consolidate an empirical science, trying to abide by the principles of exact sciences, determining the object of study of political science, it can take stances which are not well supported because one could not leave aside the values that political action entails and which determine the political actors. To that respect, Strauss is clear when he exposes the intersection between scientific and philosophical knowledge:

Any sort of knowledge on political things implies suppositions related to the essence of the political sphere, suppositions that not only have to do with a specific political situation, but also with political life or with human life as such. We cannot know anything about a war that takes place in a specific moment without having any notion, slight and vague as it might be, on the war as such and the place that it occupies in human life. One cannot see a police officer as such without a previous supposition on the law and government as such. Suppositions related to the essence the political, which are implicit in every kind of knowledge on the political, have the nature of opinions. Only when these suppositions become an object of analysis that is coherent and critical does the philosophical or scientific nature of the political appear (Strauss, 1970: 355).

In this regard, the objectivization of the political has been supported on categories and concepts developed in philosophy and political theories and one shall recall that political science in its origins wondered on the nature, origin and evolution of the State, the sovereignty, justice and law.

By the end of the XIX century the methodological support of political science were the legal and moral analysis of topics such as justice, State and law, without being it possible to clearly identify the subject of study of the science nor its difference from other areas of knowledge; given the fact that politics was perceived as knowledge contained in the studies on society. As Pasquino pointed out, “the evolution of political science is continuous, and has been produced both, through the definition and redefinition of the subject of analysis, and through the elaboration of new techniques and especially those new methods, in the search of ‘scientificity’” (Pasquino, 1995: 15).

The distinction of politics from other disciplines did not materialize until the second half of the XX century, when the western World found itself in a reality that exceeded the action of the political sphere, and hence it was an ideal moment to argue the scientific nature of it, given the fact that the atrocities and consequences of the Second World War gave rise to the creation of the empirical political science, which was in charge of studying actions around power, State and the relations between them.

However, some essential features can be identified and they are provided as part of the birth of political science. In this regard, the following moments can be mentioned:

1 From philosophy to science

The knowledge on politics was related to philosophy and even with the ethical statements that until the XIX century were the main source of inspiration for the political theory and meant a relationship that gave rise to scientific knowledge. This fact has had sharp criticisms, because for several years, the development of knowledge on politics was limited to the historical or legal study of the political ideas.

This could be explained with the following argumentation by Sartori:

Political science (or even better said a scientific empirical knowledge of politics provided with scientific validity) is instead the most recent and embryonic of the sciences. The scientific knowledge of the political facts, inasmuch as it refers to autonomous sources of inspiration (such as Machiavelli and the doctrine of the reason of State) finds difficulties to consolidate; especially because gravitating on it on finds, on the one hand, the mortgage of political philosophy (infiltrated, even disguising itself in the pleats of empirical knowledge on politics), and on the other, the pressing claim of daily political praxis, and through it the current discourse and the political ideologies in struggle (2006:16).

From Sartori's point of view, philosophical knowledge is not empirical and, hence, it does not set a statement in the search of application models; so that: "Philosophy is the evasion of the phenomenical world that allow us to measure and modify it [...] If the mental life of man shall be limited to the empirical level; if man was not allowed to perform 'speculative evasions' their existence would pass in a squat and colorless horizontality, submitted to questions without an answer, deprived of any dynamic, sense and value" (Sartori, 2006: 46-47). Considering this argumentation, the construction of political science as scientific knowledge is justified from an empirical approach.

However, this vision can have limitations such as those exposed by Aron and Strauss. Also, it could leave without sense lucid expositions such as those by Hannah Arendt, whom we can attribute establishing the link between the philosophical thinking toward the theoretical notions, provided in her action concept and which refer to the scientific scope of action.

When one recovers some aspects of Arendt's thinking, it is valid to mention the essential questioning that she had after the political experiences of the second quarter of the XX century: What is politics?. A question that became valid in view of the explanations that turned current remembering and conceiving again the old categories of comprehension and even those of moral judgment, in view of the abuses perpetrated by totalitarian regimes. According to Arendt "Politics is about being together and the others with the others of the *diverse*. Men organize politically according to specific essential communities in an absolute chaos, or from an absolute chaos of differences" (Arendt, 2001: 45).

