

РЕФОРМЫ ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО УПРАВЛЕНИЯ И ГОСУДАРСТВЕННОГО МЕНЕДЖМЕНТА 1970–2020 ГОДОВ: СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКИЙ АНАЛИЗ

Али Фаразманд^а

DOI: 10.22394/2070-8378-2024-26-2-15-28

Флоридский атлантический университет

Аннотация: В статье рассматриваются некоторые из ключевых реформ государственного управления и менеджмента, проводившихся на Западе с 1970-х годов. Автор использует стратегический анализ, диалектический и неисчерпывающий подход; рассмотрены лишь некоторые из наиболее известных реформ с потенциальным глобальным воздействием и последствиями. Статья содержит выводы для будущих реформ государственного управления. Основное предположение данной статьи заключается в том, что, помогая в определенной степени улучшить процессы государственного управления для достижения более высоких результатов, эти реформы были стратегически продуманы и служили основными инструментами трансформации для достижения двух широкомасштабных стратегических политико-экономических и идеологических целей с глобальными последствиями: (1) превращение капитализма в «хищнический» корпоративный капитализм через распространение неустанной идеологии «господства рынка» в качестве наиболее распространенного глобального экономического института в мире; и (2) трансформация (после «распада» СССР как единственной глобальной соперничающей сверхдержавы) этого капитализма в возглавляемую США «хищную глобализацию» с абсолютным «гегемонистским господством и правлением» в качестве «унитарного правителя мира» (подкрепленного военной машиной НАТО, возглавляемой США) в экономическом, политическом, военном и культурном плане. В статье делается вывод о том, что реформы преуспели в достижении стратегических целей их разработчиков. Однако при этом реформы также создали свои собственные антитезы и способствовали возникновению «многополярного мирового порядка» в XXI веке.

Ключевые слова: изменение политического уклада, реформы государственного управления, многополярность, глобализация, корпоративный капитализм

Дата поступления статьи в редакцию: 26 декабря 2023 года.

GLOBAL GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC MANAGEMENT REFORMS 1970–2020: A STRATEGIC ANALYSIS

Ali Farazmand^a

RESEARCH ARTICLE

a Florida Atlantic University

Abstract: This article examines some of the key public administration and management reforms undertaken in the West since the 1970s. The author uses a strategic analysis, dialectical and non-exhaustive approach; only some of the best-known reforms with potential global impact and implications are considered. The article draws conclusions for future public administration reforms. The main assumption of this article is that, while helping to improve governance processes to some extent to achieve better outcomes, these reforms were strategically designed and served as major instruments of transformation to achieve two broad strategic political-economic and ideological goals with global implications: (1) the transformation of capitalism into “predatory” corporate capitalism through the propagation of the relentless ideology of “market dominance” as the most pervasive global economic institution in the world; and (2) the transformation (after the “collapse” of the USSR as the only global rival superpower) of this capitalism into US-led “predatory globalization” with absolute “hegemonic dominance and rule” as the “unitary ruler of the world” (backed by the US-led NATO war machine) economically, politically, militarily and culturally. The article concludes that the reforms have succeeded in achieving the strategic goals of their architects. However, in doing so, the reforms also created their own antitheses and contributed to the emergence of a “multipolar world order” in the 21st century.

Keywords: changing political patterns, governance reforms, multipolarity, globalization, corporate capitalism

Received: December 26, 2023.

"The success of an empire depends highly on a sound economic management and sound tolerant governance well-organized and efficiently functioned by an effective administrative system, with universal laws and impartial judicial systems, and periodic reforms to perfections. The purpose is to advance human civilizations and serve the entire world".

*Darius The Great,
The King of Kings of the Persian Achaemenid World-State Empire, 520 BC.*

Introduction

Governments across the world have always adopted reforms in their governance structures and processes for better performance and more effective administration throughout history. Some have been externally motivated and required [Keddie, 1962], or forced as a conditionality for foreign aid [Amsden, 2007] or imposed upon to prevent social revolutions or serve as a «counterrevolution» [McCoy, 1971], others have been initiated domestically either by revolutionary or reform-oriented forces with genuine change intentions [Farazmand, 1989(a)]. Almost all reforms pursue certain purported purposes with goals and approaches, but all have different consequences, some positive, others negative; some with expected results, others with unexpected outcomes or consequences [Farazmand, 1989(a), 2001; Migdal, 1974; Peters, 2002]. As part of the consequences or impacts, reforms carry losers and beneficiaries. Politics and public policies determine the directions and consequences of almost all reforms, as often reforms are launched for gaining 'legitimacy' for systems in crises or at the edge of chaos [Farazmand, 1989(a), 2003, 2017; Prigogine, Stengers, 1984], system 'renewal' [Farazmand, 2003], streamlining public management organizations, or pursuing new grand transformational changes.

While discussion of change, reform, and reorganization takes multi-volume space to do a fair job, this article addresses only three of the most important and globally well-known reforms that have had fundamental transformational impacts on governance, public administration, and economic systems of the world for the last four-five decades: These include: (1) the sweeping privatization, outsourcing, and commercialization of almost everything under the public or government control or ownership as for «better government» [Savas, 1987] and restructuring the economy, (2) the so-called New Public Management (NPM) as a universal model of public administration based on the 'market-capitalism' with the ideology of a «best way» to management and administration of modern capitalist organizations; and (3) the market-based 'Good Governance' reform as the best governing and government model. The latter was, and has been, to (a) structurally change the nature and role of governance and government, and (b) use it as a required «conditionality» for domestic funding and foreign aid to implement the reforms domestically and globally to achieve the transformational goals [Amsden, 2007; Korten, 1995; Farazmand, 2004, 2017].

While these reforms did largely achieve the officially stated objectives noted above, it is a contention of this article that they were deliberately designed to strategically accomplish much bigger and hidden purposes to: (1) profoundly transform the capitalist economy, (2) structurally alter the nature and role of governments, (3) fundamentally reconfigure the structures and processes of public administration, public management, and (4) realign the public policy and related institutional arrangements of government and society economically and politically. More specifically, the real intension of the sweeping privatization reforms were aimed at: (1) dismantling the largess of the administrative state with a huge public bureaucracy grown over decades, which successfully implemented the mission of the New Deal's anti-Great Depression policy for economic renewal; (2) eliminating the 'welfare state' that was created to help lift the millions of the poor and underclass workers [Caiden, 1994] from poverty and unemployment, (3) transferring government/public assets from the public sector to the private business corporations [Farazmand, 1989(b)], (4) restructuring the economy by replacing the demand-side Keynesianism with a conservative supply-side system and neoliberal economic model [Carroll, 1995], and (5) reducing the role of government to a mere 'agent' for empowering private business corporations and their elites – hence the «agencification» of government [Farazmand, 2001, 2003; 2017(b)]. The hidden strategic goals also included (6) transforming the corporate-organized capitalism into 'predatory capitalism' with free hands to advance as a 'predatory corporate globalization' of the world [Korten, 1995; Culpitt, 1992; Dugger, 1989] led by a 'unipolar world order system'. Armed with the NATO forces as a universal standing army and the global governing institutions (UN, WB, WTO, ICC, IMF, etc.), as well as economic sanctions, the United States and its European allies, would be able to exact compliance and enforce absolute rule and control over the entire world [Amsden, 2007; Farazmand, 2001, 2003, 2017]; and (7) using both the NPM and Governance Reforms, along with other mechanisms, to fully achieve the strategic goals of the predatory globalization by all means, «including the force of violence» [Hoffman, 2006] to rule the world as the undisputed «Colossus Empire» [Fergusson, 2004; Amsden, 2007], and with a «tyrannic global dictatorship» that such a repressive world condition produce.

