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SEJIN KIM

(ACADEMIC ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this dissertation is to examine if, and how, the executive-centered approach to public administration, which emphasized public administrators’ unwavering loyalty to the president, intellectually shaped the founding and growth of Korean “mainstream” public administration in the 1962-1987 period. Specifically, this dissertation identifies the four normative tenets underlying the executive-centered approach and conducts comprehensive qualitative content analysis of mainstream scholars’ journal articles and book chapters to investigate if, and how, such normative tenets framed the intellectual trajectory of Korean “mainstream” public administration in the 1962-1987 period.

The major findings of this dissertation indicate that: 1) Korean public administration was intellectually founded upon the four tenets of the executive-centered approach and such tenets became fully entrenched as unassailable normative beliefs in Korean “mainstream” public administration scholarship in the 1962-1987 period and 2) Korean “mainstream” public administration scholars’ strong commitment to the executive-centered approach led them to uphold executive-centered governing order, in which the president exercised exclusive control of public administrators, and to champion the authoritarian developmental state, in which the authoritarian president pushed administrators into controlling civil society and market in line with his political and policy agenda, in the 1962-1987 period.

This dissertation also contends that in the post-1987 period, the advent of the new governing order of separation of powers created an intellectual dilemma for Korean public administration scholars because their blind adherence to the executive-centered approach, which stressed administrators’ exclusive responsiveness to the president, came into essential tension with the new governing order of separation of powers, in which administrators were required to be simultaneously responsive to not only the president, but also the legislative and judicial branches.
This dissertation seeks to investigate how the executive-centered approach to public administration, which emphasized public administrators’ strong loyalty to the president, influenced the intellectual development of Korean public administration in the 1962-1987 period.

In order to examine the impact of the executive-centered approach on Korean public administration scholarship, this dissertation carefully analyzes academic publications (book chapters and journal articles) written by Korean public administration scholars in the 1962-1987 period.

The major findings of this dissertation indicate that Korean public administration scholars explicitly or implicitly endorsed the executive-centered approach in the 1962-1987 period and their intellectual commitment to the executive-centered approach led them to support the strong presidents that pushed public administrators into maintaining their authoritarian regimes in the same period.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

After the Korean war (1950-1953), the U.S. government provided massive economic and technical assistance to war-ravaged Korea.1 Astutely recognizing the importance of public administration in the post-war reconstruction of Korea, the U.S. government developed a plan to assist the Korean government in the establishment of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University (GSPA-SNU) in 1959, which aimed at producing competent public administrators. In order that the GSPA-SNU might provide quality education for its students, the U.S. government decided to bring the GSPA-SNU’s faculty candidates to the U.S. and provide them with an systematic academic education through the Master of Public Administration program at the University of Minnesota before they began to teach at the GSPA-SNU (W. T. Kim 1969a; C. B. Lee 1991).2

From 1957 to 1958, a total of 19 young Korean scholars in their late 20s to mid-30s left for the University of Minnesota to study public administration, which was hardly recognized as a separate field of study in Korea (P. S. Kim 2012). After finishing their academic education in the U.S., they returned to Korea to become faculty members either at the GSPA-SNU or in public administration programs at other prestigious universities. These 19 scholars, who were later called “first-generation” public administration scholars, intellectually founded public administration as an independent field of study in Korea and their founding scholarship left an indelible imprint on the intellectual trajectory of Korean public administration (Y. D. Jung 2001; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982).

However, current scholars show little academic interest in the scholarship of these first-generation scholars and scarcely examine their influence on the intellectual development of Korean public

---

1 In this dissertation, “Korea” and “Korean” mean “South Korea” and “South Korean.”
2 In this dissertation, when I cite journal articles and books written by Korean scholars, I will include not only their last names but also their first and middle initials because many of them have the same last names. To prevent confusion, I will use the following in-text citation style: (X. X. LAST NAME, DATE).
administration. Most importantly, current scholars hardly treat seriously “orthodox” public administration theory, which first-generation scholars brought home with them after finishing their education in the U.S., and draw insufficient attention to how “orthodox” public administration theory framed founding scholarship and exerted enduring influence on the subsequent development of Korean public administration scholarship. Although several current scholars address how “orthodox” public administration theory intellectually influenced the founding of public administration in Korea, they underestimate its intellectual influence and draw a hasty conclusion that it had only limited influence on founding scholarship (Y. D. Jung 2001; C. B. Lee 1991).

Current scholars’ underestimation of “orthodox” public administration theory’s influence on founding scholarship in Korea arises mainly from the fact that they focus their attention on the technical dimension of “orthodox” public administration theory to the exclusion of its political or normative dimension. Current scholars tend to perceive “orthodox” public administration theory as non-political and technical because it was believed to deal only with technical matters and focus on increasing the performance of the executive branch. They contend that first-generation scholars initially embraced the non-political and technical “orthodox” public administration theory, which proposed POSDCORB (planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting) as the “universal” functions that “should be followed by any competent administrator (Blumberg 1981, 247),” and claimed to discover the “universal” principles of efficient administration—regardless of culture, context, and sector (Gulick 1937a; Spicer 1998). According to current scholars, however, first-generation scholars soon came to question whether the non-political and technical “orthodox” public administration theory was universally applicable to the unique administrative context of Korea and realized that it was not of much help in improving the performance of government agencies in Korea. Thus, first-generation scholars are extolled for having completely discarded the technically irrelevant “orthodox” public administration theory and adopted more technically relevant public administration theories that could be applied to the Korean
In fact, current scholars’ discussions have led to the inescapable conclusion that first-generation scholars made a fundamental break with orthodox public administration theory and, thus, it exercised only marginal influence on the founding and growth of Korean public administration scholarship (C. B. Lee 1991; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982).

However, current scholars simply scratch the surface of “orthodox” public administration theory and fail to recognize that it was not a mere “non-political” and technical theory, but also a normative and “political” theory, which addressed what public administration ought to be. As Dwight Waldo (1948) contended in his famous book *The Administrative State*, all administrative theories are also political theories because every administrative theory is driven by a “distinct political philosophy” (Rosenbloom and McCurdy 2006, 4), which provides a distinct normative vision of “good” government—in other words, how government should be run. In this sense, “orthodox” public administration theory was a normative “political” theory in that it advocated its own normative vision of good government and prescribed the appropriate role of public administration under its vision of good government. “Orthodox” public administration theory was “hostile to the tripartite partition of power . . . and sought to increase the power of the executive at the expense of the judiciary and the legislature” (Frederickson et al. 2015, 44). Promoting executive-centered governing order, it emphasized the importance of placing public administration under exclusive control of the executive and cherished administrators’ unwavering loyalty to the executive (Fry 1989; Rohr 1986; Wamsley and Dudley 1998). In fact, “orthodox” public administration theory was based on the “normative” executive-centered approach to public administration because it attempted to realize its normative vision of “executive-centered” public administration (Rosenbloom 2002, 155).

However, current Korean scholars hardly recognize that “orthodox” public administration theory was based on its normative ideal of executive-centered public administration. By misinterpreting “orthodox” public administration theory as merely non-political and technical, they are quick to conclude that it exerted

---

3 I will examine in detail current scholars’ discussions of “orthodox” public administration theory’s influence on founding scholarship in Chapter II.
no guiding influence on the founding and growth of Korean public administration scholarship (Y. D. Jung 2001; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982). This misinterpretation provides only a distorted picture of the intellectual development of Korean public administration because scholars never investigate how the executive-centered approach underlying “orthodox” public administration theory intellectually influenced the founding and growth of Korean public administration. In fact, little is known about “orthodox” public administration theory’s actual influence on the intellectual trajectory of Korean public administration.

Research Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation is to debunk current scholars’ common belief that “orthodox” public administration theory had only marginal influence on the intellectual history of Korean public administration by demonstrating that public administration was intellectually founded upon the executive-centered approach underlying “orthodox” public administration theory in Korea and it has intellectually framed the subsequent development of Korean public administration scholarship.

For this purpose, this dissertation will examine if, and how, the executive-centered approach intellectually shaped the founding and growth of Korean “mainstream” public administration scholarship in the 1962-1987 period, the heydays of Korean public administration.4 More specifically, I will identify the main tenets undergirding the executive-centered approach and conduct a comprehensive analysis of mainstream scholars’ journal articles and book chapters to investigate if, and how, such tenets framed the intellectual trajectory of Korean “mainstream” public administration scholarship in the 1962-1987 period. Furthermore, I will examine how mainstream scholars’ blind adherence to the executive-centered approach created an intellectual cul-de-sac for them in the post-1987 period.

Before proceeding to the next section, it is important to explain why I selected the 1962-1987 period as the time period for this dissertation. Given the fact that this dissertation deals with the founding and

---

4 In this dissertation, “mainstream” scholarship means scholarship by “individuals who are dominant in the leading academic institutions, organizations, and journals at any given time” (Dequech 2007, 281). I will address the question of “who are mainstream public administration scholars in Korea?” in Chapter III.
growth of mainstream public administration scholarship, it is clear that while 1962 marks the year when public administration was founded as a field of study, 1987 is the year when the field’s intellectual growth began to be stagnant.

I chose 1962 as the “founding” year when public administration was founded as a field of study in Korea because the first public administration journal, the Korean Journal of Public Administration (KJPA), was established in 1962 and public administration scholars moved beyond the simple “translation or illustration of foreign [administrative] concepts and theories” (Jun 1983, 415) and began to examine the important issues of Korean public administration in the KJPA.

Although many current scholars see the first Korean textbook on public administration written in 1955 as the inception of public administration as a field of study, they fail to recognize that the first public administration textbook simply focused on introducing key administrative concepts and theories of advanced countries—mostly, American administrative concepts and theories—to college students (I. H. Chung 1955). After the publication of the first public administration textbook in 1955, scholars wrote several introductory textbooks on public administration in the late 1950s and early 1960s. These textbooks also concentrated on providing a detailed explanation of American administrative concepts and theories (P. S. Kim 2012).

It was not until the KJPA, the first Korean public administration journal, was established in 1962 that Korean public administration scholars began to pay attention to the important issues of Korean public administration. By submitting articles that addressed such issues to the KJPA, Korean public administration scholars began to grapple with how to solve them (S. T. Kang 2005; W. T. Kim 1979). Because the founding of public administration in Korea means that Korean scholars began to conduct “self-conscious” research

---

5 By using online catalogs of major university libraries, I searched for introductory “public administration” textbooks written from 1955 to 1961. I found six “public administration” textbooks and skimmed through them. These books devoted most of their pages to reviewing American administrative concepts and theories in detail. However, these six “public administration” textbooks hardly addressed the important issues of Korean public administration. They simply allocated a small number of pages to explaining the functions of executive ministries and agencies in Korea and the main characteristics of the Korean civil service.
on Korean administrative issues rather than simply translating and introducing American administrative concepts and theories, I defined 1962, the KJPA’s establishment year, as the founding year of Korean public administration.

I also selected 1987 as the end year of public administration’s heyday in South Korea because the field’s intellectual prestige has dramatically declined there since 1987. Since its founding, the field of public administration had been praised for providing “intellectual leadership” in the study of how to run government until 1987 (KAPA 2009). By seeing public administration research as facilitating practical “problem-solving” in government, the authoritarian regimes that controlled the Korean government between 1961 and 1987 not only provided massive financial support to mainstream public administration scholars but also encouraged them to provide “problem-solving” advice and consultation to government officials (P. S. Kim 2012, 221). In fact, the field of public administration rose to intellectual prominence in the 1970s and the 1980s, which are often portrayed as “the golden age for academic public administration” (J. H. Kim 2015).

However, in June 1987, a nationwide democracy movement toppled the authoritarian regime, thus speeding up the process of democratization in Korea (S. H. Kim 1996; N. H. Lee 2007). This democratization posed a big challenge for the intellectual leadership that public administration scholars had maintained until 1987. In the post-1987 period, mainstream public administration research came to be seen as unhelpful in addressing how to run government under a new form of governance that democratization brought about (S. G. Jeung 2000). As a result, I selected 1987 as the end date of public administration’s golden age in Korea.

**Conceptual Framework**

The 1962 -1987 period encompasses the period from the Third Republic to the Fifth Republic. In that period, successive authoritarian regimes upheld an extreme type of executive-centered governing order, in which a strong president without legislative and judicial checks maintained exclusive control over public
administration (Y. W. Kihl 2005; B. C. Lee 2003). In this period, as I previously discussed, the field of public administration—especially, its mainstream scholars—reached its peak in terms of its intellectual prestige (P. S. Kim 2012). However, in the post-1987 period, during which Korea progressed towards a full-fledged democracy, the democratically elected governments emphasized the principle of separation of powers, in which the president, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch compete to exercise more control over public administration and impose their own priorities upon it, at the expense of executive-centered governing order (B. M. Ahn 2002; D. K. Yoon 1995). With the demise of executive-centered governing order, the field of public administration experienced a steep decline in its intellectual prestige (J. H. Kim 2015). In fact, the rise and fall of the field of public administration coincided with the rise and fall of executive-centered governing order.

Some scholars criticized mainstream scholars for enthusiastically upholding an extreme type of executive-centered governing order, or dictatorship and, thus, emphasizing public administrators’ complete subordination to the authoritarian presidents (S. H. Chung 2007; S. G. Jeung 2000). Responding to this criticism, however, mainstream scholars themselves contended that they simply conducted “non-political” technical research that focused on improving the performance of the executive branch without advocating dictatorship (D. S. Bark 1998; Y. D. Jung 1997). In fact, one important question still remains unsolved: Did mainstream public administration scholars provide normative support to an extreme type of executive-centered governing order or not?

This dissertation deals directly with this question. In examining how the executive-centered approach influenced the development of Korean mainstream public scholarship in the 1962-1987 period, I will focus on how the executive-centered approach led mainstream public administration scholars to provide normative support to extreme executive-centered governing order. I constructed the following conceptual framework for examining the influence of the executive-centered approach on Korean mainstreams public administration scholarship.
In my conceptual framework, I divided the 1962-1987 period into the Founding Period (1962-1972) and the Growth Period (1973-1987) because most current scholars agree that before 1973, the field of public administration was starting to grow, but was not yet in its period of rapid expansion (Y. D. Jung 1997; W. K. Paik 2006). They also point out that, since 1973, due to the authoritarian regimes’ massive support, “public administration has grown exponentially” to become a prestigious field of study (P. S. Kim 2012, 228). The Founding Period (1962-1972) and the Growth Period (1973-1987) respectively coincide with the
period of the Third Republic (1963-1972) and the period of the Fourth to Fifth Republic (1972-1987).

As my conceptual framework demonstrates, I will concentrate on addressing the following two questions in both the Founding Period and the Growth Period:

- **Question 1:** Was the executive-centered approach fully endorsed or not in the field of public administration in Korea in the Founding Period and the Growth Period? In answering this question, I will identify the main tenets underlying the executive-centered approach and pay special attention to whether or not such tenets became entrenched in mainstream public administration scholarship and, if so, how well.

- **Question 2:** How did the executive-centered approach encourage Korean scholars to uphold an excessive type of executive-centered governing order as appropriate in the Founding Period and the Growth Period? Before addressing this question, I will provide a detailed explanation of how the Korean Constitution glorified executive-centered governing order, in which public administrators were required to maintain their exclusive loyalty to the president, and how executive-centered governing order promoted the rise of the authoritarian developmental state, in which public administrators under the president’s guidance played a central role in controlling civil society and market. Then, I will examine how Korean scholars’ acceptance of the executive-centered approach led them to provide normative support for an extreme type of executive-centered governing order and the authoritarian developmental state in the Founding Period and the Growth Period.

**Significance**

The study contained in this dissertation is significant mainly for three reasons. First, it is the first academic attempt to challenge current scholars’ conventional belief that “orthodox” public administration theory exercised only marginal influence on first-generation scholars who intellectually founded public administration in Korea. Challenging this widely held belief, this dissertation seeks to demonstrate that first-generation scholars intellectually founded public administration upon the executive-centered approach underlying “orthodox” public administration theory and it shaped the founding and growth of Korean mainstream public administration scholarship. As a result, this dissertation brings a new perspective on the influence of “orthodox” public administration theory on the intellectual development of Korean public administration.

Second, this dissertation serves to direct scholarly attention to founding scholarship, which current scholars hardly recognize as an important research topic. Although current scholars have conducted several
historical studies on the intellectual history of Korean public administration, they tend to overlook and underestimate the influence of founding scholarship on the field of public administration in Korea (Y. D. Jung 1996; P. S. Kim 2012). However, this dissertation seeks to demonstrate that founding scholarship greatly determined the intellectual trajectory of the field, thus improving current scholars’ awareness of the importance of founding scholarship in the understanding of the intellectual development of Korean public administration.

Third, this dissertation provides some clues as to the origin of an intellectual dilemma that the field of public administration is now grappling with in Korea. This dilemma is concerned mainly with a huge gap between “executive-centered” public administration scholarship and the new governing order of separation of powers that democratization has promoted since 1987. By demonstrating that the main tenets of the executive-centered approach became fully entrenched as intellectual dogmas in the field of public administration, this dissertation improves the understanding of how these intellectual dogmas prevent public administration scholars from responding appropriately to the new governing order of separation of powers.

**Plan of Dissertation**

This dissertation is composed of eight chapters. Following Chapter I (Introduction), Chapter II carefully examines the executive-centered approach to public administration—what it is and why it is important to understanding the intellectual development of Korean mainstream public administration. Chapter III sketches the research design for examining if, and how, the executive-centered approach influenced Korean mainstream public administration scholarship in the Founding Period and the Growth Period. More specifically, this chapter addresses how the appropriate data collection sources were identified, how the relevant data were collected, and how the data were analyzed. Chapter IV reviews the Korean Constitution in the Founding Period and demonstrates that the Constitution upheld an excessive type of executive-centered governing order and this executive-centered governing order promoted the building of
the authoritarian developmental state in the Founding Period. Chapter V explores if the executive-centered approach influenced the intellectual founding of Korean mainstream public administration and, if so, how the executive-centered approach encouraged mainstream scholars to uphold executive-centered governing order and welcome the authoritarian developmental state with enthusiasm. Chapter VI delves into the Korean Constitution in the Growth Period and demonstrates that the Constitution still cherished extreme executive-centered governing order, which served to accelerate the consolidation of the authoritarian developmental state. Chapter VII examines whether the executive-centered approach still exercised powerful influence on Korean mainstream scholarship in the Growth Period and, if so, how it still encouraged mainstream scholars to maintain their support of executive-centered governing order and the authoritarian developmental state in the Growth Period. Chapter VIII (Conclusion) summarizes the key findings and, based on these findings, it explains why the executive-centered approach came into an essential tension with the new governing order in the Post-Growth period, and how the executive-centered approach created an intellectual dilemma for Korean public administration scholars in the same period. Then, this chapter concludes by discussing how we can overcome such dilemma.
CHAPTER II:
THE EXECUTIVE-CENTERED APPROACH TO PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Introduction

Since first-generation scholars intellectually founded public administration as a separate field of study in Korea in the 1960s, several public administration scholars in following generations have focused their attention on the first-generation’s founding scholarship. These latter-day scholars contend that first-generation scholars were initially inspired by “orthodox” public administration theory, but that they soon made a fundamental break with it by discovering its limitations (B. Y. Ahn 1979; S. H. Chung 1998; S. T. Kang 1987; C. B. Lee 1991). In fact, there seems to be a scholarly consensus that “orthodox” public administration theory had only little influence on the first-generation scholars’ founding scholarship.

In this chapter, I will carefully review current Korean scholars’ discussions of first-generation scholars’ founding scholarship. In particular, I will critically examine the current scholars’ common belief that “orthodox” public administration theory’s influence was minimal. Then, I will point out that current scholars simply touch upon the surface of “orthodox” public administration theory and thus underestimate its influence on first-generation scholars’ founding scholarship. Lastly, I will describe the executive-centered approach to public administration, which is the basis for “orthodox” public administration theory, and contend that, in order to understand how “orthodox” public administration theory actually influenced the first-generation’s founding scholarship, it is important to carefully examine how the executive-centered approach shaped the founding scholarship.

Scholarly Discussions of Orthodox Public Administration Theory’s Influence on the First Generation’s Founding Scholarship

After examining the first-generation’s founding scholarship, current scholars seem to reach a consensus that first-generation scholars initially embraced “orthodox” public administration theory (B. Y. Ahn 1979; S. H. Chung 1998; Y. D. Jung 1996). The “orthodoxy” of public administration was first
codified in Leonard White’s Introduction to the Study of Public Administration (1926) and in W.F. Willoughby’s Principles of Public Administration (1927), and reached its “high noon” with the 1937 publication of Gulick and Urwick’s Papers on the Science of Administration and the 1937 report of the President’s Committee on Administrative Management, widely known as the Brownlow Report (Hammond 1990; Sayre 1951; Waldo 1961). “Orthodox public administration theory”—also referred to as classical public administration theory—rest on “a belief in the virtues of hierarchy and centralization of authority and power in the chief executive; a belief in efficiency as the central value of administration; a belief that there must exist certain principles for good administration applicable to all organizations, regardless of institutional setting; and a belief that such principles are susceptible to empirical scientific discovery and verification” (Spicer 1998, 300).

Current scholars point out that Gulick’s academic work played an important role as a vehicle through which first-generation scholars learned “orthodox” public administration theory. Therefore, Gulick’s scholarship becomes the focus of academic attention for current scholars who wish to examine the founding scholarship of first-generation scholars. In particular, they contend that Gulick’s principles of administration and POSDCORB greatly shaped early first-generation scholarship.

**Principles of Administration**

Current research on the first-generation’s founding scholarship indicates that they were initially under the strong influence of Gulick’s principles of administration. They actively endorsed them as “one best way” to maximize efficiency in government and staunchly supported the “wholesale” introduction of Gulick’s principles into government (Y. D. Jung 2001; C. B. Lee 1991). One scholar even states that first-generation scholars performed the role of “salespersons” for Gulick’s principles (C. B. Lee 1991, 227).

However, current scholars criticize first-generation scholars for uncritically accepting Gulick’s principles without examining their applicability to the distinctive administrative context of Korea. Critics contend that first-generation scholars held a mistaken belief that there were certain fundamental principles of good (efficient) administration and these principles were applicable to all administrations regardless of
their cultural settings. They believed that the effort to transplant Gulick’s principles of administration into the Korean administrative practices was futile. These critics charge that the misguided belief in the universal applicability of Gulick’s principles of administration encouraged first-generation scholars to disregard the uniqueness of the Korean administrative practices and resulted in their making unrealistic recommendations to government officials (C. B. Lee 1991; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982).

Although current scholars are highly critical of the first generation’s early scholarship, they cast a sympathetic eye on the later immense effort of the first generation of scholars to make a fundamental break with Gulick’s principles of administration. According to current scholars, first-generation scholars soon became disillusioned with Gulick’s principles of administration and severely attacked them on two fronts. First, current scholars maintain that first-generation scholars came to reject Gulick’s claim that a science of administration could be built on his principles of administration on the grounds that these principles were non-scientific, and were merely common sense. They proceeded to embrace Hebert Simon’s behavioral approach in order to build a pure science of administration (C. B. Lee 1991).6

Second, current scholars also contend that some first-generation scholars became increasingly “aware of the inadequacies of imported principles . . . for understanding and solving Korean administrative problems” (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982, 25) as they frequently discovered that Gulick’s principles of administration failed to increase efficiency in government (Y. D. Jung 2001; C. B. Lee 1991).

6 In his administrative behavior, Simon (1947) made a devastating attack on the claim of the orthodox theorists to have discovered the universal principles of administration and to have built a science of administration based on these principles. Simon argued that their efforts were fundamentally misplaced because they were grounded in knowledge derived from common experience rather than “scientific” inquiry and a science of public administration could not be built on a foundation of common experience that the classical theorists emphasized. However, Simon did not challenge the notion of a science of public administration. Rather, he called for the establishment of a real science of public administration. By fully embracing the positivist perspective, Simon argued that facts and values could be logically separated and urged public administration scholars to acquire knowledge from facts: empirically derived, measured, and verified. In contrast to facts, he claimed, values had no place in the study of public administration. Simon encouraged scholars to take as their primary unit of analysis the decisions that administrators made because, for Simon, decisions “constituted the core of administration” (Denhardt 1984, 76) and they “could be studied scientifically, as to the effects they produced and the process for making them” (Riccucci 2006, 57). By offering an alternative theoretical framework that could replace the orthodox public administration theories, Simon made a bold attempt to shift scholarly attention from structure, which the classical theorists emphasized, to the decision-making process. Furthermore, He urged public administration scholars to hold on to the fact-value dichotomy, carefully examine the factual propositions regarding decision-making process, and build a “pure science of administration.”
Facing the huge “misfit” between Gulick’s principles of administration and Korean administrative practices, first-generation scholars began to raise doubts about the universal applicability of Gulick’s principles of administration. They shifted their academic attention to theories of comparative and development administration that examined the uniqueness of the actual administrative practices in less developed countries, in order to understand why these administrative practices existed and to provide appropriate prescriptions for improving these practices.  

**POSDCORB**

Current scholars also direct their academic attention to an examination of the intellectual influence of Gulick’s POSDCORB on the early first-generation scholarship. They point out that initially, the first generation of scholars fully accepted POSDCORB as a useful conceptual framework in clarifying the functions that should be performed by public administration and, based on the POSDCORB framework, sought to improve the functions of public administration (K. W. Kim 1979; C. B. Lee 1979; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982). One scholar ascribes PODSCORB’s strong influence to the fact that most of first-generation scholars studied in the MPA program at the University of Minnesota from the late 1950s to the early 1960s. He contends that Minnesota’s public administration curriculum, which was built around POSDCORB, decisively shaped the way first-generation scholars made sense of the functions of public administration (W. T. Kim 1969a). In a word, current scholars seem to reach an academic

---

7 To improve their understanding of the administrative practices in Korea, the first generation of scholars fully accepted theories of comparative administration. Especially, by using Fred Riggs (1964)’ theory of prismatic society, they conceptualized the Korean society as Transitia, which has a conflicted mixture of Agraria (fused traditional society) and Industria (differentiated modern society) and discussed how to overcome the dominant problems of public administration in Transitia, which are characterized mainly by formalism, overlapping structures, and nepotism, in order to improve efficiency in governments.

8 First-generation scholars were familiar with Gulick’s POSDCORB even before they began their academic training in the U.S. Fred Riggs, who was the first American public administration scholar to deliver lectures on public administration in 1956 in Korea, recalled his visit to Korea as follows:

> I went to the UN to seek advice, asking how I should approach the task of introducing administrative studies in Korea. The answer I received was stunning in its simplicity. . . I was told that if I just followed Luther Gulick’s advice and used POSDCORB as an acronym, giving lectures on Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Coordinating, Reporting and Budgeting, I could not go wrong (Riggs 2001, 142).

While Riggs (2001) recollected that he introduced “western ideas of public administration, stressing the distinctive political and economic context which made them useful” (143), he stated that he introduced Gulick’s POSDCORB in several seminars, where many first-generation scholars, who were then graduate students, were present.
agreement that the so-called “POSDCORB-oriented thinking” (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982, 24) initially prevailed among first-generation scholars.

However, current scholars also contend that the upsurge of academic interest in theories of development administration, which emphasized the leading role of public administrators in formulating and implementing policies in the developmental process, encouraged first-generation scholars to take a critical look at POSDCORB (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982; Y. D. Jung 2001). According to current scholars, first-generation scholars severely charged that POSDCORB focused only on what happened in government and, therefore, failed to include the proactive functions of public administration in responding to the external environment (Y. D. Jung 2001). Current scholars point out that, because first-generation scholars strongly supported the proactive policy role of public administration in development administration theories, they found Gulick’s “inward-looking” framework unsatisfactory and proceeded to construct a new ‘outward-looking’ conceptual framework that emphasized the active involvement of public administration in policy formulation and policy implementation (Y. D. Jung 2001; K. W. Kim 1979; C. B. Lee 1979).

**Current Scholars’ Misinterpretation of Orthodox Public Administration Theory’s Influence on the First Generation’s Founding Scholarship**

Current scholars’ analysis of the first-generation’s founding scholarship maintains that, soon after first-generation scholars initially embraced “orthodox” public administration theory through supporting Gulick’s principles of administration and POSDCORB, they critically re-examined it, discovered its limitations, and provided alternatives. As a result, their analyses led to the inescapable conclusion that first-generation scholars departed completely from “orthodox” public administration theory (K. W. Kim 1979; C. B. Lee 1979; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982). According to this analysis, “orthodox” public administration theory had only a limited influence over early first-generation scholarship and, therefore, failed to exercise any guiding influence over the subsequent development of Korean public administration scholarship.

However, it is worth indicating that “orthodox” public administration theory involves more than
just discovering the universal principles of administration and simply developing a conceptual framework that defines the proper role of public administration. Current scholars only superficially touch upon “orthodox” public administration theory and misinterpret its influence on the first-generation’s founding scholarship. This misinterpretation can be attributable to the fact that current scholars tend to emphasize the technical dimension of “orthodox” public administration theory to the exclusion of its normative dimension.

By understanding “orthodox” public administration theory as a “value-neutral” and technical theory that focuses only on increasing the performance of government, current scholars fail to recognize that “orthodox” public administration theory is based on its own normative vision of “good” public administration—in other words, what “good” administrators ought to do. As I will discuss in detail in the next section, “orthodox” public administration theory is founded upon its “executive-centered” conception of public administration. Enthusiastically supporting executive-centered governing order, it identifies the president as the sole master of public administration and upholds the “executive-centered approach” that emphasizes public administration’s unflinching loyalty to the president. However, the executive-centered approach is in an essential tension with the constitutional design of separation of powers, in which administrators are required to serve multiple masters—the president, Congress, and the courts—and feel cross-pressured by their conflicting demands (Rohr 1986; Rourke 1993; Wamsley and Dudley 1998). In fact, the executive-centered approach is “normative” in that it seeks to privilege the interests of the president at the expense of those of the legislative and judicial branches and realize its normative vision of “executive-centered” public administration (Rosenbloom 2002, 155).

The important thing to point out is that what first-generation scholars brought home with them after finishing their academic training in the U.S. was the “executive-centered approach to public administration” and this approach accorded completely with the first generation’s strong belief in executive-centered governing order. First-generation scholars were convinced that the president should exercise strong leadership in order to attain rapid economic development, and public administrators
should be completely committed to that presidential quest for economic development. As a result, they held intolerant attitudes towards the principle of separation of powers, which allows the other two constitutional branches to check presidential initiatives (D. S. Bark 1971a; W. T. Kim 1967; H. B. Lee 1967). For example, one first-generation scholar expressed outright antagonism towards the principle of separation of powers by contending that scholars had been “indoctrinated” to blindly uphold the principle of separation of powers. He criticized the principle of separation of powers for being out of touch with reality in underdeveloped, poverty-ridden nations and contended that it might retard, rather than accelerate, economic growth (D. S. Bark 1971a). In fact, first-generation scholars upheld the executive-centered approach, which requires public administrators to display exclusive loyalty to the president.

