

The center of the developed world today faces one of its worst crises in the full season of globalization. According to the office of statistics of the European Union, Eurostat, the zone as a whole today presents a negative growth rate of 0.3% of real production, with an unemployment rate of approximately 11.1% of the labor force, at the same time that some 115 million people are at risk of falling into poverty. While things are not so critical on the other side of the Atlantic, they are not radically different there either. The growth rate in the United States barely reached 1.5% in 2011, with an unemployment rate of 9.1% for July of the same year. What is happening at the core of the developed world, in the rich countries? It is no secret that they were the ones who promoted the globalization process in their own economies and imposed it on the rest of the world as well. Furthermore, in its heyday globalization was presented to friends and strangers alike as the best strategy for overcoming backwardness and poverty. In fact, globalization came to be presented as the only path to development.

Nowadays, the European crisis and the sluggish performance of the US economy display a very contradictory panorama when considered from the viewpoint of the political, economic and social developments of the last forty years, which is why it cannot be explained as the fruit of a specific conjuncture. The origins of the crisis are precisely related to this historical root, the fall of the welfare state at the beginning of the 1970s and the re-accommodation of the neoclassic economy based on the idea of the absolute freedom of the market and the struggle against state regulation and activism. The adoption of this alternative involved the liberation of domestic economies in goods, services and capital accounts which together with the deregulation and liberalization of markets promised benefits that have not substantially transformed the economic and social structures of Third World countries thus far. The results have not been as surprising as expected. It is very likely that their GDP growth rates are higher than those of their European counterparts, but they have not yet overcome underdevelopment.

Public administration has not been free of globalization, since it has penetrated all levels of national, departmental and municipal government. As noted by Kim (2008), the pressures exerted by globalization on the different levels of government were definitive in the attempt to rationalize bureaucracy, budget and organizations by privatizing, contracting and subcontracting with the private sector, deregulating, reducing personnel, and restructuring government functions and services.

Government functions and services have been reorganized at all levels of government, and the incidence of subcontracting with private entities in governmental agencies is constantly

Pedro Nel Páez Pérez
SCIENTIFIC EDITOR

CORRESPONDENCIA EN
pedronepaez@gmail.com

increasing, despite the fact that the governmental functions and the services subcontracted vary substantially. This means that the principles of absolute freedom of the market, of the market forces and the principles of the market model have been increasingly incorporated into public administration, which in many cases becomes confused with private administration. This means that just as it occurs in private administration of private businesses, emphasis has been placed on the achievement of efficiency, effectiveness, productivity, yield, responsibility, response capacity and flexibility through the adoption of techniques mainly used by private companies, which is not in itself censurable. However, Weber's assumptions regarding an ideal type of bureaucracy are no longer compatible with the modern management of public organizations. National and local governments are expected to be more efficient, effective, sensitive and responsible through structural adjustments and adequate behavior or adaptations.

Nonetheless, one question remains in the air. Public administration has been transformed by globalization, by bringing it closer to the principles of efficiency that are supposed for the private market. It is worthwhile asking whether this post-Weber type of administration has been capable of transforming itself together with the private sector and for Third World countries the social and productive structures, technological, needed to overcome the condition of non-development, or if it has been strategically associated with the private sector in order to extract profits, while the countries and globalization or capitalism itself are undergoing the deepest of crises. These reflections undoubtedly open up fields of reflection and analyses that we leave open to our Spanish American collaborators and that are reflected in the academic reasons proper to or at least not alien to Public Administration. This issue of A&D has been divided into three sections and has had contributions from collaborators in various Latin American countries and Spain.

Justice Section

Rivas, Pérez and Arriaga contributed "Implantation of the Accusatory Criminal Justice System in Mexico." The research method used was participant observation and action research as a result of participation in 17 pre-diagnosis seminars in the states of the Mexican republic. As a result of the above, it was concluded that the reform has advanced at four different speeds in Mexico, that the Technical Secretariat (SETEC) has had little success as an implementing agency due to the constant changes in its leadership and its de-structured strategic orientation and organizational design. It was also concluded that the best implantation model is that done by regions and even though the justice systems studied are very different in size and complexity, they nonetheless share a common problematic.