Offering a strategic analysis of the above, this article also argues that, while the reforms achieved most of the stated and unstated objectives to a great success [James Galbraith, 2006; Korten, 1995], achieving a total «global hegemonic» [Dugger, 1989] goal of ruling a ‘unipolar world order’ has been far from success – maybe even disastrous! This has been due to the strong resistance of the recently emerging ‘multipolar world order system’ with a growing number of regional and international challengers (e.g., Russia, China, Iran, and others under the BRICS Plus) that have entered the global governance theater. The latter have been showing the ability and willingness to confront the Empire head on and offer alternative choices with equity and justice under the BRICS-Plus to the world in the 21st Century [Farazmand, 2001, 1999, 2017]. Yet, as history has shown many times before, declining empires never learn from history, and the current self-declared world ruler (Empire) will likely continue to use every possible force, including «the force of violence» [Hoffman, 2006] and «destructions» [Farazmand, 2007; 2017; Dugger, 1989] over weaker nations to preserve its ambitions for «global dictatorship» [Farazmand, 1999 – author’s term]. Thus, the reforms seem to have created the seeds of their own anti-thesis, that is the ‘monster has finally met its own limit’! This article also offers implications for theory and practice as well as the future of governments, public management, globalization, and global governance.

Sweeping Privatization, Commercialization, and Downsizing

Sweeping privatization as a deliberate public policy was a prescription that the Anglo-Saxon USA and UK governments pursued to reform governance and economy as well as public management since the 1970s. But there was a growing background to it. It was a «big» paradigmatic economic, governance, and administrative change of the twentieth century in post-WWII era, a grand transformational project of the last century. In fact, it was the deepest and most dramatic global turn against the long held and widely cherished prosperous Keynesian demand-side economic theory that saved the entire Western world of capitalism from the deep crisis of Depression in the 1930s [McPherson, 1987; Thayer, 1981]. The Keynesian demand side economic theory to fight Great Depression and promote economic development through the active government interventions of the 1930s through 1960s contributed to the rise of a so-called large «welfare state» with a huge national bureaucracy in the United States and Europe [Farazmand, 1989(b); Nachmias and Rosenbloom, 1980]. It expanded the role of the «rational administrative state» beyond expectations in political circles who viewed it as a threat to politicians’ discretionary whims in policy and political processes [Farazmand, 1989(b); Nachmias

and Rosenbloom, 1980]. The attacks on the growth of the «administrative state bureaucracy» came from all sides, including some prominent academic scholars as well as business corporate elites, and politicians who criticized the bureaucracy as too big and unaccountable to citizen electorate [Farazmand, 1989(b)]. Their solution was to break up that power and reclaim the decision-making power by legislative politicians [Niskanen, 1971; Rosenbloom, 1983].

The theoretical groundings for this ideological and political/economic reforms were provided by the «public or rational choice theorists» like James Buchanan and Gordon Tullock (1962), Anthony Downs (1967), William Niskanen (1971), and Vincent Ostrom (1974). Another conservative economist from the Chicago University’s School of Economics Milton Friedman (1982) also joined the bandwagon of the neo-conservative theorists of the neo-liberal corporate capitalism. Their prescription for curbing the power and largess of the American bureaucracy – despite its gigantic successes in combatting depression and improving the economy – was «privatization» as the solution to all the problems of economies and governments [Savas, 1987]. Privatization came in the forms of massive full sale to private sector – total departure into marketplace – and partial sales to bidders; it covered all functions of the governments and economy – defense, security, health and human services, social welfare functions, etc. It also came in the forms of massive commercialization, ‘contracting out’ and ‘outsourcing’, arrangements to manage or manage or mismanage the economy and government. American government became characterized as «government by proxies» [Kettl, 1988].

With the elections of Ronald Reagan in the USA and Margaret Thatcher in England in the 1980s, ‘sweeping privatization’ and outsourcing became an actual public policy across the two sides of the Atlantic Ocean, with massive pressures over other European and developing to nations to follow suit – it was not an option, but a forced top-down dictate [Savas, 1987]. Both Reagan and Thatcher were the extreme conservative politicians who represented the far right-wing conservative supply-side economic theories of ‘greedy corporate capitalism’ and its elite power structure armed with the ultimate armies ready and determined to intervene and enforce economic and social reforms across the Atlantic oceans. They were the executors of the Anglo-Saxon ultimate corporate elites’ policy mandates. Extremely anti-labor unions, anti-public service and administration, and anti-welfare/administrative state, they were ready to sell all government assets to private business corporations [Rosen, 1985; Farazmand, 1989b].

Both Reagan and Thatcher officially declared that «government is a problem, not a solution» with the private market as the answer for the conservative in-

Хорошее управление

dividual as a 'self-interested economic animal' [Farazmand, 1989(b), 2002(a)]. Thus, the crusade of 'sweeping privatization' of government enterprises, organizations, economies, and social and cultural affairs began and continued throughout the 1980s [Farazmand, 1989(b); Savas, 1987]. Internationally, both governments used several global governance institutions like the United Nations and its affiliated organizations of WB, IMF, WTO, as well as USAID, British Foreign Aid Agency (BFAA), and relevant European agencies to force implementation of privatization around the world. 'Conditionality' was the most powerful tool of this global strategic ideological and economic policy enforcement [Amsden, 2007] – no conditions, no financial aid. Therefore, 'sweeping privatization' and 'structural adjustments' in economy and governance were forced upon developing countries as well as within the US, UK, and other European countries. The results were massive corporatization, commercialization, marketization, and «agencification» of governments acting as 'agents' of the transnational corporations to serve the greedy – and predatory – corporate capitalism [Farazmand, 1989(b), 2001, 2009; 2017(b)]. In the meantime, security, safety, and other main operations of governments' functions were also contracted out, outsourced, and transferred to private businesses and corporations wherever the US and UK were able to push throughout the world, leading some scholars to call it «Government by Proxy: (Mis?) Managing Federal Programs» [Kettl, 1988]. This trend has become a norm in the 21st century.

The role of governments was reduced to the basic functions of policing the citizens via a new «social contract» [Davey, 1995], while expanding the war making machines by raising the military-security budgets, expanding the business corporate capitalism's role with absolute control over the economies in the world. Thus, the 'predatory capitalism' became a gigantic reality beast in the world [Galbraith, 2006: 5/6; Graycar, 1983; Harvey, 1995]. The rich became richer over a thousand times, the middle and working classes dramatically shrunk in «a race to the bottom» [Brecher, Costello, 1994; Korten, 1995], hostile mergers and mega mergers led to increased monopolies and concentrated economic powers in the hands of fewer corporations while millions of small businesses went bankrupt. It destroyed millions of the safety nets, caused massive new unemployment and homelessness, job-related stress and health costs jumped up, and the number of social crimes and incarcerations by the police reached high records [Davey, 1995]. Many found bankruptcies, homelessness, and jumping to death as the only ways out. Western governments' names changed from «the welfare state to the penitentiary states» [Farazmand, 2001, 2003; Davey, 1995].

Internationally, unable to pay back the loans and interests imposed upon them by the World Bank and IMF

'structural adjustments' programs, several Latin American countries, including Argentina and others declared bankruptcies – all for the benefits of the 'absolute rate of profits' for the predatory capitalism and predatory global corporations. Does greed ever have a limit? The results show, as Alice Amsden [Amsden, 2007] notes, developing countries were forced to go through a "journey of hell". The home economy was also in "virtual ruin" [Thayer, 1981]. By 2015, privatization in Russia also produced overnight a few economic oligarchs (both domestic and foreign, mostly American and European) by gabbing massive state-owned/run enterprises for pennies through Western friendly self-declared president Boris Yeltsin who listened to more American and British hundreds of the CIA advisors than his Russian advisors or people. That created a small number of mega billionaire oligarchs instead of many Russian millionaires small entrepreneurs while causing huge economic despairs for the millions of hard-working Russians. In the United States and Britain, the consequences of sweeping privatization were even more devastating for many more millions. In short, the political, economic, and ideological objectives also included the 'political economy' as the "globalization of surplus values pursued by trans-world/transborder corporations to capture the realms of [virtually all] state functions, [including its] interventionist role in the economy and society that had [historically] made it a strong competitor of state capitalism for decades" [Farazmand, 2009. P. 554–555].