In addition, interestingly, the first generation’s later criticism of Gulick’s principles of administration and POSDCORB ironically reveals that first-generation scholars fully embraced the executive-centered approach. For example, they discarded Gulick’s principles of administration because they believed that these principles no longer contributed to the president’s efficient management of the executive branch (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982; Y. D. Jung 2001). First-generation scholars also tried to extend the POSDCORB framework because this conceptual framework was not sufficient to identify the necessary functions that public administrators should perform in order to accomplish developmental goals set by the president (H. B. Lee 1966; H. B. Lee 1967). In fact, Gulick’s principles of administration and POSDCORB failed to survive, but the normative ideal of executive-centered public administration behind them seemed to persist in the first-generation’s founding scholarship.

Although current scholars are convinced that first-generation scholars completely discarded “orthodox” public administration theory, they fail to recognize that first-generation scholars never challenged the normative ideal of executive-centered public administration, which lies under “orthodox” public administration theory. As a result, current scholars end up misinterpreting “orthodox” public administration theory’s influence on the first-generation’s founding scholarship. In fact, it is impossible to examine how “orthodox” public administration theory actually influenced the first-generation’s founding
scholarship and the subsequent development of Korean public administration scholarship without taking its underlying executive-centered approach into account.

The Executive-Centered Approach to Public Administration

In this section, I will provide a detailed explanation of the “executive-centered” approach to public administration, which underlies “orthodox” public administration theory. To promote the understanding of the executive-centered approach, I will focus on reviewing Gulick’s scholarship because it “represented the high noon of orthodox public administration theory in the United States” (Sayre 1958, 103). I will examine Gulick’s scholarship as a proxy for the “orthodox” executive-centered approach, which shaped the intellectual development of Korean public administration.

Before proceeding, it is important to indicate that Gulick’s conception of the president lays the groundwork for his executive-centered approach to public administration. Considering the fact that it is impossible to understand Gulick’s executive-centered approach to public administration without thoroughly examining his conception of the president, I will first investigate Gulick’s conception of the president and how it gave rise to his executive-centered approach and then identify four tenets underlying Gulick’s executive-centered approach.

Gulick’s Conception of the President

Gulick’s Conception of the President as the Sole Executive Officer

Gulick, often called “the dean of U.S. public administration” (Van Riper 1998, 187), believed that the U.S. constitutional design, which emphasized “the tripartite division of powers and the system of automatic internal checks and balances” (Gulick 1933, 65), was badly in need of drastic change because this constitutional design blocked government from responding effectively to the problems plaguing American democracy (Fry 1989; Wamsley and Dudley 1998). In Gulick’s eyes, American democracy appeared to be ineffective and faltering because the constitutional design of separation of powers gave rise to “a government that is virtually powerless to go wrong because it is powerless to go at all” (Gulick
Gulick was convinced that to “arm democracy with effective administration” (Lane and Wamsley 1998, 381), it was necessary to transform crumbling democracy into “efficient democracy” (Gulick 1928, 45). However, he charged that the American constitutional design, in which the three constitutional branches share powers over administration, tended to diminish public administrators’ ability to respond in a coherent and expeditious manner to the problems haunting American democracy because administrators were required to follow the conflicting demands from three constitutional branches (Gulick 1933). He expressed his frustration towards the U.S. systems of separation of powers as follows:

Our governmental institutions have been slowly molded to suit the work which they are called upon to perform. When some arrangement of powers or distribution of work does not give satisfactory results, we change it. . . At present moment, the government of the part of the world in which we live is in many respects three generations behind our necessities and our social and economic world (Gulick 1933, 63).

Gulick’s frustration over the U.S. systems of separation of powers led him to emphasize the strong need to “revolutionize the American system of government” (Gulick 1933, 64) and conceptualize the President as the sole executive officer who exercised the exclusive authority over the executive branch (Wamsley and Dudley 1998). In playing a leading role in the President’s Committee on Administrative Management (PCAM), which is popularly known as the Brownlow Committee, Gulick attempted to embody his conception of the president as the sole executive officer into the executive branch by proposing a reorganization plan to place “in the President alone, the whole executive power of Government of the United States” (PCAM 1937, 31; emphasis added).

In his famous “Notes on the Theory of Organization,” Gulick emphasized the importance of building a strictly hierarchical structure within an organization because he believed that this hierarchical structure would enable the organization’s top leader to exercise complete control over the organization. Then, he proceeded to examine how to build an effective hierarchical structure in his “Notes.” Given the fact that his “Notes” were intended to “develop a conceptual framework which could guide the staff of the
Brownlow Committee” (Wamsley and Dudley 1998, 333) and the Brownlow Committee recommended a sweeping reorganization of the executive branch, it is evident that what Gulick meant by organization in his “Notes” was the executive branch.

In the first place, Gulick (1937a) began his examination by asserting that “work division is the foundation of organization” (3) and “if subdivision of work is inescapable, co-ordination becomes mandatory” (6). Then, he proposed two primary ways co-ordination could be achieved: by organization and by the dominance of an idea. While Gulick (1937a) considered both ways of co-ordination as essential in the management of organizations, he focused his attention on the first way of co-ordination: how to establish and improve “the structure of co-ordination imposed upon the work-division units of an enterprise” (3).9

To build an effective structure of co-ordination, Gulick proposed his famous principles of administration: division of work, unity of command, span of control,10 departmentalization,11 and homogeneity (Gulick 1937a).12 Among these principles, the principle of unity of command most clearly demonstrates how Gulick attempted to incorporate his conception of the President as the sole executive officer of the executive branch (Denhardt 1984). Gulick (1937a) asserted that the establishment of an effective structure of co-ordination in organization required “a single directing executive authority” to “co-ordinate and energize all of the sub-divisions of work” (7; emphasis added) largely because an organizational member “subject to orders from several superiors will be confused, inefficient, and

9 Gulick (1937a) describes coordination by the dominance of an idea as “the development of intelligent singleness of purpose in the minds and wills of those who are working together as a group, so that each worker will of his own accord fit his task into the whole with skill and enthusiasm” (6).
10 Gulick (1937a) explains the principle of span of control as follows: . . . [T]he mind and will of man can span but a limited number of immediate managerial contacts . . . The limit of control is partly a matter of the limits of knowledge, but even more is it a matter of the limits of time and of energy. As a result, the executive of any enterprise can personally direct only a few persons (7).
11 Gulick contends that it is necessary to group work activities in order to maintain their homogeneity. He proposes four ways of grouping: purpose, process, persons or things, or place (Gulick 1937a).
12 Gulick (1937a) argues that “the efficiency of a group working together is directly related to the homogeneity of the work they are performing, of the process they are utilizing, and of the purposes which actuate them” (9-10). He states that when nonhomogeneous work activities are brought together in a group, the group would face “the danger of friction and inefficiency” (Gulick 1937a, 10).
irresponsible” (9). The principle of unity of command strongly stressed the importance of arranging a single executive authority in any organization regardless of its institutional setting.

In sum, Gulick stressed the importance of creating a hierarchical structure within the executive branch and placing the president at the apex of the hierarchical structure. He believed that the hierarchical structure would give the president sole executive power, which in turn would make the executive branch more efficient and more responsible.13

However, Gulick’s conception of the sole executive power, which stressed the importance of giving the president sufficient monocentric power to manage the entire executive branch as if it were a simple unified organization, was fundamentally at odds with the American constitutional design in which the three constitutional branches share powers (Aberbach and Rockman 2000; Rohr 1986; Rosenbloom 1983). Rohr explained how the constitutional text was inconsistent with Gulick’s conception of the President as the sole executive officer as follows:

It is textually demonstrable from the Constitution itself that the whole executive power is not vested in the president. The Senate’s executive role in treaties and appointments is spelled out in terms in article 2. Both houses of Congress share executive functions in their constitutional powers to declare war, to make rules for the armed forces, to create offices, to prescribe the discipline for the state militias, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and to vest the appointing power of inferior officers in the heads of the executive departments or in the courts of law (1986, 139).

As Rohr (1986) noted, Gulick’s conception of the President as the sole executive officer was “a fundamental error that transforms the president from chief executive officer to sole executive officer” (139) because the Constitution cannot be construed to place the sole executive power in the President.

Wamsley and Dudley (1998) contended that Gulick’s misconception of the President as the sole executive officer arose mainly from his “misplacement of an organizational conception upon a polity with

---

13 According to Fry (1989), Gulick believes that, compared with the legislative branch which has “no central focus of responsibility” (79), the hierarchically organized executive branch has “a single focus of . . . political responsibility more amenable to democratic control” (87).
a distinctive constitutional design” (173).  

14 Gulick defined organizations as “oriented to the pursuit of relatively specific goals (Wamsley and Dudley 1998, 336),” and believed that it was necessary to place the chief executive at the apex of a hierarchically structured organization in order to maximize the attainment of its goals. However, he “did not differentiate between a city manager, corporate chief executive, governor, or president” (Wamsley and Dudley 1998, 332). Therefore, Gulick didn’t hesitate to apply this organizational concept to the executive branch and recommended in the Brownlow Report that the executive branch should be hierarchically organized and should be under the exclusive authority of the president. However, Gulick failed to realize that his organizational conception would be problematic when applied to the executive branch because his conception of the executive branch, which stressed “hierarchy, control, and the monocentric power,” was in irreconcilable tension with the constitutional design that is “polycentric with shared and coordinate powers” (Wamsley and Dudley 1998, 338).

Although Gulick emphasized the concentration of power in the hand of the president standing at the apex of the executive branch, the Founders of the Constitution took a rather different view of the executive power in their constitutional design and required the president to share executive power with the other branches, thus blocking the president from exercising exclusive authority over the executive branch. The Founders created this system of checks and balances, in which each constitutional branch shared power with the other two, because they believed that even if a faction seized one branch, it still could not damage the whole system of government (Diamond 1987; Epstein 2007; Rohr 1986).  

15 This principle of checks and balances arose mainly from the Founders’ realistic view of human nature. Based on their realistic view that people were self-interested, they insisted that the new government should be institutionally designed to constrain the natural self-interest of people. In Federalist 51, Madison argued

---

14 Ramos (1981) states that the “misplacement of concepts takes place when the extension of a theory model or concept of phenomenon A to phenomenon B does not hold up after a thorough examination because B belongs to a peculiar context whose specific characteristics correspond only in limited ways to the context of phenomenon A” (63).

15 In Federalist 10, Madison defines faction as “a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority or minority of the whole, who are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adverse to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interests of the community” (Cooke 1961, 57).
as follows:

If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and then in the next place oblige it to control itself (Cooke 1961, 349).

Since the Founders were fully aware that a majority faction, which was formed by a group of self-interested people, could dominate the new government and pursue its own goals to the detriment of those of minorities, they felt a strong need to design a government system that could defend the rights of minorities from the majority faction. The Founders believed that the “security for civil rights” consisted “in the multiplicity of interests” (Cooke 1961, 351-352). In Federalist 10, Madison spoke directly to this point:

Extend the sphere, and you take in a greater variety of parties and interests; you make it less probable that a majority of the whole will have a common motive to invade the rights of other citizens; or if such a common motive exists, it will be more difficult for all who feel it to discover their own strength and to act in unison with each other (Cooke 1961, 64).

To prevent any attempt by majority factions to take control of the entire government and to undermine the rights of minorities, the Founders deliberately divided power among three branches, thus rendering it more difficult for a majority faction to seize all the three branches. They were convinced that the principle of separation of powers would prevent the “accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hand,” which the Founders regarded as “the very definition of tyranny” (Cooke 1961, 324).

The Founders also constructed a system of checks and balances, in which three branches shared power and each branch required the consent of the others for many of its actions. The system of checks

---

16 The Founders feared both majority and minority factions because either could control the new government and use it to their own advantage. However, they believed that factions of minority could not pose any serious threat because the majority could easily out-vote them. However, the Founders took seriously the potential danger that could be created by factions of majority. They believed that if the majority united around some policy issues, such as the redistribution of wealth, they could oppress the minority, thus undermining their civil rights (Cooke 1961).
and balances was designed to discourage a majority faction from abusing its power even if the faction took control of one branch because it would “give each branch a motive and a means for preventing abuses or misguided action by another” (Rosenbloom 1983, 224). In a word, the Founders’ constitutional design was intended to overcome “the defect of better motives” of majority factions by institutionalizing “opposite and rival interests” in government (Cooke 1961, 349).  

The Founders’ constitutional design provides “agreed upon rules . . . for individuals and groups when they seek to achieve their own interests or particular visions of the public good within the political process” (Spicer 1998, 312). Since the constitutional design restrained individuals and groups from taking complete control of not only the executive branch but also the entire government, it required them to “engage in what the Founders called “deliberation,”” and today is called authentic dialogue” (Wamsley and Dudley 1998, 349) with others to achieve their own interests and ends. Under this constitutional design, those who take control of one branch and attempt to initiate change in order to realize their own version of the public good, are more likely to engage in authentic dialogue with those who hold power in other branches because “Those opposed to change need only win at one point in the policymaking process—say in obtaining a presidential veto—whereas those who favor change must win every battle along the way” (Edwards et al. 2004, 46; emphasis in the original).

In summary, the Founders’ constitutional design ran counter to Gulick’s conception of the president as the sole executive officer. In order to defend individual rights, the Founders intentionally designed the system of checks and balances and separation of powers, which made it difficult for individuals and groups not only to take complete control of the entire government because power was divided among three branches, but also to exercise exclusive control even over one branch because power was shared among three branches. However, Gulick challenged the Founders’ constitutional design of “separated institutions sharing power” (Neustadt 1964, 42), which was intended to defend individual

---

17 The Founders’ constitutional design aimed at controlling the passions of not only factions but also men of civic virtue. They were full aware of the “bruised reed of civic virtue” and tried “to temper the aggressive passions of even the best of men” (Rohr 1986, 170). Therefore, they believed that good citizens in public office as well as those who were not so good must be controlled by the constitutional means.
rights, and instead saw this constitutional design as a stumbling block to effective government. In order to remove this stumbling block, Gulick (1937a) made a bold attempt to incorporate his organizational design of “a single directing executive authority” (7) into the executive branch. However, what he ignored in applying his organizational design to the executive branch was the mere fact that “effective government is instrumental for higher ends” (Rohr 1986, 147). In misplacing his conception of the president as the sole executive officer upon the executive branch, Gulick overemphasized effective government without paying due attention to its need to serve such higher ends and made a fundamental mistake in undermining the constitutional design, which emphasized the protection of individual rights as the most important goal of government. In other words, Gulick overemphasized the building of the effective government at the expense of the protection of individual rights.

Gulick’s Conception of the President as Primus Inter Pares

Gulick did more than simply re-conceptualize the president as the sole executive officer. He even went so far as to challenge the “constitutional heritage of coequal powers” (Wamsley and Dudley 1998, 342) and proposed “a new theory of the division of powers” (Gulick 1933, 66), which glorified executive-centered governing order. In “Politics, Administration, and the New Deal,” Gulick (1933) explained his new theory as follows:

. . . [I]t will be concerned not with checks and balances or with the division of policy and administration, but with division between policy veto on one side and policy planning and execution on the other. . . [T]he executive will be called upon to draft the master plan. Deliberative and advisory representative body will be asked to consider and adopt the broad outlines of various parts of this plan. The executive will then be given full power to work out the remainder and the interrelations of the program and to carry it into effect, not only through the established agencies of government but also through new agencies of a quasi-private character. The legislature of the future will have two primary powers: first, the veto over major policy, and second, the right to audit and investigate. . . These are the bricks and straws from which the new theory of the division of powers must be constructed (66).

Gulick thus placed the President “in a proactive role” and Congress “in a reactive role” and, therefore, tilted the power balance towards the President (Dudley and Wamsley 1998, 180). He did not hold Congress in high regard because his experiences with the municipal reform movement led him to see
the legislature as “antiquated, partisan, obsessed with patronage and pork, and generally a source of particularism, localism, confusion and centrifugal forces” (Lane and Wamsley 1998, 404). While Gulick did not discount the importance of the symbolic deference that should be paid to the legislature, he believed that the legislature was “in need of firm leadership from the president if the government was to be at all effective” (Lane and Wamsley 1998, 405). In a word, he discarded the “traditional conceptualization of the federal government as three equally powerful, counterbalanced branches” (Lane and Wamsley 1998, 393) and tried to re-conceptualize the president as “the first among constitutional equals” (Lane and Wamsley 1998, 392).

**The Executive-Centered Approach to Public Administration and Its Four Tenets**

Upon examination of Gulick’s scholarship, it becomes evident that he strongly believed executive-centered governing order to be better than the governing order of separation of powers. Upholding executive-centered governing order, Gulick came to see the president as the sole executive officer who held exclusive authority over the executive branch (Wamsley and Dudley 1998) and, furthermore, to conceptualize the president as “primus inter pares” (Lane and Wamsley 1998, 415).18

Based on his strong belief in executive-centered governing order, Gulick developed an “executive-centered” approach to public administration and proceeded to examine how to make public administration serve the president better. For example, Gulick (1937a) searched for the universal principles of administration in order to build an “executive-centered” public administration, in which the president could exercise complete control over administrators. He also identified POSDCORB as the main duties of administrators and urged them to perform POSDCORB to faithfully serve the president (Gulick 1937a).

Scholarly discussions of Gulick’s scholarship indicates that the executive-centered approach to public administration is based on at least four tenets (Arnold 1995; Fry 1989; Henry 1975; Rohr 1986; Rosenbloom 1983; Wamsley 2005; Wamsley and Dudley 1998):

---

18 The Latin term, primus inter pares, means first among equals.
Tenet 1: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be directly and solely under the President’s authority.

Tenet 2: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be the obedient instrument of the President.

Tenet 3: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to privilege managerial values at the expense of political and legal values. Managerial values include 3E (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness); political values involve 3R (responsibility, responsiveness, and representativeness), equality, and democratic values (including participation); legal values mean individual rights, due process, and the rule of law.

Tenet 4: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to increase the administrative capacity of the executive branch to maximize the attainment of the President’s goals.

The important thing to point out is that the most basic tenet that underpins the executive-centered approach to public administration is derived from the conception of the president as the sole executive officer. This conception was contrary to the original institutional design of the U.S. Constitution in which three constitutional branches share power over public administration. The executive-centered approach conceptualized the president as exercising exclusive control over public administration (Rohr 1986; Wamsley and Dudley 1998). This conception gave rise to the most basic tenet that defines the president as the sole master of public administration, which is referred to as Tenet 1 in this dissertation.

Once the president is seen as the only master of public administration, Tenet 2 necessarily follows: that public administration is the obedient instrument of the president because it remains accountable only to the single master—the president (Wamsley 2005). In such a conception, public administrators are not required to remain accountable to the legislative and judicial branches, but are expected to faithfully follow the dictates of the president as his obedient instrument. For example, Gulick’s discussion of POSDCORB clearly indicates what faithful servants should do for their sole master. After identifying the major duties of public administrators as POSDCORB,19 he contended that, since the president “has but a limited time and energy at his command” (Gulick 1937a, 35), “a group of able and informed men” (Gulick 1937a, 14)—in other words, public administrators—should be fully

19 Gulick (1937a) coined the acronym “POSDCROB” to describe “the various functional elements of the work of a chief executive” (13). POSDCORB is made up of the initials of the following functions: Planning, Organizing, Staffing, Directing, Co-ordinating, Reporting, and Budgeting
committed to fulfilling the duties of POSDCORB in order to attain the president’s goals.\textsuperscript{20} However, Gulick remained silent on whether administrators should take into account the appropriateness of the president’s goals when performing their duties. In fact, the executive-centered approach treats public administration as the only obedient instrument of the president.

The conceptions of the president as the sole master of public administration (Tenet 1) and public administration as the obedient instrument of the president (Tenet 2) inescapably leads to Tenet 3, which privileges managerial values at the expense of political and legal values. But, according to Rosenbloom (1983), there are three distinctive groups of values that public administration should consider under the principle of separation of powers—managerial, political, and legal—and each of these three groups of values “is associated with the values embodied in a different branch of government” (224). Each branch seeks to infuse its own values into public administration (Aberbach and Rockman 2000; Rosenbloom 1983; Rohr 1986; Wilson 1989).

First, the pursuit of managerial values is closely related with the executive. Because the primary concern of the executive is to make sure that administrators faithfully implement his or her policy goals, the executive encourages administrators to seek managerial values—for example, economy, efficiency, and effectiveness—to maximize the attainment of his or her goals. The goodness or badness of public administration lies in whether it contributes to the executive’s goals, and if so, how much (Gulick 1937a; Rosenbloom 1983).

Second, legislative concerns promote the maximization of political values. The legislative branch urges public administrators to uphold political values—for example, responsibility, responsiveness, and representativeness—because administrators are viewed not so much as faithful executors but as “supplementary lawmakers and policy makers” (Rosenbloom 1983, 224) in the administrative state. Because administrators are actually involved in making laws and policies, they are required to be

\textsuperscript{20} Gulick (1937a) describes the job of these able and informed men as seeing that “the President has before him all relevant facts and that all appropriate clearance is secured before decisions are made and that a decision once made is known to those who are involved” (14).
responsible and responsive to elected officials—ultimately to the citizenry. In fact, political values are promoted to strengthen the popular control of public administration (Rosenbloom 1983; Rosenbloom 1999). However, it is important to indicate that political values are often in tension with managerial values. For example, a socially representative executive agency might not be the most efficient one in the managerial sense (Krislov 1974). Legislative oversight might create a heavy burden on executive departments and agencies, undermining their managerial performance (Aberbach 1998).

Last, the quest for legal values is mainly associated with the “judicialization” of public administration, which is intended to safeguard individual rights from arbitrary and unconstitutional state actions. The judicial branch stresses the importance of legal values—individual rights, due process, and equity—and encourages administrators to uphold legal values in order to avoid violating the constitutional rights of individuals. Legal values often come into conflict with managerial values because the strong emphasis on legal values leads administrators to deemphasize the cost-benefit reasoning closely associated with managerial values (Rosenbloom 1983).

Given the fact that the executive-centered approach encouraged administrators to seek the most appropriate means to attain the president’s goals without calling into question their appropriateness, it comes as no surprise that managerial values hold a central place in the executive-centered approach (Rosenbloom 1983; Wamsley 2005). For example, Gulick’s discussion of efficiency clearly demonstrates that the executive-centered approach placed a high premium on managerial values. Gulick (1937b) defined efficiency as “the accomplishment of the work at hand with the least expenditure of man-power and money” (192) and openly contended that “Efficiency is . . . axiom number one in the value scale of administration” (192). Although Gulick (1937b) championed efficiency as the “basic good” of administration (192), it is worth remembering that “efficiency . . . is an instrumental good” (Spicer 1998, 305). It implies that the pursuit of managerial values, “when applied to government, assumes the existence of a set of . . . political purposes” (Spicer 1998, 305) and the unreserved acceptance of these political purposes. From Gulick’s standpoint, it is the president who establishes political purposes.
Compared with managerial values, political values remain on the sideline in the executive-centered approach to public administration. When it comes to political values, the executive-centered approach seemed to treat responsibility and responsiveness as important political values in the sense that it stressed administrators’ uncompromising loyalty to the president. However, it is important to indicate that the executive-centered approach did not intend to emphasize administrators’ responsibility and responsiveness to the legislative branch or even to the judicial branch. Its intent was to urge administrators to be exclusively responsible and responsive to the president (Fry 1989; Gulick 1933). In the executive-centered approach, the pursuit of responsibility and responsiveness is hardly in tension with the commitment to managerial values. The more responsible and responsive administrators are to the president, the more committed they are to pursuing managerial values in order to attain the president’s goals. For example, Gulick disregarded administrators’ responsibility and responsiveness to the legislative and judicial branches. Administrators’ commitment to these two branches might lead them to divert time and resources away from the presidential concerns and devote them to the legislative and judicial ones (Gulick 1933). In other words, the executive-centered approach encourages administrators to narrowly define responsibility and responsiveness in a way that ends up promoting the president’s interests at the expense of those of the other branches.

The executive-centered approach to public administration hardly touched upon legal values. In fact, it remained silent on legal values. This silence might be attributed to the fact that the executive-centered approach places much more emphasis on “efficient democracy” (Gulick 1928, 45) than constitutional democracy, which is intended to protect citizens from unconstitutional and arbitrary state actions.

Tenet 4, which emphasizes that public administration’s primary concern should be how to build the administrative capacity of the executive branch, is derived mainly from the executive-centered view of public administration as the president’s instrument. Because the executive-centered approach defined public administration as the president’s obedient instrument, it naturally proceeded to examine how to
refine the instrument—in other words, how to improve the administrative capacity of the executive branch—in order to accomplish the president’s goals. However, it is worth indicating that, in the executive-centered approach, building the administrative capacity of the executive branch meant increasing its capacity to accomplish the president’s goals. In contrast, it disregarded the importance of developing the administrative capacity of the executive branch in order to respond to the demands of the legislative and judicial branches (Denhardt 1984; Fry 1989; Gulick 1933). In fact, the executive-centered approach ruled out the possibility that the legislative and judicial branches might impose their own goals on the executive branch.

The executive-centered conception of public administration as the president’s instrument inescapably leads to the strong commitment to “executive-centered administrative reform” (Arnold 1995, 407), which seeks to place public administration under the complete control of the president and increase its capacity to accomplish the president’s goals. For example, Gulick paid special attention to “reform of the basic structure” of the executive branch (Fry 1989, 84). He regarded structure as a vital determinant of organizational capacity and espoused hierarchy as the ideal structure of maximizing organizational capacity because the hierarchical structure enabled a single authority to exercise energetic leadership within an organization. This strong emphasis on hierarchical structure led Gulick to propose a reorganization plan to structure the executive branch in the way it was unified under the exclusive authority of the president (Gulick 1937a; Mouzelis 1973; Wamsley and Dudley 1998).

However, it is important to indicate that the executive-centered approach is in essential tension with the constitutional principle of separation of powers, under which three branches share powers over administration (Aberbach and Rockman 2000; Rohr 1986; Rourke 1987; Wamsley and Dudley 1998). Contrary to the executive-centered conception of the president as the sole master of public administration, the principle of separation of powers introduces multiple masters for public administration, requiring administrators to inescapably remain “subject to the competing influence and power of different branches of government rather than subject to the exclusive authority and control of any one branch” (Spicer 1998,
314). As a result, public administration cannot be simply or solely the obedient instrument of the president because not only the president but also the legislative and judicial branches attempt to increase their control over public administration (Rohr 1986). The executive-centered approach’s strong emphasis on managerial values also runs counter to the principle of separation of powers, which encourages three constitutional branches to infuse their own values into public administration. Therefore, administrators should take into account political and legal values as well as managerial values in performing their duties (Rosenbloom 1983; Wilson 1989). Furthermore, under the constitutional design of separation of powers, public administration cannot focus only on developing its capacity to maximize the attainment of the president’s goals because the other two branches often require public administration to disregard the president’s goals and instead accomplish their own goals (Aberbach and Rockman 2000; Rourke 1987). In a word, the executive-centered approach comes into conflict with the constitutional design of “separated institutions sharing power” (Neustadt 1964, 42).

**Conclusion**

Current scholars’ interpretation of “orthodox” public administration theory’s influence on the first-generation’s founding scholarship in South Korea is misleading because they pay no attention to the executive-centered nature of “orthodox” public administration theory and fail to examine its influence on the founding scholarship. As a result, despite current Korean scholars’ claim that “orthodox” public administration theory’s influence was marginal at best, very little is known about “orthodox” public administration theory’s actual influence on the founding and growth of Korean public administration scholarship. In fact, it is impossible to develop an accurate understanding of how “orthodox” public administration theory influenced the intellectual development of Korean public administration without directing due attention to how its underlying executive-centered approach shaped the founding scholarship and the subsequent development of Korean public administration scholarship.

Therefore, a careful examination of the executive-centered approach makes clear that it was
based on the following four normative tenets (Fry 1989; Rohr 1986; Rosenbloom 1983; Wamsley 2005; Wamsley and Dudley 1998):

Tenet 1: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be directly and solely under the President’s authority.
Tenet 2: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be the obedient instrument of the President.
Tenet 3: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to privilege managerial values at the expense of political and legal values. Managerial values include 3E (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness); political values involve 3R (responsibility, responsiveness, and representativeness), equality, and democratic values (including participation); legal values mean individual rights, due process, and the rule of law.
Tenet 4: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to increase the administrative capacity of the executive branch to maximize the attainment of the President’s goals.

In order to correctly interpret “orthodox” public administration theory’s influence on the intellectual development of Korean public administration, I will examine if, and how, the four tenets undergirding the executive-centered approach were endorsed in the field of public administration in the Founding Period and the Growth Period. By examining the extent to which the four tenets were entrenched in Korea mainstream public administration scholarship, I will demonstrate how the normative ideal of executive-centered public administration became deeply seated as an unassailable dogma in Korean public administration. Before examining the data to support this claim, the next chapter explains how the appropriate data collection sources were identified, how the relevant data were collected, and how the data were analyzed.
CHAPTER III:
RESEARCH DESIGN

Introduction

In this chapter, I will explain my research design for investigating the influence of the executive-centered approach on the founding and growth of Korean mainstream public administration scholarship. First, I will identify the appropriate data collection sources. Next, I will describe my two-stage data collection method. Then, I will explain my data analysis method in detail. Last, I will close this chapter with a few brief comments on several limitations of my data collection and analysis methods.

Data Collection Source

In this dissertation, I used several influential public administration journals as the main data sources for examining if, and how, the executive-centered approach shaped Korean mainstream public administration scholarship in the Founding Period and the Growth Period. Such journals, as “creator[s] of significant trends in administrative thought” (Bowman and Hajjar 1978, 156), have actively determined which administrative concepts or theories are accepted or rejected, thus “norming” the field of Korean public administration (B. M. Ahn 1986; S. H. Chung 2001). Forrester and Watson (1994) concisely explain the role of influential journals in the “norming” of public administration research as follows:

The growth and direction of public administration as a field are significantly affected by . . . academic and practitioner journals. Rigorous evaluation and selection of research for publications are essential to strengthening the integrity, and, therefore, the identity, of public administration. Through the review process, journals not only establish quality standards but also provide a gatekeeping function, deciding the nature and scope of ideas presented to the practicing and academic discussion. No other mechanism . . . is as powerful in determining the boundaries and characteristics of the field. In essence, journals serve as an invisible seminar of public administration research (474).

As a result, a careful examination of major public administration journals can serve to reveal whether the executive-centered approach was endorsed or not in the field of Korean public administration and, if so, how well entrenched it became in mainstream public administration scholarship in the
The Korean Public Administration Review (KPAR), the official journal of the Korean Association for Public Administration (KAPA), was selected as the main data collection source because the KPAR had existed as the only “peer-reviewed” public administration journal from the Founding Period to the Growth Period. Therefore, since the KPAR published its first volume in 1967, it has been the most influential academic outlet for public administration scholars in the Founding Period and the Growth Period, deciding which administrative concepts or theories were worthwhile in the field of public administration (B. M. Ahn 1986). The Korean Political Science Review (KPSR), the official “peer-reviewed” journal of the Korean Political Science Association (KPSA), was used as another main data collection source because many public administration scholars, who still regarded public administration as a sub-field of political science, published their articles in the KPSR in the Founding Period and the Growth Period.