From this perspective, the study of politics is complemented with philosophical reflection, theoretical abstraction and naturally with the empirical references to scientific thinking. Arendt's reasoning with regard to the generalized supposition that the men of the modern world are not trained to judge things as such can be contained in this, given the fact that since they only have fixed and stipulated criteria they could correctly apply already known rules, just as it was stated from the explanation of scientific knowledge:

Academic teaching has broadly extended this supposition, and it is clearly perceived in the fact that the historical disciplines, which have to do with the history of the world and on what occurred in it, have been dissolved in social sciences and psychology. This does not mean anything but that the study of the historical world has been abandoned in its pretended chronological states in favor of the study of behavior, firstly social and later human, which in turn can only be the subject of the systematic research if a man who acts is included, a man who is the craftsman of verifiable events in the world, and who is reduced to the condition of a being who only has a behavior, to a being who can be submitted to experiments and from whom one can even expect to definitely be under control (Arendt, 2001: 56).

2. The administrative boom in political science

By the end of the XIX century, in the years following the expansion and consolidation of capitalism in the West, as well as the proposal that was opposite to capitalism, the expansion of Marxist ideas, politics scholars expressed a lack of credibility in democracy (leaving it in the study of political ideas and not in scientific creation), concentrating scientific knowledge on leadership topics and on the sciences of administration in service of the State; thus, the analysis of governmental issues was made from an administrative approach that was not linked to the social sphere and which was sustained as the proposal of some scholars.

The year of 1880 was key in this stage, due to the fact that the first School of Political Science was created at Columbia University; with the birth of this science as a discipline in 1903 the American Association of Political Science was established, this made room for the consolidation of the discipline from a positivist vision.

The orthodox era of public administration is located in this state. The dichotomy between politics-administration and the firmness in finding in efficiency the essential principle of the administrative process stand out. In the same way, it was considered that the optimal functioning of public administration depended on the fact that it was not completely related to political action.

In this line of thinking such dichotomy does not aim to identify real phenomena, but establishing an analytical differentiation of complex behaviors. There prevails certain obsession about deepening into the absolute lack of a policy in public administration, which clashed with the reality that reflected an indissoluble unity between them. That is why it is said that the birth of public administration as a science is artificially established, so that it was natural that during an identity crisis a school of thought of public administration restated a paternal claim to political science, where public administration had its roots; however, such thinking did not have the necessary scholar support at that moment in order to compete with the mainstream orthodox approaches. The development of public administration as politologic discipline is consolidated from said claim. The political perspective of public administration has Dwight Waldo among its main followers. He took again Wilson's definition of public administration

as government in action, he points out that power is also one of the essential aspects of the object of political science.

3. Toward the creation of laws in political science

At the beginning of the XX century, around the 20's and 30's, some works that had as a purpose to create a self-sufficient discipline were published. They were aimed at studying the political phenomena, such as the proposal by Gaetano Mosca, with the objective of providing political knowledge with its own categories, such as the definition of political class, which contributed as a base of the *Elite Theory*, and also to the instauration of laws such as the conceptions by Wilfredo Pareto in the *Circulation of elite*, or those by Robert Michels in the statement of the *Iron law of the oligarchy*. In this regard, abstraction prevails over practice and, hence, the scientific nature is to be found in the establishment of theories, so that the scientific would not only respond to moral principles, but to the methods used and the theories suggested for said end.

Pareto was very clear in this respect, as Sartori distinguishes when he studies his thesis, “the scientific theory of society (as his sociology was) cannot have practical applicability” (Sartori, 2000: 90-91).

Pareto seems to allude to two reasons. His first thesis pointed out that there was not a science of application, so that the task consisted in outlining this kind of science and not in creating practical theories. The second was based on the idea that man is neither a rational nor a reasonable animal, but a *rationable* one.¹ Men act driven by faith, not by reason; they believe before they understand; they do not know what they do and do it without knowing. What counts, then, are ideologies, feelings, what Pareto calls *residues* (Sartori, 2000: 91).