After the dissolution of the USSR in the 1990s and the emergence of a self-declared "new 'Hegemonic' Unipolar World Order under the US leadership, the globalizing corporate elites became determined to dismantle the administrative state" all together [Agnew, 2005], completely destroy the "welfare state" [Graycar, 1989], and all other alternative systems to establish the corporate capitalism's absolute "hegemonic" dictatorship [Agnew, 2005] over the entire globe's economies and financial systems [Farazmand, 1989(b), 2001(a,b); Korten, 1995]. Thus, privatization came to be seen as one of the [most powerful] global strategic instruments of 'capital' expansion, surplus value promotion, and global dominance of the [predatory] corporate capitalism..." [Farazmand, 2009. P. 555].

The results have been the of a huge 'transformation' at the global scale: Transfer of public assets, functions, and properties from the government sectors to the private corporate sector for exploitation, monopolization, and profits, and of course serving the global "corporate hegemonic world-order" [Dugger, 1989]; indeed, the new undisputed "global empire", an Empire that some of its proponents have praised as "colossus" [Ferguson, 2004]. "While WB takes direct orders from the US and its corporate elites and targets other countries to change their policies, programs, strategies, and priorities to

favor and promote the new global capitalism, it is no secret that IMF takes its instructions directly from the US Treasury Department” [Farazmand, 1999(b): 557; Hancock, 1989; Korten, 1995]. Both institutions, along with those attached to the UK and US governments, have been the “globalizers” [Woods, 2006] and “global lords of poverty” [Hamilton, 1989]. Here comes the complete process of building the “predatory globalization” in a unipolar world order” system armed by a globally standing military machine of NATO as a force of terror ready to destroy anyone or any state resisting its self-declared rule of “global dictatorship” [Farazmand, 2001, 2017]. Refusing to comply with the rules has meant crippling economic sanctions, outsourced ISIS type terrorism, and direct military invasions [Agnew, 2005; Farazmand, 2001], and other bloody outcomes, such as what happened to Chile in 1973, Iraq in the 1990s, Libya in 2011, Afghanistan, 2001–2023, and the Gaza Genocide in Palestine – as of October 8, 2023).

Needless to say, other key characteristics of this sweeping privatization campaign included commercialization of almost everything called public – from public service to infrastructures, government operations, public enterprises, schools, prisons, and more, including privatization of the Olympic Games in Atlanta for the first time in history under the order of Ronald Reagan: “You attend if you have money, you don’t if you don’t pay, and this is consistent with the American way”, (Interview with a federal officials in Washington, DC in 1986). Next to commercialization was the national frenzy of “downsizing and right-sizing” of not only government at all levels, but also of private corporate organizations as well. The declared rationale was cutting costs and services, firing employees, labor forces, downsizing or rightsizing to cut costs, and forcing those not fired to “must do more with less” – “We are told to do five other employees’ jobs as well as our own works, or be ready to let go because there are hundreds, even thousands, of experienced workers and employees are ready outside at the door to take your jobs for less pay with at least another 5–6 hours of extra mandatory ‘overtime’ work”, said one employee of a federal agency with his close friends from a manufacturing factory in Bradford, Pennsylvania in 1987”.

Greedy capitalism for absolute rate of surplus (profits) and total exploitation and control of the marketplaces and nation states [Farazmand, 1989(b); Fox, 1999] became norms and have been ultimate objectives of the predatory corporations at home and abroad. “Conditionality” [Amsden, 2007] and crippling economic sanctions” as well as violence of invasions have been common weaponry tools of the empire’s global agendas of the “predatory corporate capitalism” [Amsden, 2007; James Galbraith, 2006; Korten, 1995, 2001], “predatory globalization” [Falk, 1999], and the unipolar world order with “hegemonic dictatorship” [Dugger, 1989; Farazmand 1999, 2001].

Predatory Corporate Capitalism and Predatory Globalization

Predatory capitalism and predatory globalization are two powerful terms that clearly characterize the contemporary economic and political-military systems of the United States and its Western European allies. Elsewhere [Farazmand, 1999], I have explained in great details the concept and phenomenon of ‘globalization’, its meanings, causes, and consequences for economy, society, governance, and public administration. The following is a brief discussion of predatory corporate capitalism and predatory globalization.

The terms often used in American and Western European economic systems are ‘capitalism’, ‘market system’, and ‘free-market enterprise’ even though, according to a world-famous American economist, “the US economy is not a free market economy” [John Kenneth Galbraith, 1974. P. 99]. Yet, the words like ‘billionaires’, ‘market share’, ‘corporations’, ‘private enterprises’, and ‘corporate successes’ are the sugar quoted sweet images repeated daily to represent capitalism with praise and glorification. Rarely ever (almost never) one would read or hear words like American or European oligarchs, tycoons, ugly capitalism, destructive or predatory capitalism, crony capitalism, subsidized and state supported corporations, etc., let alone talks of “working class” people.

In the real world, all these terms plus market-failures and predatory capitalism are facts of life in capitalism and even more so under corporate capitalism with corporations as the most powerful and dangerous forms of organizations that tend to “rule the world” [Bridge, 2013; Lenin, 1921; 1983; Korten, 1995; Thayer, 1981]. And Lenin [Lenin, 1921] aptly characterizes “imperialism” as the highest stage of capitalism”. Free market economy is an illusion, a fantasy idea in America and Europe. “No matter what one thinks of the giant corporation, surely it is a delusion to consider it a private enterprise”, notes the famous American political scientist Robert Dahl [Dahl, 1970. P. 120]. “Yet the modern capitalist state is organized around that delusion” [Parenti, 1978. P. 180]. As the two prominent American political scientists, Gerth and Mills [Gerth, Mills, 1955. P. 220] state:

“The meaning of “private” as applied to the leading American corporations means merely that their policy makers are not accountable for the decisions – so long as they “stay within the law, which is often loosely defined and perhaps necessarily vague about the latest business practices”.

Yet, most things that private business corporations do are supported, subsidized, and funded by governments and most of the things that governments do are done through private business corporations, big and small [Parenti, 1983; 1978, 188–194; Korten, 1995].

Despite the national frenzy of the 1980s’ and 1990s praising corporate capitalism as, the “free market econ-

Хорошее управление

omy” was rejected not only by J.K. Galbraith earlier [Galbraith, 1974. P. 99], but also by another economist, James Galbraith later [Galbraith, 2006, 5/4] who wrote about “Taming Predatory Capitalism” in *Taming Global Capitalism Anew*. Others joined in with strong words as well. For example, Gray [Gray, 1998] wrote about the “False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism”; McPherson [McPherson, 1987] wrote on the “Rise and Fall of Economic Justice”; Michael Mann [Mann, 1980] wrote on “State, War, and Capitalism”, with a “call” for bringing the “state back in”; and Frederick Thayer [Thayer, 1981] championed “Against Hierarchy and Competition”. The latter argued that “competition is destructive, wasteful, and destroys cooperation, while hierarchy produces timidity and blind followers” in capitalism even though there is no free market or real capitalism in America.

There are two types of predators, just like in the jungles: those that attack preys only when they are hungry and need foods, and those that are greedy and attack preys and any animals that are singled out or considered weak and vulnerable, as ‘hyenas’ do; they attack in packs as a group and for ‘domination and destruction’. This is what the giant corporations and the states that support them do as a perfect example [Falk, 1999; Farazmand, 1999]. It is the latter group of predators, the greedy globalist corporations, and their predatory states, that have consistently attacked and destroyed many economies and legitimate democratically governments deemed independent and resistant to their hegemonic forces of “predatory globalization” in the unipolar world order system [Korten, 1995, 1999, 2001; Farazmand, 1999, 2001, 2009; Hoffman, 2006]. But famous American political journalists like Thomas Friedman advises nations to “accept the herd or be crushed” [Friedman, 1999; cited in Farazmand, 1999, 1].