Public Administration Section

Jiménez and Álvarez Collazos in "Development of a Merit-Based System and the Administrative Career in Colombia: Context,

Application and Limitations,” find that the merit system is an essential element in the management of the modern state and efforts have been made to adopt it in public administration in Colombia. The article seeks to establish the reasons why the merit system has faced difficulties in its application throughout the different period of the administrative career. The methodology used is qualitative, recurring to primary and secondary sources and applying the technique of documentary review and analysis. The conclusion points out that the ineffectiveness of said system is due to more to matters of political culture than to a technical problem or a matter of legal development. On the other hand, in “The Evolution and Institutionalization of the Professional Bureaucracy in the Municipality of Cali (Central Administration): 2001-2010,” Saavedra and collaborators find that within the framework of the reforms of the state and of public administration promoted in the first decade of the 21st century by relevant political actors in Colombia, the employment of administrative career civil service personnel at the central level in the city of Cali evolved institutionally in a stratified modality that relegated it to the periphery of personnel management. In contrast, other forms of association such as the *contrato de prestación de servicios*, which was designed for transitory and marginal employment in the public administration apparatus, became the hegemonic rule.

In “S+T+I Governance and the Country’s Researchers,” Burbano, with a survey of 173 professors and researchers in the Colombian university system and using the Likert scale, outlines the types of governance found in this field due to the type of participation these professionals have in the design of S+T+I policies. For example, discretionary governance, which imposes S+T+I plans, programs and projects, is perceived by the professors as something quite real in Colombia. This type of governance by science, technology and innovation is carried out by experts from public and private organizations, while excluding the country’s professors and researchers from this very important task. That is to say, the six types of S+T+I governance that are also found among the country’s professors and researchers has been based on the research of Healy (2005) and his STAGE (Science, Technology and Governance in Europe) research group in order to stimulate public actions to permit massive community participation in the field of S+T+I.

In “Open Government, Public Services 2.0 and Digital Citizenship: Notes for a New Agenda for Modernizing Public Management in Spanish America,” Ramírez-Alujas of the Instituto Universitario de Investigación Ortega y Gasset in Spain shows that different governments all around the world have recently initiated a progressive process of promoting and carrying out strategies linked to the concept of ‘open government,’ a context in which the term “Public Services 2.0” has been coined to refer to a new interactive form of creation of public value and transition to a new type of citizen collaboration and open innovation through the systematic integration of the actors in the process of governing and



administering public affairs. The article analyzes the key concepts underlying the application of Web 2.0 tools and social networks in a transformational vision of the state and public services, and the possibility of configuring a specific agenda oriented to modernizing public management in Spanish America in response to the diverse recent diagnoses regarding these questions, and based on the production among equals and the wealth of the networks, the wisdom of the multitudes, crowdsourcing and citizensourcing/wikigovernment, the innovation of open, user-centered services and an open government focus.

Economics Section

Fernández Riquelme of the Universidad de Murcia, Spain has contributed "The Social Economy of the Market." This reference point for the contemporary debate between economic development and social justice shows that in political terms the balanced co-existence between the efficient administration of resources (through the free market) and social justice (through a re-distributing state) continues to be a subject of debate on both the theoretical and the ideological plane in the 21st century. The economic-political school of thought known as 'Social Economy of the Market' (Soziale Marktwirtschaft), responsible for the none-too-surprising German post-war 'economic miracle' contributed throughout the past century to this possibility, of notable media impact in periods of crisis. This article analyzes its historical development and key doctrines, outlining a historiographical interpretation of the relationship between administration and justice, through the notion of the 'social function of the economy,' presented in a context of urgent socio-economic national development.

References

Kim, C. K. (2008). "Public Administration in the Age of Globalization". *International Public Management Review*, 9(1).