

1: The Bureaucracy: The Real Government [www.enganchecubano.com]

The Bureaucracy and Policymaking Bureaucrats put government policy into practice, and therefore the federal bureaucracy has a large impact on policymaking. In order to get their policies passed, the president and Congress must work with the bureaucracy.

His ideal-typical bureaucracy, whether public or private, is characterized by: Wilson advocated a bureaucracy that "is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting house are a part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. But it is, at the same time, raised very far above the dull level of mere technical detail by the fact that through its greater principles it is directly connected with the lasting maxims of political wisdom, the permanent truths of political progress. Although politics sets the tasks for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices". This essay became the foundation for the study of public administration in America. Ludwig von Mises[edit] In his work Bureaucracy , the Austrian economist Ludwig von Mises compared bureaucratic management to profit management. Profit management, he argued, is the most effective method of organization when the services rendered may be checked by economic calculation of profit and loss. When, however, the service in question can not be subjected to economic calculation, bureaucratic management is necessary. He did not oppose universally bureaucratic management; on the contrary, he argued that bureaucracy is an indispensable method for social organization, for it is the only method by which the law can be made supreme, and is the protector of the individual against despotic arbitrariness. Using the example of the Catholic Church, he pointed out that bureaucracy is only appropriate for an organization whose code of conduct is not subject to change. He then went on to argue that complaints about bureaucratization usually refer not to the criticism of the bureaucratic methods themselves, but to "the intrusion of bureaucracy into all spheres of human life. The former makes for stagnation and preservation of inveterate methods, the latter makes for progress and improvement. Merton[edit] American sociologist Robert K. He believed that bureaucrats are more likely to defend their own entrenched interests than to act to benefit the organization as a whole but that pride in their craft makes them resistant to changes in established routines. Merton stated that bureaucrats emphasize formality over interpersonal relationships, and have been trained to ignore the special circumstances of particular cases, causing them to come across as "arrogant" and "haughty". Elliott Jaques describes the discovery of a universal and uniform underlying structure of managerial or work levels in the bureaucratic hierarchy for any type of employment systems. Number of levels in a bureaucracy hierarchy must match the complexity level of the employment system for which the bureaucratic hierarchy is created Elliott Jaques identified maximum 8 levels of complexity for bureaucratic hierarchies. Roles within a bureaucratic hierarchy differ in the level of work complexity. The level of work complexity in the roles must be matched with the level of human capability of the role holders Elliott Jaques identified maximum 8 Levels of human capability. The level of work complexity in any managerial role within a bureaucratic hierarchy must be one level higher than the level of work complexity of the subordinate roles. Any managerial role in a bureaucratic hierarchy must have full managerial accountabilities and authorities veto selection to the team, decide task types and specific task assignments, decide personal effectiveness and recognition, decide initiation of removal from the team within due process. Lateral working accountabilities and authorities must be defined for all the roles in the hierarchy 7 types of lateral working accountabilities and authorities: They also have a practical application in business and administrative studies.

2: Foreign Policy Bureaucracy by Mike Colella on Prezi

Bureaucracy (/ b j ũŠÉ™Ēr É' k r É™ s i /) refers to both a body of non-elective government officials and an administrative policy-making group. Historically, [when?] a bureaucracy was a government administration managed by departments staffed with non-elected officials. [2].

Definition, Theory, Development and Control Article shared by: The word bureaucracy is derived from the French word bureaucratic which is again derived from bureau. The dictionary meaning of bureaucracy is a system of government in which most decisions are taken by state officials rather than by elected representatives. This definition of bureaucracy is somewhat exaggerated because in most of the modern states the representatives take majority decisions and top government officials act as advisers to the representatives. The definition given by Hague, Harrop and Breslin appears to be more relevant. In another definition the bureaucracy has been termed as a government run or managed by permanent officers, In other words, it can be said that bureaucracy is that type of government or administration which is primarily manned by some permanent officers recruited by a body which acts independently. Though this definition does not embrace all aspects, it conveys the real situation. We can further say that bureaucracy is a government of permanent officers. They act as the advisers to the ministers but bear the burden of policy-making and policy implementation and they are responsible to their immediate boss. The boss may be a bureaucrat or a minister or any other person appointed by the government. Marx said that the modern state was the outcome of capitalist development. But Weber does not agree with this view of Marx. The State existed and even developed before the development of modern capitalism. But there is an important contribution of capitalism. It created a huge machinery for the management of public and private administration. Before the advent of capitalism this gargantuan administrative structure did not have any existence. It is the considered opinion of Weber and today many share this view of Weber. Marx said that bureaucratic organisation was parasite in the state. He did not regard it as an integral part of society. But Weber here again differed. He said that centralised bureaucratic administration was an integral part of modern state structure and it is inevitable. Weber has clearly stated in his *Economy and Society*: Weber has clearly stated the origin and inevitability of bureaucratic organisation and rule. In *Economy and Society* Max Weber has pointed out some features of bureaucracy: In bureaucracy office is arranged or ordered hierarchically like a pyramid. That is, officers hold office according to their rank. All the officers are subject to the higher authority. Bureaucratic system is characterised by impersonal and written rules. The entire administration is run by impersonal authority and the authority is vested in rules. In other words, in bureaucratic system, human appeal has no importance. Laws and rules conduct the administration. All the decisions are taken on the basis of rules and their methodical application. All the officials are recruited strictly on the basis of proven efficiency and potential competence. Officials are given specialist training. For the purpose of recruitment, qualifications are fixed; of course there may be provision for relaxation. Each official, in bureaucracy, has special or demarcated task. That is, there is clear division of work and each official will have to strictly observe it. The tasks are -so demarcated that it involves full time employment. The separation of officials from ownership of the means of administration. It means that the officials will simply conduct the administration and they cannot claim the ownership of the means of administration. The officials who perform their duties competently will have security in services salaries and promotion. In other words, in bureaucracy efficiency, merit and honesty are duly rewarded. There is also the scope of recognition of seniority. In every modern state and administration bureaucracy is practically indispensable. Without bureaucracy no administration can be run properly and efficiently. Even the ordinary management of administration is not possible. Why is bureaucracy completely indispensable? Weber has stated the reason in the following words: The fully developed bureaucratic apparatus compares with the non-mechanical modes of production. Without bureaucracy the administration will suffer and also will suffer general public. Complexities in modern administration and economic organisation have no doubt made the bureaucracy indispensable. But Weber has attributed another reason to its growth and it is the largeness of modern state. The ancient Greek city-states were small in size and the administration and economic systems