Reforms of the 1990s-2020: USA and the World

While the sweeping privatization reforms fundamentally transformed the governance, government, public management, and the economic systems in the US and worldwide, the new unipolar global world empire needed more fundamental reforms to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of its governance and administrative systems. To this end, several major new reforms were launched that swept the Western capitalist countries and their satellite nations in the South. Of these, the following two are considered the most strategic and powerful reforms towards institutionalizing and reinforcing the existing predatory capitalism and predatory globalization, and to make sure “governments and their administrative systems perform with “expected results” [Ellig, McTigue, Wray, 2011/12]. Performance-based governance and ‘results-oriented management’ became new fads in towns, though many questions were left

unanswered as to what the performance movement was and meant to serve. Of the major reforms noted above, the first one was the so called “New Public Management (NPM)”, and the second as “Good Governance”. Both complimented each other. A close examination of these two reform measures reveals three real and hidden strategic goals of their designers, as detailed partially here and fully elsewhere [Farazmand, 2001]. Both models are powerful “strategic instruments” deliberately designed and forcefully operationalized to transform the entire world of predatory capitalism and reinforce a “global hegemonic” power structure in the North and South countries to promote the “predatory globalization regime” worldwide.

New Public Management (NPM)

The New Public Management or NPM gained prominence as it was quickly and widely spread in public administration and governance of the Western world in the 1990s. It was presented as an innovative idea to improve the performance of the machineries of governments – that is the bureaucracy and public administration systems. Several elements were claimed to underpin the basic assumptions of the new public management, but three were purportedly the most important ones: (1) efficiency, obtained through high performance; (2) a market-business model of management; (3) and accountability to the “stakeholders” [Barzelay, 2001; Hood, 1991]. These were the core values of NPM, and they initially gained the model some popularity with several catch words of “new management”, “business management as a model”, “privatization”, “stakeholders”, “accountability”, “efficiency”, and “performance measurements” by “private sector business contractors” through outsourcing, contracting out, and subcontracting of public services.

Sounded appealing as these catch words were, most failed to deliver what they had promised [Farazmand, 2001], only “false promises” [Garvey, 1995]. For example, efficiency can easily be increased in business management by cheating on the quality of performance or products, cutting corners on what is delivered versus what is agreed to or promised, underpaying labors and employees while forcing them to work longer hours and harder. Efficiency can also be achieved by using low quality parts and materials, and not counting the “social overhead costs” that are provided to all, including business enterprises, by government agencies and paid for by taxpayers. Governments cannot engage in such activities to raise efficiency. Therefore, a close examination simply reveals several major flaws of this business-market model for public management. Elsewhere [Farazmand, 2001, 2004, 2009] I have detailed these and other flaws of NPM. Briefly stated, in addition to the misleading word of efficiency, accountability is also in

trouble – accountability to whom? Stakeholders? Which or what stakeholders? The rich and powerful elites? To corporate elites and their contractors? To administrators left with little capacity to monitor and assure quality control? Or to hold the violators and cheaters accountable? These and many other questions that caused many problems in many countries like Switzerland – even its birthplace New Zealand – to abandon NPM on accountability and delivery issues.

Similarly, efficiency is not a main goal of governments and their public service administration; the quality, fairness, justice, and timely delivery of service are. Governments have higher goals of providing justice, national defense, fairness, poverty reduction, providing public services, and security. Private sector businesses are interested in maximizing profits as their bottom line, and there are many ways to cheat and get higher profits to declare “efficiency and success”. Next, market models of management do not offer anything new, never had, never will, for public management and administration. In fact, there was nothing “new” about the “new public management” – it was an “old cheap wine in the new bottles” [Farazmand, 2001, 2002]. This was a consensus among experts of public administration’s assessment of NPM. Further, NPM was a new way to market the early twenty-century model of “managerialism” introduced and propagated by Frederick Taylor who developed the concept of the so-called “Scientific Management” for high productivity. It was a theory of management with excessive focuses on exploitation of workers and employees through a strict and dictatorial “One Best Way” approach to managerial iron-fist system [see Farazmand, 2002, chapter 2 for details; Taylor, in Fischer, Sirianni, 1984]. It was then and has always been a managerial ideology of corporate capitalism, according to Frank [Fischer, 1984] who calls Taylor’s managerialism as a managerial ideology “to confer advantage upon the privileged capitalist class” [Fischer, 1984. P. 175].

The NPM was nothing but a deceptive and ruthless system of business/corporate models of “managerialism” in public service and administration [Garvey, 1995]. Why? Because the dominant models of neoliberal “supply-side” economic theory dominating the governments, and their public organizations necessitated it as a reform model and propagated it not only in the United States, but also UK and Europe, and by extensions to most developing nations [Carroll, 1995] – all for the bigger pockets of the corporate barons. Yet, despite the critics who attacked the consequential problems and flaws of NPM, it mostly remained as a model most governments were required to adopt. It was reinforced mainly by the global governing institutions or the globalizers, the “barons or lords” of the predatory corporate globalization of the world – namely, the World Bank, the IMF, the American AID, the British AID agencies, and other donor organiza-

tions. NPM was claimed to be a “paradigmatic change” that caused deeply profound transformations in public service and administration theory and practice worldwide but for a historically worse medicine that killed more patients. The above problems were addressed in reference to the officially stated goals and purposes of NPM – by its proponents [Barzelay, 2001; Hood, 1991], not the true purposes and hidden agendas of the model. The hidden and true agendas of NPM were to “culturally” change the value systems and spirits of “public service and administration” so deeply ingrained in the education and training of public servants for the values that cannot be measured by dollar criteria used in private business management systems [Denhardt, Denhardt, 2000; Rosen, 1985].

The neoliberal, corporate/business model of NPM was launched to also change and transform the honorable “belief systems of public service values” in teaching and training as well as theory and practice within public administration enterprises [Farazmand, 2009]. This was, and still is, the most destructive impact the corporate designers as consultants have inflicted on the ancient-long noble profession of public service and administration worldwide, including the United States and Europe, and elsewhere under their neo-colonial instrumentalities [Rosen, 1985; Thayer, 1997]. Although critics strongly attacked this model and tried to change the tempo from NPM to “New Public Service” with core values of trust, integrity, ethics, sense of community, responsiveness, and accountability, as well as performance results [Robert Denhardt, 2004. P. 99–111; Robert Denhardt and Janet Denhardt 2000; Farazmand, 2004], the intended damages were already done. Everywhere, public managers and administrators as well as governors, politicians, and public employees were forced to believe in the “ideology of ‘public’ management or administration being “bad”, and “private” management and business administration as “good”. They were forced to “abandon” their long-held noble values of public service and instead internalize the fake values of corporate business interests as “public values”. This caused a huge psychological impact on public employees and workers who were forced to question their own public service spirit, commitment, mission, and dedication against their own personal identity and belief systems [Fox, 1999; Denhardt, Denhardt, 2000].

This destructive, brainwashing, and ideological slogan caused over time a deep transformational alteration in the “mind-sets” of public servants who were told to abandon their “public service spirit”. This ultimate destructive damage has left a long-standing scar on the souls and minds of public servants for a long time – a feeling of “self-denial, self-rejection, and self-inflicted alienation”, perhaps a deep wounding crime to their souls and hearts [Farazmand, 2001].

Хорошее управление

Hence, while the earlier “sweeping privatization” achieved the First “structural strategic goal” of transferring public assets to the private corporate sector and structurally change the “public-private sector configurations” [Wise, 2002], the NPM implementation achieved the Second strategic goal of the “cultural belief” system of the predatory corporations’ total domination over the world by the US-led hegemonic unipolar world order. Both strategic goals were accomplished with the results of the more concentrated powers and wealth in the hands of the “few” oligarchs and monopolistic and oligopolistic transnational corporations [Korten, 1995; Parenti, 1995]. This happened while more millions or billions of ordinary middle-and-working class peoples fell deeper and lower in a “race to the bottom”, proving Korten’s [Korten, 1995] and Brecher and Costello’s [Brecher, Costello, 1994] claims of “global pillaging” and “global dictatorship” [Farazmand, 2001, 2002(b), 2004]; a “tyrannic global dictatorship” indeed.