4. The behaviorist revolution

As a background for the empirical science, in the 40's, the philosophical and legal perspectives were submitted to debate. This also occurred to the

¹ In *rationable* italics are mine, due to the fact that Sartori writes it with quotation marks, considering that, for Pareto, human condition is not sustained on rationality as modern authors sustained, it is instead sustained on aspects related to faith and customs which determine not only the thinking of human beings, but their actions.

interpretation from the empirical logic, so that it was necessary to adopt methods from psychology and sociology in order to analyze the political phenomena.

The *behaviorist* approach is created in this context; it set a new political science influenced by sociology. In it, an empirical approach was imposed and political science should pass from the analysis of political philosophy to that of scientificity. This made it move away from the “is-ought” and the “art of politics” towards the “being” and the science itself, given the fact that the objective of the so called *behaviorist revolution* consisted in setting as a paradigm of the political science a methodology that was adequate to it. So that political scientific knowledge could have the parameters of natural sciences; this fact privileged the use of diverse research techniques such as: polls, statistics, surveys and interviews.

The behaviorist revolution proposed the study of political relations, so the authors of this intellectual context aimed at explaining how and why the political behavior occurred. Such explanations are based on the identification of the reasons, values and cognitions with the objective of discovering explanatory regularities through observation and measurement techniques. Authors such as Robert A. Dahl, Seymoung M. Lipset and Gabriel Almond are considered representative of this orientation.

Despite the valuable contributions made from behaviorism, the explanations of political realities in these terms led scholars to two different planes: a) in the first, politics tended to be extremely complex and ambiguous, therefore it was difficult to establish solutions that were obvious and simple in view of the political problems. b) In the second, the study of reality was based on the discovery of the behavior of political processes. In this regard, the studies that were part of political science moved away from the traditional approaches such as history, law and philosophy, which in turn gave rise to the fact that political sciences explained the political phenomena from different approaches such as: the sociological, economical, psychological and anthropological.

It is worth mentioning that the behaviorist revolution is created as an approach that is contrary to socialist regimes and attempts to leave out any “ideological” or “doctrinarian” interpretation of the political reality. Therefore, behaviorism has been an approach from which political science is

justified within a capitalist system, and in Huntington's (1992) words the labor of political science can only be understood in democratic societies, because it is only in them where participation has a place. However, this statement is not free from doctrinal influence, given the fact that it gains meaning from the liberal approach and in societies with economic development, and it is self-evident that they were framed in a capitalist system. Therefore we can say that based on behaviorism, and within the limitations that it sets, we can start to speak about the political science as such, as scientific construction and scientific knowledge, whose object of study is the political action in all its manifestations and with all the implications it entails.

The scientificity of Politics

When thinking of politics as a science the search is directed towards a relation between theory and practice, that is, in visualizing politics as an applied science where political action does not become the goal of knowledge, but the subject itself. That is, political praxis is presented as the subject of study, the phenomena to explain and, for some, the approaches to be measured.

With this idea in mind and when recalling the beginnings of political science, it seems that the objective of it is kept in an ambiguous field; to establish if the objective of political science lies in contributing to political practice, and not only from its explanation, but at the prescriptive level towards proposals of improvement in practice itself, necessarily directed to social benefit. This becomes the topic of debate among political science scholars, given the fact that some of them expect a pure political science and others, an applied one. Nevertheless, it is reality which sets the political phenomena to be studied. It is worth quoting Sartori on the reflection about that regard:

Pure science shall not be distracted from the claims of the world and shall not be occupied or concerned about its "fruits". On the contrary, applied science shall make as much as possible to help with the little part it knows. Back to political science, which subordinates it to "practical purposes" and which will have to admit that without a valid and objective scientific knowledge one cannot reach any practical satisfactory success. Conversely, someone who

affirms the priority of the scientific demand, cannot but wonder: knowledge for what? In my opinion, this question can only be answered arguing that it shall be science with regard to the method, but practice with regard to the ends (Sartori, 2006: 133).

Political science is not only concerned on reflection and theoretical construction, it also foresees alternatives of action that correspond to the present and to the costs of it. These perceptions, of course, do not imply certainty, but the objective is to prepare actions under schemata of analysis that cover and use the political problem.