However, the KPAR and the KPSR have one limitation as the main data sources because they contain only incomplete information about mainstream public administration research conducted in the Founding Period (1962-1972). Given the fact that the KPAR’s first volume was issued in 1967 and public administration scholars did not submit any articles to the KPSR until 1966, it is clear that while both journals are adequate date sources for examining mainstream public administration scholarship in the 1967-1972 period, they are the inadequate sources for investigating mainstream public administration scholarship in the earlier 1962-1966 period.

Therefore, I chose two supplementary data sources for examining mainstream public administration scholarship in the 1962-1966 period: the Korean Journal of Public Administration (KJPA),

---

21 Someone might argue that mainstream scholars’ books might be the good data sources for investigating whether mainstream scholars endorsed the executive-centered approach or not. However, I believe that mainstream scholars’ books are inadequate data sources for examining how the executive-centered approach was related to mainstream scholarship because they focused simply on introducing core concepts and theories of the U.S. public administration to college students (Y. D. Jung 1996; T. H. Park 1997). As a result, it is not clear whether mainstream scholars supported the executive-centered approach or not in their books.

22 It was not until 1992 that the second “peer-reviewed” academic journal appeared in the field of public administration. In 1992, policy-oriented scholars established the Korean Association for Policy Studies (KAPS). In the same year, the KAPS began to publish its “peer-reviewed” journal, the Korean Policy Studies Review (KPSR) (W. K. Paik 2006).
the official journal of the Graduate School of Public Administration (GSPA) at Seoul National University (SNU), and book chapters written by mainstream public administration scholars from 1962 to 1966. The first supplementary source is the KJPA. The KJPA, the oldest journal in the field of public administration, began to publish its first volume in 1962. Although the KJPA was not “peer-reviewed” and limited its contributors to the SNU’s professors, it was the only public administration journal in the field of public administration before the KPAR made its first appearance in 1967 (Y. D. Jung 1996; P. S. Kim 2012). Based on this unrivaled status, the KJPA exercised strong academic influence in the field in the 1962-1966 period. I also selected mainstream scholars’ book chapters as the second supplementary data source. From 1962 to 1966, mainstream scholars contributed several book chapters to edited books. In these book chapters, mainstream scholars went beyond the simple introduction of the U.S. administrative concepts and theories and sought to apply them to the Korean administrative issues. Current scholars regard these book chapters as important to understanding mainstream scholars’ early thinking on public administration (Y. D. Jung 1996; W. K. Paik 2006). As a result, a close examination of the KJPA and book chapters would serve to provide the important information about mainstream public administration scholarship in the 1962-1966 period. Table 3-1 indicates the data collections sources of this dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Data Collection Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1967 - 1972 Korean Public Administration Review &amp; Korean Political Science Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

Defining Mainstream Scholarship

After identifying the appropriate data collection sources, it is important to first define the “mainstream” public administration scholars in Korea because the main focus of attention in this
dissertation is not on public administration scholarship in general, but on mainstream public administration scholarship in particular. In this dissertation, I define Korean mainstream public administration scholars as those who served as president of either of the two most influential academic associations in the field of public administration (the Korean Association for Public Administration (KAPA) and Korean Association for Policy Studies (KAPS)) because such scholars are viewed as the leading figures in the intellectual development of Korean public administration (S. T. Kang 2005; W. K. Paik 2006). From 1956 to 2016, 50 scholars served as president of the KAPA; from 1992 to 2016, 24 scholars were elected as the president of the KAPS. Therefore, by my definition, there have been 74 mainstream scholars in the field of public administration.

However, not all 74 scholars were actively engaged in their research in the Founding Period and the Growth Period.\textsuperscript{23} Forty three out of 74 mainstream scholars (35 out of the 50 KAPA presidents and eight out of the 24 KAPS presidents) either wrote book chapters or published their articles in the KJPA, the KPAR, and the KPSR in the Founding Period and the Growth Period. Therefore, I will examine the academic publications of 43 mainstream scholars to investigate if, and how, the executive-centered approach shaped their intellectual development in the Founding Period and the Growth Period.\textsuperscript{24}

\textbf{Sorting Relevant from Irrelevant Publications}

While mainstream public administration scholars published 64 academic articles in the KJPA, the KPAR, and the KPSR, and wrote six book chapters in the Founding Period, they authored 126 academic articles in the KPAR and the KPSR in the Growth Period. In total, mainstream scholars wrote 196 academic publications (190 articles from the three journals previously identified and six book chapters) in

\textsuperscript{23} Especially, most of mainstream scholars who served as president of either the KAPA or the KAPS after 2011 gained their doctoral degree in the post-1987 period. As a result, they could not publish any academic articles in the Founding Period (1962-1972) and the Growth Period (1973-1987).

\textsuperscript{24} My own research indicates that these 43 mainstream public administration scholars have several common characteristics. First, most of them were educated in the U.S. Thirty three out of 43 mainstream scholars (around 81 percent) held the U.S. degree (master’s degree or doctoral degree). Second, almost every mainstream scholar taught in public administration programs in Seoul, the capital of Korea. Only one out of 43 mainstream scholars belonged to a public administration program outside Seoul. Last, 31 of 43 mainstream scholars (72 percent) were either professors or graduate students at the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University.
both the Founding Period and the Growth Period.\textsuperscript{25}

I did not seek to analyze all 196 academic publications because not all of them were relevant to the purpose of this dissertation. Instead, I attempted to sort relevant from irrelevant publications and focus on analyzing relevant publications. However, because this sorting process involves making a judgment about whether a publication is relevant or not, it is inevitably haunted by the problem of selection bias (Babbie 2012; Bingham and Bowen 1994). For example, in distinguishing relevant from irrelevant publications, a researcher might intentionally or unintentionally select only publications that support his or her arguments as relevant and ignore other publications that refute them as irrelevant. Selection bias might therefore creep into the sorting process and distort the research results.

To reduce selection bias, one doctoral degree holder and one doctoral candidate in public administration assisted me in sorting relevant from irrelevant publications.\textsuperscript{26} The sorting was conducted in two stages: 1) screening out “unnecessary” publications and 2) identifying “relevant” publications. In the first stage, we developed five “Unnecessary Categories” to screen out publications that obviously had nothing to do with the purpose of this dissertation as follows:

- Unnecessary Category 1 (Publications on the Mere Introduction of Foreign Administrative Ideas): Because this dissertation deals with mainstream scholars’ thoughts on Korean public administration, we decided to eliminate publications that focused simply on explaining administrative concepts and theories developed in advanced countries (mostly in the U.S.) in detail without discussing their relevance for Korean public administration. Because these publications never touched upon issues of Korean public administration, they provided no information about mainstream scholars’ views on Korean public administration.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} The number of articles authored by mainstream scholars in the Growth Period (1973-1987) was much higher than that in the Founding Period (1962-1972) mainly for two reasons. First, the Growth Period (15 years) was longer than the Founding Period (11 years). As a result, many more articles were published in the Growth Period than in the Founding Period. Second, the number of mainstream scholars drastically increased in the Growth Period. Although only a handful of first-generation scholars wrote academic articles in the Founding Period, not only first-generation scholars but also a younger generation of scholars, many of whom were educated under first-generation scholars’ guidance and became mainstream scholars in the post-founding period, published their journal articles in the Growth Period. In fact, the advent of a new generation of mainstream scholars led to a dramatic increase in the number of articles published in the Growth Period.

\textsuperscript{26} One of the two helpers received his doctoral degree in public administration from a Korean university in 2009. The other received his master of public administration in Korea and was pursuing his doctoral degree in public administration in the U.S. when he helped me in 2011.

\textsuperscript{27} For example, although one article provided a detailed explanation of different organization development (OD) strategies, it never addressed how to apply such strategies to the Korean government (J. P. Yoon 1976).
• Unnecessary Category 2 (Publications on the Simple Descriptions of Foreign Administrative Institutions): In a similar vein, we agreed to exclude publications that focused on simply describing foreign administrative institutions without examining how to transplant them on the Korean soil. Because these publications simply focused on promoting the understanding of foreign administrative institutions, they were of little help to understanding mainstream scholars’ views on Korean public administration.  

• Unnecessary Category 3 (Publications on Public Administration at the Provincial and Local Level): Since this dissertation focuses on examining mainstream scholars’ views on public administration at the level of the central government, publications that only addressed public administration in provincial and local governments were eliminated.

• Unnecessary Category 4 (Publications on Public Administration in Pre-Modern Korea): Because this dissertation addresses mainstream scholars’ thoughts on public administration in modern Korea, we decided to remove those works that deal with the historical development of pre-modern administrative institutions, which existed before a modern form of government was founded in Korea in 1948. As a result, publications on administrative institutions under the Chosun dynasty (1392-1910), the Japanese colonial rule (1910-1945), and the U.S. military government (1945-1948) were excluded.

• Unnecessary Category 5 (Publications on Research Methods): Publications on research methods were eliminated because this dissertation was not meant to explore methodological trends of mainstream public administration research.

In this screening process, each of us independently reviewed all 196 publications and identified “unnecessary” publications that might belong to the above-mentioned five categories. However, we did not discard all publications that each of us respectively considered as irrelevant. Only if all of us agreed that an article or a book chapter fell into the same “unnecessary” category, we decided to exclude it from further consideration. This unanimous decision rule was introduced to avoid the arbitrary removal of publications deemed to refute my argument, thus reducing selection bias. Through this screening process, a total of 63 publications were found to belong in the five Unnecessary Categories. Table 3-2 demonstrates the outcome of the first-stage screening for “unnecessary” publications.

---

28 For example, one article carefully examined the historical evolution of the European welfare state, but never addressed how to build the welfare state in Korea (B. Y. Ahn 1984).
29 In both the Founding Period and the Growth Period, mainstream scholars wrote no articles and books on ancient administrative institutions that existed before the Chosun dynasty.
Table 3-2. The Outcome of the First-Stage Screening for Unnecessary Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Unnecessary Category 1</th>
<th>Unnecessary Category 2</th>
<th>Unnecessary Category 3</th>
<th>Unnecessary Category 4</th>
<th>Unnecessary Category 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founding Period</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Period</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After removing 63 “unnecessary” articles from a total of 196 academic publications in the first stage, we examined the remaining 133 publications to distinguish relevant from irrelevant publications in the second stage. Because the purpose of this dissertation is to examine if, and how, the four tenets of the executive-centered approach shaped Koran mainstream public administration scholarship in the Founding Period and the Growth Period, relevant publications were considered those that contain adequate information about the influence of the four tenets on mainstream scholarship. As a result, we constructed the following three “Relevant Categories” to identify such relevant articles or book chapters:

- Relevant Category 1 (Publications on the Relationship between Public administration and the Three Constitutional Branches): This category was used for collecting publications whose analysis could provide the useful information about whether mainstream scholars supported or rejected Tenet 1 (public administration in the executive branch is expected to be directly and solely under the President’s authority) and Tenet 2 (public administration in the executive branch is expected to be the obedient instrument of the President). Because both Tenet 1 and Tenet 2 are inextricably linked to the question, “who is the master of public administration?” we tried to collect all articles that discussed how to position public administration in relation to the three constitutional branches—the President, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch.

- Relevant Category 2 (Publications on Administrative Values): Publications that dealt with various administrative values were collected in this category. Because Tenet 3 (public administration in the executive branch is expected to privilege managerial values at the expense of political and legal values) addresses the question of “what are the primary values of public administration?” a careful analysis of such publications was believed to serve to show whether mainstream scholars endorsed Tenet 3 or not.

- Relevant Category 3 (Publications on Management and Policy Prescriptions): This category was reserved for book chapters and journal articles that proposed various management and policy prescriptions for improving the administrative capacity of the executive branch. Because Tenet 4 (public administration in the executive branch is expected to increase the administrative capacity of the executive branch to maximize the attainment of the President’s goals) is closely concerned with the question of whether management and policy prescriptions should focus on accomplishing the goals of the President or those of the legislative and judicial branches, a close examination of mainstream scholars’ publications on management and policy prescriptions was believed to serve to reveal whether Tenet 4 was supported or rejected in mainstream public administration scholarship.
After we developed the three Relevant Categories, each of us independently reviewed and allocated 133 publications into the three categories. However, it is important to note that many publications had information about more than one tenet and they might be assigned into more than one category. For example, one publication dealt with both the question of “who is the master of public administration?” and the question of “what are the primary values of public administration?” and, thus, it could be assigned into either the Relevant Category 1 or the Relevant Category 2. Rather than arbitrarily selecting the one best category for such publications, we decided to allocate them into multiple categories because we believed that, by allocating as many relevant publications as possible into each category, we could obtain more information about if, and how, each of the four tenets influenced mainstream public administration scholarship.

In deciding whether one publication was relevant or irrelevant, we used the same unanimous decision rule that was applied in the first stage. Only if all of us found a publication to belong in at least one of the three categories, we considered it as relevant. In other words, if at least one of us believed that a publication belonged to none of three categories, we discarded it as irrelevant. After the second-stage sorting process was completed, we found that while 103 out of 133 publications were considered to be relevant, the remaining 30 publications were believed to be irrelevant.\(^{30}\) Table 3-3 shows the outcome of the second-stage screening. However, it is important to note that because we assigned publications to multiple categories, the total number of relevant articles belonging to all of three Relevant Categories (165) far exceeds the actual number of relevant articles (103).

---

\(^{30}\) Although we double-checked if some of the 30 irrelevant publications might be included in any of three Relevant Categories, we found that none of them were relevant. These 30 irrelevant publications dealt with a wide range of issues that had nothing to do with the purpose of this dissertation: the role the United Nations in the world, the intellectual history of political science, party reform, and college students’ perception on communism, to name only a few examples.
Table 3-3. The Outcome of the Second-Stage Screening for Relevant Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Relevant Articles</th>
<th>Irrelevant Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Category 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding Period</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Period</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the two-stage screening process was completed, we found that 103 out of 196 publications were selected as relevant and the remaining 93 publications were chosen as either unnecessary or irrelevant. We also discovered that, while 30 out of the 103 relevant publications were written in the Founding Period, the remaining 73 publications were authored in the Growth Period. Table 3-4 indicates the final outcome of the two-stage screening.

Table 3-4. The Final Outcome of the Two-Stage Screening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Relevant/Unnecessary &amp; Irrelevant</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Relevant/Unnecessary &amp; Irrelevant</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding Period</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30/40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17/12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Period</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>73/53</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51/34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>103/93</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>68/46</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis: Qualitative Content Analysis**

After identifying 103 relevant publications (29 journal articles and one book chapter in the Founding Period and 73 journal articles in the Growth Period), I conducted qualitative content analysis of 103 publications to examine if, and how, the executive-centered approach influenced the founding and
growth of Korean mainstream public administration scholarship. I used qualitative content analysis as my data analysis method for the following reasons. In explaining why I chose qualitative content analysis, I will compare it with its quantitative counterpart because the merits of qualitative content analysis can best be understood by examining the limitations of quantitative content analysis.

First, unlike quantitative content analysis that emphasizes the “objective, systematic and quantitative description of the manifest content” of a document (Berelson 1952, 18), qualitative content analysis is useful in analyzing not only its manifest content but also its latent content, or the “underlying meaning of the text” (Graneheim and Lundman 2004, 106). While quantitative content analysis focuses on simply counting “manifest textual elements” in a document (Zhang and Wildemuth 2016, 319), qualitative content analysis seeks to interpret the latent content, which is “written between the lines and is not subject to discovery via counting” (Starosta 1988, 372).

The correct interpretation of the latent content of mainstream scholars’ publications was important to this dissertation because it was impossible to decide if such publications endorsed the main tenets without carefully interpreting their latent content. I found that many of mainstream scholars’ publications were less than explicit as to whether they supported or rejected the main tenets of the executive-centered approach. For example, one article written in the Founding Period strongly contended that it was the moral duty of administrators to push through developmental goals (D. S. Bark 1968). If I focused only on examining manifest content of that article, I would find that it had nothing to do with Tenet 2 (public administration in the executive branch is expected to be the obedient instrument of the President) because it did not explicitly address the relationship between the president and administrators. However, when I analyzed the latent content of the same article, I realized that, in actuality, it supported Tenet 2 because it was the president who established developmental goals in the Founding Period. In fact, my analysis of the latent content of the above-mentioned article revealed that its author emphasized administrators’ strong commitment to the president and his developmental goals. As a result, I found

---

31 I could find only one relevant book chapter because, in the Founding Period, mainstream scholars were more interested in introducing new administrative concepts and theories than applying such concepts and theories to the Korean context in their book chapters (P. S. Kim 2012).
qualitative content analysis to be useful for investigating the latent content of mainstream scholars’ academic publications.

Second, in contrast to “context-free” quantitative content analysis, qualitative content analysis emphasizes the importance of context in the understanding of texts in a document. This “context-sensitive” method rests on the belief that a text is not written in a vacuum, but in a given context which affects its meaning (Creswell 2012). Tosh (2002) even went so far as to state that context “is . . . as important as text itself” in the understanding its meaning (95). By carefully examining the contextual meaning inscribed in a text, qualitative content analysis seeks to correctly interpret what the text says (Hsieh and Shannon 2005; Marshall and Rossman 1999).

Context-free quantitative content analysis might be misleading in examining the influence of the four tenets of the executive-centered approach. For example, several mainstream scholars emphasized the importance of “democracy” as one central value of public administration. Although they seemed to support the importance of building Western-style democracy, which upheld the principle of limited government and cherished the individual rights, a careful examination of the context in which they used the term “democracy” revealed that what they meant by “democracy” was the so-called “Koreanized democracy,” which emphasized “the subordination of the rights of citizens to their duties towards the nation” (Helgesen 2014, 168). This example shows that context-free analysis of a text might provide the incomplete or distorted information about the text. As a result, in order to understand the context in which particular meanings emerge from texts, I decided to use qualitative content analysis in this dissertation.

Third, qualitative content analysis is useful for discerning the dominant themes of mainstream scholars’ publications. As Zhang and Wildemuth (2016) noted, “quantitative content analysis usually uses individual themes as the unit of analysis, rather than the physical linguistic units . . . most often used in quantitative content analysis” (320). However, this does not necessarily mean that quantitative content analysis does not seek to discern the major themes of a document. In fact, quantitative content analysis is

---

32 Holsti (1969) defines theme as “a single assertion about some subject” (116).
very different from its qualitative counterpart in “detecting” the central themes of a document. Quantitative content analysis is based on the assumption that the counting of the recurrence of words can “provide an accurate rendering of the issues (or themes) that are salient within texts” (Roberts 1989, 153). In other words, the most frequently used words in a document are believed to reflect the dominant themes of the document. In contrast, qualitative content analysis runs counter to this quantitative assumption. In this qualitative tradition, “a glorified frequency count” of words (Carney 1972, 26) is not believed to automatically reveal the major themes of a document because, as Zhang and Wildemuth (2016) pointed out, “An instance of a theme might be expressed in a single word, a phrase, a sentence, a paragraph, or an entire document” (320). In fact, qualitative content analysis is based on the assumption that the central themes can be not only explicitly stated but also implicitly implied in a document. As Braun and Clarke (2006) noted, in qualitative content analysis “the importance of a theme is not necessarily dependent on quantifiable measures, but rather on whether it captures something important” that a document is meant to convey to its audience although it is only implicitly revealed in the document (82).

In capturing the central themes of a document, qualitative content analysis emphasizes the in-depth and careful reading of the whole document rather than the counting of its physical linguistic units such as words (Marshall and Rossman 1999; Stacks 2011) because it seeks to unearth any “[implicit] theme that is not frequent but that is nevertheless telling” (Starosta 1988, 381). As Miller and Jaja (2005) noted, “[central] themes are identified and extracted from the [textual] data through reading and rereading the data, sometimes called immersion in the data” (730; emphasis original).

Qualitative content analysis, by nature, is a data analysis method of discerning the central themes in any document, (Starosta 1988). Because the purpose of this dissertation is to examine if, and how the four tenets underlying the executive-centered approach prevailed as the dominant themes of Korean mainstream public administration scholarship in the Founding Period and the Growth Period, qualitative content analysis can be the appropriate data analysis method for the purpose of this dissertation. In addition, given the fact that such dominant themes were only implicit in many of mainstream scholars’
publications, it is clear that an in-depth and careful reading of mainstream scholars’ publications is necessary to capture their implied themes. In this sense, qualitative content analysis can be a good data analysis method for this dissertation.

**Conclusion: Methodological Limitations**

From a methodological viewpoint, this dissertation has the following limitations. First of all, selection bias might be involved in screening out unnecessary publications and separating relevant from irrelevant publications. Given the fact that there are no objective criteria by which to decide whether one publication is relevant or irrelevant, it is clear that subjective criteria must be developed and used in deciding the relevance of mainstream scholars’ publications. As a result, a two-stage sorting process was not free from selection bias. Although my two colleagues’ involvement in this two-stage sorting process served to alleviate selection bias, it could not completely remove it.

Second, my qualitative analysis of the “latent” content of mainstream scholars’ relevant publications inevitably involves my own interpretation. This interpretation might be criticized for being arbitrary. However, it is impossible to develop a deep and nuanced understanding of the influence of the executive-centered approach on Korean mainstream public administration scholarship without interpreting the latent content of mainstream scholars’ publications. As a result, whenever I interpreted the latent content of a publication and used that interpretation to support my argument, I tried to display the logic of my interpretations in as much detail as possible so that potential readers can evaluate the reasonableness of my interpretations.

Before turning to my interpretations of mainstream public administration scholarship in the Founding Period, the next chapter, Chapter IV, will explain the governing order of the Founding period in order to improve understanding of the context in which mainstream scholars conducted their research. It is impossible to correctly interpret the latent content of mainstream scholars’ academic works in the Founding Period without understanding the governing order.
CHAPTER IV:
GOVERNING ORDER IN THE FOUNDING PERIOD

Introduction

As explained in the Introduction, the periods examined for this dissertation are the Founding Period (1962-1972) and the Development Period (1973-1987). In order to appreciate the examination of Korean mainstream public administration scholarship of these two periods, it is important to understand the context of mainstream public administration scholarship, the governing order of each period. Thus, the dissertation first turns to a description of the governing order of the Founding Period in this chapter, Chapter IV, followed in the next chapter, Chapter V, by a careful investigation of whether and how the executive-centered approach affected mainstream scholarship in the Founding Period. Chapter VI focuses on explaining the governing order of the Development Period and, then, Chapter VII seeks to examine the extent to which the executive-centered approach influenced mainstream scholarship in the Development Period.

The first period reviewed in this dissertation, the Founding Period (1962-1972), encompasses the period of the Third Republic (1963-1972). Before the Third Republic was founded in 1963, Korea underwent two important constitutional experiments in terms of governing order. The First Republic’s Constitution (July 1948–June 1960), on the surface, seemed to uphold the principle of separation of powers, but in reality advocated executive-centered governing order by establishing a “monarchical” presidential system (C. Y. Pak 1968, 112) in which the President with extraordinarily strong constitutional powers could easily encroach upon authority of the legislative and judicial branches. In the absence of legislative and judicial checks on the President, the presidential system of the First Republic soon descended into a presidential dictatorship. To prevent the recurrence of presidential dictatorship, the Second Republic’s Constitution (June 1960–May 1961) abolished the presidential system and, instead, introduced a parliamentary system. By concentrating all important powers into the legislative branch, it
espoused the principle of legislative supremacy.\textsuperscript{33}

However, the Third Republic’s Constitution revived executive-centered governing order by bringing back the “monarchial” presidential system—although it still maintained the principle of separation of powers on the surface. Severely charging the Second Republic’s parliamentary system with having created political instability and social chaos, the chief architects of the Third Republic’s Constitution justified giving extraordinary powers to the President on the grounds that only a strong executive could maintain political stability and promote economic growth (B. Y. Choy 1971; Dull 1948; Henderson 1968; J. K. Oh 1968). In a word, Korea’s constitutional experiments had the effect of adopting a “monarchial” type of executive-centered governing order.

In this chapter, I will first examine how a “monarchial” type of executive-centered governing order became firmly institutionalized in the Founding Period—or, in the Third Republic—by comprehensively reviewing the Third Republic’s Constitution. Then, I will explore how monarchial executive-centered governing order enabled the strong president to build the authoritarian developmental state, which exercised tight control over civil society and market. In doing so, I will also pay attention to the role of public administration in defending and maintaining the authoritarian developmental state.

\section*{Introducing Monarchial Executive-Centered Governing Order}

In this section, I will carefully look into the Constitution of the Third Republic and demonstrate that monarchial executive-centered governing order was fully entrenched in the Founding Period. Special attention will be paid to how the Third Republic’s Constitution divided constitutional powers into the President, the National Assembly, and the courts.

\textbf{The Third Republic (1963-1972)}

After the military toppled the civilian government of the Second Republic in May 1961, it declared martial law and dissolved the National Assembly. Then, the military created the Supreme

\textsuperscript{33} For a more detailed explanation of the First Republic’s Constitution and the Second Republic’s Constitution, see Appendix A.
Council for National Reconstruction, a military junta which had “final authority on all matters” (Scalapino 1962, 6). The Supreme Council justified the military coup on the grounds that one of its main goals was to establish a “Koreanized democracy” (Scalapino 1962, 2). It emphasized the importance of creating “a system of democracy suitable to the needs of Korean society” (Scalapino 1962, 2) by pointing out that the blind acceptance and uncritical application of western democratic ideas and institutions greatly contributed to extreme social chaos in the Second Republic (Haggard et al. 1991).

While the Supreme Council severely criticized the so-called “excessive democracy” for threatening to destabilize society, it glorified economic development as the most important national goal. Chung-Hee Park (1971), Chairman of the Supreme Council, directly spoke to this point as follows:

In order to ensure efforts to improve the living conditions of the people in Asia, even undemocratic measures may be necessary. . . It is also an undeniable fact that the people of Asia today fear starvation and poverty more than the oppressive duties thrust on them by totalitarianism. . . In other words, the Asian peoples want to obtain economic equality first and build a more equitable political machinery afterward (39-40).

In establishing national priorities, the Supreme Council emphasized economic development at the expense of political democracy. Considering political stability as a prerequisite for rapid economic development, the Supreme Council contended that only a strong executive under the presidential system could maintain both political stability and promote economic development (B. M. Ahn 2002; C. Y. Pak 1968). In the military junta’s view, rapid economic development could be “conceivable only under strong political leadership leading to [political] stability” (C. Y. Pak 1968, 110).

The Supreme Council established the Constitution Deliberation Committee to amend the Second Republic’s Constitution. The Committee recommended a draft constitution, which supported the reintroduction of the presidential system, to the Supreme Council.\footnote{The Committee consisted of nine members and 21 advisors, most of whom were professors of constitutional law, administrative law, and political science. They were said to be relatively free from the influence by the military junta and to play a “dominant role” in creating the Constitution (S. D. Lee 1986, 19). In addition, two American law professors, Thomas Emerson of Yale Law School and Gisbert Flanz of New York University Law School, were invited by the military junta to help draft a new constitution. However, their roles in drafting the Third Republic’s Constitution remain uncertain (T. S. Kim and S. D. Lee 1992).} Accepting the Committee’s
recommendation, the Supreme Council proposed a constitutional amendment to revive the presidential system. Nationwide public hearings were held and public opinion on the proposed constitutional amendment was referred to the Supreme Council for final review. The Supreme Council decided to hold a national referendum on the constitutional amendment in December 1962. About 85 percent of all eligible voters participated and almost 79 percent voted in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment (Flanz 1967-68, 25). As a result, the presidential system was revived in the new Constitution. In October 1963, Chung-Hee Park, Chairman of the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction, was elected as President, and, in November 1963, a legislative election was held to create the National Assembly.

The Original Constitution (December 26, 1962)

The Third Republic’s Constitution—hereinafter also referred to as the 1962 Constitution—represented an “institutional return” to the presidential system of government (C. Y. Pak 1968, 113). Because the First Republic’s presidential system ended up being a presidential dictatorship, this “institutional return” was made with new constitutional safeguards against the recurrence of presidential dictatorship. As Scalapino (1963) pointed out, however, “the primacy of presidential power . . . is made emphatically clear” in the Third Republic’s Constitution (34). Most Korean scholars also cast a critical eye at the 1962 Constitution on the grounds that it fell far short of introducing strong institutional arrangements to check the powers of the powerful President (H. K. Lee 1974; S. D. Lee 1986; C. Y. Pak 1968). As a critic of the 1962 Constitution noted, “Though the new Constitution was purported to have been modeled on the democratic principle of the separation of powers, it conferred on the executive inordinate powers over the other branches” (D. K. Yoon 1988, 6).

35 The true intent of the Supreme Council to hold public hearings was “to counter the prevailing complaint that the regime was dictatorial and enjoyed little popular support” (D. K. Yoon 1988, 6) rather than to promote the active participation of the Korean people. Since the Supreme Council banned all political activities right after the military coup, it was impossible for political and civic leaders to express disagreement with the proposed amendment. As a result, the dissenting voices on the amendment were hardly heard in public hearings (S. M. Lee 2006).

36 In August 1961, the military junta issued an official statement that “the Army would return to barracks after establishing a civilian government in the spring of 1963” (quoted in S. D. Lee 1986, 18). However, the military junta broke this promise by nominating its leader, Chung-Hee Park, as the presidential candidate in the 1963 presidential election. He was elected as the first President of the Third Republic.
The President

Under the 1962 Constitution, the President was elected directly by the people (Article 64-1) for a four-year term (Article 69-1). He was allowed to run for a second term (Article 69-3). The President served as the chief of the state (Article 63-2), the chief administrator (Article 63-1), and the commander-in-chief of armed forces (Article 72).

The President had the following “unusually strong” powers: he had a range of emergency powers that enabled him to circumvent the National Assembly (Article 73); he had the power to preside over the State Council, which was instituted to help him decide “important national policies” within the scope of his powers (Article 83); he was allowed to appoint most high-ranking officials without the consent of the National Assembly; he enjoyed the de facto power to make an annual budget (Article 86); the executive branch, including the President, had the right to propose legislative bills to the National Assembly (Article 48); and he also had the right to veto legislative bills (Article 49-2). These powers

37 In the Third Republic, President Park was rather cautious about using his emergency powers. Indeed, he never used these powers. This stood in stark contrast to his excessive use of emergency powers in the Fourth Republic, during which he issued 9 emergency decrees (Y. D. Jung and C. S. Kim 2007). This frequent use of emergency powers implies that President Park increasingly became a dictator.

38 The State Council was composed of the President, the Prime Minister, and ministers (Article 83-2).

39 Article 86 of the 1962 Constitution enumerated the so-called “important national policies.” These important policies included fundamental plans and policies on state affairs; foreign policy; proposed constitutional amendments; bills and proposed orders of the President; budgets and other financial matters; extraordinary sessions of the National Assembly; state of siege; military affairs; appointment and removal of justice of the Supreme Court; and other matters presented by the Prime Minister or other ministers.

40 There were two exceptions of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Article 99-1) and the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection (Article 93-2), whose appointments required the approval of the National Assembly.