Governance Reforms: The Good the Bad, and the Ugly

1990s-2020 also witnessed another set of worldwide engaging reforms under the rubric of governance, governing, and government. Governance reforms came in a whole list of various conceptual and practical perspectives. While many such perspectives produced a fairly large size of literature on governance, one top-down governance reform concept was officially launched across the Atlantic Ocean and spread worldwide. As if the earlier avalanches of reform [Osborn, Gabler, 1992], were not enough to play with top-down reforms, there came the idea of “good governance” and “government reforms”. Hence a huge army of both academic scholars and practitioners was generated and tasked to tackle the problems or challenges of governance and government across the world – especially the South.

Why there?

Well, simply it was a top-down requirement as a must “condition” for foreign aids, international and regional cooperations, and of course with anything that the United Nations was involved in [Amsden, 2007]. That included socioeconomic and political-cultural developments of developing and underdeveloped nations through numerous conferences, meetings, training, and more. All the sudden, “governance reforms” became a gospel to be required and promoted by all global governance institutions and their subsidiary organizations everywhere. The central pushes came from the US, UK, European Union, and all globalizers and globalizing institutions that were heavily involved in the building and reinforcement of the predatory corporate capitalism in the “unipolar world order system” under the United States leadership.

Elsewhere [Farazmand, 2004], I have detailed this literature with its variations and implications with critical feedback. Below is a very brief relay of these concepts and ideas that emerged through the growing scholarly literature on “governance” with a covered a huge body of knowledge. All the sudden the concept of “government” was replaced by the term “governance” everywhere. Diversity in perspectives, ideas, and applications filled the knowledge base. They included partnership-based governance [Farazmand 2004], business and corporate governance, public governance, collaborative governance, network governance, regulatory governance, “public administration as governance”, “market governance”, “good governance”, and more [Farazmand, 2004, 2009; Peters, 2001].

Surveying the above, three important points emerge: first, is concept “public administration as governance and governance as public administration”. Recall the earlier discussion on how “public’ administration” was forcibly abandoned and replaced by “business management”, the same happened in reference to “public governance” and “government”. Instead, corporate governance and “market-based governance, and entrepreneurial governance” began to dominate the applications in public institutions as well as in higher educational systems where young and older and established scholars were discouraged to use the term “public” and instead focus on using such market and business governance models [Barzelay, 2001]. Alienated and gone were – and still are – the traditional concepts of “bureaucracy”, “administrative state”, “public administration”, and “public service”. In fact, many university departments and schools of public administration were forced into merges with other departments like Planning, Political Science, Urban Studies, Community Services, etc. This was, and still is, another deepening layer of the cultural transformation of the concept governance into the corporate globalization of the world.

Second, the concepts of “governance” and NPM were viewed almost all virtually dichotomous and hierarchical in order – corporate-business dominated “governance” actors decide, and corporate market management systems with privatized, outsourced, and contracted out organizations implement [Farazmand, 2001]. Third, came the top-down hammering concept of “good governance”, with all its promotional sticks, rhetorical propaganda, and forceful applications using the financial instruments as the most powerful tools of “conditionality” to exact compliance [Amsden, 2007; Farazmand, 2001, 2009]. Conceived and deigned by the business-corporate advisors and leaders, the idea came from the World Bank and UN and was required as a “conditionality” reform by almost all governments under the Empire’s hegemony across the world to adopt it. What was “good” governance? What did it mean?

Good Governance

Good governance was launched by the World Bank (under American government policy elites), a powerful global governing institution and instrument of the corporate capitalism's globalization of the world. The idea of "good" governance automatically connotes "good" versus "bad" or "not good" – a strong normative value. The assumptions underlying such a global reform required most if not all governments of the Global South to adopt this mandatory reform as part of the broader "structural adjustments"; it quickly became an official public policy. It included, and still does, at least two presumptive claims that the (1) the existing or traditional models of government or governance are not good enough, (2) or they are even actually bad, and that the countries need to, and should, (3) change and reform their governance systems with the new "good governance" model.

These two assumptions with the prescription for change based on presumptive judgments tell a million-page story about what is going on in the world and what the WB or United Nations are up to with such a grand reform idea. Here the United Nations and its affiliate agencies like the WB, IMF, UNDP, and UNDESD plus the powerful nations of the North provided a definition for "good governance" and made it a key requirement for any financial or technical aid to the countries of the South [Amsden, 2007].

Speculations aside, the UN and the WB had defined "good governance" as: "the exercise of political, economic, and administrative authority to manage a nation's affairs. It is the complex mechanisms, processes, relationships, and institutions through which citizens and groups articulate their interests, exercise their rights and obligations, and mediate their differences" [UNDP, 1997: 9]. According to this UNDP definition, "governance transcends the State to include civil society organizations and the private sector, because all are involved in most activities promoting sustainable human development" [UNDP, 1997: 9. P. 11; quoted from Farazmand, 2004: 6–7]. Elsewhere [Farazmand, 2004: 7], I wrote as a critique that "This definition identifies three key components of governance: (1) the state and its institutions, (2) the civil society organizations that were traditionally left out in the past governing systems, and (3) the private sector supposedly not involved in the governing process or dynamics". I further elaborated then, and provide it below:

First (1) the concept's definition is deficient due to at least two factors: for one, it assumes that all parties of 'good governance' are well informed with the arts and science of effective governance and that they all engage readily with the best and most efforts and cooperation to govern. This is more like a fantasy than a blueprint for governance. The second factor is

that the interaction of only three forces is considered to constitute or involve 'good governance', that is the interaction among the state, the civil society, and the private sector, broadly defined. This triad interaction totally ignores perhaps the most important external forces (4th element) of the governance process in developing and less developed nations – that is the global and international power structures or the globalizing state power and the trans-world corporate elites (that tend to rule the world in the unipolar world order) [Farazmand, 2004: 9].

Is it even possible to exclude these external forces of power? An impossibility! How can the external foreign colonial, neocolonial, and imperialist forces along with their transnational predatory corporations be excluded from national governance process of sovereign countries? These colonial and imperialist global powers have the hegemonic economic and financial leverages that can crush most resisting and independent nations through crippling sanctions, economic blackmails, political or even military threats, and ruthless invasions, terrorism, and coup de tats. As barons of the neoliberal capitalist world, this global western "power structure has for almost two centuries dominated the politics and governments of developing and less developed nations, their cultures, resources, and markets" [Farazmand, 2004: 9]. While enriching their Western capitalist nations of the North, they have mercilessly and brutally destroyed the economies, cultures, governance, leaders, and infrastructures in other countries. As "lords of poverty", they have kept countries of Africa, Latin America, and Asia in absolute destitute dependency with miserable life of debts, deprivation, and exploitations with little hope for their children. Exaggerations? Absolutely not. History is empirical evidence, and it does not lie. The "lords of poverty" as John Hancock [Hancock, 1989] calls them, and as "neo-colonizers", they have already demonstrated in action and with all means, including illegal economic sanctions, staging military coup d' e tats, and creating and funding proxy terrorist groups, as well as direct military invasions and occupations across the worlds. They have violated almost every globally-collectively accepted international rules and laws and replaced them with their "laws of jungle – even their own jungle" – in which the "logic of force and coercion" rather than mutual respect and tolerance prevail. This is a potentially dangerous epochal era of global politics and administration that tends to turn humanity and civilizations back to the pre-ancient and even more barbaric times" [Farazmand, 2004: 9].

The second (2) major problem with the definition of good governance is its heavily loaded "normative" values. Good versus bad, and good for whom? This is a huge question. Given what the United Nations and its key agencies of WB and IMF have already required full

Хорошее управление

implementation of the unilaterally dictated “structural adjustments” and “good governance”, the developing nations have been pushed to the walls. They are forced to comply with further colonization and corporate globalization of the world, even by the force of violence. They are turning the countries of the South to the operating fields under the new global empire, the American Empire [Hard, Negri, 2000]. Can this be sustained? Not under the emerging multipolar world order with many new opportunities for the countries of the South.