Despite this, one cannot but point out the complexity of politics as a science, which is asserted in political knowledge, and that does not mean that it is aimed at giving power to those who have such knowledge. In other words, the scholar on politics can know about power, but that does not mean he has it, unlike the other sciences in which this distinction does not exist, because the one who knows them is the one who has them; in the case of a doctor, practice is not separated from theory.

This can seem a suggestion to the politicians, because they are not necessarily scientists, but they can listen to the political scientist with the objective of providing the political action with a sense and maybe more profundity in decision making towards the public realm.

However, the consolidation of a political science has given rise to several debates such as: the search for homogeneity when establishing the subject of study and the broadening of it, with the objective of understanding what in political action is shown. In other attempts the discussion was focused on defining the political subject, what would be considered as a political action?; and the other great branch was concerned with defining the methodologies that were part of political science.

In view of this, it is worth recalling what Marsh and Stoker pointed out with regard to the definition of politics, which cannot concentrate on a homogeneous vision. In its scientific foundations it will be necessary to recover the notion of politics in its broadest sense as “an generalized activity that takes places in all those scopes in which human beings produce and reproduce their life; an activity that can entail both confrontations and cooperation, so that the problems are presented and solved through decisions made collectively” (Marsh and Stoker, 1997: 22).

Despite the mentioned polemic, the development of political science will inevitably face the knowledge of public realm, in which one observes the relations and actions of human beings, beyond any strict notion that unifies it with the idea of State and vice versa: which confronts with it. This occurs considering that the public realm is where the political community prevails and in it exists the link between the State, society and the market; which is subject of study of another discipline that is inseparable from political science: public administration.

The encounter of political science and public administration in the public sphere

For a considerable amount of time, public administration was consigned to the technical, operative and instrumental scopes and it was not seen as a subject of scientific study. When thinking the public administration as a governmental and instrumental apparatus, it is disregarded that it can become a power in itself, a power that influences the decision making of political power.

It is by the end of the XIX century that public administration gives its first steps in the U.S. to be set as a science with a theoretical field that is prone to be studied in an orderly and systematic way so as to organize theoretically the administrative reality of the government. The formation of the theoretical field of public administration took place during two periods: the orthodox and the political. The former had its origin in the publishing of the article called “The study of public administration” by Woodrow Wilson. In this regard, the field of study is not a result of the tradition of the political thinking, but in opposition to political science; Wilson’s heritage to the political period would be, paradoxically, his definition of public administration as the most obvious part of the government. The government in action, since based on this it is stated that the public administration behaves politically because the government from any perspective is political, not only an execution; it has in fact capacity of decision. “The political time of public administration means the consolidation of the public administration as a defined science and with a certain degree of autonomy; it consists of the time that favors finding the public administration in an institutional, academic and professional environment that is innate to it”

(Guerrero, 2001: 83-83). Public administration, as in the case of political science, alludes to the state power, but in the administrative dimension of the governing process.

The scientific study of politics does not imply that it shall leave out the study of other phenomena that revolve around power, such as poverty, marginalization and the abuses in the exercise of it. Political science, hence, has a lot to contribute to public life, to improve the operation of the government and decision making. In this idea we can argue that “Political Science is nourished with democracy and never with totalitarisms [...] Where democracy is weak, political science is weak as well (Uvalle, 1998: 200) It is precisely in democratic contexts where the public sphere consolidates as the common space between the citizen and the State, where public administration and political science concur.

The relation between political science and public administration is even narrower and receives feedback to the extent in which both converge in the public space where they have “the moral and historical compromise [...] according to the validity of the public liberties, the political democracy, the social justice; to sum up with the governance of the society and the useful, fair, prosperous and vigorous process of the state” (Uvalle, 1998: 2008). To that respect it is worth questioning if the public administration is also an altruist activity directed to compensate for the social inequalities; however, in case it is that way, it shall not halt in view of the questionings regarding its political nature. Hence, public administration as a body representing the capitalist State and characterized by social contradictions cannot solve the social problems created by it, it only looks for superficial palliatives.