41 In practice, the power to propose bills greatly helped the executive branch dominate the legislative process. As the following Table indicates, the executive branch ‘overwhelmed’ the legislative branch in terms of the number of proposed bills, the number of passed bills, and the passage rate (SKNA 2008). Given the fact that the President had full control over the executive branch, it is clear that the President played a leading role in the legislative process by influencing the way the executive branch proposed bills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republic</th>
<th>National Assembly</th>
<th>Total Number of Bills</th>
<th>Total Number of Passed Bills</th>
<th>Passage Rate</th>
<th>Legislative-Originative Bills</th>
<th>Executive-Originative Bills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Proposed Bills</td>
<td>Number of Passed Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Proposed Bills</td>
<td>Number of Passed Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Proposed Bills</td>
<td>Number of Passed Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>6th Assembly</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>7th Assembly</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th Assembly</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Number</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)
ensured “the preponderant position of the President” in the Third Republic’s Constitution (J. K. Oh 1968, 160).

*The National Assembly*

The 1962 Constitution granted the National Assembly the legislative power (Article 35) and stated that “The term of office of members of the National Assembly shall be four years” (Article 37). It abolished the bicameral system and, instead, introduced a unicameral one largely because “the military leaders were committed to promptness of governmental action” (J. K. Oh 1968, 159). Upon examination of the 1962 Constitution, it becomes clear that it stopped far short of empowering the legislative branch to restrain the powers of the President.

The 1962 Constitution conferred upon the legislative branch the following constitutional powers to hold the President in check: the power to approve the annual budget submitted by the executive branch (Article 50-1)\(^42\); the power to approve the presidential appointments of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Article 99-1) and the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection (Article 93-2); the power to override a presidential veto (Article 49-4); the power to inspect and investigate the administration of the executive branch (Article 57)\(^43\); and the power to impeach high ranking officials in the executive branch,

\(^42\) The 1962 Constitution restrained the National Assembly from adding new items or increasing the amount of items of expense. In addition, the 1962 Constitution had a provision, which made the legislative control over the annual budget weak. According to Article 54, even if a proposed budget failed to be passed by the beginning of the fiscal year, the executive branch could, in conformity with the budget of the previous year, disburse the expenditures for 1) “emolument of public officials and basic expenditures for the conduct of administration,” 2) “maintenance cost for agencies and institutions established by the Constitution or law and the obligatory expenditures provided by law,” and 3) “expenditures for continuous projects already provided in the budget,” until the budget was adopted by the National Assembly. This limited power greatly influenced the way the National Assembly controlled the annual budget in practice. The following table shows that the legislative control over the annual budget was “feeble indeed” in the Third Republic (J. K. Oh 1968, 1960).

\(^43\) During the Third Republic, the National Assembly conducted its annual inspection every year and made 40 investigations (6th assembly, 30; 7th assembly, 10; 8th assembly, 0).
including the President (Article 61-1).\footnote{The National Assembly also had the power to impeach the judges (Article 101-1).}

Among them, two powers were considered to be especially effective in checking the powers of the President. First, the 1962 Constitution empowered the legislative branch to investigate the administration of the executive branch. One foreign observer even argued that, because of the investigative power, “The National Assembly has emerged as a more powerful body than was originally expected” (Flanz 1967-68, 30). The 1962 Constitution also had a new provision, which required the Prime Minister and the Cabinet members to appear in the National Assembly to answer questions if more than 30 assemblymen made such a request in the process of investigating particular problems of the executive branch (Article 58).\footnote{Flanz (1967-68), a strong supporter of the Park regime, expressed a deep concern that the active use of investigative power tended to “consume much of the time and energy of busy cabinet members” (30).} In the absence of other powerful constitutional measures to keep the executive branch in check, the investigative power greatly helped the legislative branch to expose and correct wrongdoing committed by executive branch officials (Flanz 1967-68; C. Y. Pak 1968).\footnote{The power to investigate particular problems of the executive branch greatly helped the legislative branch to reveal the mismanagement, corruption, and electoral fraud committed by executive branch officials and led many people to turn their backs on the Park regime (Y. C. Paik 1995). President Park saw the investigative power of the legislative branch as a great obstacle to his one-man rule and removed this obstacle by depriving the National Assembly of the investigative power in the Fourth Republic’s Constitution (see the next chapter for a detailed explanation of the Fourth Republic’s Constitution).}

Second, the 1962 Constitution had a lower voting threshold for impeaching high ranking officials of the executive branch, including the President. In order to pass a motion for impeachment, the former Constitution required two-thirds or more of members of the National Assembly to be present. Then, two-thirds or more of members present were required to approve the motion for impeachment. Under the 1962 Constitution, however, the National Assembly had the power to impeach high-ranking officials by a simple majority of its total members (Article 61-1).\footnote{In fact, the legislative branch could not use its power to impeach high-ranking executive officials throughout the Third Republic because the pro-president Democratic Republican Party (DRP) always “captured the legislature” (J. K. Oh 1968, 169) by holding a majority in the National Assembly (B. M. Ahn 2002).}

Although the legislative branch had several constitutional powers to check the President, it failed to exercise them, except its investigative power, because the Park regime assured that the pro-president Democratic Republican Party (DRP) always “captured the legislature” (J. K. Oh 1968, 169) by
committing massive electoral fraud, including vote buying, intimidation, and ballot stuffing (S. H. Kil and C. I. Moon 2001). Given the fact that decision-making in the legislative branch was based on simple majority rule in most cases, it is clear that the pro-president DRP needed to win more than half of all the legislative seats to push through bills that were designed to promote the President’s political and policy agenda or discourage the main anti-president party from holding the President in check (C. W. Park 1998). As Table 4-2 shows, the DRP dominated the three assemblies in the Third Republic.

Table 4-1. Party Division in the Third Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Party Division in the National Assembly</th>
<th>6th National Assembly</th>
<th>7th National Assembly</th>
<th>8th National Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Seats</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>Other Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Republican Party (Pro-president)</td>
<td>Democratic Political Party (Anti-president)</td>
<td>24 (16/8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>175 (131/44)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110 (88/22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41 (27/14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Democratic Party (Anti-president)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1/0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129 (102/27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45 (28/17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>204 (153/51)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113/86/27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89 (65/24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2/0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: While the former number in each parenthesis is the number of district seats, the latter number is the number of proportional representation seats.
Source: Modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)

The pro-president DLP maintained tight party discipline over its incumbents and, therefore, they always cast votes in line with the President’s wishes. As a result, the DRP-controlled assembly could not exercise its constitutional powers to hold the President in check largely because the DRP majority always rejected any attempt by the main anti-president party to exercise a legislative check on the President (S. M. Lee 2006; C. W. Park 1998). In a word, the DRP-dominated legislative branch did little more than “rubber stamp” the President’s decisions.

The DRP incumbents’ unflinching loyalty to the President was attributed largely to one constitutional provision that provided that every candidate in a legislative election must obtain a party nomination (Article 36-3). This provision prohibited candidates from running for office as independents.48 Given the fact that the President, as the head of the pro-president DRP, monopolized the power to

48 The 1962 Constitution did not allow independents to run for office in order to “prevent the political confusion caused by independents, and the corruption involved in seeking to buy their support, and also to prevent an excessive number of candidates from running for office” (Scalapino 1963, 34).
nominate candidates for the legislative elections, it comes as no surprise that the DRP incumbents who did not want to lose party nomination for the following election neither voted against any bills sponsored by the President and his political appointees nor joined any legislative initiatives to restrain their power (B. M. Ahn and K. W. Kim 1988; C. W. Park 1998). In a word, this provision greatly helped the pro-president DRP incumbents to remain faithful to the President, thus discouraging the DRP-dominated assembly from exercising its powers to check the President.

The Courts

Although the 1962 Constitution conferred upon the National Assembly insufficient powers to check the President, it granted relatively strong powers to the judicial branch, thus enhancing the principle of judicial independence. Especially, the 1962 Constitution adopted an “American-style judicial review system” (K. W. Ahn 1997-98, 86), in which the Supreme Court performed an independent role as “the final arbiter of the constitutionality of statutes and other governmental acts” (Healy 2000-01, 216). In a word, the Supreme Court acquired the strong power to effectively check the legislative and executive branches by testing the constitutionality of their laws and actions. There was “a high expectation of an active judiciary” (K. W. Ahn 1997-98, 87).

Although “Great care was taken to render the judiciary truly independent” (Flanz 1967-68, 27) in the 1962 Constitution, several provisions still left room for threatening the principle of judicial independence. First, the 1962 Constitution provided that the President exercised the power to periodically reappoint judges, who did not have the life tenure guarantee (Article 99-100). Therefore, judges were less likely to declare unconstitutional laws that the President regarded as essential in pursuing his political and policy agenda unless they ran the risk of giving up an opportunity to be reappointed (K. W. Ahn

---

49 The 1962 Constitution remained silent on whether lower courts had the power to review the constitutionality of laws. However, in 1966, the Supreme Court held that “all the courts have the power to determine the unconstitutionality of a legislation regardless of the level of the court. Yet the Supreme Court can make a final decision about the constitutionality” (quoted in D. K. Yoon 1990, 159).

50 This American-style system of judicial review received overwhelming support from Korean judges. Inspired by the judicial activism of the Warren Court in the early 1960s, the Korean judges had aspiration to establish judicial supremacy (S. D. Lee 1986).

51 The 1962 Constitution provided that “The term of office of judges shall be ten years and they may be reappointed as prescribed by Act” (Article 100).
Second, the mode of appointing the Justices of the Supreme Court stated in the 1962 Constitution posed a serious problem for judicial independence. Under the 1962 Constitution, the President had the power to appoint the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court only with the approval of the National Assembly upon the recommendation of the Judge Recommendation Council, and the power to appoint the other Justices only upon the recommendation of the Chief Justice and with the consent of the Council (Article 99). One Korean political scientist explained why this mode of appointing the Justices of the Supreme Court might undermine judicial independence as follows:

. . . the requirement that the Judge Recommendation Council must propose the Chief Justice does not pose any problem for the President. The mere fact that four judges, two lawyers, and one professor of law nominated by the President, the Minister of Justice, and the Prosecutor General constitute the Judge Recommendation Council, diminishes the constitutional significance of its power to propose the Chief Justice. Since the members of the Council are likely to be under the political shadow of the President, they may not contribute to the strengthening of judicial independence through such an elaborate mode of appointing the Chief Justice. The same thing can be said of the Justices of the Supreme Court who are appointed by the President upon the recommendation of the Council (C. Y. Pak 1968, 118).

In fact, the Judge Recommendation Council had an inherent difficulty in proposing the Justices independently because most of the nine council members were subject to strong influence from the President. By controlling these members, the President could influence the way the Council selected and recommended the candidates for the Justices of the Supreme Court (K. W. Ahn 1997-98; C. Y. Pak 1968).

Given the fact that the Supreme Court was under the strong influence of the President, it comes as no surprise that the Supreme Court hardly declared laws unconstitutional. Although trial and appellate courts challenged the constitutionality of several laws, the Supreme Court reversed their decisions in most cases (Ginsburg 2003; D. K. Yoon 1989). As Healy pointed out, “judicial activism remained more of an ideal than a practical reality” (Healy 2000-01, 216).

Throughout the Third Republic, the Supreme Court declared only two laws unconstitutional.

---

52 Judges, other than the Justices of the Supreme Court, were appointed by the Chief Justice through the decision of the Council of the Supreme Court Justices (Article 99-3).
However, these two cases caused a far-reaching and detrimental impact on the fate of the Supreme Court. In June 1971, the Supreme Court struck down Article 2(1) of the Government Tort Liability Act, which provided that if a member of the armed forces was killed during combat, drill or other duty, his family was entitled only to a military pension, which “was considerably smaller amount of money than a money judgment by a civil court” (S. D. Lee 1986, 22), and was not allowed to bring a tort action against government in a civil court. The Supreme Court held the provision of the Government Tort Liability Act unconstitutional on the grounds that it violated the equal protection clause provided in the Constitution (S. D. Lee 1986).

However, it is important to note that, before striking down Article 2(1) of the Government Tort Liability Act, the Supreme Court first had to examine the constitutionality of Article 59 (1) of the Judiciary Organization Act. When the Supreme Court began to review the constitutionality of the Article 2(1) of the Government Tort Liability Act, the President and the pro-president Democratic Republican Party (DLP) were determined to save the provision because, if the Supreme Court declared the provision unconstitutional, the Park regime would have to compensate victims and their families for their injuries and death in not only accumulated tort claims but also future ones, creating a huge burden on the state budget (D. K. Yoon 1989). Expecting the Supreme Court to overturn Article 2(1) of the Government Tort Liability Act, the DLP-controlled legislative branch passed a bill to revise Article 59 (1) of the Judiciary Organization Act in July 1970. This revision was intended to make it difficult for the Supreme Court to declare Article 2(1) of the Government Tort Liability Act unconstitutional by “raising the voting threshold required to hold a law unconstitutional from a simple majority to two-thirds of all justices” (Ginsburg 2003, 211-212). As one Korean legal scholar pointed out, “The sole purpose of the revision of Article 59(1) of the Judiciary Organization Act was to save the provision of Article 2(1) of the Government Tort Liability Act” (S. D. Lee 1986, 22).

However, by an eleven to five majority, the Supreme Court declared the revised Article 59(1) of the Judiciary Organization Act unconstitutional on the grounds that “due to the principle of separation of powers enunciated in the Constitution, an exception to the majority rule in deciding cases could only be
made by revising the Constitution itself” (Healy 2000-01, 217). Based on this decision, the Supreme Court also held Article 2(1) of the Government Tort Liability Act unconstitutional by a simple majority—a nine-to-seven majority.

By overturning the Government Tort Liability Act, the Supreme Court took on an active role in checking the executive and legislative branches and defended the principle of separation of powers. However, President Park “was not ready for such an activist Court” (Healy 2000-01, 217). The audacious decision of the Supreme Court led President Park to oppress the Supreme Court relentlessly as a “clear retaliation” (K. W. Ahn 1997-98, 88). With the founding of the Fourth Republic, the Supreme Court was deprived of its power to review the constitutionality of laws.53

The foregoing analysis of the constitutional powers of three branches indicates that although the 1962 Constitution had several provisions to strengthen the legislative and judicial branches, it stopped far short of granting them with sufficient constitutional measures to prevent the recurrence of presidential dictatorship. In other words, the 1962 Constitution failed to institutionalize the principle of separation of powers (S. D. Lee 1986; C. Y. Pak 1968). This failure could be largely attributed to the preoccupation of the military junta with “a strong and effective executive” which was believed to be necessary “to effect [sic] an industrial revolution in Korea” (C. H. Park 1971, 175). The military leaders saw the legislative and judicial checks on the President and ‘his’ executive branch as great cumbersome obstacles in achieving economic development.

This unwavering commitment to executive-centered governing order led to concentration of important powers in the hands of the President in the 1962 Constitution, even at the expense of constitutional measures against presidential dictatorship. Under the 1962 Constitution, the President was not co-equal with the legislative and judicial branches. He was rather like a monarchial ruler who stood over the other two constitutional branches (B. M. Ahn 2002; C. Y. Pak 1968).

This constitutional emphasis on a monarchial type of executive-centered governing order left

53 See Chapter VI for a more detailed explanation of how President Park disarmed the constitutional weapons of the Supreme Court and undermined its independence.
room for the President to encroach upon the legislative and judicial branches and usurp their powers. It implied that the President would often face a strong temptation to wield unlimited powers by completely controlling the other two branches. In fact, without strong constitutional safeguards to counter the strong powers of the President, the 1962 Constitution had a potential danger of promoting the rise of presidential dictatorship (K. W. Ahn 1997-98; Healy 2000-01; C. H. Park 1998).

### The 1969 Constitutional Amendment (October 27, 1969)

Although the 1962 Constitution granted the President extraordinarily strong powers, it imposed a two-term limit on the President in order to prevent the recurrence of presidential dictatorship. However, President Park became increasingly dissatisfied with the fact that he could exercise these strong powers for no more than two terms—especially after he was re-elected in 1967. Although he repeatedly pledged not to revise the 1962 Constitution to stay longer in office, he broke his pledge by pushing the pro-President DRP into proposing and passing a constitutional amendment in 1969 to lift the two-term limit on the President (B. M. Ahn 2002; Y. C. Han 1971).

In September 1969, the DRP proposed a constitutional amendment, which allowed President Park to run for a third term in 1971. The DRP made the following arguments to support the proposed amendment:

First, South Korea needs a strong leadership to maintain political stability, which is a pre-condition for . . . economic development. As of this moment, Park is the only one who could continue to provide such a leadership. Second, continuity in political leadership is essential to the ultimate success of economic development plans. . . . The economy of South Korea made remarkable progress under the first two five-year plans initiated and carried out by the Park regime. In order to maintain the momentum and make the third five-year plan (1972-1976) successful, Park should stay in power. Finally, the continuation of Park’s rule is needed for national security reasons . . . . North Korea appears determined to communize the whole of Korea by military means . . . . The transfer of power in the south, in the face of provocative acts by the north, would cause political and social unrest. (Y. C. Han 1971, 243-244).

---

54 In the 1962 Constitution, one third or more of the total members of the National Assembly could introduce a proposal to amend the existing Constitution. In addition, 500,000 voters or more could collectively request a constitutional amendment (Article 119-1).
However, the anti-president assemblymen regarded this constitutional amendment as paving the way for President Park to remain in power for life, thus establishing his permanent rule. Therefore, they were determined to obstruct the passage of the proposed amendment. Confronted with strong resistance from the anti-president party, however, the pro-president DRP neither gave up its plan to pass the constitutional amendment nor persuaded the anti-president party to negotiate over it. Instead, the DRP blocked the anti-president assemblymen from attending a voting session for the proposed amendment and “railroaded” it without their participation (Y. C. Han 1971; D. K. Yoon 1988). One Korean scholar described how the pro-president DRP “railroaded” the 1969 constitutional amendment as follows:

... [T]he ruling [Democratic Republican] party clandestinely called into session its members of the [National] Assembly in another building across the street. This was at 2:29 a.m. on September 14, 1969 early Sunday morning. On hand were 122, more than the required two-thirds... The vote was taken and the amendment was carried without a dissenting vote... Thus, without the participation of the opposition, a third term was made lawful for President Park. While opposition members were occupying the Assembly building, ruling party members held a separate session under heavy security. They went so far as to keep the lights out until the discussion actually got underway. It was too late when the opposition members caught on and stormed into the building (D. K. Yoon 1988, 7).

After the 1969 constitutional amendment was passed in this less than admirable fashion in the National Assembly, the Park regime massively mobilized administrative and financial resources to encourage the Korean people to approve the constitutional amendment in the 1969 national referendum. For example, the Park regime forced government officials to campaign openly for the 1969 constitutional amendment, thus breaking the principle of political neutrality. Although, in previous elections, government officials were also mobilized to help the pro-president party, they had not campaigned openly for it, but supported it behind the scene (S. H. Kil and C. I. Moon 2001). As one Korean political scientist pointed out, “the 1969 referendum was notable for the scope and thoroughness of the interference” (Y. C.

55 The 1962 Constitution required a proposed amendment to receive the concurrent vote of two thirds or more of the total members of the National Assembly if it was to be passed (Article 120-2). When the pro-president DRP proposed the 1969 constitutional amendment, it had more than two thirds of the total legislative seats (see Table 4-2).
56 The 1962 Constitution required a proposed amendment to not only be passed in the National Assembly but also be approved by a national referendum (Article 121-1).
Han 1971, 246). The Park regime also spent a huge amount of money “buying” votes during the 1969 referendum campaign. For example, while the anti-president party failed to raise even 300,000 dollars, which was needed to maintain official observers at each polling place on the referendum day, the pro-president DRP could spend about 60 million dollars in the referendum campaign (Y. C. Han 1971). Largely because of the illegal mobilization of administrative and financial resources, the constitutional amendment was approved in the 1969 national referendum. Almost 76 percent of all eligible voters participated and around 65 percent voted in favor of the 1969 constitutional amendment (Smith 1986).

The passage of the 1969 constitutional amendment clearly demonstrates that President Park remained hostile to the principle of separation of powers, holding a firm belief that the legislative branch should play a marginal role of simply legitimizing whatever he decided. By taking full advantage of the power to nominate candidates for the legislative elections, President Park, as the head of the pro-president RDP, easily pushed reelection-seeking RDP incumbents into passing the 1969 constitutional amendment (Y. C. Han 1971; Y. D. Yoon 1988). In fact, President Park de facto usurped the power of the legislative branch to pass the 1969 constitutional amendment. In his eyes, the legislative branch was not co-equal with him: it was simply a “subordinate agent of executive authority” (D. K. Yoon 1995, 404). By breaking the principle of separation of powers, Park’s government quickly moved towards another dictatorial regime.

Monarchial Executive-Centered Governing Order, the Authoritarian Developmental State, and the Role of Public Administration

As discussed in the previous section, in the Founding Period, the Third Republic’s Constitution maintained the principle of separation of powers on the surface, but allowed the President to exercise

---

57 After the sixth amendment went into effect, the DRP incumbents became even more faithful to the President. The sixth amendment enabled President Park, if elected in the 1971 presidential elections, to remain in power for a third term—from February 1972 to February 1976. As a result, reelection-seeking DRP incumbents became even more dedicated to advocating the President’s policy agenda because President Park, if reelected, would continue to exercise the power to nominate candidates for legislative elections until the end of his third term (Y. C. Han 1971). As one Korean political scientist noted, “The most serious consequence of the 1969 constitutional revision . . . is that the [pro-president] party is becoming more and more identified with and dependent upon the policies . . . of one man, [President] Park. Power is being concentrated excessively in one individual” (Y. C. Han 1971, 256).
extraordinarily strong powers. In contrast, the constitutional powers of the legislative and judicial branches stopped far short of holding the President in check (D. K. Yoon 1988). In fact, the Third Republic’s Constitution upheld the governing order of “monarchial” executive-centered governing order in the Founding Period.

This monarchial executive-centered governing order enabled the President to play a dominant role in steering the ship of state and build what is later called the “authoritarian developmental state” in the Founding Period (E. M. Kim 2010, 97). This strong state was “authoritarian” in that it harshly cracked down on civil society’s demand for the transition to democracy (B. K. Kim 2011; H. R. Kim 2003); it was also “developmental” in that it attempted to achieve rapid development by effectively “governing” the market (Chang 1994; Chibber 1999). In the absence of the legislative and judicial checks, the monarchial President could exercise exclusive control over the executive branch and easily push its administrators, as his faithful agents, into running the authoritarian developmental state in the way he wanted. In this “hard” state, the proper role of public administrators was whatever role the President wanted them to play. In fact, public administration became the President’s “efficient and submissive instrument” in defending and maintaining the authoritarian developmental state (S. H. Chung 1998, 327).

State–Civil Society Relations: The Authoritarian State and the Role of Public Administration

In this section, I will explore how the monarchial President ran the state in terms of its relation to civil society and market in the Founding Period. More specifically, I will examine how the authoritarian developmental state under President Park of the Third Republic controlled civil society and market. In doing so, I will also pay attention to the role of public administration in defending and strengthening the authoritarian developmental state.

President Park of the Third Republic viewed civil society as a sphere of citizens’ struggle against his authoritarian regime. In particular, the Park regime held an antagonistic stance toward political activist groups—including student groups—committed to democracy and advocacy groups devoted to public interest, human rights, occupational health and safety, and other good causes. By exercising the exclusive control over the executive branch, President Park pushed its administrators into mounting attacks against
advocacy groups and political activists’ groups (S. H. Kim 1997; H. Y. Cho 2000).

The Park regime launched attacks against civil society in two ways. First, it curbed the growth of advocacy groups by trampling on citizens’ right to associate freely according to their own interests and wishes. In 1963, the Act on the Registration of Social Organizations (ARSO) was passed to “suppress anti-government activities of civil organization” (H. R. Kim 2000, 601). The ARSO made it mandatory for civic groups to register with relevant government agencies and obtain their approval. These agencies also had the authority to cancel the registration of civic groups when these groups failed to meet their requirements. Because many provisions of the ARSO were written in vague language, public administrators in government agencies were allowed to use a good deal of discretion in deciding whether to approve or cancel the registration of civic groups under their jurisdictions (H. R. Kim 2013).

Under the guidance of President Park, public administrators took part in obstructing the growth of advocacy groups. By using a broad range of discretion in line with the President’s wishes, they not only refused to approve the registration of advocacy groups which challenged the major policies of the Park regime but also cancelled the registration of civic groups which held a critical stance toward the Park regime (H. R. Kim 2013). As one Korean sociologist points out, “Only . . . government-patronized organizations in civil society enjoyed free existence under military authoritarianism” (H. Y. Cho 2000, 279).

In addition to controlling the registration of advocacy groups, the Park regime took full advantage of the power of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (KCIA) in oppressing political activist groups and student groups. Although the original goal of the KCIA was to defend national security from communism, President Park empowered the KCIA to orchestrate the “sophisticated and systematic repression of any element within South Korea’s society that challenged his political power” (P. Y. Park 2007, 217). As one Korean political scientist pointed out, “the centerpiece of Park’s power apparatus was the Korean Central Intelligence Agency” (B. K. Kim 2011, 143).

58 For example, all civic groups were required to report their membership and main activities to relevant agencies on a regular basis. This requirement enabled government agencies to keep civic groups under close control (H. R. Kim 2013).
The Central Intelligence Agency Act, which was enacted in 1961, placed domestic as well as foreign intelligence functions within the legal jurisdiction of the KCIA (Article 1) and authorized the KCIA to “coordinate and supervise state ministries’ intelligence and investigation activities” on issues related to national security (Article 2-5) and directly investigate those who threatened the national security (Article 2-3). The CIA Act also enabled the KCIA to “receive support and assistance from all state institutions when necessary for [its] work” (Article 14) and empowered the KCIA director to transfer any administrators from other ministries or agencies to the KCIA and hire them for any given period of time (Article 9). In a word, in terms of intelligence and investigation functions, the KCIA stood at the apex of all executive ministries and agencies and held power to exercise complete control over them.

The KCIA faithfully executed the will of President Park in oppressing his opponents and critics. It was thus his chief coercive instrument for maintaining his authoritarian regime. The KCIA agents actively exercised intelligence power to monitor the activities of political opponents in anti-president parties and other political dissidents and student activists in civil society. Furthermore, the KCIA agents were directly involved in blackmailing, intimidating, torturing, and even killing them (B. K. Kim 2011; B. C. Lee 2003).

President Park held an even more antagonistic stance towards pro-democracy civil society activists, most of whom were university students, than his political adversaries in anti-president parties (S. H. Kim 1996). Therefore, the KCIA often fabricated evidence to frame political dissidents and student activists as communists or communist sympathizers and then charged them with violating the Anti-Communist Law (ACL) and National Security Law (NSL). By exercising the power to supervise and

---

59 It is important to indicate that the legislative branch did not pass the CIA Act, but the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction (SCNR), a military junta headed by General Park, did so. Through the 1961 military coup, the military dissolved the legislative branch. Instead, the SCNR acted as a temporary legislative body (Henderson 1968).

60 Right after the 1961 military coup, the Anti-Communist Law (ACL) was enacted to “strengthen the anticommunist posture . . . [and] block the activities of the communist organizations that endanger the national security” (N. H. Lee 2007, 82). The ACL allowed government to punish “any person who has praised, encouraged, or sided with anti-state organizations or members thereof on foreign communist lines or benefited the same in any way through other means” (N. H. Lee 2007, 82). Although the NSL and the ACL substantially overlapped in content, the military regime enacted the ACL “in order to emphasize anti-communism as a prime purpose of the regime” (K. Cho 1997). The ACL was merged with the NSL in 1981.
coordinate intelligence and investigation activities, the KCIA easily pressured police officers into arresting innocent activists, prosecutors into indicting them, and the courts into convicting them on fabricated charges of cooperating with or sympathizing with communists (B. K. Kim 2011).

The deliberate fabrication of the so-called “communist” charges against innocent civil society activists was intended not only to silence their criticism but also to manipulate public opinion in favor of the Park regime. The KCIA intentionally put into action its fabrication schemes to charge civil society activists with conspiring with the communist regime in the North to topple the government in the South just before presidential and legislative elections were held. This fabrication dramatically increased the fear of communism among citizens who had experienced the communist invasion in 1950. This escalating fear encouraged many citizens to cast votes for pro-president candidates who glorified national security rather than anti-president candidates who supported democracy (B. C. Lee 2003).

**State–Market Relations: The Developmental State and the Role of Public Administration**

President Park of the Third Republic tried to maintain his authoritarian regime by promoting economic development as the most important national goal. His full commitment to economic development arose in part from his lack of political legitimacy. President Park was the chief architect of the military coup that toppled a legitimate, democratically elected government in May, 1961. Although Park ran as a civilian candidate for the Democratic Republican Party in the 1963 presidential election and won the presidential race, “the lack of legitimacy was the Achilles’ hill of Park’s regime from the outset” (H. K. Han 2003, 250). President Park attempted to win wide public support by attaining economic

---

61 The National Security Law (NSL) was enacted in 1948 to defend South Korea from Communist North Korea. To prevent communist subversion from within, the NSL allowed government to punish communists and communist sympathizers. For example, the NSL prohibited South Koran citizens from contacting, supporting, and praising the communist regime in North Korea.

62 In addition, the KCIA produced and spread false information that labeled anti-president candidates who supported democracy as communists or communist sympathizers. Exploiting the fear of citizens about communism, the KCIA misled many citizens into supporting pro-president candidates who emphasized national security. Furthermore, the KCIA extracted a huge amount of illegal political donations from industrialists to cover the campaign expenses in presidential and legislative elections (B. K. Kim 2001).

63 After the 1961 military coup, Park ruled through the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction until he was elected as President in the 1963 election. However, Park did not voluntarily agree to hold the 1963 presidential election. Although he planned to extend the military rule, his plan faced strong opposition from the U.S. As a result, Park had no choice but to hold the 1963 presidential election (Haggard 1990).
development which most people saw as the most important national goal, rather than struggling with the issue of political legitimacy (S. H. Kil 2001; B. C. Lee 2003).

Right after the 1961 military coup, the Supreme Council for National Reconstruction, a military junta headed by General Park, accused leading industrialists of illicitly accumulating wealth and launched a nationwide campaign against the so-called “illicit wealth accumulators.” The Supreme Council arrested industrialists and even threatened to expropriate their properties. Although the Supreme Council released industrialists on the condition that they should invest their wealth in new industries whose growth the Supreme Council believed to contribute to rapid economic development, it nevertheless sent a strong message that, in terms of the relationship between the state and business, industrialists were no longer co-equal partners (E. M. Kim 1997). In fact, the state was “the primary decision-maker” whose policy decisions should be “taken by businessmen as equivalent to compulsory orders” (B. N. Song 1990, 91).