were very simple. Naturally the citizen of ancient Greek city-states did not feel the need of bureaucracy Weber writes: Nor was there power politics as it is today. We cannot think of any modern administration which is not technical in character. Some political scientists have devised few models of bureaucracy. We shall discuss here three main models. The first one is rational administrative model Secondly conservative power bloc model and, finally government over supply model. The above mentioned three models are explained below: The first model of bureaucracy is rational-administrative model. Bureaucracy is run by rational administrative machine and because of the rationality Weber calls it an ideal type. We have just now analysed Weberian theory of bureaucracy which states that it is hierarchical, the area of each official is strictly demarcated, it is based on rules and laws, the authority of officers is impersonal and appointments are done on the basis of recruitment and through open and public examination. Seniority, experience and efficiency are recognised and duly rewarded. These are the reasons of why bureaucracy is an ideal type. Because bureaucracy is rational it has earned tremendous popularity during the last one century and every state, both small and big, has adopted the bureaucratic mode of administration. It has also been asserted by Weber that bureaucratic authority or administration is superior to traditional or charismatic authority. The administration is, everywhere, being gradually bureaucratized. Weber believes that it is efficient and reliable. Above all, it is a rational method of administration. The advance of democracy or the rapid growth of democratisation has considerably accelerated the growth of bureaucracy in recent years. So we can say that the concept of rationality revolves around the ideas of efficiency, experience and neutrality. Some men today raise question about these qualities of bureaucracy. But there is no doubt that it is far better than the traditional or charismatic authority. Rapid industrialisation has also made the bureaucratic form of administration a must for every industrial society. It is due to the reason that the management of large scale industries requires a particular class which is called managerial class—and this is another name of bureaucracy. Today many people call it managerialism. We are at the threshold of the twenty first century and in this age there has arisen an immense importance of bureaucracy which has been accentuated by the rapid growth of industrialisation and globalisation. In our analysis of power theory we referred to the corporatist theory which deals with how big corporations in advanced capitalism are controlling political and economic power. Repetition of some arguments in this section is inevitable. Like Weber, Marx did not develop a well-knit theory of bureaucracy, but he was quite aware of its existence and importance in capitalist country. He believed that bureaucracy was a machine used by the bourgeoisie for the attainment of the goals. Bureaucracy and capitalists work in tandem for the furtherance of the economy controlled by capitalists. In some capitalist countries the socialist elements may be quite active and these create pressures upon the state authority to adopt pro-labour and pro-common people policies. This attempt is thwarted by the top and experienced bureaucrats. These bureaucrats are members of the higher class and have received their education from the best schools and naturally they have, from the very childhood, developed strong affinity to their own class—the capitalist class. Ralph Miliband has said: Miliband further maintains that the top civil servants are conservative in their outlook and political ideology and this makes them very much close to the capitalist class. Wherever any anti-capitalist measure is going to be adopted the top bureaucrats of the state administration—by hook or by crook—scuttle the attempt. To sum up, it is the enormous affinity of the top bureaucrats of all advanced capitalist countries which has always foiled the implementation of pro-socialist or pro-labour policies. Bureaucracy acts as a power bloc. Whether Weber was aware of it or not we do not know. Of course, in his time, bureaucracy was not used in abundant measure as a weapon to further the interests of the capitalist. It was generally concerned with the administration of the state. The socialist wave or feeling made bureaucracy more conscious and its role as a machine of class rule was sharpened. So far as bureaucracy is concerned there are two opposite views. According to Weber, bureaucracy is not a machine of class rule but a machine of administration. From this conception arises a different model which is known as bureaucratic over supply model. Bureaucracy is not only inevitable for the management of modern state but also it is the most rational choice.

3: Bureaucracy | Definition of Bureaucracy by Merriam-Webster

The federal bureaucracy performs three primary tasks in government: implementation, administration, and regulation. When Congress passes a law, it sets down guidelines to carry out the new policies. Actually putting these policies into practice is known as implementation. Often, policy directives.

Cabinet secretaries are usually torn between their responsibilities as presidential advisers and heads of their departments. As the first woman Cabinet member, Frances Perkins served for 12 years, helping draft legislation such as the Social Security Act and the first federal minimum wage laws. Each has a special area of policy, although their responsibilities are still very broad. The organization of each is quite complex, but they have some things in common. All Secretaries have a Deputy or Undersecretary, as well as a host of Assistant Secretaries, who all direct major programs within the department. Most departments are divided into bureaus, divisions, and sections. For example, the FBI lies within the domain of the Justice Department, and the Secret Service is currently within the Treasury Department agency, but soon to be moved under the auspices of the Department of Homeland Security. Government Corporations Government corporations do not belong to any department – they stand on their own. They are different from other agencies in that they are businesses created by Congress, and they charge fees for their services. Like any other business, government corporations have private competition – such as Federal Express and United Parcel Service – and sometimes state competition – such as the New Jersey Transit Authority. At the time of its creation, NASA was assumed by many to be a defense-related agency. Today, it brings nations together in highly publicized efforts like the International Space Station shown here. Independent Agencies Independent agencies closely resemble Cabinet departments, but they are smaller and less complex. Generally, they have narrower areas of responsibility than do Cabinet departments. Most of these agencies are not free from presidential control and are independent only in the sense that they are not part of a department. Congress creates them as separate agencies for many reasons, practical as well as symbolic. However, it is an independent agency because the space program has many other purposes than the defense of the nation. The ATF is a division of the Department of the Treasury that regulates alcohol, tobacco, and firearms. Regulatory Agencies These agencies regulate important parts of the economy, making rules for large industries and businesses that affect the interests of the public. Because regulatory commissions are "watchdogs" that by their very nature need to operate independently, they are not part of a department, and the President does not directly control most of them. Each commission has from 5 to 11 members appointed by the President, but the President cannot remove them for the length of their terms in office. Examples of these commissions are the Securities and Exchange Commission, which regulates the stock market, brokers, and investment practices. With over 2, different agencies, the federal bureaucracy is almost certain to run into problems with organization, overlapping responsibilities, and efficiency. Almost every recent President has come into office determined to refashion and trim the bureaucracy. However, none has been able to make more than minor adjustments. Well-established agencies have lives of their own, and are difficult to change. Besides, the country has large, complex, needs requiring special attention.

4: bureaucracy - Dictionary Definition : www.enganchecubano.com

Bureaucracy definition is - a body of nonelective government officials. How to use bureaucracy in a sentence. The Roots of bureaucracy an administrative policy.