The weakening and decrease of that which is understood as the public space has been part of the inheritance of modernity.² It invokes the freedom of society to restrict the political space. That occurs in the idea that society drains the public space, and where society and public space confront each other necessarily. The promotion of the social sphere has a relatively abstract formulation that coincides with the arising of the State-nation and with the differentiation of State-society, with the spread of the private sphere at the expense of the public one.

In this regard, the studies performed by Bodino and Hobbes stand out. They analyze the surge and development of the absolute monarchy, highlighting the disconnection between the political and civil life as an essential fact. They do it just as Rousseau and Tocqueville when they tackled the formation of republican systems, as a reaction of the society to the excesses of the State power; whereas Marx and Hegel restated the breakup between the society and the State. The dichotomy State-society is a characteristic reality of capitalism and the reason for the existence of public administration as a body of the State in society.

When political science recovers public administration as a field of study, as a body of the State in society, as a relation of the State with it, it will also understand in the same way as public administration does the government action as a political and administrative dynamic that makes a reality the state presence at the bosom of civil society. "The government, we have said, is the exercise of the power of the State in Society and, it is therefore a relation that connects both. The government is a formula that compensates the separation between the society and the State, a way to relate two divided bodies" (Guerrero, 1981: 73).

The subject of study of political science and public administration is power, but while political science is interested in the political struggle and the way in which it is constituted, public administration is interested in the power that is already constituted as a government, power seen as governmental action that has the political domain of one class over another.

That is why public administration is a science involved with the structure and use of political power.

Wilson and Mosca have neither explained the social roots of governmental power, nor the role of public administration as the exercise of that power; they have not pointed out the origin of the power of the government at the bosom of the State, nor the origin of their power as the power of the ruling classes; they have not understood, to sum up, that the state power that is exercised in the society is nothing but the relation that links two bodies that

² The idea is to highlight one of the characteristics of modernity, in which the public sphere seems to confront the private, leave a space between the State and Society, which is an essential problem of political science and public administration.

are separated, and that this relation contributes to establishing reciprocal ties that are necessary to alleviate the effects of their separation (Guerrero, 1981: 37).

Final reflections

As it has been explained, the development of political science shows the analytical rigor of the discipline in the spread of its subject of study, which in the last two decades has resulted in a variety of approaches to analyze the political sphere. By means of a short historical reference to the development of political science and public administration, it has been aimed to show the challenges that shall be overcome by both in order to set their development at present.

It is necessary to leave aside the paradigm on the unfruitfulness of philosophy without having another that makes political science a practical activity at any cost, given the fact that it is not convenient to reduce the dimension of human life only to that of the action, but one shall reevaluate the ideological and doctrinarian influence from it; to approximate to the being, without going off course from the must be.

We shall understand political science, in view of the capitalist reality of the XXI century, and all its signs as a discipline that promotes social change, which is committed to the study of the social phenomena derived from it; taking once more and at the same time, the study of government actions as a materialization of the State in society. Our discipline shall help strengthening democracies in all those spaces where it is expressed, we cannot understand the political science as a body isolated from the society, but on that shall be rescued in order to take part in the decision making of public affairs and to contribute in the formation of demanding and transforming citizenship; that is, to broaden its scope, to go beyond the study of the political, official and voting agents.

Political science and public administration are consolidated to the extent that they accumulate and systematize the preceding theories and the paradigms which gave them an origin, that is why certain paradigms will have to be recovered at the light of the XXI century. In the case of political science, its continuous redefinition, and the search for new methods shall not completely abide by the principles of the exact sciences. This has

proven to make it complex and undetermined, and this shall not promote the prevalence of abstraction over practice, but theory and philosophy shall complement the study of political science.

Public administration exists due to its function to mediate between the State and society, taking the universal nature of the State to the particularity of society.

The politics-administration dichotomy that provided scientificity to public administration shall be reconsidered at the bosom of the public realm in order to latter reflect on the dichotomy between State and society, where the political science recovers the study of public administration as a body that manages reveal the will of the State, and which is reflected in the study of government. That is, it shall study the public administration as a product of the capitalist model and, at the same time, from its double nature: political and administrative.