However, the Park regime was far from being anti-industrialists. In fact, it co-opted industrialists into the quest for economic development and created what is called the “developmental alliance” (Hundt 2008) with industrialists as its junior partners in its growth-oriented economic development model (Caiden and Jung 1985; E. M. Kim 1997). Kamuzora (2006) succinctly explained the rationale of growth-oriented economic development model as follows:

Societies can break out of the vicious circle of poverty and underdevelopment only by placing the highest priority on . . . overall economic growth, at the expense of social spending. The reasoning is that when adequate rates of growth are achieved the benefits will “trickle down” to all; according to this perspective, too much emphasis on equity now will jeopardize economic growth and perpetuate poverty and deprivation (69).

Since a growth-oriented economic development model posited that industrialists’ accumulation of wealth would lead them to expand investment in existing industries and jump into new industries, thus boosting economic growth, the Park regime offered industrialists the opportunity to “serve the nation through the enterprise” (Chang 1993, 152) rather than punishing them for accumulating wealth illicitly.

---

64 Chang (1993) even described the industrialists under the military rule as “a paper tiger with little power to make investment decisions—the ultimate capitalist prerogative” (152).
Industrialists did not hesitate to accept the offer because they could not maintain or increase their wealth without cooperating with the Park regime (Amsden 1989; Chang 1994; Fields 1995).

In order to foster economic growth, the Park regime enthusiastically pursued an export-oriented growth plan. It ‘herded’ industrialists into nurturing labor-intensive manufacturing industries such as clothing and cheap electronics and helped them export their manufactured goods overseas. The Park regime believed that if export-oriented industries accumulated sufficient capital to expand their investment, the benefits of investment expansion—for example, job creation—would trickle down to all segments of the population (Caiden and Jung 1985). Although it is debatable whether the benefits of the Park regime’s export-oriented growth plan trickled down or not, it is undeniably true that the Park regime attained tremendous economic growth. For example, the average annual growth rate was 8.8 percent in the 1962-1971 period, which was twice as high as the rate prior to 1962. Per capita income drastically increased from US$ 82 in 1961 to US$ 286 in 1971 (B. N. Song 1990).

However, it is important to indicate that growth-oriented economic development came at the price of inequality. As Caiden and Jung (1985) indicated, “the issue of income distribution and equitable social development was not considered important by the Park government. [For the Park regime,] it seemed pointless to worry about the redistribution of wealth until there was something to distribute” (22). The Park regime emphasized the importance of ‘cheap labor’ which greatly helped export firms to remain competitive in the international market. As a result, the Park regime often intervened in labor-management disputes to suppress workers’ collective demands for fair wages, reasonable working hours, and safe working conditions (S. H. Kim 2005). In short, the Park regime emphasized growth at the expense of equity.

Although the Park regime encouraged industrialists to accumulate wealth to the detriment of low-income workers’ interests, it emphasized the role of the ‘hard’ state in disciplining industrialists who

---

65 The Park regime’s pursuit of export-oriented industrialization did not necessarily mean that it gave up the protectionist policies. As Chang (2008) noted, “Korean exports in the earlier period . . . were all means to earn the hard currencies needed to pay for the advanced technologies and expensive machines that were necessary for the new, more difficult industries, which were protected through tariffs and subsidies” (xxi).
would have otherwise pursued their own economic interests and pushing them into contributing to the national goal of economic development (Chibber 2002; Wade 1990). In fact, the Park regime established the “developmental state” whose goal is “to “guide” or “govern” the process of resource allocation so as to produce a different production and investment profile than would result under a free market system” (Onig 1991, 112).

The developmental state pursued the so-called “industrial policy,” which is “commonly known as “selective industrial policy” or “targeting”—namely, a policy that deliberately favors particular industries over others, against market signals, . . . [in order] to enhance efficiency and promote productivity growth” (Chang 2011, 84). As Onig (1991) noted, “A high degree of selectivity was the centerpiece of industrial policy” (112). The goals of industrial policy were first, to identify and select infant industries to be developed; second, to provide a selected group of infant industries with “tariff protection, subsidies, and other forms of government support (e.g. overseas marketing services provided by a state export agency) until they ‘grew up’ enough to withstand international competition” (Chang 2008, xx); and third, to monitor their performance (Amsden 1989; Wade 1990).

The Park regime did not hesitate to punish firms that were badly managed. The Park regime specified stringent performance requirements in return for its subsidies and tariff protection and refused to bail out firms which failed to meet its performance standard (Fields 1995). As Chang (2007) noted, “tariff protection and subsidies were not there to shield industries from international competition forever, but to give them the time to absorb new technologies and establish new organizational capabilities until they could compete in the world market” (15). The Park regime also nationalized all the banks to “direct the life blood of business—credit” (Chang 2008, xx). The control over the banking system made firms remain in strict compliance with the Park regime’s industrial policy because the state-owned banks would have ignored recalcitrant firms’ applications for bank credit or not renewed their bank loans (E. M. Kim 1997).

However, it is important to indicate that the Park regime could not push through industrial policy without the help of public administrators in the Economic Planning Board (EPB), a pilot agency which exercised strong coordinating authority across executive ministries and agencies in terms of industrial
policy. Because politicians lacked the economic expertise to handle industrial policy, the EPB administrators were actively involved in designing, implementing, and monitoring industrial policy. First, they selected target industries to be developed; second, they identified and chose the best means of rapidly developing the target industries; and third, they monitored the performance of the target industries to increase their international competitiveness (Chang 1994; C. K. Chung 1989). In fact, the EPB—in particular its administrators—was the chief architect of the Park regime’s industrial policy.

Conclusion

My careful review of the Third Republic’s Constitution indicates that although the Korean presidential system was modeled after the U.S. presidential system, it failed to institutionalize the principle of separation of powers, which is an essential foundation of the U.S. presidential system. In the Third Republic, the Constitution maintained the appearance of separation of powers, dividing national powers into three constitutional branches. In reality, however, the Constitution glorified executive-centered governing order, concentrating all important powers in the President (S. D. Lee 1986; C. Y. Pak 1968). The Korean presidential system was a far cry from that of the U.S. in that it emphasized the principle of concentration of powers.

The Framers of the U.S Constitution invented the presidential system in order to inject what Hamilton called “energy in the executive,” which was necessary to make a government effective and stable (Cooke 1961, 471). Despite their emphasis on a strong, effective executive, however, they also paid

66 In the previous governments, economic development policies failed to work as planned in part because there did not exist any strong coordinating authority to achieve policy coherence across executive ministries and agencies. Although economic development policies involved the issues that cut across many ministries and agencies, the previous governments hardly recognized the importance of a pilot agency that had the power to coordinate activities across different ministries and agencies and manage conflicts between them. Because economic policy-making authority was scattered across several ministries and agencies, the “parcelization of authority” (Chibber 1999, 315) often encouraged each ministry and agency to pursue its own policy priorities and compete for resources, thus generating interagency rivalry. This interagency rivalry created policy deadlock to the detriment of the long-term goals of economic development plan (Y. M. Ahn 1992; Chibber 2002). In a word, the fragmentation of economic policy-making authority was a fundamental obstacle to policy coherence necessary to achieve economic development. In order to facilitate policy coherence, the Park regime created EPB as a pilot agency that had the overriding power to coordinate different interests within the government.

67 The EPB was not created as a “line” ministry and, therefore, it was insulated from the interests of powerful clients. As a result, the EPB moved beyond merely catering to these clients to discipline them (Chang 2004).
attention to the strong possibility of the presidential system to turn into dictatorship and, therefore, threaten individual rights. To prevent the presidential system from ending up as a presidential dictatorship, they fully embraced the principle of separation of powers and constructed a limited government which, by institutional design, could not threaten individual rights because powers were dispersed among the three branches of government so that each branch could restrain the others (Cooke 1961; Diamond 1987; Epstein 2007).

Edwards and his colleagues (2004) succinctly explain the principle of separation of powers in the U.S. Constitution as follows:

Each of the three branches of governments—executive (the president), legislative (Congress), and judicial (the courts)—would be relatively independent of another so that no single branch could control the others. . . Power was not divided absolutely, however; rather it was shared among the three institutions. . . Because powers were not completely separate, each branch required the consent of the others for many of its actions. This created a system of checks and balances (45-46; emphasis in the original).

By creating the system of checks and balances, the Framers of the U.S. Constitution could attain the balance between the concern for safety from dictatorship and the need for an effective government (Diamond 1987; Green 2002). In other words, the principle of separation of powers served as an essential safeguard against presidential dictatorship, and enabled the U.S. presidential system “to secure a strong, albeit safe, national executive” (Thach 1923, 52).

Unlike the Framers of the U.S. Constitution who emphasized the importance of not only ensuring effective presidential leadership but also preventing presidential dictatorship, the architects of the Third Republic’s Constitution overestimated the importance of effective presidential leadership while underestimating that of democratic presidential leadership. As a result, powers were not dispersed among three constitutional branches; rather, they were concentrated in the hands of the President. This concentration of powers encouraged the President to often encroach upon the other two branches, thus

---

68 In addition, after debate between the Federalists and Anti-Federalists, most Founders of the U.S. Constitution supported the first ten amendments to the Constitution, which specifically emphasized individual rights (Edwards et al. 2004).
paving the way for the emergence and consolidation of presidential dictatorship (B. M. Ahn 2002; B. Y. Choy 1971; J. K. Oh 1968). As one American legal scholar observed, the effective but unsafe Korean presidential system was a “very distorted version of the U.S. presidential system” (Flanz 1967-68, 26). In fact, the Third Republic’s Constitution glorified an excessive type of executive-centered governing order rather than the separation of powers as the appropriate governing order.

This extreme executive-centered governing order provided a fertile ground for the rise of the authoritarian developmental state. By wielding his strong powers without any legislative and judicial checks, President Park of the Third Republic could easily build the authoritarian developmental state, which placed civil society and market under its strict control (S. D. Lee 1986; D. K. Yoon 1988). President Park easily made public administrators fully committed to defending the authoritarian developmental state because he dismantled the legislative and judicial checks on the executive branch and placed its administrators under his exclusive control (E. M. Kim 1997; Y. C. Paik 1995). In sum, in the Founding Period, the President acted as the sole master of public administrators and pushed them into intervening with civil society and market in a way consistent with his political and policy agenda.
CHAPTER V:
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SCHOLARSHIP IN THE FOUNDING PERIOD

Introduction

As argued in the previous chapter, in the Founding Period (1962-1972), the period of the Third Republic, the Korean Constitution maintained the appearance of a separation of powers, but in actuality extraordinarily strong powers were concentrated in the hands of the President. In contrast, it failed to empower the legislative and judicial branches to hold the President in check. In practice, the President exercised complete control over the executive, legislative, and judicial branches by abusing his strong constitutional powers. He was like a monarchical ruler who stood at the apex of the entire government (B. M. Ahn 2002; B. Y. Choy 1971; J. K. Oh 1968). Thus, a “monarchical” type of executive-centered governing order came to be entrenched in the Founding Period.

Without being subject to any legislative and judicial checks, the President could easily build the “authoritarian developmental state” that placed both civil society and market under its tight control. In the authoritarian developmental state, the President put public administrators at the forefront of controlling civil society and market in a way consistent with his political and policy agendas (Chang 1994; B. K. Kim 2011; H. R. Kim 2003). In fact, administrators were required to commit themselves to defending and strengthening the “authoritarian development state” in the Founding Period.

In the same period, a small band of scholars, who would later be called first-generation public administration scholars, attempted to found public administration as a separate field of study. By strongly supporting monarchical executive-centered governing order, first-generation scholars paid strong attention to how to make public administrators serve the president better (S. H. Chung 1998; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982). This strong commitment to monarchical executive-centered governing order led first-generation scholars to fully embrace the executive-centered approach to public administration, whether they acknowledged that embracing or not, because its main concern was to build an executive-centered public administration, which stresses administrators’ unwavering loyalty to the President (Rohr 1986;
Rosenbloom 1983; Wamsley 2005). In fact, I argue that first-generation scholars intellectually founded public administration upon the executive-centered approach.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine if, and how, the executive-centered approach influenced founding scholarship in the field of public administration. In the first section, I will explain several factors that provided fertile ground for the founding of public administration in Korea. In the second section, I will investigate how founding scholars’ acceptance of the executive-centered approach reinforced their belief in executive-centered governing order and welcomed the authoritarian developmental state with enthusiasm. Then, I will close this chapter by making several comments on the implications of the founding scholarship for the subsequent intellectual development of Korean public administration.

**The Founding of Korean Public Administration as a Field of Study**

In this section, I will briefly discuss the main factors that facilitated the founding of public administration. Special attention will be paid to the role of Korean first-generation scholars who intellectually founded public administration as an independent field of study.

**The Pioneers of Korean Public Administration Scholarship**

During the first decade after 1945, when Korea gained independence from Japan, public administration had not received a good deal of attention from scholars as a separate field of study because most scholars understood public administration as “an off shoot of political science and of another older field, administrative law” (Jun 1983, 413). Despite the scarce attention paid to public administration, several scholars began to show academic interests in public administration. The legal approach to public administration was dominant among these scholars (H. B. Lee 1970). However, the legal approach led scholars to spend too much academic attention on legal details and, therefore, discouraged them from

---

69 The prominence of the legal approach was largely attributed to the fact that these scholars were educated under the Japanese ruling and, therefore, they were strongly influenced by the Japanese scholarship that saw public administration as part of administrative law (H. B. Lee 1970).
discovering the true importance of public administration as an independent field of study (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982). Although several scholars, who were later called the “pioneers” of Korean public administration (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982, 20), recognized the importance of public administration as a separate field, the strong legal bent was so deeply embedded in academia that these pioneering scholars failed to establish public administration as a “self-conscious” field (S. T. Kang 1971). One Korean public administration scholar even described the founding process of public administration as “the rough road of emancipation” from the confines of administrative law (H. B. Lee 1970, 321).

However, even within the confines of administrative law, a small band of “self-conscious” pioneering scholars made meaningful, albeit disconnected, efforts to challenge the legal approach to public administration. In the late 1940s, pioneering scholars introduced the administrative concepts and theories of Leonard White and W. F. Willoughby to college students and emphasized the importance of the managerial approach to public administration. In the early 1950s, they also brought in the administrative thoughts of John Gaus and Paul Appleby (H. B. Lee 1970). Although the pioneering scholars encouraged their fellow scholars and students to recognize the fact that public administration was more than administrative law, they stopped short of establishing public administration as a “self-conscious” field largely because the number of pioneering scholars “was so small and the impact of their teaching was also very limited” (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982, 19). In addition, “there was no organized effort among them until the mid-1950s” (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982, 19). To break out of the shackles of administrative law and acquire its own identity as a management-oriented field, public administration as a fledgling field urgently needed strong momentum to bring together disconnected pioneering scholars and to motivate more scholars and students to pay attention to the importance of the managerial approach to public administration.

70 From the late 1940s to the early 1950s, pioneering scholars made a major contribution to the early Korean public administration scholarship in terms of teaching rather than research. They were more committed to teaching the administrative concepts and theories of advanced countries—mainly, the U.S.—rather than conducting research and writing articles or books.
Momentum for the Founding of Korean Public Administration as a Self-Conscious Field

From the mid-1950s through the 1960s, the momentum for the academic founding of public administration arose from a combination of related factors, including the publication of the first Korean textbook on public administration in 1955, the founding of the Korean Association for Public Administration (KAPA) in 1956, the founding of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University (GSPA-SNU) in 1959, the Park regime’s strong interest in public administration in the 1960s, and the publication of the Korean Public Administration Review (KPAR) in 1967.

The First Textbook on Public Administration

The publication of the first textbook on public administration contributed to the founding of public administration. In 1955, Chung In-Hung wrote the first textbook on public administration, which was later seen as the founding document of Korean public administration, in which he systematically examined the concepts and theories of the U.S. and German public administrations. Although Chung failed to examine the implication of these administrative concepts and theories for Korean public administration, his book inspired many scholars to direct academic attention upon the importance of public administration and to appreciate the need for the self-conscious departure of public administration from administrative law (I. H. Chung 1955; Y. M. Kim 1992).

The Korean Association for Public Administration

The growing interest of scholars and practitioners in public administration led the “self-conscious” pioneers to establish their own academic association, the Korean Association for Public Administration (KAPA) in 1956 (W. K. Paik 2006). The KAPA promoted the collaborative efforts of

---

71 The KAPA was composed of not only scholars (political scientists who had an academic interest in public administration and legal scholars who studied administrative law), but also public administrators who were interested in managerial skills. After the Korean War ended in 1953, the most urgent task of the Korean government was to reconstruct the physically destroyed economy. However, the Korea government lacked not only economic resources but also efficient administration in pushing through reconstruction policies. Even though a massive amount of international aid was provided to assist the postwar reconstruction of Korea, the Korean government wasted much of the aid in part because administrators often mismanaged their own executive ministries or agencies and implemented public policies inefficiently. As a result, high-ranking administrators began to pay strong attention to how to improve their managerial skills needed to run the government and implement public policies efficiently. This strong interest in managerial skills encouraged them to join the KAPA (H. B. Lee 1968).
the pioneers in establishing public administration as an independent field by providing “a rallying point for pioneering energy that had been scattered in the previous years” (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982, 22). For example, the KAPA sponsored six leading scholars to jointly translate Leonard White’s *Introduction to the Study of Public Administration* in 1958, and published a lexicon of public administration terms in 1959 (H. B. Lee 1970).

*The Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University*

The establishment of the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University (GSPA-SNU) in 1959 gave further impetus for founding public administration as an independent field. The GSPA-SNU was a product of a U.S. aid program to assist the post-war reconstruction of Korea (W. T. Kim 1969a; C. B. Lee 1991). In 1954, the U.S. Foreign Operation Administration urged the University of Minnesota to make what was called the “Minnesota Plan” to help Seoul National University (SNU) “upgrade the faculty members to the point where the programs there would compare favorably to those of high-ranking universities anywhere in the world” (McGinn et al. 1980, 91).

As part of the Minnesota Plan, the University of Minnesota decided to establish a graduate school of public administration by 1959. Before the decision to establish a new graduate school was made, the Korean and U.S. government officials had a discussion as to whether establishing such a graduate school was necessary. In 1955, Lloyd Short, Chairman of the department of political science at the University of Minnesota, was invited to facilitate the discussion. The Korean and U.S. officials

---

72 The KAPA also helped increase the communication between political scientists who supported the managerial approach to public administration and legal scholars who emphasized the legal approach. This promoted smooth transition from the legal approach to the managerial approach without legal scholars’ resistance. This smooth transition was also attributed to the fact that young scholars who studied public administration in the U.S. replaced old legal scholars in the 1960s (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982).

73 Under the Minnesota Plan, the University of Minnesota also provided assistance programs to not only the field of public administration but also other fields of study. These programs were intended “to strengthen and develop educational research in the fields of agriculture, engineering, medicine, and nursing; to establish a graduate school of public administration; to exchange professional staff; to provide technical advice for the rehabilitation of the physical plant; and to develop educational practices and procedures” (S. H. Lee 1989, 99-100). According to Dodge (1971), the U.S. government spent about 6.5 billion dollars on the Minnesota Plan, which was initiated in 1954 and terminated in 1962.
quickly reached an agreement that it was necessary to establish a graduate school of public administration. Then, the Korean government established a special committee, which was in charge of examining how similar academic institutions in other countries operated. This special committee was made up of professors of the Law College of SNU and government officials. Most committee members were the founding members of the KAPA. In 1956, the committee visited the Institute of Public Administration (IPA) at the University of Philippines, which had been founded with the help of the University of Michigan in 1952. Satisfied with the operation of the IPA, the committee urged the Korean government to endorse the plan to found a graduate school of public administration (H. B. Lee 1969; J. H. Yoo 1991).

In addition to founding the graduate school of public administration, the University of Minnesota decided to train the faculty candidates for the new graduate school. From 1957 to 1958, a total of 19 young scholars were sent to the two-year Master of Public Administration (MPA) program at the University of Minnesota. After finishing their academic training, eight of them were appointed faculty members at the GSPA-SNU and the rest of them became professors of public administration programs at other major universities (W. T. Kim 1969a; C. B. Lee 1991).

The newly established GSPA-SNU greatly accelerated the founding of public administration as an independent field in several ways. First, the GSPA-SNU produced many young public administration scholars, most of whom were later to become mainstream scholars in the field. Although the GSPA-SNU only offered the Master of Public Administration (MPA) program in its early stage, it admitted 100 master’s students every year. After receiving their MPA, many of the GSPA-SNU’s graduates went to

74 A new graduate school of public administration was supposed to be established under the Law College of Seoul National University (SNU). Therefore, the law professors of SNU were invited to join this special committee. The GSPA-SNU was separated from the Law College and became independent in 1961 (W. T. Kim 1969a).
75 The majority of 100 master students, who were admitted to the GSPA-SNU every year, were high-ranking government officials. The GSPA-SNU had two different MPA programs. While one program was offered to college graduates who wanted to pursue an academic career, the other program was intended for high-ranking government officials. Although the GSPA-SNU had an official admission policy to limit the total number of new students to 100, it did not have any policy to specify the number of new students admitted to each program. Although the difference between the two programs in terms of the number of new students varied from year to year, high-ranking officials had greater opportunity to join the GSPA-SNU than the college graduates. From 1959 to 1968, a total of 1,003 students were admitted to the GSPA-SNU. Among 1,003 students, 635 (63%) were high-ranking government officials; 368 (37%) were the students who aspired to a faculty career (D. S. Bark 1969; W. T. Kim 1969a).
western countries—in most cases, the U.S.—in order to seek their doctoral degrees, or began to teach public administration at major universities (D. S. Bark 1969; W. T. Kim 1969a). These young scholars constituted the “critical mass” which accelerated the founding of public administration and later strengthened the field (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982, 23).  

Second, the GSPA-SNU’s management-oriented curriculum served as the model curriculum for newly established public administration programs in other universities and greatly reduced the influence of administrative law. Inspired by the founding of the GSPA-SNU, many universities began to establish public administration programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels. The GSPA-SNU’s management-oriented curriculum provided a set of standards upon which other universities’ public administration programs could build their curriculum. The adoption of the GSPA-SNU’s management-oriented curriculum in the newly created public administration programs greatly diminished the influence of the legal approach to public administration and, therefore, helped public administration break out of the confines of administrative law (W. T. Kim 1969a; H. B. Lee 1970).  

Third, the GSPA-SNU professors, most of whom gained their academic training at the University of Minnesota, created the first public administration journal, the Korean Journal of Public Administration (KJPA), in 1962. By publishing their articles in the KJPA, they could easily introduce new management-oriented concepts and theories of U.S. public administration to their fellow scholars and students, and share their management-oriented research with them (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982). As a result, the KJPA greatly helped raise the self-consciousness that public administration was more than administrative law.

---

76 In 1976, the GSPA-SNU became the first institution to create the doctoral program of public administration in Korea (H. Yu 1979).
77 The GSPA-SNU’s curriculum was modeled after that of the Center for Public Administration at the University of Minnesota (W. T. Kim 1969a).
78 Most Korean universities established public administration programs not only at the graduate level, but also at the undergraduate level. One Korean public administration scholar charged that their original intention of creating undergraduate public administration programs was to make profits by enrolling more students at these programs (D. S. Bark 1968).
79 The KJPA was the only public administration journal before the Korean Public Administration Review (KPAR), the official journal of the KAPA, made its first appearance in 1967.
The Park Regime’s Growing Interest in Public Administration

In the Third Republic, the Park regime expressed a strong interest in public administration, which contributed to the founding of the field of study in Korea (S. H. Chung 1998; Y. D. Jung 1996; C. B. Lee 1991). This strong interest arose largely from the Park regime’s belief that public administration could be an effective instrument in accomplishing economic development, which was considered to be the most important national goal. Therefore, the Park regime encouraged universities to establish public administration programs on the grounds that such programs could produce competent public administrators with management skills needed to implement a wide range of developmental policies (S. H. Chung 1998; Y. D. Jung 1996). With the support of the Park regime, 11 universities established new public administration programs at the undergraduate level during the 1960s (J. P. Yoon 1987).

The Park regime’s strong interest in public administration was also attributed to the “non-political” orientation of public administration teaching, literature, and research. In fact, in the Founding Period, public administration scholars were committed to non-political research, which focused on managerial issues, without raising politically sensitive issues. Satisfied with this non-political orientation, the Park regime encouraged public administration research by providing government-funded research grants to public administration scholars (S. H. Chung 2007). For example, the Administrative Improvement Research Commission issued 25 research grants to private or university-affiliated research institutes from 1965 to 1972. Out of 25 grants, five grants were awarded to public administration-related research institutes (H. K. Ahn 1972).

Korean Public Administration Review

Last but not least, the KAPA’s creation of its official journal strengthened the collective identity

---

80 Only two universities established the department of public administration at the undergraduate level during the 1940s. Four universities founded undergraduate public administration programs during the 1950s (J. P. Yoon 1987).
81 However, the participation of public administration scholars in actual government decision-making was not apparent. As of 1970, the Park regime established nine public administration-related commissions. While 180 people were invited to join these commissions, only 18 commissioners were identified as public administration scholars (Y. H. Kim 1972).
82 Most of 25 grants were awarded to “non-political” research institutes: nine grants to business administration-related research institutes and two grants to economics-related research institutes (H. K. Ahn 1972).
among public administration scholars, which greatly helped found public administration as a separate field. In 1967, the KAPA created the Korean Public Administration Review (KPAR) and the KPAR provided a common forum for public administration scholars. Before the KPAR was created, major universities had their own academic journals in which public administration scholars published their articles on administrative theories and practices. However, these university-affiliated journals served not only public administration scholars but also those in political science and law. As a result, the university-affiliated journals fell far short of serving as a common forum for public administration scholars (H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982). In addition, the fact that universities which published academic journals restricted authorship to their own faculty members diminished the importance of the university-affiliated journals in that these journals helped promote the academic exchange of only a few public administration professors (B. M. Ahn 1986).

In contrast, the KAPA’s creation of the KPAR established a common forum for public administration scholars. By publishing and sharing academic articles in the KPAR, public administration scholars began to actively exchange their administrative ideas with each other. This active exchange not only facilitated the knowledge accumulation in public administration, but developed the collective identity among public administration scholars. By engaging in academic exchange through the KPAR, public administration scholars could find common ground in terms of their research and strengthened their identification with the newly emerging field of study. This common identity greatly promoted cohesion among public administration scholars, thus providing important impetus for the founding of the field (B. M. Ahn 1986).

First-Generation Public Administration Scholars and Their Legacy

The most distinctive characteristic of Korean public administration scholarship in the Founding Period was its transition “from legal-oriented thinking to management-oriented thinking” (C. B. Lee 1991, 225). Inspired by Leonard White’s (1926) gospel that “The study of administration should start from the base of management rather than the foundation of law” (vi), many scholars “self-consciously” discarded
the legal approach to public administration, and tried to found public administration as a “management-oriented” field (C. B. Lee 1991; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982).

However, it is important to note that although several pioneering scholars raised the importance of founding public administration as a management-oriented field in the late 1940s and early 1950s, it was a small band of scholars, referred to as “first-generation” public administration scholars, who actually founded public administration as a management-oriented field throughout the 1960s (Y. D. Jung 1996; H. B. Lee and S. T. Kang 1982; C. B. Lee 1991).

First-generation scholars, most of whom were educated at the University of Minnesota in the late 1950s and early 1960s, were strongly influenced by American public administration scholarship which stressed the management-oriented approach. After finishing their academic education, they brought the management-oriented administrative concepts and theories back home and became the ‘unrivaled’ intellectual authorities largely because not many Korean scholars had the same opportunities to receive the systematic academic training in public administration programs that the first-generation scholars had received in the United States (B. Y. Ahn 1979; S. T. Kang 1987).

First-generation scholars, who became the faculty members in undergraduate or graduate public administration programs at major universities, intellectually established public administration as a management-oriented field, thus playing a leading role in public administration research and education in the Founding Period. In terms of research, first-generation scholars devoted a great deal of effort to writing public administration textbooks (Y. D. Jung 1996; W. T. Kim 1969a). These textbooks were intended to “introduce and spread the new administrative theories of the developed countries such as the United States” (W. T. Kim 1969b, 87). Given the fact that the new administrative theories were dominantly management-oriented ones that first-generation scholars had learned in the United States, it followed that the first generation tried to establish public administration as a management-oriented field.

---

83 One scholar stated that first-generation scholars performed the role of “diffusion agents” on the grounds that they actively spread new management-oriented administrative theories across the fledgling public administration community (H. B. Lee 1970, 327).
The first generation also accelerated the founding of public administration as a management-oriented field by teaching various public administration classes to college and master level students. Since they were professors at major universities, they could directly influence the way their students understood public administration (C. B. Lee 1991). Many of these public administration students became the chief advocates for founding scholars’ management-oriented approach (S. H. Chung 1998). Thus, they played a key role in strengthening the management-oriented approach in the post-founding period.

In sum, first-generation scholars greatly shaped the contour of Korean public administration scholarship in the Founding Period by upholding the management-oriented approach. However, it is worth noting that their influence was not limited to the Founding Period. First-generation scholars, who were of relatively young ages in the Founding Period, constituted the “mainstream” of the public administration community in the post-founding period. As a result, their management-oriented approach has exerted a guiding influence on the intellectual development of Korean public administration in the post-founding period.

**The Executive-Centered Approach to Public Administration and Its Influence on Founding Scholarship in Korea**

As discussed in Chapter II (The Executive-Centered Approach to Public Administration), first-generation scholars’ management-oriented approach was based on orthodox public administrative theory—especially, the universal principles of administration and POSDCORB. Although orthodox public administrative theory seemed to be non-political and technically-oriented, it was actually political—or, normative—in that it upheld the normative ideal of “executive-centered” public administration, which identified the President as the sole master of public administrators and required administrators to remain accountable only to the president (Rohr 1986; Wamsley 2005). In fact, first-generation scholarship was based on the “normative” executive-centered approach.

When first-generation scholars attempted to intellectually found public administration upon the executive-centered approach, monarchial executive-centered governing order began to be entrenched as
the governing order. Undoubtedly, monarchical executive-centered governing order provided fertile ground for the executive-centered approach to be accepted in the field of public administration. The executive-centered approach is in an irreconcilable conflict with the principle of separation of powers, which requires public administration to serve multiple masters, not only the president but also the legislative and judicial branches. But it is in harmony with executive-centered governing order, in which the president is conceptualized as the sole master of public administration (Rosenbloom 1983; Wamsley and Dudley 1998). However, it is important to indicate that the rise of executive-centered governing order did not necessarily lead first-generation scholars to accept the executive-centered approach. If they had seen executive-centered governing order as inappropriate, they would have rejected the executive-centered approach. But, they responded with enthusiasm to monarchical executive-centered governing order and wholeheartedly accepted the executive-centered approach (D. S. Bark 1967a; H. B. Lee 1967).

In this section, I will conduct a qualitative content analysis of founding scholars’ academic works (journal articles and book chapters) to examine how the executive-centered approach shaped founding scholarship.84 More specifically, I will focus on how the four tenets of the executive-centered approach encouraged founding scholars to reinforce their belief in “monarchical” executive-centered governing order and support the rise of the authoritarian developmental state, which “monarchical” executive-centered governing order accelerated.