Regular posts in the Nan Song civil service numbered about 20,, without counting numerous sinecures, temporary commissions, and a slightly larger number of military officers. Besides eliminating most patronage privilegesâ€”by which high officials were entitled to obtain an official title for a sonâ€” Characteristics and paradoxes of bureaucracy The foremost theorist of bureaucracy is the German sociologist Max Weber â€” , who described the ideal characteristics of bureaucracies and offered an explanation for the historical emergence of bureaucratic institutions. According to Weber, the defining features of bureaucracy sharply distinguish it from other types of organization based on nonlegal forms of authority. Weber observed that the advantage of bureaucracy was that it was the most technically proficient form of organization, possessing specialized expertise, certainty, continuity , and unity. Contemporary stereotypes of bureaucracy tend to portray it as unresponsive, lethargic , undemocratic, and incompetent. In the pure form of bureaucratic organization universalized rules and procedures would dominate, rendering personal status or connections irrelevant. In this form, bureaucracy is the epitome of universalized standards under which similar cases are treated similarly as codified by law and rules, and under which the individual tastes and discretion of the administrator are constrained by due process rules. Despite the widespread derogatory stereotypes of bureaucracy, a system of government grounded in law requires bureaucracy to function. Nevertheless, the words bureaucracy and bureaucrat are typically thought of and used pejoratively. They convey images of red tape, excessive rules and regulations, unimaginativeness, a lack of individual discretion, central control, and an absence of accountability. Far from being conceived as proficient, popular contemporary portrayals often paint bureaucracies as inefficient and lacking in adaptability. Because the characteristics that define the organizational advantages of bureaucracy also contain within them the possibilities of organizational dysfunction, both the flattering and unflattering depictions of bureaucracy can be accurate. Thus, the characteristics that make bureaucracies proficient paradoxically also may produce organizational pathologies.

Jurisdictional competency Jurisdictional competency is a key element of bureaucratic organization, which is broken into units with defined responsibilities. Fundamentally, jurisdictional competency refers to bureaucratic specialization, with all elements of a bureaucracy possessing a defined role. The responsibilities of individuals broaden with movement upward through an organizational hierarchy. The organizational division of labour enables units and individuals within an organization to master details and skills and to turn the novel into the routine. This feature of bureaucracy also can lead organizational units to shirk responsibility by allowing them to define a problem as belonging to some other unit and thereby leave the issue unattended. Alternatively, every unit within an organization is apt to put a face on a problem congenial mainly to its own interests, skills, and technologies.

Command and control Bureaucracies have clear lines of command and control. Bureaucratic authority is organized hierarchically, with responsibility taken at the top and delegated with decreasing discretion below. Because of the risk of organizational parochialism produced by limited and specific jurisdictional competencies , the capacity to coordinate and control the multiplicity of units is essential. Authority is the glue that holds together diversity and prevents units from exercising unchecked discretion. Yet, few features of bureaucratic life have received so much adverse attention as the role of hierarchical authority as a means for achieving organizational command and control. Popular criticisms emphasize that hierarchical organization strangles creative impulses and injects hyper-cautious modes of behaviour based on expectations of what superiors may desire. Command and control, which are necessary to coordinate the disparate elements of bureaucratic organization, provide for increasing responsibility upward, delegation, and decreasing discretion downward.

Continuity Continuity is another key element of bureaucratic organization. Rational-legal authority necessitates uniform rules and procedures for written documents and official behaviour. The ability to utilize standard operating procedures makes organizations more efficient by decreasing the costs attached to any given transaction. Organizational files record procedures, antecedent

behaviour, and personnel records. They also allow an organization to be continuous and, thus, independent of any specific leadership. Without its records, it would be impossible to maintain transactions grounded in legality. Yet continuity also has a dysfunctional side, leading organizations to behave predictably and conservatively or, worse perhaps, merely reflexively. Continuity also may lead a bureaucracy to repeat regularly activities that may be inaccurate and whose inaccuracies thereby cumulate. Professionalization of management, another basic element of bureaucracy, requires a full-time corps of officials whose attention is devoted exclusively to its managerial responsibilities. In government, professionalization is vested in the corps of civil servants whose positions have generally been obtained through the passage of tests based upon merit. The civil service is sometimes considered a permanent government, distinct from the transient politicians who serve only for a limited time and at the pleasure of the electorate in democratic political systems. In businesses and in other nongovernmental bureaucratic organizations, there is also a professional cadre of managers. Professionalization increases expertise and continuity within the organization. Even when organizations are temporarily leaderless or experience turmoil in their top leadership positions, the professional cadre helps to maintain an organizational equilibrium. The virtues of professionalization are clear; without a professional corps, organizations would suffer from crises induced by incompetency. Professionalization thus contributes to the superior technical proficiency that Weber claimed was the hallmark of bureaucratic organization. Despite its virtues, professionalization also carries potential risks. Often the professional corps of managerial experts itself becomes a covert source of power because it has superior knowledge compared to those who are its nominal but temporary superiors. By virtue of greater experience, mastery of detail, and organizational and substantive knowledge, professional bureaucrats may exercise strong influence over decisions made by their leaders. The existence of powerful bureaucrats raises issues of accountability and responsibility, particularly in democratic systems; bureaucrats are supposedly the agents of their leaders, but their superior knowledge of detail can place them in a position of indispensability. In addition, although a permanent corps of officials brings expertise and mastery of detail to decision making, it also deepens the innate conservatism of a bureaucracy. The permanent corps is usually skeptical of novelty because the essence of bureaucratic organization is to turn past novelties into present routines. Professional bureaucrats, be they in the civil or private sector, also tend to favour the organizational status quo because their investments are. Consequently, the more professionalized the cadre becomes, the more likely it is to resist the intrusion of external forces. Rules are the lifeblood of bureaucratic organization, providing a rational and continuous basis for procedures and operations. Bureaucratic decisions are "above all" procedures are grounded in codified rules and precedents. Although most people dislike rules that inhibit them, the existence of rules is characteristic of legal-rational authority, ensuring that decisions are not arbitrary, that standardized procedures are not readily circumvented, and that order is maintained. Rules are the essence of bureaucracy but are also the bane of leaders who want to get things done their way instantly. Rules restrain arbitrary behaviour, but they also can provide formidable roadblocks to achievement. The accumulation of rules sometimes leads to the development of inconsistencies, and the procedures required to change any element of the status quo may become extraordinarily onerous as a result of the rule-driven character of bureaucracy. One perspective holds that the strict adherence to rules restricts the ability of a bureaucracy to adapt to new circumstances. By contrast, markets, which can operate with very few rules, force rapid adaptation to changing circumstances. Yet, most major business organizations are arranged in bureaucratic form because hierarchy and delegated responsibility reduce the transaction costs of making decisions. Summary Thus, the most basic elements of pure bureaucratic organization are its emphasis on procedural regularity, a hierarchical system of accountability and responsibility, specialization of function, continuity, a legal-rational basis, and fundamental conservatism. The emergence of capitalism and the emphasis on standard currency transactions over and above barter systems created the need for bureaucratic forms of organization in both the private and public sectors. However, the critical elements of the bureaucratic form of organization also can conflict with one another and are often at the base of criticisms that regard bureaucracies as dysfunctional. In sum, what makes bureaucracy work also may work against it. Bureaucracy and the state All forms of governance require administration, but only within the past few centuries has the