To be clear, the “structural adjustments” have required developing and less developed nations to implement the: (1) sweeping privatization, (2) small government, (3) large private sector connected as subordinate agents to the Western global corporations that are after all and every resource in those countries, and (4) governance and market-based business managerial reforms. They also included the relaxing environmental and labor laws, dismantling labor unions, providing military bases to the global “empire” for security and exploitation, and opening their markets and governance systems integrated into the global capitalism and unipolar world order system. It was no surprise that, when delivering the keynote address at the UN conference on Governance in Africa in 1998, the President of Tanzania Julius Nyerere “severely criticized the notion of ‘good governance’ as an imperialistic and colonial concept” [Farazmand, 2004: 6]. He noted that these corporations, their agents, their powerful governments, and their UN representatives are telling us we in Africa have “bad” governance and must adopt “good governance” according to their requirements of “structural adjustments”, so we can develop? [See Farazmand, 2004: 6; and UNDESA, 1998]. This sounded more like slavery than good governance or any governance, he stated. It was a grand “ideology” of the grand design for a global governance under a globalist unipolar world order system, a true global dictatorship [Farazmand, 2004; Dugger 1989; Falk 1999; Hancock, 1989; Woods, 2006].

The problems of the ‘good governance’ definition continue with its three core elements too. Except for the first party, the “state”, which is also vulnerable to external powerful forces of business and other sources of pressures and manipulations, the civil society organizations and the private sectors can be viewed as the “extended agents” of powerful foreign institutions and actors like the World Bank, the transnational globalizing corporations, the IMF, and institutions. They are supposed to represent women, minorities, and even the other civil societies that are often funded and directed with clear globalization agendas from outside. If the local “state” refuses to cooperate, that “state” will be subjected to internal strife, terrorism, and even external invasions. Examples of such cases have been many,

including Libya, Syria, Afghanistan where they had different degrees of successes, plus those areas that they have failed such as in Belarus, Iran, Georgia, and other places with so-called “color revolutions” funded and directed by the US, British, EU agents, and American corporations.

In short, civil societies are by now globally well-known as mostly agents of violent riots for regime change into totally subservient puppet governments to obey the globalist dictates of the Empire. Moreover, many legitimate, independent, and democratic “good governments” have been targeted with destruction, relentless economic and political-cultural sanctions, and threats of military invasions to change course and fall in line with the so-called “rules-based” unipolar world order – the rules of the Empire. A world order characterized by global tyranny, virtual slavery and colonialism, repression, mass murder, and barbarism – this is the current world order. Evidence includes cases of Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya (by direct invasions despite its very good governance system), Russian ethnic people of Eastern Ukraine, or Syria (through the proxy and terrorist wars), the ongoing Gaza Genocide in Palestine, and other cases as demonstrated the last thirty years.

Conclusions: Reforms, Predatory Globalization, and Future Implications

Governance and administrative reforms have been experienced throughout the history from the ancient time. Reforms often carry intended and unintended consequences, but strategically designed reforms to achieve certain hidden strategic goals are neither sincere nor honorable. They may raise hopes and buy temporary legitimacy, but they only exacerbate the bad situations. Therefore, as explained in this article, the (evil?) visionary prescriptions of scholars like Samuel Huntington [Huntington, 1993] who prescribed a “unipolar global world governance system” with total Westernization as a “clash of civilizations” against the world’s longest in history Eastern civilizations, and Christopher Hood [Hood, 1991] who prescribed a New Public Management (NPM) “For All Seasons” offered the unitary global empire.

It is safe to conclude with strong affirmation that the ‘bold propositions’ stated as main/hidden objectives at the beginning of this article, have been supported. This bold confirmation entails the successful implementation of the three strategic reforms of the: (1) sweeping privatization of most if not all countries of the world – exceptions aside [Carroll, 1995; Farazmand 2001; Rosen, 1985]; (2) the universalization of the NPM with its global authoritarian ‘managerialist ideology’ to manage the globalized capitalist world [Hood, 1991; Barzelay, 2001; Carroll, 1995]; and (3)

the “global governance reforms” via the normative “good governance” as the grand ideology of governing a global unipolar world order under the US leadership, “crushing the Eastern civilizations” [Huntington, 1996] and enforcing a dominant universal “corporate hegemony” [Dugger, 1989; Falk, 1999; Donohue, Nye, 2002]. Missions accomplished! Yes? Think twice! A world system with the entire Eastern Civilizations assimilated (or crushed) into the Western ideas, where all nations and peoples are transformed into “a world of marketplaces” with citizens and noncitizens living as spending “costumers” and “consumers” [Ohmae, 1993; Ferguson, 2004; Harvey, 1995]? It shows how ignorant people like Huntington are.

In short, at least two broad conclusions may be drawn from this article: first, the grand ideological design of “good governance” strategy completed the “process” of establishing a global predatory corporate hegemony and a predatory globalization (through sweeping privatization and NPM) [Falk, 1995; Korten, 1995; Ferguson, 2004; Farazmand, 2004; Galbraith, 2006]. However, the designers’ ability to impose a total “hegemonic” unipolar world order [Mander, Goldsmith, 1996] has been significantly curtailed by a growing strong resistance from independent nations and rising powers to counter them head on. Examples include Iran, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and of course China and Russia – there is a limit to the use of coercion and the will to domination. All monsters meet their own demise, and all empires are bound to fall [Kennedy, 1987; Johnson, 2008].

Second, as noted earlier, the dialectical law of nature dictates the inevitable rise of anti-thesis to the unipolar world order system of the globalist designers from the start [Brucan, 1978; Engels, 1873]. American author Chalmers Johnson’s two must read book, *Blowback: The Sorrows of the Empire* (2004) and *Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Republic* (2008) explains this dialectical law of nature with details. Accordingly, any thesis generates its own anti-thesis, that is the internal forces of its own destruction if the dialectical process is “contradictory”, as is the cases of capitalism generating the seeds of its own destruction from within; the harder and the more intensified the internal contradictions, the stronger the “anti-thesis” they create [Engels, 1873; Farazmand, 2002, chapter 2; Schumpeter, 2008]. Examples of this phenomenon include the rising “regionalization”, “anti-globalization”, “de-globalization”, “parallel or rival globalization”, and the “multipolar world order globalization” as well as ‘de-dollarization’, the BRICS Plus, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the Eurasian Organization, and the Central & South American/Andes Organizations to name a few. Power, greed, and abuse of power are not a sign of strength or success; rather, they can be a sign of deep-down weakness.

“Success should always call for showing greater kindness, generosity, and justice; only people lost in the darkness treat it as an occasion for greater greed” – Cyrus the Great, 550 BC.

Future Implications: Three Possibilities

The unipolar world order vision gives many “lights” for the few global barons and “deep darkness” for the 95 % of the world. Their market-based capitalism to efficiently manage such a Westernized unipolar world order system was indeed a strategic design for such strategic grand purposes from the start. They both prescribed paradigmatic changes with strategic goals in mind – turning all human beings into “consumers” of the “marketplace world” while leaving the management and governance functions to predatory corporations and the unipolar world Empire, signaling a US led global totalitarian dictatorship enforced by the NATO military machine. The changes have been profoundly transformational and paradigmatically frightening – they signaled further destructions with bloodsheds and loss of humanity with rising tyrannies for survival!

This global view may sound apocalyptic to some, but the sad thing is it is not far from reality. The fundamental question for survival of the humanity is how to divert this reality and escape from it – is there any strategic solution? This author briefly outlines three alternative possibilities before the humanity and for the world order system to avert the potential global catastrophe.

The **first possibility** has already started as an emerging alternative to the apocalyptic, and that is the rise and expansion of the BRICS Plus system. This is a viable global economic system with social, political, and governance and administrative implications. It is a huge challenge to the current world order system, but there are many internal and external contradictions that challenge its viability. Internally, there are many contradicting diversities in preferences and historical alliances as well as ideological differences that make it almost impossible to form a coherent “One” system. The biggest obstacle is the existing global governance institutions as external challenges, no matter how much they may be reformed. The colonialists-imperialists always have ways to divide and rule, with carrots and sticks, against the vulnerable and double-headed members! They will stage and force many genocides before admitting defeats.