As Riggs points out: "Political science is the only able to contribute to the understanding of public administration and even though other disciplines can and indeed shall contribute to the understanding of public administration, to the training of professional administrators, none of them can or want to make the crucial contribution that is necessary to solve the crisis of identity" (Riggs quoted by Guerrero, 2001: 93).

The challenge for scholars of public administration is to know that it is far from being a study separated from politics; in it converges all the aspects of its action. In the opposite case, when studying public administration only from its administrative nature and not from the political, the only thing that we will achieve will be the reduction of the subject of study to its minimal expression. Therefore, the contemporary researcher shall look for the reorientation of the subject of study, where the point of departure is the division of the State-society, and public administration is conceived as the body that mediates between them, which belongs to the participation within the society.

In this regard, the analysis of public administration shall transcend the instrumental and procedural spheres; it shall not be studied only as a managerial cycle or as an internal management procedure, but as a function of the State and government in order to relate to society and to correct its contradiction at the bosom of capitalism.

This dialectical approach constitutes one of the most solid statements to sustain the scientific status of public administration. In order to transcend it, it is necessary to raise awareness in the researcher, because as Omar Guerrero points out: “the reorientation of Public administration is, above all, rising awareness in the researcher in view of the subject which is being researched on, considering themselves as a part of the reality under study. No sooner will we be aware of this, we make Public administration a decent, useful and valuable discipline” (Guerrero, 1981: 257), whose essential support is constituted by political science.

Bibliography

- Arendt, Hannah (2001), *¿Qué es la política?*, Barcelona: Paidós.
- Arendt, Hannah (2005), *La condición humana*, Barcelona: Paidós.
- Arond, Raymond (1997), *Estudios políticos*, Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Batlle, Albert (2000), *Diez textos básicos de Ciencia Política*, Madrid: Ariel.
- Guerrero, Omar (1981), *La administración pública del Estado capitalista*, Mexico, Mexico City: Instituto Nacional de Administración Pública (INAP).
- Guerrero, Omar (1985), *Teoría de la Administración Pública*, Mexico, Mexico City: Harla.
- Huntington, Samuel (1992), “Ciencia política y reforma política. De alma en alma”, in *Estudios políticos y sociales*, Mexico: National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM).
- Marsh, David and Soler Ferry (1997), *Teoría y Métodos de la Ciencia Política*, Madrid: Alianza.
- Pasquino, Gianfranco (1988), “Naturaleza y evolución de la disciplina”, in Pasquino *et al.*, *Manual de la Ciencia Política*, Madrid: Alianza Universidad Textos.
- Strauss, Leo (1970), *¿Qué es filosofía política?*, Madrid: Guadarrama.
- Strauss, Leo and Joseph Cropsey (1997), *Historia de la filosofía política*, Mexico, Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Sartori, Giovanni (2006), *Política: Lógica y Método en las Ciencias Sociales*, Mexico, Mexico City: Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Uvalle, Ricardo (1998), *Las transformaciones del Estado y la Administración Pública en la Sociedad Contemporánea*, Mexico: Public Administration Institute of the State of Mexico (IAPEM) and Autonomous University of the State of Mexico (UAEM).

Zamitz, Héctor (1999), “Origen y desarrollo de la ciencia política: temas y problemas”, in *Convergencia, Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, September-December, year 6, num. 20, Toluca, Mexico: Faculty of Political Science and Public Administration, Autonomous University of the State of Mexico (UAEM).

Julio César Olvera García. He holds a Ph. D. in Political and Social Sciences from the National Autonomous University of Mexico. He is a professor-researcher at the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences of the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico. His research lines are: democracy, citizenship and public management. Some of his recent published works are: “Ciudadanía, gestión y vida colectiva: una visión hacia la democracia en el contexto de la reforma del Estado”, in *Memoria del XII Congreso del CLAD* (2008); “Retos de la construcción democrática ante lo global: participación ciudadana”, in *Memoria del Coloquio Internacional: Enfoques multidisciplinarios sobre retos nacionales y regionales en la globalización* (2008); “Transformaciones en el proceso democratizador: de la gestión pública hacia la gestión estratégica”, in *Memoria del XII Congreso Internacional del CLAD* (2008).

Sent to dictum: January 26th, 2009.

Approval: February 23rd, 2009.