bureaucratic form become relatively common. Although Weber observed bureaucratic forms of administration in ancient Egypt , during the later stages of the Roman Empire, in the Roman Catholic Church , and in imperial China , the rise of the modern nation-state was accompanied by a commensurate elevation in the status of its administration, the bureaucratization of the administration, and the indispensability of its permanent officialdom. The bureaucracy, in service to the crown, was the manifestation of the state. Building the state essentially was identified with the increasing proficiency of its bureaucratic apparatus and the status of its permanent officials. The development of public bureaucracy generally accompanied the capacity of a state to extend its reach and to unite its territories under a single sovereignty. The bureaucratization of the state, odd as it may initially seem, typically provided the basis for its democratization because it eliminated feudal, plutocratic, and patrimonial bases of administration. Some states, typically those that experienced a struggle to break the power base of a provincial aristocracy , developed a strong professional bureaucracy to serve the crown and unify the state. During the reign of Louis XIV “ , France established a strong professional corps of officials responsible for public works , extracting revenues, and otherwise supporting the ambitions of the crown. The term bureaucracy was coined as bureaucratie in the mid-17th century by French philosophe Vincent de Gournay, derived from the French bureau, meaning writing desk , and -cratie, meaning government. In the 19th century the Meiji Restoration in Japan “ , motivated by powerful modernizing ambitions, centralized the state, weakened the aristocracy, and created a powerful bureaucracy. In the United States a professional civil service was not created at the federal level until 1862 , and in many of its states and localities not until much later. The actual realization of a modern bureaucracy at the federal level in the United States was a patchwork, reflecting responses to specific problems and its complicated system of political authority. Traditionally, governments have reformed their administrative operations in response to evident failures. Until the end of the 20th century, administrative reforms generally strengthened the meritocratic and universalistic bases of administrative organization to guard against the malignant influences of corruption, a lack of accountability, and patronage. However, by the 1980s reform efforts in established democracies gained momentum, emphasizing decentralization and market-based decision making and, in some instances, even the replacement of full-time civil servants with managers on contract. These reforms often fall under the rubric of what is called New Public Management. The administrative apparatus of the state in developing countries , however, rarely has come close to achieving the impersonal, rule-based status that Weber depicted. Nor has it generally been able to produce the level of proficiency that Weber claimed was characteristic of bureaucracy. Often the lack of sufficient resources to pay officials in resource-scarce societies has led to corruption and, at the very least, shirking on the job so that officials can tend to other, more remunerative ventures. The absence of a strong professionalized corps of officials in such settings has meant that the civil service is often a source of patronage, allowing leaders to pay off supporters or deter the formation of an opposition. As these countries generally lack adequate resources, the state bureaucracy has less to extract to allow for the proficient delivery of services. Many of the problems identified in developing countries, of course, affect even the most affluent countries, though usually to a lesser degree. The extent to which bureaucracy performs in accordance with the Weberian characterization is related to the external circumstances governing its capabilities. As a consequence, when these resources are lacking or when there is little basis for the rule of rational-legal authority, the state bureaucracy is unable to act in ways that may make it accountable, proficient, or rule-based. Further, when pay is low and educational resources limited, the officials responsible for running the administrative machinery may have inadequate skills and become susceptible to corruption and shirking. In developing countries ideas about administrative reform often move in the direction of the more formalistic Weberian ideal “ particularly the creation of universalistic standards, regular procedures, and accountability. By contrast, in more-affluent countries, there is some emphasis, particularly but not exclusively in the largely English-speaking democracies, to reduce administrative formalism associated with bureaucracy, diminish the number of rules, and increase discretion and performance accountability lower down in organizations. Whereas in developing countries the main need is the reduction of corruption, in more established countries the reform motif is focused on rapid adaptability and performance. In settings where the state bureaucracy is believed to have been essential to the identity and performance of the state itself. Trends in bureaucratic

organization Empirical studies of ostensibly bureaucratic organizations have often revealed a rich informal life within them that is at odds with the formal chain-of-command depictions. The classic work *Administrative Behavior*, originally published in 1947 from the doctoral dissertation of Herbert Simon, dissected the vintage bureaucratic paradigm and concluded that it was frequently inconsistent with psychological and social realities. Workers on production lines, for example, often generated their own norms that produced suboptimal results for the organization. In reality, the Weberian ideal of bureaucratic organization is frequently imperfect. The terms bureaucracy and bureaucrat are often loosely employed as interchangeable with any form of administrative organization, however distant its pattern of behaviour from the Weberian model. Frequently, therefore, criticisms of bureaucracy and bureaucrats are criticisms of administrative behaviour that departs significantly from the ideals of bureaucratic organization and the professionalism of its corps of officials. Still, bureaucracy has been challenged by more informal and adaptive modes of organization e.

5: Bureaucracy: Definition, Theory, Development and Control

In government, bureaucrats implement policies, write rules and regulations and administer them on people, among others. In organizations, bureaucracy structure is divided into different levels, from frontline employees up to the upper management.