To systematically analyze the influence of the executive-centered approach on founding scholarship, according to the two-stage screening scheme explained in the Chapter III (Research Design), I first sorted all 70 publications written by founding scholars (64 articles published in the Korean Public Administration Review, the Korean Journal of Public Administration, and the Korean Political Science Review and six book chapters) into 30 relevant, 10 irrelevant, and 30 unnecessary publications as shown

---

84 I will use the term ‘founding scholars’ rather than the term ‘first-generation scholars’ to refer to scholars who intellectually founded public administration as a separate field of study because not only first-generation scholars but also pioneering scholars were academically active in the Founding Period. For example, in my qualitative content analysis, 24 out of 30 academic writings were authored by first-generation scholars and six writings were produced by pioneering scholars. Therefore, it seems more appropriate to use a more inclusive term ‘founding scholars’ in this chapter.
in Table 5-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Academic Publications</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>The First Screening Stage</th>
<th>The Second Screening Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unnecessary</td>
<td>Relevant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Irrelevant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, I carried out a qualitative content analysis of the 30 “relevant” publications to investigate whether the following four tenets of the executive-centered approach were approved or rejected in such publications:

Tenet 1: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be directly and solely under the President’s authority.
Tenet 2: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be the obedient instrument of the President.
Tenet 3: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to privilege managerial values at the expense of political and legal values. Managerial values include 3E (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness); political values involve 3R (responsibility, responsiveness, and representativeness), social equity, and democratic values (including participation); legal values involve individual rights, due process, and the rule of law.
Tenet 4: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to increase the administrative capacity of the executive branch to maximize the attainment of the President’s goals.

Previously in Chapter III (Research Design), I developed three relevant categories for determining which publications should be analyzed in examining each tenet’s influence on founding scholarship and allocated all 30 relevant publications into the three categories (see Table 3-3). As a result, I will not examine all 30 publications in examining the influence of each tenet on founding public administration scholarship. Instead, I will look closely into each category’s “target” publications. Table 5-2 indicates the number of “target” publications falling into three relevant categories.

---

85 Most of 30 relevant publications were assigned into multiple categories (see Table 5-5).
Table 5-2. Target Publications for Qualitative Content Analysis (Founding Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category I: Public administration &amp; Three Constitutional Branches</th>
<th>Category II: Administrative Values</th>
<th>Category III: Management &amp; Policy Prescriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding Tenet</td>
<td>Tenet 1 &amp; Tenet 2</td>
<td>Tenet 3</td>
<td>Tenet 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Publications</td>
<td>23/30 (76.7 %)</td>
<td>29/30 (96.7 %)</td>
<td>21/30 (70.0 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5-3 demonstrates the detailed outcome of my qualitative content analysis of founding scholars’ publications. In this table, I first listed founding scholars and then investigated whether their publications approve or disapprove the four tenets of the executive-centered approach. If I found a publication to either explicitly state or implicitly imply its endorsement of a tenet, I assigned the “Emphasis” marker (E) to it. In contrast, if I regarded a publication as being either critical of a tenet or indifferent to it, I assigned the “Non-Emphasis” marker (NE) to it.

Table 5-3. Qualitative Content Analysis (Founding Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Academic Journal</th>
<th>Tenet 1 President as Sole Master</th>
<th>Tenet 2 PA as Instrument</th>
<th>Tenet 3 Managerial Values</th>
<th>Political Values</th>
<th>Legal Values</th>
<th>Tenet 4 Administrative Capacity as Main Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, H. K. (1964)</td>
<td>KJPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S. (1964)</td>
<td>KJPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho, S. C. (1964)</td>
<td>KJPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, H. K. (1965)</td>
<td>KJPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S. (1965)</td>
<td>Book Chapter</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, W. H. (1965)</td>
<td>KJPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S. (1966)</td>
<td>KJPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, H. D. (1966)</td>
<td>KJPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, W. T. (1966)</td>
<td>KJPA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>Academic Journal</td>
<td>Tenet 1: President as Sole Master</td>
<td>Tenet 2: PA as Instrument</td>
<td>Tenet 3: Managerial Values</td>
<td>Political Values</td>
<td>Legal Values</td>
<td>Tenet 4: Administrative Capacity as Main Concern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, H. B.</td>
<td>KJPAA</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho, S. C.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, W. T.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, H. B.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, M. Y.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1967)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1968)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung, I. H.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1969)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, H. D.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1969)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. H.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1969)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, W. T.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1969)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, M. O.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1969)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. H.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, H. B.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kang, S. T.</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. H.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1971)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, H. K.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. H.</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1972)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Emphasis=E, Non-Emphasis=NE
Table 5-4 below shows several findings from my qualitative content analysis. First, founding scholars wholeheartedly accept Tenet 1 and Tenet 2.²⁸² Twenty two (95.7 percent) out of 23 “target” publications strongly support the normative ideal of executive-centered public administration, which emphasize the President’s exclusive control over public administrators (Tenet 1) and administrators’ steadfast commitment to the President and his political and policy goals (Tenet 2). In contrast, only one publication rejects Tenet 1 and Tenet 2 by contending that the president’s complete control of public administration might promote the rise of presidential dictatorship and, thus, the legislative branch should check the president’s control over public administration (M. Y. Lee 1967). No publications address the role of the judicial branch in controlling public administration.

Second, Tenet 3 is unreservedly endorsed in founding scholarship. While 25 (86.2 %) out of 29 target publications contend that public administrators should uphold managerial values, 11 publications (37.9 %) assert that administrators should pursue political values. While seven out of 29 target publications emphasize both managerial and political values, they place more emphasis on managerial values than political ones. Interestingly enough, no publications address the importance of legal values.

Third, founding scholars fully accept Tenet 4. All of 21 “target” publications that provide management and policy recommendations focus on building the administrative capacity of the executive branch in order to increase the accomplishment of the President’s goals rather than to respond to those of the legislative and judicial branches. In fact, there are no publications that deal with how to increase the legislative and judicial control of public administration.

These findings clearly indicate that the four tenets of the executive-centered approach were fully accepted in founding scholarship. In fact, public administration was intellectually founded upon the normative ideal of executive-centered public administration in Korea. I will further explain below how the executive-centered approach shaped founding scholarship in terms of its four tenets.

²⁸² Tenet 1 is inextricably linked to Tenet 2. If the President is identified as the sole master of public administration (Tenet 1), it is natural that public administration should be seen as the faithful agent of the President (Tenet 2). Once Tenet 1 is endorsed, Tenet 2 is inevitably accepted. In fact, all founding scholars who accepted Tenet 1 also supported Tenet 2.
Table 5-4. Findings of Qualitative Content Analysis (Founding Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Tenets</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>The Number of Founding Scholars’ Publications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President as Sole Master</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>022 (95.7 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Emphasis</td>
<td>1 (4.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA as Instrument</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>022 (95.7 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Emphasis</td>
<td>1 (4.3 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Values as Primary Values</td>
<td>Emphasis on Managerial Values</td>
<td>25 (86.2 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on Political Values</td>
<td>11 (37.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on Legal Values</td>
<td>0 (0.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Capacity as Main Concern</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>21 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Emphasis</td>
<td>0 (0.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenet 1: The President as the Sole Master of Public Administration**

The executive-centered approach upheld executive-centered governing order and conceptualized the president as the sole master of public administration. This conceptualization became Tenet 1, a central tenet which underpinned the executive-centered approach to public administration (Rohr 1986; Wamsley and Dudley 1998; Wamsley 2005). Because founding scholars fully embraced the executive-centered approach, its central tenet, Tenet 1, began to take root in Korean public administration scholarship in the Founding Period.

Founding scholars’ wholesale acceptance of the executive-centered approach can be attributed to their single-minded dedication to economic development. Stressing the importance of the strong leadership of the president in attaining economic development, founding scholars glorified executive-centered governing order as a better governing order than that of separation of powers, ending up embracing Tenet 1 without hesitation (D. S. Bark 1967a; H. B. Lee 1967).

In the Founding Period, a prominent theme had resonated most strongly with founding scholars:
national development. For example, KPAR’s first volume (1967) included a symposium on national development and the role of public administration. Many founding scholars joined the symposium and advanced their arguments about various kinds of development (political, social, and economic developments) and the proper role of public administration in each development (D. S. Bark 1967b; W. T. Kim 1967; M. Y. Lee 1967). In fact, it is no exaggeration to say that almost all founding scholars dealt either explicitly or implicitly with national development at least once in their academic work.

Although the founding scholars raised many important issues, they focused mainly on two central issues. The first issue was concerned with whether economic development should go hand-in-hand with political development or should take precedence over political development. The second issue was related to the proper role of public administration in achieving political and economic developments.

In addressing the first issue, most founding scholars explicitly or implicitly emphasized economic development at the temporary expense of democracy—one dimension of political development (D. S. Bark 1967a; W. T. Kim 1967; H. B. Lee 1967). One founding scholar went so far as to state that if the pursuit of economic development clashed with the commitment to democracy, economic development should always take priority over democracy (D. S. Bark 1965).

They gave high priority to economic development because they believed that the most important goal of government in poverty-ridden Korea was to fulfill the basic subsistence needs of people such as adequate food, housing, health care, and a minimum level of income. The fulfillment of these basic needs depended largely on economic development (D. S. Bark 1967b; H. B. Lee 1967). One founding scholar pointed out that human beings could build a democratic system designed to defend their political rights only after they met their basic subsistence needs (D. S. Bark 1967b). In the eyes of founding scholars, the

---

87 Founding scholars often used the term “development” interchangeably with the terms “modernization” in their work (H. K. Ahn 1964; D. S. Bark 1967a).
88 Only one professor, Moon-Young Lee (1967), emphasized that political development—in his words, democratic government and individual freedom—should not be sacrificed in the process of rapid economic development. His relentless faith in democracy led him to stand against the authoritarian governments during the 1970s and 1980s. Unlike other founding scholars who gained prestige by collaborating with the authoritarian governments, he was imprisoned for five years and dismissed from professorship for ten years.
elimination of absolute poverty was the primary concern while the building of a democratic government was the secondary concern.

Although founding scholars glorified economic development as the most important national goal, it does not necessarily mean that they ignored the importance of political development. When they addressed the issue of democracy as a form of government, they did not champion an alternative form of government to democracy but fully embraced democracy as an ideal system of government (D. S. Bark 1967a; W. T. Kim 1967; M. Y. Lee 1967). In fact, they were different from those government-patronized scholars who denigrated Korea as not “fit for democracy” and openly supported modernizing autocracy as an alternative form of government.

However, founding scholars reached a consensus that Korea was not “ready for democracy” because, in their eyes, Korean people lacked “citizen competence.” They pointed out that a genuine democracy required citizens to be competent in perceiving and acting upon their true interests. Then, founding scholars proceeded to argue that because a majority of Korean people were poorly educated, they couldn’t look beyond their immediate short-term needs to pursue their genuine long-term interests (D. S. Bark 1967b; W. T. Kim 1967). Holding this negative view of the Korean people’s citizen competence, founding scholars expressed a great deal of reservation about popular rule by contending that placing power in the hands of the poorly educated might encourage government to rush headlong to pursuing populist economic policies that maximized the short-term interests of the Korean people to the detriment

---

89 One founding scholar severely charged that Korean intellectuals uncritically accepted the “dogma” of western democracy and glorified the universality of western democracy. He contended that fledgling democracies such as Korea were more suited to “guided democracy.” However, even this scholar made it clear that guided democracy should be only temporary and emphasized the importance of building a genuine democracy in the long run (D. S. Bark 1965, 266).

90 The argument that Korea was not “fit for democracy” implied that its cultural values derived from Confucian traditions were inherently incompatible with democracy. According to this argument, Confucian values that emphasized the respect for hierarchical authority and the priority of the collective interest over individual interests were irreconcilable with democracy that stressed the equality of individuals and gave the priority to individual rights over collective goals (Dalton and Ong 2005; Lee 1994). In a word, this anti-democratic argument ruled out the possibility of building a democracy in Korea.

91 Because the founding scholars argued that Korean citizens were not ready for democracy does not necessarily mean that they cast skeptical eyes at democracy itself. Unlike those who strongly asserted that Korea was inherently incompatible with democracy, founding scholars had a firm belief that Korea would become increasingly “fit for democracy” in the long run (D. S. Bark 1968; M. Y. Lee 1967).
of a long-term economic development plan that was designed to increase the true interests of the Korean people in the long run (D. S. Bark 1965; H. B. Lee 1966).

In discussing how to improve citizen competence, the founding scholars argued that economic development would *ultimately* lead the Korean people to become more competent as citizens. In their view, the benefits of economic growth would trickle down to the low-income segments of the population, and the rising income in turn would encourage the economically disadvantaged families to spend much of their income on their children’s education. They supposed that these educated children would grow up to be competent citizens (D. S. Bark 1965; D. S. Bark 1970). For the founding scholars, economic development was a necessary condition for building a genuine democracy in the sense that it would promote the emergence of competent citizens.

The above discussions of the priorities of national development clearly show that the founding scholars posited a trade-off between economic development and political democracy. Although founding scholars did not discount the importance of building a genuine democracy, they expressed a deep concern that the reckless commitment to the rapid transition to a genuine democracy would slow down or hinder long-term economic development by making government responsive to the immediate needs of incompetent citizens. They even pointed out that slow economic growth was not conducive to the emergence of competent citizens, which might be *ultimately* detrimental to democracy itself (D. S. Bark 1965; H. B. Lee 1966; W. H. Lee 1965). Out of these concerns, founding scholars came to advocate a “sequenced approach” to national development: economic development first, political democracy second.

Given the fact that founding scholars championed the sequenced approach to national development, it comes as no surprise that they explicit or implicitly showed their enthusiastic support for a state-led “uneven development” strategy, which aimed to “demobilize the social and political sectors while pouring resources into the economic sector” (Johnson 1989, 70), in their academic work (D. S. Bark 1967a). However, their full commitment to economic development seemed to lead them to remain unsympathetic to the problem of civil rights violations in the developmental process. For example, not a
single scholar addressed the issue of civil rights even though government often restricted the political rights of citizens and infringed upon the constitutionally protected rights of low-wage workers (S. H. Chung 2007).

After advocating the importance of the sequenced approach that privileged economic development at the expense of political democracy, the founding scholars shifted their attention to the role of the state in the developmental process. They championed the active role of the state in attaining economic development by enthusiastically supporting the president’s agenda of “guided capitalism,” in which the strong state provided “directional thrust to the operation of the market mechanism” (Onis 1991, 110) and, in doing so, disciplined local firms and pushed them into pursuing the long-term developmental goals of the state (D. S. Bark 1971; W. H. Lee 1965). In other words, the founding scholars welcomed the rise of the developmental state with enthusiasm.

In discussing the role of the state in the developmental process, the founding scholars paid particular attention to the unified and decisive leadership of the president in developing a long-term economic development plan. Their discussion of presidential leadership indicates that they encouraged the president to exercise active leadership in the entire planning process: setting a national plan, formulating comprehensive strategies for the national plan, mobilizing and allocating resources, and outlining implementation arrangements (D. S. Bark 1966; D. S. Bark 1968; H. B. Lee 1967). In fact, founding scholars pointed out that the president’s national constituency made him more attuned to the aggregate interests of the whole people—the national interest—rather than the legislative branch whose members were inclined to represent the parochial interests of their own constituencies (D. S. Bark 1967b; W. T. Kim 1967). They argued that the president should capture and be responsive to strong popular sentiment in favor of economic development (D. S. Bark 1965). According to founding scholars, the president should provide a clear “vision” of how his development plan could improve people’s lives and come up with concrete strategies needed to realize his vision (H. B. Lee 1967, 106), mobilize and allocate scarce resources to developmental policies that had “broader ripple effects” throughout the nation (D. S.
Bark 1967b, 94), and build institutions necessary to facilitate the implementation of the developmental policies (W. T. Kim 1966).  

Although founding scholars openly advocated the leading role of the president in the economic development process, they showed disapproval of the National Assembly. For example, they often denigrated the National Assembly as “being incompetent” (W. T. Kim 1967), “seeking their particular and private interests” (D. S. Bark 1968), or “being full of bitter partisan strife” (D. S. Bark 1971). With a negative image of the legislative branch, founding scholars expressed a deep concern about the excessive legislative oversight of the executive branch on the grounds that it might slow down the implementation of developmental policies or constrain the administrative discretion necessary to carry out development policies.  

Out of this concern, they made it clear that the legislative oversight should be reduced to a minimum (D. S. Bark 1971; W. T. Kim 1967). In the founding scholars’ view, the legislative check on the executive branch was a cumbersome obstacle to the promotion of the developmental goals.

While founding scholars cast skeptical eyes at the role of the legislative branch in the developmental process, they hardly paid attention to the role of the judicial branch. In fact, only one founding scholar touched upon the role of the judicial branch and made a favorable evaluation that the judicial branch of the Third Republic had become increasingly independent and had fulfilled its constitutional role well (W. T. Kim 1967).

It is important to indicate that in the Third Republic (1963–1972), the executive branch enforced several unconstitutional laws to silence citizens’ criticism of civil rights violations. Responding to those

92 To show that the majority of people in Korea endorsed economic development as the most important national goal, a first-generation scholar provided the results of a public opinion poll conducted in 1965: when asked “what do you think is the most important problem facing Koreans?” 67 percent of respondents mentioned the economic issues as the top problems (D. S. Bark 1965, 249).

93 In addition, one founding scholar pointed out that the legislative branch lacked expertise necessary to monitor the detailed implementation of developmental policies. He emphasized that the legislative branch should establish its own policy research institute to help its members master substantive policy details and effectively monitor the implementation of developmental policies (W. T. Kim 1966).

94 For example, the National Security Act (NSA), which was enacted to “restrict anti-state acts that endanger national security and to protect [the] nation’s safety,” was criticized for suppressing the political rights of citizens as the instrument of the authoritarian regime. But, the Supreme Court defended the constitutionality of the NSA in the Third Republic. For a detailed explanation of the alleged unconstitutionality of the NSA, see D. K. Yoon (1989).
laws, citizens brought them to the Supreme Court to challenge their constitutionality on the ground that they violated political rights guaranteed in the Constitution (D. K. Yoon 1989). But, the Supreme Court did not declare any single law unconstitutional from 1963 (the birth of the Third Republic) until 1967 (the time of the publication of the article written by the above-mentioned scholar).

Given the inactive role of the Supreme Court, it is clear that the above-mentioned scholar didn’t expect the judicial branch to actively check unconstitutional actions by the executive branch or provide constitutional remedies for civil rights violations created in the developmental process. In fact, he took for granted the passive role of the judicial branch in checking the executive branch.

The above discussion of the role of three constitutional branches—the President, the National Assembly, and the Supreme Court—clearly indicates that in their strong commitment to economic development, founding scholars came to glorify executive-centered governing order (D. S. Bark 1967a; H. B. Lee 1967). Founding scholars seemed to believe that Korea’s economic fate rested solely on the shoulders of the president.

Given the fact that founding scholars discounted the role of the legislative and judicial branches, it comes as no surprise that they fully accepted Tenet 1, which identifies the president as the sole master of public administration. Founding scholars’ wholehearted acceptance of Tenet 1 is most clearly manifested in their discussion of the role of public administration in attaining economic development. Upholding Tenet 1, they discussed in detail what public administrators should do for their sole master—the president (D. S. Bark 1968; Y. H. Kim 1970; H. B. Lee 1967).

After founding scholars reached a consensus that economic development should be stressed at the temporary expense of political development and executive-centered governing order was necessary to attain economic development, they directed their academic attention to another important issue: the role of public administration in the promotion of economic development. Upon examination of founding scholarship on this issue, it becomes obvious that there was a scholarly consensus that public administrators should be actively engaged in formulating as well as implementing developmental policies
In discussing the role of public administration in policy-making, founding scholars outright rejected the strict politics/administration dichotomy by contending that career administrators should actively participate in making policies. Nevertheless, they believed that politicians—in their views, the president and his political appointees—and administrators should be involved in making policy decisions on economic development in different ways: the president should develop comprehensive strategies for accomplishing his development agenda; the heads of executive ministries and agencies should formulate concrete developmental policies in conformity with the president’s strategies; and administrators should help appointees master substantive policy details and seek the most feasible policy prescriptions, which could bring the president’s development agenda into reality (D. S. Bark 1964; D. S. Bark 1966; H. B. Lee 1967). Founding scholars argued that although administrators could offer substantive policy advice and make practical recommendations to their appointed superiors and ultimately to the president, they should not make actual policy decisions.

However, founding scholars astutely recognized that the president couldn’t translate his economic development agenda into concrete developmental policies without the help of administrators because they had expertise that even talented political appointees couldn’t match. They pointed out that administrators had long addressed complex policy problems and therefore came to acquire substantive expertise, involving experience and knowledge, in their policy domains. This substantive expertise, founding scholars claimed, enabled administrators to take into account potential obstacles—technical, legal, and budgetary—and help their appointed superiors formulate the most appropriate developmental policies (D. S. Bark 1964; D. S. Bark 1966).

Although founding scholars emphasized the importance of the policy expertise of public administrators, their emphasis didn’t necessarily mean that the heads of executive ministries and agencies, who were appointed by the president, should blindly defer to the expertise of administrators and simply follow their advice and recommendations. In fact, founding scholars cast a critical eye on administrators
on the grounds that bureaucratic inertia—in their own words, bureaucratic unwillingness to change—had plagued the entire executive branch. They contended that “change–averse” and lethargic administrators failed to make full use of their expertise in facilitating the president’s development agenda that was intended to drastically change the status quo (D. S. Bark 1966, H. D. Kim 1969). In short, founding scholars were concerned that administrators might not be fully responsive to the president’s development agenda.

Responding to the problem of the so-called “bureaucratic responsiveness,” founding scholars maintained that the president should actively exercise his appointing power to enhance bureaucratic responsiveness to him. In other words, the president was encouraged to appoint well-qualified people as the heads of executive ministries and agencies to make administrators fully committed to the president and his development agenda. Then, founding scholars proposed loyalty and policy expertise as the most important prominent criteria that the president should consider in selecting political appointees (D. S. Bark 1966; H. B. Lee 1967).

Observing the practice of selecting political appointees, however, one scholar criticized that while all political appointees had steadfast commitment to the president and his development agenda, many of them lacked policy expertise to discern whether or how administrators’ advice and recommendations contributed to the attainment of the president’s agenda. He strongly recommended that the president select political appointees based not only on loyalty, but also on competence and to make them exercise firm control of administrators (D. S. Bark 1964). In sum, founding scholars strongly believed that public administration should be completely responsive to the president and his development agenda when they were involved in policy-making.

Although founding scholars stressed the complete responsiveness of public administration to the president in policy-making, they held a more relaxed view of the role of public administration in implementation. They contended that administrators should be allowed to exercise discretionary judgment, based on their policy expertise, when implementing public policies. Rather than monitoring whether

---

95 In addition to loyalty and policy expertise, founding scholars proposed intellectual ability, interpersonal skills, managerial skills, and political skills as other selection criteria (D. S. Bark 1966; W. T. Kim 1966).
administrators carried out developmental policies in line with the president’s wishes, founding scholars pointed out, many political appointees tended to interfere to an excessive degree, in the detailed implementation of those policies. Then they expressed a deep concern that ‘expert’ administrators took a back seat while ‘non-expert’ appointees played a major role in making important decisions on the technical details of implementation (S. C. Cho 1964; W. T. Kim 1966).

Founding scholars mounted a severe attack on these meddlesome appointees on the grounds that, because appointees lacked expertise in the technical details of implementation, their arbitrary interference often constrained the administrative discretion necessary to facilitate the implementation of developmental policies, thus turning out to be a serious impediment to effective implementation. Then, founding scholars urged political appointees to defer to the policy expertise of administrators and delegate more discretion to administrators implementing developmental policies (H. K. Ahn 1972; D. S. Bark 1971; W. H. Lee 1965).

However, founding scholars’ emphasis on administrative discretion in implementation doesn’t necessarily mean that administrators could act largely on their own initiative in implementing developmental policies. They made it clear that administrators could exercise their discretion in relatively unconstrained ways only as long as they implemented developmental policies in a manner that the president and political appointees found acceptable (D. S. Bark 1964; D. S. Bark 1968).

Founding scholars’ discussions of the role of public administration clearly indicate that they placed the highest premium on administrators’ unwavering commitment to the president and his development agenda. It implies that founding scholars enthusiastically upheld Tenet 1, which highlights the complete subordination of public administration to the president, and, in turn, Tenet 1 exercised guiding influence over the way founding scholars defined the proper role of public administration. Indeed, Tenet 1 permeated all discussions of the role of public administration.

**Tenet 2: Public Administration as the Obedient Instrument of the President**

Tenet 2 is the natural outgrowth of Tenet 1. Once the President is defined as the sole master of
Public administration, it is natural that public administration should be conceptualized as the loyal and faithful servant of the President. Tenet 2 implies that public administration should not remain accountable to the legislative and judicial branches because the President is the sole master who has the exclusive authority to control public administration. Therefore, public administration is expected to faithfully implement whatever decisions the President makes as the obedient instrument of the President (Rohr 1986; Wamsley and Dudley 1998; Wamsley 2005).

During the Founding Period, Tenet 2 became implanted in Korean public administration scholarship, promoting the instrumental view of public administration. In particular, founding scholars’ discussion of rationality clearly demonstrates that the instrumental view of public administration prevailed in founding scholarship. Founding scholars examined rationality in detail and stressed the importance of pursuing and improving rationality in government. (D. S. Bark 1968; W. T. Kim 1967; H. B. Lee 1967; W. H. Lee 1965). One top scholar even described rationality as the most important virtue that should be upheld by public administrators (D. S. Bark 1967b).

It is important to indicate that when founding scholars referred to rationality, they usually meant instrumental rationality, not substantive rationality. Instrumental rationality is the ability to “coordinate the right means with a given end” (Horkheimer 1974, 50). In contrast, substantive rationality means “the ability to understand the purposeful nature of the whole system of which a particular task is a part” (Adams 1992, 366). While instrumental rationality is limited to means, taking ends as given, substantive rationality involves “rational consideration of . . . the relative importance of different possible ends” (Alexander 2000, 245). Although founding scholars frequently claimed that public administrators should pursue rationality, their claim did not mean that public administrators should consider whether a given end was politically or morally desirable, but simply meant that they should faithfully accomplish the given end (H. K. Ahn 1972; D. S. Bark 1968; W. T. Kim 1967; H. B. Lee 1967).

Nowhere is the founding scholars’ emphasis on instrumental rationality more obvious than their discussions of the role of public administration in economic development. They glorified the national plan...
for economic development as a given end and urged public administrators to choose the most appropriate means for the realization of this end (D. S. Bark 1967b; H. B. Lee 1967). Given the fact that founding scholars considered the president to be ultimately responsible for developing a master plan for economic development, it comes as no surprise that they regarded substantive rationality as residing in the hands of the president. In contrast, founding scholars contended that only instrumental rationality fell into the sphere of public administration (D. S. Bark 1965; H. B. Lee 1970). From their standpoint, the proper role of public administration was to seek technically appropriate means to bring the president’s master plan into reality.

The founding scholars’ discussions of rationality implies that the only criterion by which administrators should evaluate the rationality of their own actions should be whether their actions contributed to the attainment of the president’s goals, and if so, how much. Then, it naturally follows that, for rationality-seeking administrators, whatever maximizes the attainment of the president’s goals becomes good; whatever doesn’t become bad (D. S. Bark 1968; D. S. Bark 1971). In fact, the founding scholars’ emphasis on instrumental rationality leads to the inescapable conclusion that public administration is simply an instrument to be exploited by the president in the pursuit of his goals.

Thus, administrators can be instrumentally rational only by faithfully following the dictates of their superiors. As Denhardt (1984) pointed out, “[instrumental] rationality translates quickly into obedience to hierarchically superior authorities” (79). Once career administrators uphold instrumental rationality, they are expected to remain obedient to the president and his political appointees. Obedience becomes an important virtue for public administrators.

Upholding instrumental rationality, founding scholars emphasized that administrators should demonstrate their unquestioning obedience to the president. For example, they urged administrators to simply follow the president’s growth-oriented economic development strategy without evaluating whether his strategy was desirable or not (D. S. Bark 1968; W. H. Lee 1965). However, it is worth indicating that, at the time when founding scholars addressed the issue of rationality in their academic work, the
president’s economic development strategy was severely criticized for overemphasizing growth to the exclusion of equity. His growth-oriented strategy helped exporting firms to improve their competitiveness in the international market by imposing repressive labor policies to keep workers’ wage extremely low (Chang 1994; S. H. Kim 2005). Critics pointed out that although the growth-oriented economic development strategy provided industrialists with greater opportunities to accumulate wealth, it failed to help workers escape from extreme poverty because of their extremely low wage. Furthermore, they contended that the growth-oriented strategy at best reinforced or at worst exacerbated inequality between industrialists and workers (E. M. Kim 1997; B. C. Kim 2003).

Despite the prevailing inequality in society, however, founding scholars encouraged public administrators to concentrate their attention on formulating and implementing growth-oriented developmental policies rather than shift their attention to developing equity-oriented policies to alleviate inequality created in the developmental process (D. S. Bark 1968; H. B. Lee 1967). In their eyes, administrators should not cast doubt on the appropriateness of the president’s growth-oriented economic development strategy because they were not allowed to intrude into the sphere of substantive rationality.

This instrumental view implies that administrators should acquiesce to the president’s policy agenda even if they find it undemocratic or unconstitutional. By fully embracing the instrumental view, founding scholars implicitly approved that administrators should remain obedient to whoever happens to be the president and faithfully follow whatever he wants. In fact, the unquestioning obedience became an important virtue in founding scholarship.

**Tenet 3: Managerial Values as the Main Values of Public Administration**

The instrumental view of public administration greatly helped managerial values become ingrained as primary values in Korean public administration scholarship. Because founding scholars saw public administration as the obedient instrument of the president, they encouraged administrators to commit themselves to attaining the president’s goals without questioning their appropriateness. In fact, their instrumental view presupposed that administrators were not allowed to challenge the president’s

This instrumental view led founding scholars to emphasize managerial values at the expense of political and legal values. In founding scholarship, managerial values were glorified because they were mainly concerned with determining the most appropriate means to a given end; in contrast, political and legal values received far less attention because they were often associated with questioning the appropriateness of the end itself. In this way, managerial values became the main values of public administration in founding scholarship.

Managerial Values

A careful analysis of founding scholars’ discussions on values of public administration reveals that one common theme ran throughout their discussions: their single-minded preoccupation with such managerial values as 3E—economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. Founding scholars contended that public administrators should take these managerial values as superior to other values (D. S. Bark 1967a; W. T. Kim 1967; Y. H. Kim 1969; H. B. Lee 1967). For example, one scholar pointed out that an administrator’s pursuit of managerial values might be in tension with his or her commitment to political or legal values. However, he strenuously insisted that the administrator should uphold managerial values, even at the expense of other values, if he or she failed to resolve the tension (D. S. Bark 1968).