The **second possibility** is creating a totally new global space by the BRICS Plus and many other potential members to join it. This possibility requires a separate set of global governance institutional arrangements, in parallel or side by side, in cooperation or competition and rivalry with the existing global arrangements. Living in the United States for over 45 years and knowing the mindsets of its people and leaders plus the cultural and value bases of this and other Western countries of Eu-

Хорошее управление

rope that follow it, I would anticipate a strong possibility of a total end-of-the world apocalyptic scenario. The gaps between this Western set of paradigms and those of the entire East and the South are huge. The unipolar world rulers see themselves as the barons of the entire world with material powers to subjugate the rest of the world and are willing to use the ultimate nuclear weapons to force them into submission – but they are totally wrong. Their lack of rationality, sense of over-confidence, and resulting blindness lead them towards global annihilation attempts. This colossal blunder will undoubtedly trigger total retaliations from the Russian and Chinese own nuclear responses from land, sea, and space – hence an assured mutual destruction (Madness), an annihilation of the world. Simply put, sadly, Americans and their European vassal states almost never had true “statesmen”, men or women of high intellectual capacity with broad vision and “practical wisdom of high caliber” who could recognize time and condition and navigate with high morality for the sake of all universes. Sadly, they are brought up with a high sense of selfishness and “bullying” character with little or no sense of empathy for others. Combined with their central tenets of “arrogance” and “ignorance” plus “self-indulged racism”, this general character becomes the “most dangerously frightening force” the history has ever witnessed, unless defeated by equal or more powerful forces. They may not win, but they have shown over time that they can destroy and carry-on massive genocides by mass-murdering multiple millions of people, including children and women. How possible is this possibility? Very high, but not the highest! Then, there is:

The **third possibility**, and that is a mutual realization of the facts above and the search for co-existence solutions through ‘hard negotiations’, accepting the realities by the ‘global barons’ to admit their limits by

whatever self-interest rationality, or irrationality they may display, and settle for a world order system with shared seats of power and responsibilities. Founded and guided by Cyrus the Great’s political philosophies of “synthesis of civilizations and Tolerant Governance” with multiple institutional checks and balances, plus equality among all peoples regardless of age, ethnicity, race, color, and gender; the Persian’s multinational-multiethnic One-World State Achaemenid Empire (559 BC) practiced such a world order; it was the most diverse, the most efficient and effective for 230 years in the ancient time [Olmstead, 1948; Farazmand, 2009]. Its “hegemonic power” was not based on fear or threat of horror; rather based on principles of humanity, equality, respect, prosperity, and peacefulness. Persian “hegemonic order” was universal and saved the world from potential chaos and wars, offered prosperity, peace, and stability for all, gave the world the most comprehensive Universal Charter of Human Rights, expanded equality and participation, built gigantic development projects like the Suez Canal in North Africa and Egypt for global navigations and the Atosa Canal in Europe, as well as numerous inventions and innovations in communications, technologies, governance, and public administration. A multi-polar world order system today with these philosophies and administrative principles will help save the planet and its peoples. And great powers like the US, Russia, and China, and others like Iran, Brazil, Cuba, Koreas, Europeans, all Asians, Africans, and Americans can work together – with differences aside – and make this beautiful world a heavenly place for all its peoples. This is a lesson for survival and learning to live with others in a real world of magnificent differences, and the globalists will find it not a bad experience after all. This is not an option, but an absolute necessity, the only real possibility if human civilizations are to survive. Let’s hope for it.

References

- Agnew J. Hegemony: The New Shape of Global Power. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005. In English
- Amsden A. Escape from Empire: The Developing World’s Journey Through Heaven and Hell. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007. In English
- Barnes B. Imperialism’s March Toward Fascism and War. *New Internationalist*. 2003. No. 10. P. 217–331. In English
- Bartholomew A. Empire’s Law: The American Imperial Project and the War to Remake the World. Pluto Press, 2006. In English
- Barzela M. The New Public Management. Berkely, CA: University of California Press, 2001. In English
- Boyer R., Drache D. States Against Markets: The Limits and Globalization. London: Routledge, 1996. In English
- Brecher J., Costello T. Global Village or Global Pillage. Boston, MA: South End Press, 1994. In English
- Bridge R. Midnight in American Empire: How Corporations and their Political Servants are Destroying American Dream. Create Space Independent Publishing Platforms. 2013. In English
- Brucan S. The Dialectic of World Politics. New York: The Free Press, 1978. In English
- Buchanan J., Tullock G. The Calculus of Consent. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan Press, 1962. In English
- Carroll J. The Rhetoric of Reform and Political Reality in the National Performance Review. *Public Administration Review*. 1995. No. 55. P. 302–312. In English
- Cook J. The Persian Empire. New York: Schocken Books, 1983. In English
- Culpitt I. Welfare and Citizenship: Beyond the Crisis of the Welfare State? London: Sage, 1992. In English
- Dahl R. After the Revolution. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1970. In English
- Davey J. The New Social Contract: American Journey from the Welfare State to the Police State. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1995. In English
- Denhardt R. Trust as capacity: The Role of Integrity and Respon-