If present, remove userrights made redundant by the sysop flag. ListGroupRights for details on which other rights are included with the new user rights level. Please reference the RfA or RfB when making the promotion Remove the request from requests for adminship For successful nominations, add a summary of the outcome to successful requests for adminship or successful bureaucratship candidacies and update the relevant counts. For unsuccessful nominations, add the summary to Wikipedia: Unsuccessful adminship candidacies Chronological and Wikipedia: Unsuccessful adminship candidacies Alphabetical , or Wikipedia: Unsuccessful bureaucratship candidacies and update the relevant counts For requests for membership in the Bot Approvals Group Add the user to Wikipedia: Bot Approvals Group Add a summary of the outcome to successful or unsuccessful Bot Approvals Group candidacies Inform the user of the result, whether it is successful or unsuccessful perhaps using one of the optional templates Removal of permissions Bureaucrats may remove the "administrator" user right from an account in some situations [4]: If self-requested by the administrator By official request of the Arbitration Committee If the administrator is deemed inactive per Wikipedia: Administrators Procedural removal for inactive administrators If the account belongs to an editor who has been verified as deceased in which case, all user rights should be removed. Bureaucrats should include a permanent link to the request or relevant policy when removing permissions. If necessary, the affected user should be immediately notified and given a reason for the removal along with advice on seeking the reinstatement of the permissions. Should the extended confirmed group have been removed from the account since becoming an administrator, it should be restored when removing administrator permissions. The use of these procedures is not intended to constrain the authority of the Wikimedia Stewards to undertake emergency removal of permissions on their own discretion, or removal following a request from the Arbitration Committee, pursuant to the relevant policies governing Steward actions. Deceased Wikipedians If an editor is verified as having died, all permissions on the account should be removed. Unless the account is suspected of being compromised, it should not be blocked. For Checkuser, Oversight and Bureaucrat rights, which cannot be removed locally, a request to remove those should be posted on m: Inactive bureaucrat accounts There are two separate activity requirements applicable to bureaucrat accounts: Bureaucrat accounts which have been completely inactive for at least one calendar year without any edits or other logged actions may have their bureaucrat permissions removed. The bureaucrat must be contacted on their user talk page and via email one month before the removal of permissions and again several days before the request is made. Should the bureaucrat remain inactive, another bureaucrat may request the procedural removal of permissions. Bureaucrats are expected to exercise the duties granted by their role while remaining cognizant of relevant community standards concerning their tasks. If a bureaucrat does not participate in bureaucrat activity [5] for over three years, their bureaucrat permissions may be removed. The user must be notified on their talk page and by email one month before the removal, and again a few days prior to the removal. If the user does not return to bureaucrat activity, another bureaucrat may request the removal of permissions at meta: Permissions removed for not meeting bureaucrat activity requirements may be re-obtained through a new request for bureaucratship. Restoration of permissions WP: Check that the user in question is indeed a former administrator or bureaucrat in particular, a bureaucrat restoring permissions should satisfy themselves that the account has not been compromised since the permissions were relinquished. Check their talk page history and any pertinent discussions or noticeboards for indications that they may have resigned or become inactive for the purpose, or with the effect, of evading scrutiny of their actions that could have led to sanctions. If a former administrator "lengthy inactivity" or bureaucrat "inactive bureaucrat accounts" has been inactive defined by zero edits or logged actions for a period of three years or longer after the removal of permissions or for three years from the last edit or log action in the case of permissions removed due to inactivity , they must be

successful in a new request for adminship or bureaucratship to have the permissions restored. If a former administrator has been administratively inactive defined by zero logged administrative actions for a period of five years or longer at the time of their last administrative rights removal, and the removal was for inactivity, they should be successful in a new request for adminship to have the permissions restored. If the permission is restored, list the user at [Wikipedia: List of resysopped users](#). Bot flags Bot flags may be granted or removed in accordance with the bot policy, often on the advice of the Bot Approvals Group. This extends to the copyviobot flag. UserRights to set or remove the flag, with a link to the approved BRFA or permanent link to the relevant discussion as the rationale. Mailing list A Bureaucrat mailing list was established in March, [8] but was retired following a discussion in For sensitive matters you may contact an individual bureaucrat directly. List of resysopped users: Bureaucrat activity statistics historical ; m: As a result of the final implementation of global accounts, username changes must now be completed globally by a user with centralauth-rename rights on meta Global renamers and Stewards. Due to their experience in this area, many bureaucrats also hold those rights and continue to perform username changes. ListGroupRights, administrators also have these technical abilities.

6: Bureaucratic politics: A Glossary of Political Economy Terms - Dr. Paul M. Johnson

PUBLIC POLICY AND THE BUREAUCRACY 1. PUBLIC POLICY AND THE BUREAUCRACY 2. Policy-making involves not only making decisions, but also different kinds of decisions. There are four distinct stages in the policy process: Policy initiation Policy formulation Policy implementation Policy evaluation T.

Abdulkareem Abdulrazaq Kayode Abstract Decision making in foreign policy analysis tends to explain an aspect in the study of international politics and explains why and how states behave the way they behave in the international arena. However, in the quest for decision making, there are actors involved in which one of the actors is the state bureaucracy. National bureaucracies have been at the heart of foreign policy analysis. Bureaucracies are found in both small and large states whose interest is to defend the national interest. Therefore, this paper seeks to question who are the foreign policy decision makers, what interest do they have? Which foreign policy instrument do they hope to use to achieve their objective? This paper concluded thus, the bureaucracy is an important institution of the state whose functions have been primarily policy execution, however, the influence of bureaucracy had gone beyond the execution of policies alone, and it has permeated through the policy formulation process and the policy itself. Therefore, the role of bureaucracy is far more than just the implementation of foreign policy but rather it remains one of the key actors involved in the making of the policy through dialogue, debate, conflict and compromise. INTRODUCTION Foreign policy is the strategy chosen by the national government of a state to achieve its relations with external entities; this may even include the decision to do nothing within the context of international relations Smith. S et al, States relates with its external environment via code of conducts, these codes can be regarded as the foreign policy of the state. These policies needs to be in place to guide the relationship of a state and its international environment as noted by William Wallace Foreign policy is just like every other state policy directed to solve a specific issue within the state but seeks to address issues outside the boundary of the state but formulated within the state. Bureaucracy is any large-scale organization of appointed officials whose primary function is to implement the policies of the decision makers. It is a rational system or organized structure designed to permit the efficient and effective execution of public policy Tasie, Decision making in foreign policy analysis tends to explain the approach to the study of international politics and explains why and how states behave the way they behave in the international arena. As noted by Smith et al, Therefore, it boils down to the question of who are the foreign policy decision makers, what interest do they have? Also, it seeks to address the process involved by which the participants and organizations struggle to bring about the decision they want. And to identify the sources of bureaucratic power and the resultant effect of their decisions that later emerge. There are several approaches to the understanding of international politics or better say world politics. The bone of idea usually lies within the Realists, Liberalists and the Radicals or the structuralisms. Foreign policy decision making does not refer only to the making of conscious choices, but also to a range of personal, organizational, institutional and environmental factors which also help account for the flow of events Micheal Clarke, Therefore to understand the realm of decision making, we need to critically analyse it from the system approach- having input, output, feedback and the environment. The models of foreign policy making tend to explain how different answers can be offered to a single question. The realist pushed an argument forward claiming that the government of a state is the monolithic actor in realm of foreign policy formation. And sees inter- state struggle for power as the order of the day in the international arena which tagged the international environment as chaotic, hostile and dangerous. There are however, three basic concepts in the realm of traditional foreign policy decision making; decision, decision- maker and the decision- making process. The trend goes thus; foreign policy entails a series of decisions made by a group of people who can be labeled decision makers. It goes further to explain the behavior of an individual or a group of individuals who are saddled with the responsibility of choosing, making and enforcing decisions within a structured environment Synder et. But the question often raised is why does a policy maker tend to pursue a course rather than the other? The foreign policy maker is however seen an actor that considers possible course of actions and evaluates the likely outcomes of each in terms of costs and benefits. In essence, the foreign policy decision