However, founding scholars did not give equal importance to the three managerial values. They established priorities among these values by defining effectiveness as the most important managerial value, efficiency as the second most important one, and economy as the third most important one (D. S. Bark 1967b; H. B. Lee 1967). As one leading scholar recollected, effectiveness and efficiency began to be glorified as “administrative ideals” that should guide the actions of public administrators in the Founding Period (D. S. Bark 2001, 189).

Founding scholars defined effectiveness as “the degree of goal attainment” (D. S. Bark 1967b, 97) and recommended public administrators to take as the most important decision criterion the extent to which their decisions contributed to the accomplishment of the goals of their executive ministries or
agencies (D. S. Bark 1967b). However, it is important to point out that, at the time of publication of the founding scholars’ articles on effectiveness, President Park of the Third Republic filled key appointive positions in executive ministries and agencies with his faithful supporters. His faithful appointees tightened their grip on their ministries and agencies, and established and pursued policy priorities in a manner consistent with the president’s agenda of promoting economic development (Y. C. Ha and M. K. Kang 2011; K. K. Hwang 1996). In a word, the main policy goals of executive ministries and agencies reflected the president’s developmental agenda. Therefore, the founding scholars’ recommendation implies that administrators’ pursuit of effectiveness should ultimately contribute to the developmental goals of the president.

Stressing that the president’s developmental goals were intended to create greater benefits in the future than in the present, founding scholars contended that effectiveness-seeking administrators should be “forward-looking” (H. B. Lee 1966). They severely criticized that administrators often failed to contribute to developmental goals because they responded to the immediate needs of citizens without taking their future benefits into account. In order to increase effectiveness, founding scholars argued, administrators should make “future-oriented” policy decisions that would give rise to greater benefits to citizens in the long run (H. B. Lee 1966; D. S. Bark 1971). In a word, founding scholars urged administrators in making important policy decisions to sacrifice the immediate needs of citizens to secure their future benefits.

Founding scholars pointed out that once administrators found their policy decisions to contribute to the attainment of the goals of their executive ministries and agencies, they should search for the optimal methods to implement their decisions. Then, they contended that in selecting the optimal methods, administrators should see efficiency as the main criterion (D. S. Bark 1968; Y. H. Kim 1972). None of the founding scholars clearly defined the meaning of efficiency. Upon examination, however, it immediately becomes apparent that they used the term “efficiency” to mean “technical
efficiency” in most cases. When founding scholars addressed efficiency, they stressed that public administrators should uphold the importance of the minimization of inputs and the maximization of outputs (S. C. Cho 1967; S. T. Kang 1971). However, in some cases, what founding scholars meant by efficiency was more than technical efficiency. In fact, they also emphasized the importance of what is known as “dynamic efficiency” in the parlance of developmental economics (H. B. Lee 1966).

To understand founding scholars’ discussion on dynamic efficiency, it is necessary to briefly explain the difference between static efficiency and dynamic efficiency. Static efficiency refers to making the best use of resources “at any given point of time” (Andrew and Entwistle 2013, 256). Technical efficiency is classified as one kind of static efficiency. In contrast, dynamic efficiency is distinguished from static efficiency in that it is concerned with “efficiency over time” (Andrew and Entwistle 2013, 257). When dynamic efficiency is applied to government, it focuses on investing resources in building the capacity of government; for example, building physical infrastructure, offering professional education and on-the-job training to administrators, and promoting policy development and innovation. Supporters of dynamic efficiency contend that the investment on capacity-building will make government become increasingly capable of performing their tasks, thus improving the performance of government in the long run (Andrew and Entwistle 2013; Ghemawat and Costa 1993).

In addressing dynamic efficiency, founding scholars fully recognized that dynamic efficiency might be in tension with technical efficiency. They pointed out that because the allocation of resources to capacity building was not intended to create immediate and visible benefits in the short term, it might be seen as the inefficient use of resources in terms of technical efficiency. However, they emphasized the importance of dynamic efficiency because capacity-building would make government agencies become

---

96 The concept of efficiency not only include the meaning of the minimization of inputs—in other words, “the least cost means of achieving given ends” (Grandy 2009,115)—but also one of the maximization of outputs—in other words, “choice of alternatives which produces the largest result for the given application of resources” (Simon 1976, 179).

97 According to Andrews and Entwistle’s (2013) classification scheme of efficiency, there exist three kinds of static efficiency in government: technical efficiency, allocative efficiency, and distributive efficiency. Founding scholars paid no attention to allocative efficiency and distributive efficiency.
increasingly efficient by improving their administrative capacity to manage public policies, thus creating greater benefits in the long term (D. S. Bark 1968; H. B. Lee 1967).

Although founding scholars upheld effectiveness and efficiency as the most important managerial values, they did not discount the importance of economy. They defined economy as the minimization of the consumption of inputs and emphasized that government needed to tighten its belt. They contended that public administrators should exactly calculate the costs of running their agencies and managing policies, and eliminate the unnecessary waste in government (H. B. Lee 1967). However, they were fully aware of the fact that administrators’ strict adherence to economy might be incompatible with their pursuit of effectiveness (D. S. Bark 1968; H. B. Lee 1967). For example, one scholar pointed out that economy-seeking administrators were inclined to focus only on reducing the initial costs of a policy, thus failing to formulate policies that initially incurred high costs, but produced huge benefits in the long term. This scholar reminded administrators that they should uphold effectiveness rather than economy (H. B. Lee 1966).

**Political Values**

While managerial values attracted a great deal of attention from founding scholars, political values received far less attention from them. Some founding scholars examined several political values that public administrators should uphold, including responsiveness, representativeness, and accountability. The lack of attention to political values can be mainly attributed to founding scholars’ instrumental view of public administration, which accorded primacy to managerial values while harboring considerable skepticism about the role of political values in guiding the actions of public administrators. In fact, this skepticism encouraged founding scholars to brush aside the importance of political values (S.

---

98 In this dissertation, the meaning of responsiveness is limited to responsiveness to people’s demands.
99 The original meaning of “responsibility” was “an inward sense of moral obligation” (Finer 1941, 338). This term is often distinguished from “accountability,” which emphasized the “external scrutiny” (Mulgan 2000). However, the contemporary meaning of “accountability” is extended to include the internal aspect of responsibility. In this dissertation, I will use “accountability” instead of “responsibility” in order to contain the meanings of not only internal obligation but also external scrutiny. For a more detailed discussion on different meanings of accountability used in different contexts, see Mulgan (2000).
A close look at founding scholars’ discussions of the role of public administration in fostering political development reveals that they narrowly defined the range of political values that public administrators should uphold. Before examining the argument of founding scholars in more detail, it is important to note that they were not consistent in their use or application of the term “political development” because political development has multiple dimensions. As Pye (1963) notes, “no single scale can be used for measuring the degree of political development” (16). For example, Huntington (1965) identifies the four dimensions of political development as rationalization, national integration, democratization, and participation. Pye (1965) also recognizes three dimensions as equality, the capacity of the political system, and the differentiation of governmental organizations. Because of this multi-dimensionality, each founding scholar paid particular attention to one dimension of political development while discounting the importance of the other dimensions, and used the term “political development” in a different sense. As a result, each scholar made a different judgment about the role of public administration in promoting political development, depending on which dimension of political development was examined.

In discussing the relationship between political development and public administration, founding scholars used the term “political development” mainly in three distinct senses: political development as democratization, political development as participation, and political development as rationalization. First, some founding scholars defined political development as democratization and advanced their argument of the role of public administration in promoting democratization. These scholars expressed strong skepticism by contending that public administrators could make little, if any, contribution to democratization because it did not fall into the sphere of administration (D. S. Bark 1968; W. T. Kim 1967; H. B. Lee 1970). In other words, they claimed that it was not unelected administrators that were responsible for building a democratic state, but elected officials. For example, when one influential founding scholar addressed the issue of how to build a democratic state, he described the role of elected
officials as an “independent variable” and the role of unelected administrators as a “dependent variable” (D. S. Bark 1967b, 96). It implies that only if elected officials explicitly embraced the goal of democratization, would unelected administrators be allowed to help promote democratization. Given the fact that when founding scholars spoke of elected officials, they meant the president, it is clear that they conceptualized public administration as a mere appendage to whoever happened to be a president—whether he supported or rejected the goal of democratization. In the eyes of these scholars, the proper role of unelected administrators was to faithfully follow whatever an elected president wanted them to do, leaving aside the issue of democratization (D. S. Bark 1964; D. S. Bark 1971).

This strong emphasis on the complete subordination of public administrators to the President greatly influenced the way founding scholars addressed accountability, responsiveness, and representativeness. In fact, it drove them to narrowly conceptualize the three political values. This narrow conceptualization is most clearly manifested in their discussion on accountability. As Romzek and Dubnick (1987) note, public administrators are situated in four different, but overlapping types of accountability—bureaucratic, legal, professional, and political—and are required to maintain those four types of accountability. However, founding scholars’ discussions of accountability clearly indicate that they overestimated the importance of a political type of accountability while underestimating that of the other three types. For example, one founding scholar pointed out that administrators’ increasing accountability to the developmental goals of the president—political accountability—might clash with the laws and rules that they had followed—bureaucratic and legal accountabilities. He made it clear that, in that case, public administrators should assign priority to political accountability over bureaucratic and legal ones (D. S. Bark 1968). Another scholar also contended that administrators’ political accountability

100 Romzek and Dubnick (1987) identify four types of accountability: bureaucratic, legal, professional, and political. Bureaucratic accountability involves a high degree of internal control through supervision, which is based on superior-subordinate relationships, and written rules; legal accountability also focuses on a high degree of external control through the laws and policy mandates that the lawmakers establish; however, professional accountability places less importance on external control by emphasizing the importance of deference to expertise within the executive agency; and political accountability rests on the principle of responsiveness. Under this type of accountability, administrators are responsive to many stakeholders such as elected officials, interest groups, and citizens. Because of the various types of accountability, public administrators often suffer from “multiple accountability disorder” (Koppell 2005, 94).
to the president should take precedence over their professional accountability when they came into conflict with each other (H. B. Lee 1967).

Above examples indicate that, even when founding scholars used the concept of political accountability, they narrowed its meaning only to administrators’ political accountability to the president (H. B. Lee 1967, W. H. Lee 1965). Given the fact that the original meaning of political accountability implies that administrators should maintain their political accountability not only to the president, but also to other key stakeholders such as the legislative branch, interest groups, and citizens (Romzek and Johnston 2005), it becomes clear that founding scholars denied or at least questioned the legitimacy of the legislative branch as a constitutional master of public administration and downplayed the importance of interest groups and citizens (H. K. Ahn 1965; D. S. Bark 1964). In other words, founding scholars, who were blinded by the complete subordination of public administrators to the president, narrowly defined the meaning of accountability as political accountability to the president.

In addressing responsiveness, founding scholars expressed a deep concern that the increasing responsiveness to the immediate demands of citizens might be detrimental to their true interests. They believed that a majority of citizens failed to perceive and articulate their true interests because of their lack of education and tended to pursue their immediate needs without concern for the long-term interests. Out of this concern, they argued that well-educated public administrators should not succumb to the irrational demands of ill-educated citizens and instead should identify their true interests for them, and, using their policy expertise and experience, incorporate them into public policies (D. S. Bark 1967b). In a word, founding scholars maintained a paternalistic view that public administrators should discern the best interests of citizens in their behalf rather than merely follow what citizens themselves believed were in their best interests.

A closer look at founding scholars’ paternalistic view of the role of unelected administrators

---

101 Even one scholar carried his paternalistic belief to an extreme and made a recommendation to restrict the rights of illiterate citizens to elect their leaders. Assuming that illiterate citizens lacked the intellectual ability to decide whom to choose as their leaders, he strongly recommended that suffrage should be restricted to literate people (D. S. Bark 1965).
reveals that they felt administrators should define the best interests of citizens and push them forward only when their definition was not at odds with the developmental goals of the president. For example, a founding scholar contended that the most important criterion by which to judge whether an administrator made an ethical decision should be whether his or her decision contributed to the developmental goals of the state (D. S. Bark 1968). Given the fact that this scholar envisioned the president as setting the developmental goals of the state, it becomes obvious that, from his standpoint, “ethical” administrators should fully accept the developmental goals which the president believed promoted the best interests of citizens. For founding scholars, it was unethical for administrators to champion a different definition of public interest from that of the president.

While founding scholars held a paternalistic view of responsiveness, they expressed either hostility or indifference towards representativeness (H. K. Ahn 1965; D. S. Bark 1965; W. T. Kim 1967). In Meier’s (1975) terminology, they showed hostility towards “active representation” but remained indifferent to “passive representation.” In dealing with active representation, founding scholars strongly criticized that interest groups did not support policies that benefited all the segments of the population, but pursued policies that maximized their own parochial interests (H. K. Ahn 1965; W. T. Kim 1967). One founding scholar even described these parochial interest groups as “pseudo–interest groups” (W. T. Kim 1967, 18) on the grounds that they tried to privilege a tiny segment of the population by manipulating government agencies. Founding scholars expressed concern that the active representation would help pseudo-interest groups to capture government agencies and distort policy outcomes in favor of their parochial interests. Furthermore, they urged administrators to defend their agencies from these

---

102 Originally, the concept of representation was applied only to elected officials. As Edwards and his colleagues (2004) noted, representation meant that “the desires of the people should be replicated in government through the choices of elected officials” (15). However, after non-elected administrators were found to play a key role in making policies that could greatly influence the interests of the people, how to make non-elected officials represent the interests of the people became a critical issue among scholars. As a result, the concept of representation was extended to include non-elected officials.

103 According to Meier (1975), a public agency can represent the people mainly in two ways: active and passive. While active representation means “representation of the specific clientele interests of the agency” (526), passive representation is closely related with the notion of representative bureaucracy, in which “the bureaucrats resemble the general public in terms of social origins and general values” (526).
pseudo-interest groups and develop policies to promote the national interest (D. S. Bark 1965; W. T. Kim 1967). In short, founding scholars drew a sharp line between “the public” and “the clientele public”, and chastised the clientele public for pursuing their own parochial interests.

In contrast, not a single scholar paid attention to passive representation as an important political value. This lack of academic attention seemed to arise from the fact that founding scholars emphasized the importance of the merit system, which was designed to recruit the most talented citizens into government. In fact, they believed that the so-called “best and brightest” citizens, recruited and promoted through the merit principle, should run government agencies (D. S. Bark 1970; H. B. Lee 1966). Founding scholars’ emphasis on the merit-based recruitment of the “best and brightest” seemed to shift their attention away from representative bureaucracy where, from their standpoint, unqualified and undeserving citizens might enter the public service.

Second, unlike scholars who stressed the limited role of public administration in promoting democratization, several scholars defined political development as participation and emphasized the active role of public administration in fostering participation. These scholars contended that public administrators should enthusiastically endorse participation as one of the most important political values of public administration (H. K. Ahn 1972; D. S. Bark 1966; Y. H. Kim 1972). However, it is important to note that founding scholars ironically fell short of emphasizing the active role of citizens in the policy-making process. In fact, they encouraged public administrators to confine citizen participation to simply communicating information, not to taking part in actual policy decisions. In addressing the question of who should decide policies, founding scholars contended that citizens not only failed to perceive their genuine interests in most policy domains, but also lacked the policy expertise to develop policies. They expressed a deep concern that the active participation of non-expert citizens who were unrealistic about what government should do and could do was likely to create confusion and inefficiency in the policy process (D. S. Bark 1965; D. S. Bark 1967a). In contrast, they pointed out that administrators received a higher level of education than citizens (H. B. Lee 1967), gained the sufficient experience to understand
the complexity in a particular policy domain (D. S. Bark 1967b), and acquired the expertise necessary to solve the various problems in that domain (S. C. Cho 1967). For founding scholars, it was not non-expert citizens that were qualified to make actual policy decisions, but expert administrators. Therefore, in their eyes, the only role of non-expert citizens in the policy-making process was to present necessary information to decision-makers.

Although founding scholars highlighted the importance of expertise of administrators in the policy-making process, they also recognized that the strong emphasis on expertise was likely to dramatically increase the discretion of administrators and proposed several safeguards to prevent administrators from using their discretion in an arbitrary or capricious way (H. K. Ahn 1972; Y. H. Kim 1972). One of their proposed safeguards was to encourage outside citizen-experts to actively participate in the actual policy-making process (Y. H. Kim 1970). They argued that these citizen-experts would keep a watchful eye on administrators, helping them exercise their discretion in a rational way.

Last, some founding scholars defined political development as *rationalization* and supported the active role of public administration in eliminating the irrational and emotional elements of society (W. T. Kim 1967). They argued that building “rational” government agencies, which were founded on such bureaucratic principles as standardized procedures, merit-based recruitment, and impartial and universal rules, would drastically change the way citizens interacted with government. These scholars expected citizens to change their behavior “from particularism to universalism, from diffuseness to specificity, from ascription to achievement, and from affectivity to affective neutrality” (Huntington 1965, 387) if citizens continued to experience “rational” government practices. They believed that this behavior change would help accelerate the transition to rational society (W. T. Kim 1967).

While these scholars focused on the role of public administration in fostering rationalization at society level, other scholars touched upon the issue of rationalization at the organizational level: how bureaucratic rationalization influenced the way public administrators performed their jobs in government agencies (S. C. Cho 1967; Y. H. Kim 1970). They contended that bureaucratic rationalization would make
administrators subject to strict rules, thus limiting their individual initiatives to a minimum. These scholars expressed a deep concern that, by suffocating the creativity of administrators, bureaucratic rationalization might create, rather than eliminate, a great deal of inefficiency in government agencies (D. S. Bark 1971; W. T. Kim 1966).

In order to prevent or mitigate the adverse effects of bureaucratic rationalization, founding scholars pointed out, politicians should abolish unnecessary rules that restrained administrators from unleashing creativity and give administrators sufficient discretion to perform their duties in creative ways (D. S. Bark 1971). These scholars also contended that political appointees should allow administrators to express their creative ideas freely (H. K. Ahn 1964; D. S. Bark 1964) and encourage the so-called “creative” administrators—regardless of their job position, seniority, and gender—to participate in making major policies (D. S. Bark 1968; S. C. Cho 1964).

**Legal Values**

Given the fact that founding scholars remained silent about civil rights violations, it comes as no surprise that they failed to emphasize legal values, which served to protect civil rights. In fact, compared with managerial and political values, legal values drew the least attention from these scholars.

Founding scholars never discussed which legal values public administrators should uphold to protect citizens from the state. Only one founding scholar expressed his academic interest in what he defined as a legal value: “legality” (D. S. Bark 1967b). Upon examination, however, it immediately becomes apparent that his notion of legality had nothing to do with the protection of civil rights. He defined legality as “the degree to which public administrators follow the written laws and rules” (D. S. Bark 1967b, 98), and urged administrators to see legality as an important legal value.104 However, even when he emphasized the importance of legality, he expressed a deep concern that the strict adherence to legality might restrain administrators from fully embracing such managerial values as effectiveness and efficiency. This concern for managerial values clearly shows that founding scholars’ preoccupation with

---

104 The notion of legality is same as Romzek and Dubnick’s notion of legal accountability (1987).
managerial values prevailed throughout every discussion of values in public administration.

**Tenet 4: Building the Administrative Capacity of the Executive Branch as the Main Concern of Public Administration**

Founding scholars’ instrumental view of public administration as the obedient instrument of the president naturally led them to examine how to refine the instrument. Upholding the instrumental view of public administration, founding scholars believed that public administrators should simply follow the president’s developmental goals without questioning their appropriateness (D. S. Bark 1968; H. B. Lee 1967). Then, they emphasized the importance of building the administrative capacity of the executive branch to translate the president’s developmental goals into concrete developmental policies, and transform these policies into meaningful outcomes (H. K. Ahn 1972; D. S. Bark 1971; S. C. Cho 1964). In fact, founding scholars wrestled with how to reform the executive branch in order to improve its administrative capacity to push through developmental policies.

Founding scholars paid attention to several reform issues. Most of all, they stressed the importance of fighting corruption in the executive branch by pointing out that many corrupt officials still diverted public resources for their selfish personal gains. Founding scholars contended that corruption would lead to waste or the inefficient use of public resources, ultimately eroding the administrative capacity to allocate resources into developmental policies needed to attain economic growth (H. D. Kim 1969; H. B. Lee 1966). In order to root out corruption in the executive branch, founding scholars proposed several policy recommendations. First, founding scholars contended that administrators’ salaries should be raised to prevent them from committing corruption. They regarded the low salaries of administrators as one important cause of widespread corruption in the executive branch because underpaid administrators were more likely to succumb to temptation and indulge in corruption (H. D. Kim 1966). Second, founding scholars proposed a strict penal policy to strip pensions from administrators who were convicted of corruption. They predicted that this strict anti-corruption policy would lead administrators to fear losing pensions, thus preventing them from engaging in corruption (W. T. Kim 1966). Third, founding scholars expressed a deep concern that inspectors in the Board of Audit and
Inspection lacked expertise to investigate corruption and emphasized the importance of developing professional training programs for inspectors (H. D. Kim 1966).

In addition to eliminating administrative corruption, founding scholars emphasized the importance of filling the executive branch with competent administrators. Therefore, they expressed strong interests in how to build a robust personnel system that could recruit the talented people and train them into development-oriented administrators (D. S. Bark 1970; W. T. Kim 1966). Expressing an emphatic concern that incompetent people, through patronage appointments, still held many important merit positions in the executive branch, founding scholars contended that the principle of merit-based recruitment should be applied to all candidates who wanted to enter the civil service. Then, they recommended that government should require all applicants for civil service to take competitive entrance examinations to ensure merit-based recruitment (D. S. Bark 1971; H. B. Lee 1966). Founding scholars also stressed the importance of establishing development-oriented post-entry training programs to provide administrators with new management skills that were necessary to push through developmental policies (H. B. Lee 1966).

Last, founding scholars introduced new management theories to public administrators, which they believed could improve the administrative capacity of the executive branch. In particular, they paid strong attention to theories of decision-making because they believed that increasing the rationality of administrators’ decision-making could enhance the capacity of government agencies, thus contributing to their performance (S. C. Cho 1967; Y. H. Kim 1967). One founding scholar took as examples Queuing Theory, Operation Research, Inventory Theory, Linear Programming, Statistical Decision Theory, Dynamic Programming, and Game Theory, and encouraged administrators to apply these theories in testing the rationality of their decisions (S. C. Cho 1967).

**Conclusion**

Founding scholars captured the spirit of an era—the era of economic development in the 1960s.
By cherishing excessive executive-centered governing order, which they felt was necessary to accomplish rapid economic development, founding scholars wholeheartedly accepted the executive-centered approach to public administration, which emphasized administrators’ steadfast commitment to the president and his political and policy agenda, and intellectually founded public administration upon the normative ideal of executive-centered public administration. Then, they paid strong academic attention to how to make public administrators serve the president better (D. S. Bark 1968; H. B. Lee 1967).

However, as Fry (1989) pointed out, the executive-centered approach fails to recognize that an “executive branch headed by a powerful chief executive may result in tyrannical government” (92) although the strong chief executive might provide “energetic leadership” to the executive branch (84). Fry (1989) expressed a deep concern that the mere acceptance of the executive-centered approach might lead to the uncritical support of public administrators’ “unquestioned loyalty” to the president, whether he was democratic or authoritarian (81). Unfortunately, Fry’s concern became a reality in the field of public administration in Korea. Founding scholars who enthusiastically accepted the executive-centered approach cherished administrators’ unwavering commitment to the authoritarian developmental state headed by the powerful president, who was then portrayed as a brutal dictator (S. H. Chung 1998).

Founding scholars’ acceptance of the executive-centered approach made an indelible impact on the intellectual development of Korean public administration. As Chapter VII (Public Administration Scholarship in the Growth Period) will show, mainstream scholars, including founding scholars, continued to uphold the executive-centered approach and its four tenets became fully entrenched as the central normative beliefs in the field of public administration in the Growth Period, which is described as the era of “presidential dictatorship” (B. C. Lee 2003). By strongly adhering to the four “normative” tenets, mainstream scholars continued to uphold the president’s exclusive control of public administrators and cherish the active role of administrators in maintaining the authoritarian developmental state built by the president. In fact, the executive-centered approach provided intellectual justification for mainstream scholars’ support of the authoritarian regimes in the Growth Period.
CHAPTER VI: GOVERNING ORDER IN THE GROWTH PERIOD

Introduction

The Growth Period (1972–1987) is the period from the Fourth Republic (1972-1980) to the Fifth Republic (1980-1987). In the Growth Period, the authoritarian regimes of both republics repeatedly amended the Korean Constitution to maximize the constitutional powers of the President and minimize those of the legislative and judicial branches. As a result, the Korean Constitution under both the Fourth Republic and Fifth Republic came to uphold an excessive type of executive-centered governing order (Y. W. Kihl 2005; B. C. Lee 2003). However, it is important to indicate the these two “Growth Period” Constitutions promoted even more excessive executive-centered governing order than the “monarchial” executive-centered governing order that the “Founding Period” Constitutions espoused. Although the “Founding Period” Constitutions at least maintained the appearance of separation of powers, the “Growth Period” Constitutions completely dismantled the institutional scheme of separation of powers by granting the President nearly “omnipotent” powers to take complete control of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches (M. S. H. Kim 2015; West and Baker 1988). In fact, it can be said that the “Growth Period” Constitutions glorified “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order—when compared with the “soft” executive-centered governing order of the Founding Period.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order came to be fully entrenched as the governing order in the Growth Period, and how the omnipotent Presidents under this governing order consolidated the authoritarian developmental state. This chapter is composed of two sections. In the first section, I will trace the development of “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order in the Growth Period by analyzing the Constitutions of the Fourth and Fifth Republics. In the second section, I investigate how the authoritarian developmental state, headed by the omnipotent Presidents, worked to control civil society and market in the Growth Period. In doing so, I will also discuss the role of public administration in maintaining the authoritarian
Establishing “Hard-Core” Monarchical Executive-Centered Governing Order

In this section, I will comprehensively review how “hard-core” monarchical executive-centered governing order was institutionalized in the Constitutions of the Fourth and Fifth Republics in the Growth Period. To examine the extent of this hard-core” monarchical executive-centered governing order, I will focus on how both Constitutions allocated constitutional powers to the President, the National Assembly, and the courts.

The Fourth Republic (1972-1980)

In October 1972, President Park declared martial law and suspended the Third Republic’s Constitution. Under this martial law, the National Assembly was dissolved, all political activities were banned, and the stringent press censorship was imposed. The State Council temporarily took the place of the National Assembly and proposed a constitutional amendment. This constitutional amendment was passed by a national referendum in November 1972. Almost 92 percent of all voters participated and 91.5 percent of all participants approved the new Constitution. The passage of the 1972 constitutional

105 The official purposes of the 1972 constitutional amendment were: 1) “to back up positively the current South-North Korea talks with a view to achieving the historic task of peaceful unification of the fatherland”; 2) “to cope effectively with the trials and challenges of the rapidly changing international situation, especially changes in the existing order and balance of power in Asia as a whole”; and 3) “to eliminate the causes of inefficiency and social disorder so that the resources of the nation might be channeled towards maximum national development and prosperity” (H. K. Lee 1974, 46). However, the true purpose of this amendment was to enable President Park to “maintain his near absolute power, possibly for life” (J. K. Oh 1975, 72-73).

106 Korean scholars argued that two elections held in 1971 prompted the Park regime to press on the 1972 constitutional amendment (J. K. Oh 1976). In the 1971 presidential election, President Park defeated his opponent, Dae-Jung Kim, but not by a wide margin. While Park received 53% (6,342,828) of total votes, Kim gained 45% (5,395,900). Given the fact that government officials committed massive electoral fraud such as vote-buying to re-elect President Park, it was clear that without widespread electoral fraud, Kim could have won the 1971 presidential election. Kim’s near-win indicated that many people had already turned their backs on the Park regime. In addition, the 8th legislative election held in 1971 struck a blow against the Park regime. While the pro-president party maintained a majority by winning 113 out of 204 seats (55.4%), the major anti-president party made enormous gains by winning 89 seats out of 204 seats (43.6%). Given the fact that the pro-president party won landslide victories in the 6th and 7th elections and government officials were mobilized to help the pro-president party win a comfortable majority in the 8th election, it was certain that the 8th election was a de facto defeat to the Park regime. The 1971 presidential election and the following 1971 legislative election “made it crystal clear . . . that the nationwide support of the [Park] regime was not nearly as solid as had been believed” (B. M. Ahn et al. 1988, 32).
amendment brought about the founding of the Fourth Republic. In December 1972, President Park was elected indirectly by a newly created electoral body for a six-year term. Then, a legislative election was held to reconstitute the dissolved National Assembly in February 1973 (B. M. Ahn 2002; C. I. E. Kim 1973).

**The Fourth Republic’s Constitution (December 27, 1972)**

The Fourth Republic’s Constitution—hereinafter referred to as the 1972 Constitution—had unique characteristics distinct from those found in the Third Republic’s Constitution. As one Korean legal scholar noted, “The major characteristic of the Constitution of 1972 was concentration of powers in the President” (S. D. Lee 1986, 26). By conferring upon the President “nearly unlimited powers overriding the three separate branches of government,” the 1972 Constitution discarded the principle of separation of powers, the backbone of the genuine presidential system (D. K. Yoon 1988, 8). The Korean presidential system fell into “neo-presidentialism” (Loewenstein 1957, 65), an authoritarian or dictatorial type of presidential system which had nothing in common with the genuine presidential system with a separation of powers except its name.

**The President**

The 1972 Constitution provided that the President must be elected *indirectly* by the National Conference for Unification (NCU) for a six-year term (Article 39 and 47). The NCU was a specially organized electoral body, which was charged with the indirect election of the President. Although the 1972 Constitution stated that the NCU should be a non-partisan electoral body, in which its members were prohibited from membership in political parties (Article 35), “members of this body were elected by popular vote from candidates carefully screened” by President Park (D. K. Yoon 1995, 401). By

---

107 The fact that the 1972 constitutional amendment was proposed and passed very quickly—in fact, it took less than one and half month—indicates that the 1972 amendment “had been secretly and well-prepared by a handful of political advisors around President Park” (S. D. Lee 1986, 25). This secrecy stood in stark contrast to the openness found in the process of drafting the Third Republic’s Constitution. In drawing up the Third Republic’s Constitution, the military junta held many public hearings to solicit various opinions. In drafting the Fourth Republic’s Constitution, however, the Park regime held no public hearings to listen to public opinions (D. K. Yoon 1988).
manipulating the candidate selection process, President Park placed the NCU under his direct control. Therefore, it came as no surprise that 2,357 out of the 2,359 total members of the NCU voted for President Park in the 1972 presidential election held right after the 1972 Constitution was approved (C. I. E. Kim 1973). In addition, the 1972 Constitution removed any constitutional term limit on the President and allowed him to run for unlimited terms (B. M. Ahn 2002). By dominating the NCU and eliminating any constitutional restriction on presidential eligibility for reelection, President Park became a *de facto* “life-time” President, who could be elected for as many terms as he wanted.