- siveness. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal*. 2002. No. 2 (1). P. 65–76. In English
- Denhardt R., Denhardt J. The New Public Service: Serving Rather Than Steering. *Public Administration Review*. 2002. No. 60 (6). P. 549–559. In English
- Donohue J., Nye J. Market-Based Governance. New York: M. E. Sharp, 2002. In English
- Downs A. Inside Bureaucracy. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967. In English
- Downs G., Larkey P. The Search for Government Efficiency: From Hubris to Helplessness. New York: Random House, 1986. In English
- Dugger W. Corporate Hegemony. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989. In English
- Ellig J., McTigue M., Wray H. Performance and Results: An Evaluation of the Government Performance and Results Act Government. ASPA Series in Public Administration and Public Policy Series, 1st ed. Routledge, 2011/12. In English
- Engels F. Dialectic of Nature. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1873. In English
- Falk R. Predatory Globalization: A Critique. UK: Oxford: Blackwell, 1999. In English
- Farazmand A. The State, Bureaucracy, and Revolution: Agrarian Reforms and Regime Politics. Westport, CT: Praeger, 1989(a). In English
- Farazmand A. Crisis in the US Administrative State. *Administration and Society*. 1989(b). No. 21 (2). P. 177–199. In English
- Farazmand A. Modern Systems of Government: Exploring the Politicians and Bureaucrats Relationships. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997. In English
- Farazmand A. Globalization and Public Administration. *Public Admin Review*. 1999. No. 59 (6). P. 509–522. In English
- Farazmand A. Privatization or Reform: International Case Studies. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2001. In English
- Farazmand A. Privatization and Globalization: A Critical Analysis with Implications for Public Management Education and Training. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*. 2002(a). No. 68 (3). P. 355–371. In English
- Farazmand A. Modern Organizations: Theory and Practice. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002(b). In English
- Farazmand A. Sound Governance: Policy and Administrative Innovations. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004. In English
- Farazmand A. Building Administrative Capacity for the Age of Rapid Globalization: A Prescription for Survival in the 21st Century. *Public Administration Review*. 2009. No. 69 (6). P. 1007–1020. In English
- Globalization and Governance. In: Handbook of Globalization, Governance, and Public Administration. Edited by Ali Farazmand and Jack Pinkowski. CRC/Taylor and Francis, 2009. In English
- Farazmand A. The Future of Public Administration: Challenges and Opportunities. *Administration and Society*. 2012. No. 44 (4). P. 487–517. In English
- Farazmand A. Comparative Governance Reforms: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly; and the Sound Governance. *Public Organization Review: A Global Journal*. 2017. 17 (October). P. 595–617. In English
- Ferguson N. Colossus: The Price of American Empire. New York: Penguin, 2004. In English
- Fischer F. Ideology and Organization Theory. In: Critical Studies in Organization and Bureaucracy. Edited by Frank Fischer and Carmen Siran. P. 172–190. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984. In English
- Fox H. The Market as God: Living in the New Dispensations. *Atlantic Monthly*. 1999. March 18–23. In English
- Friedman M. Capitalism and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962, 1982. In English
- Friedman T.L. The Lexus and the Olive Tree. New York: Farrar, Straus, Girous, 1999. In English
- Friedman T. L. The World is Flat. 2005. In English
- Galbraith J. Taming Predatory Capitalism. In: Taming Global Capitalism Anew. 2006, 5/4. In English
- Galbraith J. The U.S. Economy Is Not a Free Market Economy. *Forbes*. No. 113 (10), May. P. 99. 1974. In English
- Garvey G. False Promises: The NPM in Historical Perspective. In: Inside the Reinvention Machine: Appraising Governmental Reform. Edited by Donald Kettl and John Dilulio. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. P. 87–106. 1995. In English
- Gerth H., Mills R. Character and Social Structure. Harcourt, Brace and World, 1955. In English
- Gray J. The False Dawn: The Delusions of Global Capitalism. London: Granta Books, 1998. In English
- Graycar A. The interrelationship of Voluntary, Statutory, and Informal Services. *British Journal of Social Work*. 1983. No. 13 (4). P. 379–393. In English
- Hamilton E. America's Global Interests: A New Agenda. New York: W.W. Norton, 1989. In English
- Hancock G. Lords of Poverty. New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 1989. In English
- Harvey R. The Return of the Strong: The Drift to Global Disorder. London: Macmillan, 1995. In English
- Hard M., Negri A. Empire. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001. In English
- Hoffman S. Chaos and Violence. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2006. In English
- Hood C. Public Management for All Seasons? *Public Administration*. 1991. No. 69 (1). P. 3–19. In English
- Huntington S. Political Order in a Changing Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1968. In English
- Huntington S. The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World Order. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1996. In English
- Johnson C. The Nemesis: The Last Days of the American Republic. 2008. In English
- Johnson C. Blowback. 2004. In English
- Kazancigil A. The Significance of Statehood in Global Governance. In: Regulating Globalization: Critical Approaches to Global Governance. Edited by Pierre de Senarclens and Ali Kazancigil. New York: United Nations University Press, 2007. P. 37–68. In English
- Kettl D. Sharing Power: Public Governance and Private Market. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1993. In English
- Kettl D. Government by Proxy: (Mis?) Managing Federal Programs. 1987/88. In English
- Kettl D. Transformation of Government: Public Administration for the Twenty-First Century. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002. In English
- Kennedy P. The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers. New York: Vintage Books, 1987. In English
- Korten D. When Corporations Rule the World. West Hartford, CT: Kumarian Press, 1995. In English

Хорошее управление

- Farazmand A. When Corporations Rule the World (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Kumarian Press, 2001. In English
- LeFeber W. Inevitable Revolutions: The United States in Central America. New York: W.W. Norton, 1984. In English
- Lenin V.I. State and Revolution. New York: International Publishers, 1921, 1971. In English
- Mann M. States, War and Capitalism. Oxford, England: Blackwell, 1980. In English
- Mander J., Goldsmith E. The Case Against the Global Economy and For the Return to Local. San Francisco, CA: Sierra Club Books, 1996. In English
- Marx K. Selected Works. Moscow: Progress Books, 1951. In English
- Marx K. The Spirit of Bureaucracy and Beyond Bureaucracy: The Paris Commune. In: Critical Studies in Organization and Bureaucracy. Edited by Frank Fischer and Carmen Sirianni. P. 40–41. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1984. In English
- McPherson C.B. The Rise and Fall of Economic Justice. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987. In English
- MacCoy A. Land Reform as Counterrevolution. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars*. 1971. No. 3 (1). P. 14–49. In English
- Magdoff H. The Age of Imperialism. New York: Monthly Review, 1969. In English
- Migdal J. Peasant, Politics, and Revolution. Pressures toward Political and Social Change in the Third World. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974. In English
- Nachmias D., Rosenbloom D. Bureaucratic Government USA. New York: St Martin's Press, 1980. In English
- Niskanen W. Bureaucracy and Representative Government. Chicago: Adline & Atherton, 1971. In English
- Ohmae K. The Borderless World: The Rise of Regional Economics. London: Harper-Collins, 1990. In English
- Olmstead A. History of the Persian Empire: The Achaemenid Period. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. In English
- Osborne D., Gabler T. Reinventing Government: Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1992. In English
- Ostrom V. The Intellectual Crisis in Public Administration. University, AL: The University of Alabama Press, 1974. In English
- Parenti M. Democracy for the Few. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1988, 2010. In English
- Parenti M. Power and the Powerless. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978, 1983. In English
- Peters G. The Future of Governing, 2nd ed. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2001. In English
- Farazmand A. Government Reorganization: Theory and Practice. In: Modern Organizations: Theory and Practice. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002. P. 159–180. In English
- Prigogine I., Stengers I. Order Out of Chaos. New York: Bantam, 1984. In English
- Rosen H. Servants of the People. The Uncertain Future of American Federal Civil Service. Salt Lake City: Olympus, 1985. In English
- Rosenbloom D. Public Administration Theory and the Separation of Powers. *Public Administration Review*. 1983. No. 43 (3). P. 219–221. In English
- Savas E. Privatization: The Key Better Government. Chatham, NJ: Chatham House, 1987. In English
- Schumpeter J. Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy. New York: Harper & Row, 1950, 2008. In English
- Smith D. Globalization: The Hidden Agenda. Malden, MA: The Polity Press, 2006. In English
- Snyder L. The Imperialism Reader. The University Series in History. New York/London: D. Van Nostrand Co, 1962. In English
- Stiglitz J. Globalization and its Discontents. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003. In English
- Thayer F. The US Civil Service: 1883-1993 (R.I.P.). In: Ali Farazmand (ed.). Modern Systems of Government: Exploring the Role of Bureaucrats and Politicians. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997. P. 95–124. In English
- UNDESA (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs). "Governance in Africa: Consolidating the Foundations". Report of the DCA/DESAE. 1998. In English
- Conference on Governance in Africa, Adis Ababa, Ethiopia, March 2–6. In English
- UNDP (United Nations Development Program). Governance for Sustainable Human Development: A UNDP Policy Document. New York: UNDP, 1997. In English
- Vernon R. Sovereignty at Bay: The Multinational Spread of U.S. Enterprises. New York: The Basic Books, 1971. In English
- Wise C. The Public Service Configuration Problem: Designing Public Organizations in a Pluralistic Public Service. P. 135–158. In: Ali Farazmand (ed.). Modern Organizations: Theory and Practice. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002. In English
- Woods N. The Globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank, and Their Borrowers. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006. In English
- Zysman J. The Myth of a Global Economy: Enduring National Foundations and Emerging Regional Realities. *New Political Economy*. 1996. No. 1. P. 157–184. In English

ИНФОРМАЦИЯ ОБ АВТОРЕ:

Али Фаразманд, доктор философских наук, профессор Школы государственного управления Флоридский атлантический университет (777 Glades Rd, Бока-Ратон, Флорида 33431, США).
E-mail: afarazma@fau.edu

Для цитирования: Али Фаразманд. Реформы глобального управления и государственного менеджмента 1980–2020 годов: стратегический анализ. *Государственная служба*. 2024. № 2. С. 15–28.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE AUTHOR:

Ali Farazmand, Doctor of Sci. (Philosophy), Professor, School of Public Administration Florida Atlantic University (777 Glades Rd, Boca Raton, FL 33431, United States). E-mail: afarazma@fau.edu

For citation: Ali Farazmand. Global governance and public management reforms 1980–2020: a strategic analysis. *Gosudarstvennaya sluzhba*. 2024. No. 2. P. 15–28.