maker is expected as a rational being to take the right step after weighing the positive and negative consequences the decision might bring. Four basic concepts are quite central to the Rational Actor Model; goals and objectives, alternatives, consequences and choice. Ranks all possible sets of consequences in terms of her or his values and objectives - number of side effects Graham T. It further takes its alternative choice to the output of decision. Thirdly is Consequences which further takes rational actors to consider that to each alternative is attached a set of consequences or outcomes of choice that will ensue if that particular alternative is chosen. And lastly is Choice which is the most difficult of all. The decision maker is at liberty to use any criteria to choose among sets of alternatives. Ideally, the rational actor chooses the options with less negative consequential effect after a careful survey of the costs and benefits. So much we have discussed that decision makers are seen as rational actors and take rational decisions, there is often a case of interest in the field of decision making which are normally sorted out via arguing and bargaining. As argument is seen as a major tool in the process of decision making which more often than not replace bargaining. As decision makers seek to protect their core policies and interests; Smith. Allison in *Essence of Decision* argues that the traditional type of analysis must be supplemented, if not supplanted, by frames of reference that focus on the governmental machine- the organizations and the political actors involved in the policy process Graham T. He pushed two ideas forward about the actors to be involved in the foreign policy making of a state. First is the organizational process model claiming that governmental agencies with semi- autonomous power having a stake or interest in the process of decision making. The other view of Allison sees foreign policy making to be borne out of various bargaining games among the key players within the government. These perspectives are commonly regarded as the bureaucratic politics perspective to the explanation of foreign policy analysis. More on this model would be explained later as it is the crux of this paper. Pluralist maintain that media and publics are independent of political interference and, as such, can and should act as powerful constraints upon governments. The pluralist model placed more emphasis on the role of public opinion and the media in shaping the foreign policy of the state. The liberalist is seen as to be having a stronghold in the explanation of the pluralist model. Example of this model can be derived from the March anti- war protest in the New York, the Washington D. C protest and the Washington D. This shows the level of awareness of the publics through the media to influence the policy of the government. The psychological model assumptions is that there is an influence shaping the rationality of the decision makers. These scenarios give a room for an account to explain the psychological model. Each bureau is saddled with certain roles and responsibilities as individual leaders cannot consider solution to every problem that arises. Therefore there would be need for numerous alternatives that would be considered in the advent of seeking solution to problems or devising policies to promote an agenda. Therefore, as complex issues arises from international politics, state needs to align into bureaucracies meaning that there would be arrangement in ministries, departments and agencies as the case may be. The role of bureaucracy in a state setting cannot be over emphasized as bureaucracy performs a lot of governmental functions and are seen to be influential in decision making and execution. This argument is supported by Tasié G. Their influence makes bureaucrats not just policy executors but policy makers and indirectly the policy itself. They draft memoranda, prepare policy agenda, negotiate funds and technical assistance, work out governmental priorities, etc. When an issue arises, players from different bureaus seek to address the issue base on their organizational interest and perception towards the issue. Each and every unit of the state bureaucracy feels important in decision making because they are safe guarding a particular unit of the state relations. Although it should be noted that decisions arrived at to form the state foreign policy at that time and on that particular issue is a resultant of huge debate, conflict and compromise. Rosati tried to distinguish between the structure and the process of decision making trying to gauge the degree of involvement of the participants involved in foreign policy formulation and what initiate such involvement. It explains that the position of the participants on foreign policy decision making is highly influenced by the position they hold or the organization they represents. Also, Rosati tried to link up the relationship between position and preference. This perspective of foreign policy analysis offers a distinct different explanation as against the traditional rational actor model. Foreign ministries, state departments, external affairs ministry, defense ministry, the finance ministry, economic planning unit, trade and investments etc. Be it large or small, every state has units

of bureaucracies carrying out routine functions aiding the movement of the state. Although, names might differ but function could be similar. C and Raymond G. Other agencies also bear responsibility for specialized aspects of U. S foreign relations, such as the Treasury, Commerce and Agriculture departments. This governmental politics is quite prevalent in the United States and other countries where democracy is the order of the day and there is wider participation in the decision making processes. Unlike the less democratic societies such as North Korea where there is high level of dictatorship. Foreign policy of North Korea has always been centered on the Kim Yong II where he reflects in every decision making be it directly from him or a recommendation from the Ministry of foreign Affair. Model I explains governmental action as a result of a monolithic and unified decision of the state as the sole foreign policy decision maker and taker for the state. Model II explains the decision of the state as an organizational output. It explores the nature of organizations based on their Standard Operational Procedures. Policies are characterized neither by a unitary actor nor as an organizational output but rather a result of serious bargaining games among the players in the national government. However, in the course of evaluating the three models to see which suits to explain the model more, it was seen that the three models complement one another. Rather, each individual in this group is, in his or her own right, a player in a central, competitive game. The game is politics: In dissecting the Model III stated above and applying it to the reality of the crisis, the American Blockade of Cuba and the withdrawal of Soviet missiles from Cuba summarizes it all. It was a long process of debate and arguments before President Kennedy could push up a decision foreign policy as to how to deal with the missiles planted in Cuba by the Soviet forces which is a danger in view for America. Although, there were sharp differs in given solution to what should be done to the crisis on ground. With the discovery of the problem, President Kennedy informed the inner circle of advisers who met at the Oval Room of the White House from 16th to 19th of October. The Joint Chiefs of staff was so keen to invasion of Cuba and the Soviet forces to eliminate the threat although the new head Max- well Taylor wants a more intelligence report to be gathered before any action would be taken, this could take up to few days. The Secretary of Defense- Mc Namara wants a retaliatory attack and a blockade to avoid future planting of missiles in the American neighborhood to avoid threat to the country. Mc George Bundy who serves as the National Security Adviser was uncharacteristically reticent but two days after he supported the attack against the missiles. On the 19th of October, President Kennedy met the Chiefs of Staff and found that they insist on the attack and Mc Namara on the blockage- negotiation option. The debate now slims down to two sides, air attack and blockade. President Kennedy subscribed to the ideas and suggests that the deal will be taking a- two route agenda. First a blockade with two days ultimatum and if no compliance, an air strike will follow of which the air strike will only be limited to the missile bound areas. Although, there was an amendment to this position by Dillon who suggested a seventy- two hours interval between demand and action Department of Defense,

7: The Organization of the Bureaucracy [www.enganchecubano.com]

Policy making is not only about the cut and thrust of politics. It is also a bureaucratic activity. In this ground-breaking work, two leading authorities come together to examine the world of the policy bureaucrat for the first time.

Although it exists, there are groups that criticize its efficacy and complexity. However, there are also those who see this as a rational and relevant way to run some government agencies. It is a form of administrative system used by both public and private institutions. Simply put, it is a government body that is composed of non-politicians but who are appointed to help in policy-making and be in charge of administrative tasks in government agencies. In government, bureaucrats implement policies, write rules and regulations and administer them on people, among others. In organizations, bureaucracy structure is divided into different levels, from frontline employees up to the upper management. While there are countries doing well with this kind of structure, there are also groups not in favor of this system. Here are some of the views about this controversial issue: List of Advantages of Bureaucracy 1. Central authority in bureaucracy makes it effective in organizing. Advocates for bureaucracy have positive views on having hierarchy in an organization. They say that since there is a chain of command, there will be specific roles and tasks for people involved in the departments. This way, management will be able to monitor the performance of the people in lower ranks. Also, with strict regulations and policies that need to be observed, there is a big possibility that duties will be carried out in a systematic and timely manner. Following these set of rules before decision making ensures choices and steps are ideal and well selected. It supports the hiring of specialized officials. Supporters of bureaucracy prefer the idea of designating appointed officials who have the educational background and expertise on the agency they will assigned to. These bureaucrats also have the training and skills particular to their designation. This ensures these non-elective members know what they are doing and will be able to maximize their knowledge and apply their skills. As a result, tasks are effectively carried out. Another point proponents express in connection with officials having specialization is the possibility that there will always be solutions to issues since problems which cannot be handled by an officer will be escalated to an individual who is also competent. It follows Standard Operating Procedure. Proponents of bureaucracy look at these formalized rules to bring about efficiency and predictability in results. In this set-up, officials are to follow instructions and procedures step by step in handling tasks and situations. This way, outcomes will be within the specified range. It sets no room for favoritism. People in favor of bureaucracy claim that with the regulations and procedure to be followed in order to achieve results, the risks of favoring some individuals over others will be minimal if not none at all. A scenario mentioned is one of a student applying for a loan. There is a systematic process involved and certain requirements to be met to get an approval. With skipping a step or one of these requirements lacking, the process will not be able to move forward. With bureaucracy, all will be treated fairly and will undergo the same procedure regardless of affiliation to any of the officials in the particular agency. It allows for merit-based hiring and promotion. For a non-elective member of a government agency, he or she should be qualified and pass the qualifying exams to be employed or appointed as well as climb the hierarchy. This means that whoever is appointed has the knowledge, expertise and skills to handle the job. No one will be considered simply because he or she is a relative or a friend of a high-ranking official in the agency. It plays an important role in policy making. Although civil servants do not make policies, they gather the data forwarded to the political executive. They are also responsible for formulating several alternative policies and determine the pros and cons of each. In turn, the political executive will choose one policy which will then be used as an alternative. List of Disadvantages of Bureaucracy 1. It can hamper achievement of results in time. Critics are arguing that with the certain steps needed to carry out tasks and the need to follow a chain of command to proceed, lots of time can be lost especially if decisions and results are needed immediately. If a government is run by bureaucrats and there is a chain-of-command, a certain decision like military defense can result to unfavorable outcomes since an action cannot be carried out without different personalities or officials in the hierarchy have approved such. This makes the process slow, according to proponents. It breeds boredom and can affect productivity. Opponents are criticizing the

repetitive tasks in specialized jobs. They claimed that in time, it can bore members of the organization or agency. They added that even in a business which uses bureaucracy, employees might not be able to withstand doing the same work daily. The routine might just be too much from them and may result to absenteeism and less productivity. It results to passive and rule-based human beings. Another disadvantage being pointed out by some people who do not like a bureaucratic structure say that the strict rules and regulations imposed in bureaucracies seem to remove the freedom of an individual to act and discern on his or her own because of certain restrictions. This, according to some, is not beneficial. It can result to inefficiency. In bureaucracy, there is less competition since hiring and promotion is based on merits and qualifications. Moreover, once a civil servant is appointed, he or she has a fixed salary, works on specialized tasks and cannot function outside the sphere of the department he or she belongs to. Some people see this as unproductive and a disadvantage because it can demoralize civil servants who belong in a bureaucracy. Conclusion A bureaucracy structure might be considered ineffective by critics but there are also valid arguments posited by supporters. Other countries run well with bureaucrats but there are also obvious flaws within the structure which make others critical about it. But the fact still remains, bureaucracy exists and is here to stay.

8: The Functions of the Federal Bureaucracy

A bureaucracy is a large administrative organization that handles the day-to-day business of a government or society. Here in America, the government's bureaucracy operates on national, state, and.

See Article History Bureaucratic politics approach, theoretical approach to public policy that emphasizes internal bargaining within the state. The bureaucratic politics approach argues that policy outcomes result from a game of bargaining among a small, highly placed group of governmental actors. These actors come to the game with varying preferences, abilities, and positions of power. Participants choose strategies and policy goals based on different ideas of what outcomes will best serve their organizational and personal interests. Bargaining then proceeds through a pluralist process of give-and-take that reflects the prevailing rules of the game as well as power relations among the participants. Because this process is neither dominated by one individual nor likely to privilege expert or rational decisions, it may result in suboptimal outcomes that fail to fulfill the objectives of any of the individual participants. Most discussions of bureaucratic politics begin with Graham T. Allison provides an analysis of the Cuban missile crisis that contrasts bureaucratic politics bargaining with two other models of policy making. Thus, bureaucratic politics is often offered as a counterpoint to realist or rationalist conceptions of policy decision making. The second alternative approach describes policies as guided by, even resulting from, previously established bureaucratic procedures, which leaves little room for autonomous action by high-level decision makers. Compared with these and other alternative conceptions of policy making, the bureaucratic politics model represents a significant and distinctive strain of organization- and state-level theory in international relations, organization theory, public policy, and American politics. Perhaps the most-abiding concept from the bureaucratic politics model, and the shorthand many have used to define it, is that actors will pursue policies that benefit the organizations they represent rather than national or collective interests. A central and intuitively powerful claim of bureaucratic politics explanations, this premise has been criticized for its narrow view of preference formation. For example, critics note that it fails to explain the role of many important actors in the original bureaucratic politics case study of the Cuban missile crisis. Yet even the early bureaucratic politics theorists, including Allison, were explicit in acknowledging that other factors, such as personality, interpersonal relations, and access to information, also play important roles in the bureaucratic politics process. Each of these queries masks a number of additional questions and hypotheses about the bureaucratic politics process. Whether actors are elected or appointed, high-, mid-, or low-level, and new to their stations or old hands can all affect their interests and bargaining positions. For example, actors who serve as part of a temporary political administration, such as political appointees of the U. Many aspects of the policy environment also influence the bureaucratic politics dynamic. Issues that are highly salient and visible to key constituencies, for instance, may cause politically ambitious actors to alter their bargaining positions. The venue in which bargaining takes place—“cabinet room, boardroom, public news media, and so forth”—may also privilege some actors and some interests over others. Important implications can be drawn from this model. To understand the actions of a state—indeed, of any large, complex organization—one must understand the rules governing its decision-making processes and the motivations of actors participating therein. The result of such a process may well indicate a compromise point without any clear internal strategic logic and may even reflect the unintended consequence of a dynamic tug-of-war among actors. Thus, it may be very difficult to interpret the intentions that underlie the seemingly strategic behaviour of complex organizations, making interactions with these bodies less predictable and, in some spheres, such as international conflict, consequently more dangerous. Though the bureaucratic politics model has been used to describe decision making in many different contexts, it is most commonly applied to national policy making in the United States and particularly to U. This focus has meant that the theory remains underdeveloped in many policy areas, and the traditional pluralistic view of bureaucratic politics has been challenged by critics who claim alternative paths to policy making. Some critics argue that in the American context the model underestimates the power of the president, who dominates policy through the selection and control of appointed officials. Others critique the model

because it places too little emphasis on the power of lower-level administrators and structures to influence policy through the control of information and implementation. Because the bureaucratic politics approach has most often been applied to studies of crisis decision making, critics have also asserted that its value for explaining ordinary policy making, particularly over time, is limited. Finally, some have expressed normative worries about the implications of the bureaucratic politics model for government accountability:

â€¢ Faced challenges from the foreign economic bureaucracy
â€¢ Higher level foreign policy roles for treasury secretaries and other economic policy advisers and agencies.

In order to get their policies passed, the president and Congress must work with the bureaucracy. Controlling the bureaucracy can be difficult for the following reasons: The president cannot monitor everyone or even every group within the bureaucracy, so much of what bureaucrats do goes unmonitored. The people who administer policy often know much more about those issues than the president or members of Congress. This expertise gives the bureaucrats power. Firing bureaucrats, even for incompetence, is very difficult. Many federal agencies provide services to thousands of people, and those people sometimes rally to defend the agency. When Congress creates a new program, it does not establish all the details on how the policy will be implemented. Instead, Congress passes enabling legislation, which grants power to an agency to work out the specifics. Although the agency must stay within some bounds, it has a great deal of latitude in determining how to carry out the wishes of Congress. The president must lobby or persuade bureaucrats. For this reason, many presidents have seen the bureaucracy as an obstacle to getting their agendas approved.

Rule-making The federal bureaucracy makes rules that affect how programs operate, and these rules must be obeyed, just as if they were laws. The rule-making process for government agencies occurs in stages. After Congress passes new regulatory laws, the agency charged with implementing the law proposes a series of rules, which are published in the Federal Register. Interested parties can comment on the rules, either at public hearings or by submitting documents to the agency. After the agency publishes the final regulations, it must wait sixty days before enforcing those rules. During that time, Congress can review and change the rules if it desires. If Congress makes no changes, the rules go into effect at the end of sixty days. Federal regulations affect many groups of people, who have often challenged those regulations in court. Because litigation is a slow and expensive way to change regulations, Congress passed the Negotiated Rulemaking Act of 1990 to limit the need for litigation by opening the rulemaking process to those affected by it. The act encouraged federal agencies to engage in negotiated rule-making. If an agency agrees to the proposed regulations, for example, it publishes the proposals in the Federal Register and then participates in a negotiating committee overseen by a third party. Agreements reached by the committee are then open to the normal public review process. Parties to negotiated rule-making agree not to sue over the rules.

Administrative Adjudication In some cases, executive agencies function like courts: They hold hearings in which each party presents arguments and evidence for or against certain rules. The executive agencies then make a decision that settles the argument between the agencies. This power is called administrative adjudication, and it involves applying rules and precedents to specific cases.

He turned around, shrugging his shirt back on. / Universal gcode sender tutorial Insiders Guide to Civil War Sites in the Southern States, 3rd 5 minute mysteries ken weber Tales from the Arabic, Volume 3 Importance of the law 3d art and design book After the Chuppah Msi ms 7507 motherboard manual A Map of Glass (Library Edition) How to plan and finance a growing business Durst laborator 1200 manual 2005 Harris Maryland Manufacturers Directory The choir teacher as comprehensive musician Rehabilitation Techniques in Sports Medicine with PowerWeb Triptychs: A Panoramic Postcard Book Non-violence and justice as inseparable principles : a Gandhian perspective Veena Rani Howard Welcome To Odyssey RPM B1 Teasing Dad Is (PM Story Books Blue Level) Beauty and the Beast (Dove Kids) Mein kampf ford edition Brief english handbook 7th edition Market safety and safeguards Heart of darkness research paper Art as style/style as art, and the problem with that Change active voice to passive voice worksheets My teenage werewolf Theorising National Cinema Go Get Filthy Rich Hascher Jehle Architektur Lawrence in Oaxaca Anton Janscha on the swarming of bees Last flight from Iran Age word problems worksheets One Minute Movies Butyrylcholinesterase and its synthetic C-terminal peptide confer in-vitro suppression of amyloid fibrils Famous and successful bloggers share their secrets. Dictionary of Earth Mysteries Parallel of the antient architecture with the modern Voters, patrons, and parties