The 1972 Constitution retained most provisions of the Third Republic’s Constitution, which granted the President strong constitutional powers. The President had the power to preside over the State Council, which was instituted to help him decide “important national policies” within the scope of his powers (Article 66); the executive branch over which he exercised complete control enjoyed the right to propose legislative bills to the National Assembly (Article 87) and he also had the right to veto legislative bills (Article 88-2); and he was allowed to appoint most high-ranking officials without the

---

108 In addition, the President assumed the role of the Chairman of the NCU. Therefore, he could strongly influence the way the NCU operated (Article 36).
109 The State Council of the Fourth Republic was composed of the President, the Prime Minister, and ministers (Article 65-2).
110 The list of the “important national policies within the scope of powers of the President” in the Fourth Republic was almost same as that in the Third Republic. For the list of these policies, see footnote 39.
111 The 1972 Constitution enabled the President to exercise unlimited control over the National Assembly by allowing the President to appoint one-third of its members. As a result, the National Assembly simply performed the role of rubber-stamping the legislative bills proposed by the executive branch (S M. Lee 2006). As the following Table shows, the total passage rate of executive-originative bills during the Fourth Republic was extremely high (92%). In addition, the executive branch far outperformed the legislative branch in terms of the number of proposed bills.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number of Bills</th>
<th>Total Number of Passed Bills</th>
<th>Passage Rate</th>
<th>Legislative-Originative Bills</th>
<th>Executive-Originative Bills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Proposed</td>
<td>Number of Passed Bills</td>
<td>Passage Rate</td>
<td>Number of Proposed Bills</td>
<td>Number of Passed Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Republic 9th National Assembly</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th National Assembly</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)
In addition, several provisions, which were either newly added or drastically modified, made the President’s powers much stronger than those found in the Third Republic’s Constitution. First, the President was allowed to exercise more extensive emergency powers under the Fourth Republic’s Constitution. In times of crisis—as determined by the President—he had the power to “take necessary emergency measures in the whole range of the State Affairs, including internal affairs, foreign affairs, national defense, and economic, financial and judicial affairs” (Article 53, emphasis added). Furthermore, in a state of emergency, he could “temporarily suspend the freedom and rights of the people,” which were guaranteed in the Constitution (Article 53). While the President had these extensive emergency powers, the legislative and judicial branches did not have any constitutional means to restrain him from abusing these powers. Although the legislative branch could recommend that the President lift a state of emergency with the consent of one-half or more of the total members of the National Assembly, the President had the power to make a final decision about whether he would comply with this recommendation (Article 53-6). In addition, the judicial branch was not allowed to review the constitutionality of the President’s emergency decrees (Article 53-4).

Second, the President acquired several new constitutional powers which encroached upon those

112 The 1972 Constitution required the consent of the National Assembly only when the President appointed the Prime Minister (Article 63), the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection (Article 72-2), and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Article 103). Since President Park exercised complete control of the National Assembly, he could easily gain the approvals of the National Assembly when appointing these officials. In fact, the National Assembly approved all presidential appointments during the Fourth Republic (SKNA 2008).

113 Throughout the Fourth Republic, President Park frequently used his emergency power. One Korean scholar even described the Fourth Republic as the period of “permanent emergency” (J. K. C. Oh 1976, 72). In total, President Park announced nine emergency decrees. Five (1st, 2nd, 4th, 7th, and 9th) of nine emergency decrees were issued to crack down on those who criticized and resisted his dictatorial regime; three decrees (5th, 6th, and 8th) were announced to repeal the previously issued emergency decrees; and one decree (3rd) was intend to tackle an economic hardship. For a comprehensive explanation of the nine emergency decrees issued by President Park, see S. J. Han (1975) and J. K. C. Oh (1976).

114 In terms of the scope of emergency powers, the Fourth Republic stood in stark contrast to the Third Republic. The Third Republic’s Constitution allowed the President to take “the minimum necessary financial and economic actions” in a state of emergency (Article 73; emphasis added). In contrast, the Fourth Republic’s Constitution conferred upon the President extensive powers to “take necessary emergency measures in the whole range of the State Affairs” (Article 53, emphasis added).

115 The President’s exercise of emergency powers was “less hampered by the civil rights provisions in this constitution” than it had been in the Third Republic’s Constitution (C. I. E. Kim 1973, 222). The Third Republic’s Constitution did not allow the President to restrict the civil rights of the people even in a state of emergency.
of the legislative branch. These new powers included the power to disband the National Assembly *at his will* (Article 59). The *de facto* power to appoint one-third members of the National Assembly (Article 40), and the power to “submit important policies of State to national referendum in case he deems it necessary” *even in times of non-crisis* (Article 49) were also included.\(^{117}\)

Third, the Fourth Republic’s Constitution abolished the Judge Recommendation Council, which, under the Third Republic, had recommended a candidate for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Instead, it allowed the President to appoint the Chief Justice *at his will* (Article 103-1). While the President’s appointment of the Chief Justice still required the consent of the National Assembly, the mere fact that the President had the right to name one-third of the members of the Assembly diminished the importance of its power to approve the President’s appointment of the Chief Justice (D. K. Yoon 1989). In addition, the President acquired the power to appoint all the judges of the appellate and trial courts upon the recommendation of the Chief Justice without the consent of the National Assembly (Article 103-2). As a result, these appointing powers placed the judicial branch under the direct control of the President, thus greatly undermining the principle of judicial independence.

*The National Assembly*

While the 1972 Constitution notably expanded the constitutional powers of the President, it drastically reduced the powers of the National Assembly. As one Korean political scientist pointed out, “The enormous increase in the power of the Presidency has been accomplished, to a great extent, at the expense of the National Assembly” (S. I. Choi 1973, 1092).

The Park regime debilitated the National Assembly in the 1972 Constitution in two ways. First, the Park regime introduced a new electoral system, which was intended to always give the pro-president

---

\(^{116}\) According to the 1972 Constitution, the National Conference for Unification (NCU) had the authority to approve candidates for one-third of the total National Assembly members recommended by the President (Article 40). However, given the fact that the NCU was under the shadow of the President, it was clear that the NCU would not reject the President’s recommendations (S. I. Choi 1973). Therefore, the President had the *de facto* power to appoint one-third of the National Assembly members.

\(^{117}\) This constitutional power implied that even if the National Assembly refused to pass a bill submitted by the President, he could enact the bill into a law without the consent of the Assembly by using a national referendum. As a result, the sole authority of the National Assembly to make laws was drastically undermined (C. I. E. Kim 1973).
party a comfortable majority in the National Assembly. This new electoral system assured a pro-president assembly, which would not exercise any check on the President (S. I. Choi 1976). The new electoral system was composed of 1) an indirect electoral system, in which the President recommended candidates for one-third of the total National Assembly membership and the National Conference for Unification (NCU) had the authority to approve these candidates, and 2) a two-member district system, in which the people directly elected two members in every district and, in total, two-thirds of the National Assembly members (B. M. Ahn et al. 1988; S. M. Lee 2006).¹¹⁸

This mixed electoral system greatly helped place the National Assembly under complete control of the President in two ways. First, the newly introduced indirect electoral system assured that the President easily could fill one-third of the National Assembly seats with pro-president assemblymen. Since President Park filled the NCU with his loyal supporters, the NCU automatically approved the President’s handpicked candidates who were to hold one-third of the total legislative seats. These indirectly elected assemblymen became “President Park’s direct legislative arm” (C. I. E. Kim 1979, 525). Second, the new two-member-district system assured that even an unpopular pro-president party would win half of the remaining two-thirds of the total National Assembly membership. One Korean political scientist spoke directly to this point:

Under the original single-member district (SMD) system, the government party typically won more than 50% of the available seats because of the advantages it had being the largest party. As opposition became more unified and electoral competition increased, government advantages in the single-member districts declined and its ability to win a majority safely was threatened . . . Under the new two-seat system, this problem would be solved . . . While government party candidates would surely not be first-place winners in all . . . districts, there would be virtually none where they would lose to a second-place winner (S. M. Lee 2006, 71-72).

As Table 6-1 indicates, this mixed electoral system greatly helped the pro-president legislative members, pro-president members elected under the two-member district system and all legislative

¹¹⁸ Although the previous 1962 Constitution stated that the members of the National Assembly served a four-year term, the 1972 Constitution provided that “The term of office of members of the National Assembly shall be six years. However, the term of office of the members of the National Assembly elected by the National Conference for Unification shall be three years” (Article 77).
members appointed by the National Conference for Unification, always maintain more than a two-thirds supermajority in the National Assembly, thus completely dominating it. This complete domination precluded the National Assembly from using its constitutional powers to check the President throughout the Fourth Republic (B. M. Ahn 2002; C. W. Park 1998).

Table 6-1. Party Division in the Fourth Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Party Division in the National Assembly</th>
<th>Total Seats</th>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Other Parties</th>
<th>Independents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th National Assembly</td>
<td>Appointment (National Conference for Unification)</td>
<td>March 12, 1973 - March 11, 1979</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Democratic Republican Party (Pro-administration) 73</td>
<td>New Democratic Party (Anti-administration) 52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th National Assembly</td>
<td>Appointment (National Conference for Unification)</td>
<td>March 12, 1979 - October 27, 1980</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Democratic Republican Party (Pro-administration) 68</td>
<td>New Democratic Party (Anti-administration) 61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)

It is important to indicate that although the 1972 Constitution drastically reduced the constitutional powers of the National Assembly, it still granted the National Assembly several powers to check the President, if properly exercised. These powers included: the power to approve the annual budget submitted by the executive (Article 89); the power to approve the presidential appointments of

---

119 The complete domination of pro-president members over the National Assembly greatly discouraged it from exercising effective budgetary control over the executive branch. As the following table shows, the 9th and 10th assemblies played a marginal role in increasing or reducing the original budget proposed by the executive branch. However, it is important to note that although the 9th assembly approved all 12 budget bills, the 10th assembly approved only two out of all four budget bills and put the other two on shelf (SKNA 2008). Shelving two budget bills could be largely attributed to a political turmoil created by the assassination of President Park in October 1979. President Park’s sudden death led his one-man regime to crumble quickly. The collapse of the Park regime made it impossible for the 10th assembly to perform its budgetary activities as scheduled (D. S. Suh 1982).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republic</th>
<th>National Assembly</th>
<th>Number of Budget Bills Proposed by the President</th>
<th>Number of Budget Bills Approved by the National Assembly</th>
<th>Approval Ratio Of Budget Bills</th>
<th>Budget Increase/Decrease Rate after the Process of Budget Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th Republic</td>
<td>9th Assembly</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>- 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th Assembly</td>
<td>10th Assembly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>- 0.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)
the Prime Minister (Article 63), the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection (Article 72), and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Article 103), the power to remove the Prime Minister or individual members of the State Council from office (Article 97), the power to override a presidential veto (Article 84); and the power to impeach high ranking officials, including the President (Article 99).

However, the newly introduced electoral system greatly diminished the importance of these constitutional powers to check the President by assuring that pro-president legislators would always gain more than a two-thirds supermajority in the National Assembly. Since these pro-president legislators never agreed to exercise legislative checks on the President, the National Assembly did not have the slightest chance of holding the President in check (S. M. Lee 2006).

Second, the Park regime disabled the most powerful weapon of the legislative branch by removing from the 1972 Constitution the power to inspect and investigate the administration of the

---

120 During the Fourth Republic, the National Assembly approved all the appointments made by the President (SKNA 2008).
121 Unlike the Third Republic’s Constitution, which provided that the National Assembly, with the consent of more than one half of its total members, had the right to recommend the removal of the Prime Minister or any member of the State Council to the President, the Fourth Republic’s Constitution authorized the National Assembly, with the concurrence of a majority of its total members, to directly remove the prime minister or individual members of the State Council (Article 97-2). In addition, when a motion for the removal of the Prime Minister was passed, the President was required to remove not only the Prime Minister but also all members of the State Council (Article 97-3). Although this “removal” provision appeared to greatly strengthen the power of the National Assembly to check the appointing power of the President, the National Assembly did not have any chance of using its removal power largely because the new electoral system assured that pro-president members would always occupy more than two-thirds of the total seats in the assembly. In fact, not a single motion for removal was proposed throughout the Fourth Republic (SKNA 2008).
122 Although the Fourth Republic’s Constitution conserved the power of the National Assembly to impeach high-ranking officials, it drastically reduced its impeachment power. The Third Republic’s Constitution required more than 30 members of the National Assembly to propose an impeachment motion for high-ranking officials, including the President, and one-half or more of its members to approve the motion for impeachment. However, the Fourth Republic’s Constitution established an exceedingly high threshold for invoking impeachment for high-ranking officials, and made the legislative branch’s impeachment power meaningless. Concerning the National Assembly’s power to impeach high-ranking officials other than the President, the Fourth Republic’s Constitution required one-third or more of the total members of the National Assembly to propose a motion for impeachment while it retained the provision that allowed the National Assembly to approve the impeachment motion by a simple majority (Article 99-2). Given the fact that the new electoral system made it very difficult for anti-president legislators to win more than one-third of the total seats of the National Assembly, it was self-evident that the National Assembly could not even propose a motion for impeachment. In addition, the Fourth Republic’s Constitution made the impeachment of the President even more improbable by requiring one-third or more of total members of the National Assembly to propose an impeachment motion and the two-thirds or more of its total members to approve the motion for impeachment (Article 99-2). Given these strict impeachment requirements, it is no surprise that during the Fourth Republic, not a single impeachment motion was brought against not only the President but also his cabinet members (SKNA 2008).
executive branch (S. H. Kil 2001). Throughout the Third Republic, the legislative branch’s power to inspect and investigate the executive branch was a great distress to the Park regime because the anti-president parties effectively used this power to disclose its mismanagement, corruption, and electoral fraud. This disclosure often led many people to turn hostile to President Park’s absolute rule. In particular, the Park regime found the investigative power most troublesome because the National Assembly was allowed to initiate an investigation into the executive branch if a mere 30 members agreed to do so (Flanz 1967-68; C. Y. Park 1968). For example, although the pro-president party dominated the National Assembly throughout the Third Republic, the assembly undertook 40 investigations into the executive branch (SKNA 2008). To prevent a small number of anti-president members from exercising such a legislative check on the President, the Park regime stripped the National Assembly of its power to inspect and investigate the executive branch in the Fourth Republic’s Constitution, making the legislative branch “nothing but an appendage of the administrative state” (S. H. Kil 2001, 51). In sum, Park’s authoritarian regime never tolerated any chance of legislative checks.

*The Courts*

The 1972 Constitution, which glorified the concentration of powers in the hands of the President, not only made the National Assembly a “handmaid” of the President (C. L. Kim and S. T. Pai 1981, 31), but also greatly undermined judicial independence (S. D. Lee 1986). After experiencing a brief period of an activist Court, which invalidated some of his policies at the end of the Third Republic, President Park felt a strong need to maintain complete control over the judicial branch in order to keep his absolute rule (Healy 2000-01).123

The 1972 Constitution, President Park’s handiwork, provided the President with new constitutional measures to exercise unlimited control over the judicial branch. First, the President obtained the power to appoint all the judges of the supreme, appellate, and trial courts (Article 103). Given the fact that President Park became a *de facto* “life-time” President under the 1972 Constitution and the tenure of all the judges, except the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, was ten years (Article

---

123 For an episode of an activist Court, see pages 57-59.
it was certain that all the judges would face the reappointments by President Park and he would not reappoint judges who made decisions in a manner inconsistent with his political and policy agendas. Therefore, this extensive appointing power of the President placed judges under his shadow (D. K. Yoon 1989).

Second, the President acquired the power to “enforce emergency measures with regard to the rights and powers of ... the Judiciary” in times of crisis (Article 53). Considering the fact that the President had the sole authority to decide whether a situation was a crisis or not, it was clear that the President could disempower the judicial branch anytime he wanted to do so in the name of crisis (Wright 1975).

In addition to these constitutional measures which enabled the President to ‘tame’ the judicial branch, the 1972 Constitution delivered a knock-out blow to judicial independence by depriving the Supreme Court of the power to test the constitutionality of laws. Instead, the 1972 Constitution revived the Constitutional Committee, which proved to be a complete failure under the First Republic, and empowered it to review the constitutionality of laws. A new version of the Constitutional Committee was a standing body with nine members: three members appointed by the President, three by the National Assembly, and three by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Because the President had the power to appoint three members of the Constitutional Committee, pro-president legislators held more than two-
thirds of seats in the National Assembly, and the President appointed his faithful follower as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the President could easily fill the Constitutional Committee with the pro-president members. As a result, it was clear that even if the Committee had any opportunity to review the constitutionality of a law, it would do so in a way that the President found acceptable (H. J. Kim 1992; D. K. Yoon 1989).

The Constitutional Committee “was not empowered to review the constitutionality of laws on its own initiative” (Healy 2000-01, 218; emphasis added). Rather, the Committee had to wait for the Supreme Court to refer to it the questions of the constitutionality of laws. It implied that the Committee would have no opportunity to conduct a judicial review of a law if the Supreme Court did not request it to do so (Healy 2000-01). In fact, the Supreme Court, which was under President Park’s complete control, did not make a single referral of a constitutional question to the Constitutional Committee during the Fourth Republic. Therefore, the Committee had no opportunity to test the constitutionality of a single law (D. K. Yoon 1995). Under the Fourth Republic, the Constitutional Committee remained as “merely a nominal being that existed only on a paper” (K. Yang 1993, 2).

**The Fifth Republic (1980-1987)**

In October 1979, President Park was assassinated by the director of the Korean Central Intelligence Agency, who was his own right-hand man. Since President Park placed himself above the legislative, executive, and judicial branches and concentrated all powers in his hands, his assassination created political turmoil. During the turmoil, the military seized power by launching a coup in December 1979. The growing civil protest against the military rule led the military to declare martial law throughout the entire country in May 1980. After declaring martial law, the military brutally cracked down on civilians who protested the military rule.128 Then it dissolved the National Assembly, disbanded all political parties, banned political activities, and applied strict censorship on the press (B. M. Ahn 2002).

After declaring martial law, the military forced President Kyu-Ha Choi, who was elected as President by the National Conference for Unification (NCU) right after President Park was assassinated, 128 For a detailed explanation of the military’s bloody suppression and its atrocities, see the Asia Watch (1986).
to step down in August 1980. Only 11 days after President Choi resigned, the NCU was convened to elect a new President. General Doo-Whan Chun, the leader of the 1979 military coup, ran for the presidency as a sole candidate. The NCU elected him as President. Among 2,525 members of the NCU, 2,524 members voted for General Chun (C. S. Lee 1980). He became “the last president of the fourth republic, elected in accordance with the provisions of Park’s constitution” (D. S. Suh 1982, 108).

Right after his inauguration, President Chun established the Constitution Deliberation Committee to pushed for a constitutional amendment. This amendment was approved by a national referendum in October 1980. Ninety-five and a half percent of eligible voters participated and 91.6 percent of all participants approved the 1980 constitutional amendment (Smith 1986). The amendment drastically changed the Fourth Republic’s Constitution in many aspects. As a result, a new Constitution was called the Fifth Republic’s Constitution to distinguish the differences between the old and new Constitutions.

Finally, martial law was lifted in January 1981, signaling the beginning of the Fifth Republic. In accordance with the new Constitution, President Chun was again elected as the first President of the Fifth Republic in February 1981 by the newly created Presidential Electoral College. The people were allowed to form political parties—although the political activities of influential politicians were still prohibited. Then, a legislative election was held in March 1981 to reinstate the dissolved National

---

129 With the sudden death of President Park, the Fourth Republic’s Constitution “lost its raison d’etre” because its sole purpose was “to make possible President Park’s stay in office indefinite” (S. D. Lee 1986, 26-27). As a result, there was a strong need to frame a new Constitution. Even, President Kyu-Ha Choi stated in his inaugural speech in December 1979 that “a new constitution supported by a majority of the people would be adopted within in a year” (quoted in C. S. Lee 1981, 126). This statement implied that “his government . . . was to be a transitional one to usher in a new political structure,” which was to be created by a new constitution (C. S. Lee 1981, 126). President Choi dispatched several missions abroad to study the constitutions of advanced countries and held many hearings to solicit various public opinions. He also encouraged scholars to discuss how to change the Fourth Republic’s Constitution. However, the military leaders, after seizing power by a coup, made these efforts futile by submitting their own draft for a new constitution, which was made in secrecy, to a national referendum (S. D. Lee 1986).

130 In the 1981 presidential election, four candidates, including President Chun, ran for the presidency. Since the military regime prohibited the political activities of influential politicians, “Chun’s opponents were virtually unknown, even to the best-informed observers” (D. S. Suh 1982, 109). In addition, Chun’s hand-picked electoral college “resulted in the absence of effective opposition to President Chun Doo Hwan” (West and Baker 1988, 141). As a result, President Chun polled 90.23 percent of electoral votes and won nearly unanimously (D. S. Suh 1982).

131 In November 1980, the military regime banned the political activities of 567 politicians, “destroying the power base of all existing political figures and groups” (C. S. Lee 1980, 130). As a result, most prominent politicians were not allowed to run for the 1981 legislative election. Therefore, it came as no surprise that the Democratic Justice Party, the military leaders’ handiwork, swept the 1981 legislative election (B. M. Ahn et al. 1988).
The Fifth Republic’s Constitution (October 27, 1980)

The President

The Fifth Republic’s Constitution—hereinafter referred to as the 1980 Constitution—“resembled in large measure the Park’s [1972] constitution” (D. S. Suh 1982, 109). It granted the President powers similar to those wielded by President Park of the Fourth Republic. The President had the power to: submit important policies to a national referendum, circumventing the regular legislative process (Article 47); use emergency powers that could temporarily suspend the rights of the people “in a whole range of State Affairs” in times of crisis (Article 51);132 dissolve the National Assembly (Article 57);133 run the executive branch, which was allowed to propose legislative bills to the National Assembly; and veto legislative bills (Article 88);134 appoint most high-ranking officials without the consent of the National Assembly (Article

132 The Fifth Republic’s Constitution placed a new restriction on the emergency powers of the President. Once the President issued an emergency decree, the Fifth Republic’s Constitution required the President to promptly submit it to the National Assembly and obtain its approval. If no approval was obtained, the emergency decree immediately lost its effect (Article 51). In contrast, the Fourth Republic’s Constitution simply required the President to notify his issuance of an emergency decree to the National Assembly. The National Assembly’s approval of the emergency decree was not constitutionally required (J. K. C. Oh 1976). In practice, President Chun issued no emergency decrees throughout the Fifth Republic (SKNA 2008).

133 Under the Fourth Republic’s Constitution, the President had the power to dissolve the National Assembly as he deemed it necessary (J. K. C. Oh 1976). However, the Fifth Republic’s Constitution placed one restriction on this power by providing that the President was not permitted to dissolve the National Assembly within one year of its formation (Article 57-1).

134 In the Fifth Republic, a newly introduced mixed electoral system, which was intended to assure that the pro-president party candidates would always grab more than a majority of legislative seats, placed the National Assembly under the strong control of the pro-president party. As a result, the pro-president assembly simply “rubber-stamped” legislative bills proposed by the executive branch—headed by the President (West and Baker 1988). In fact, the executive branch completely dominated the legislative process. As the following Table indicates, in both the 11th and the 12th assemblies, the executive branch proposed much more bills than the legislative branch did. In addition, in each assembly, the passage rate of executive-originative bills was much higher than that of legislative-originative bills (SKNA 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republic</th>
<th>National Assembly</th>
<th>Total Number of Bills</th>
<th>Total Number of Passed Bills</th>
<th>Passage Rate</th>
<th>Legislative-originative Bills</th>
<th>Executive-originative Bills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Proposed Bills</td>
<td>Number of Passed Bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Republic</td>
<td>11th National Assembly</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th National Assembly</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>868</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)

129
and decide important policies, which came within the scope of his powers, with the help of the State Council (Article 64).

The most distinctive feature of the new constitution is a constitutional single-term limit on the President (S. D. Lee 1986; D. K. Yoon 1995). Under the 1980 Constitution, the President was elected indirectly by the Presidential Electoral College only for a single seven-year term (Article 39 and 45). Although this constitutional term limit on the President could be removed by a constitutional amendment, the incumbent President was prohibited from running for another term (Article 129). This prohibition was designed to discourage the incumbent President from amending the Constitution in order to stay in office longer (D. S. Suh 1982).

However, the mere fact that the 1980 Constitution retained the indirect election of the President diminished the importance of a single-term limit on the President. The 1980 Constitution abolished the National Conference for Unification, which was charged with the election of the President under the Fourth Republic’s Constitution, and instead introduced the Presidential Electoral College (PEC) with the authority to elect the President. The PEC consisted of more than 5,000 electors, who were elected by the people, and these electors had the right to elect the President (Article 40). Although the PEC was designed to be a non-partisan body, in which electors were prohibited from joining any political party, the Chun regime conducted a thorough screening procedure for all the candidates for electors in order to make sure that all the candidates were chosen from its strong supporters. As a result, the people had no choice but to select electors only from pro-president candidates hand-picked by the Chun regime. These pro-president electors completely dominated the Presidential Electoral College (West and Baker 1988).

Given the fact that the Presidential Electoral College (PEC), which was packed with strong supporters of President Chun, enjoyed the constitutional power to choose the next President, it was self-

---

135 There were three exceptions of the Prime Minister (Article 62-1), the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection (Article 73-2), and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Article 105-1), whose appointments needed the approvals of the National Assembly. The National Assembly approved all the appointments made by the President during the Fifth Republic (SKNA 2008).

136 The list of the “important national policies within the scope of powers of the President” in the Fourth Republic was almost same as that in the Third Republic. For the list of these policies, see footnote 39.
evident that President Chun’s hand-picked successor would be elected as the next President (C. P. Chung 2003). As West and Baker (1988) pointed out, the PEC’s indirect election of the next President might turn into “no more than a rubber-stamping for [Chun’s] choice” (141). Although the new constitutional single-term limit prevented the incumbent President from being reelected, the newly introduced PEC still left open the possibility that the incumbent President might influence who was to be elected as the next President and exercise unlimited influence behind the scenes even after he stepped down (S. D. Hahm 1999).

The National Assembly

Like its predecessor of the Fourth Republic, the National Assembly of the Fifth Republic had weak constitutional powers, which were insufficient to restrain the overriding powers of the President and the executive branch over which he exercised exclusive control. In fact, the powers of the National Assembly in the 1980 Constitution were largely similar to those found in the 1972 Constitution, except that the 1980 Constitution restored the constitutional power to investigate particular problems of the executive branch (Article 97). The 1980 Constitution granted the National Assembly several important constitutional powers. These powers included the power to propose and pass bills (Article 76 and 88); to approve the annual budget (Article 90); the power to approve the presidential appointments of the Prime Minister (Article 62), the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection (Article 73), and the

---

137 In the Fifth Republic, the National Assembly had no opportunity to investigate any problems created by the executive branch. The 1980 Constitution required more than 30 members to request an investigation and a majority of the total members to approve it. Although the anti-president members in the 11th and 12th assemblies requested 19 investigations, they gained no investigation approvals because both assemblies were under the control of the pro-president party and it disagreed to investigate the wrongdoings of the executive branch that was fully responsive to the President’s political and policy agenda (C. W. Park 1998; SKNA 2008).

138 Since both the 11th and 12th assemblies were dominated by the pro-president party (Table 6-2), the legislative branch failed to exercise active budget control over the executive branch. The following table shows the marginal role of the legislative branch in the budgetary process. The National Assembly approved all budget bills submitted by the executive branch. In addition, it neither reduced nor increased the original budget to a significant extent (SKNA 2008).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republic</th>
<th>National Assembly</th>
<th>Number of Budget Bills Proposed by the President</th>
<th>Number of Budget Bills Approved by the National Assembly</th>
<th>Approval Ratio Of Budget Bills</th>
<th>Budget Increase/Decrease Rate after the Process of Budget Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5th Republic</td>
<td>11th Assembly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>- 0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12th Assembly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>- 0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)
Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Article 105);\textsuperscript{139} the power to override a presidential veto (Article 89); the power to remove the prime minister and the members of the State Council (Article 99);\textsuperscript{140} and the power to impeach high ranking officials, including the President (Article 101).\textsuperscript{141}

At first glance, the 1980 Constitution appeared to create more favorable conditions for the National Assembly than did the 1972 Constitution mainly because the 1980 Constitution eliminated the power of the President to appoint one-third members of the National Assembly. Therefore, the President of the Fifth Republic was expected to exercise less control over the legislative branch than did his predecessor of the Fourth Republic. However, the introduction of a new electoral system assured that the pro-president party, the President’s own handiwork, could easily win the majority seats in the National Assembly, thus encouraging the President to exercise exclusive dominance over the National Assembly. As West and Baker (1988) noted, the Chun regime used the new electoral system “to retain a façade of democratic institutions for its authoritarian rule” (141).

Under the new electoral system, the National Assembly was composed of 276 legislative members. One hundred and eighty four “local district” members (two-thirds of the total members) were popularly elected as representatives of 92 local districts with two representatives from each district.\textsuperscript{142} The

\textsuperscript{139} In the Fifth Republic, the National Assembly approved all the appointments made by the President (SKNA 2008).
\textsuperscript{140} Like the 1972 Constitution, the 1980 Constitution conferred upon the National Assembly the power to bring down the Prime Minister or any member of the State Council. The National Assembly was allowed to remove them from office if one-third or more of its total members requested \textit{and} one-half or more of its total members agreed to do so. In addition, if the National Assembly passed a motion for the removal of the Prime Minister, the President should remove not only the prime minister but also all members of the State Council. However, the 1980 Constitution placed one restriction on the removal power of the National Assembly by providing that the National Assembly was not permitted to remove the Prime Minister within one year of his appointment (Article 99-1). Although the anti-president parties proposed 18 motions for the removal of members of the State Council (the 11th assembly: 11 motions; the 12th assembly: 7 motions) in the 11th and 12th assemblies, they failed to remove the State Council members because the pro-president party, which was under the complete control of the President, occupied the majority seats and they disagreed to remove the President’s appointees (SKNA 2008).
\textsuperscript{141} There is no difference between the Fourth and Fifth Constitutions in terms of the impeachment power of the National Assembly. For a concise explanation of the impeachment power of the National Assembly, see pages 54.
\textsuperscript{142} Electoral districts were arbitrarily drawn to privilege the pro-president party to the disadvantage of the anti-president parties. This arbitrary electoral districting was intended to increase the voting power of rural districts that “provided the pillar of support for the government party” and to dilute the voting power of urban districts that were seen as “the bastion of the opposition” (B. C. Koh 1985, 890). For example, in the 1985 election, the four largest cities, with around 42 percent of all eligible voters, were allocated only about 27 percent (54 seats) of all 184 local district seats. This gerrymandering made the relative value of one vote in rural areas higher than that in urban areas, thus contravening the egalitarian principle of “one citizen-one vote.” This intentional malapportionment scheme was designed to yield more seats for the pro-president party than the anti-president party (S. M. Lee 2006).
remaining 92 “national district” members (one-third of the total members) were elected in accordance with a unique proportional representation formula (Article 77). This unique electoral system was intended to benefit the pro-president party more than its counterparts. In the first place, the two-member district system assured that pro-president candidates would always win close to one-half of local district seats. In the single-member district system, in which only one top vote-getter was elected in each district, a pro-president party candidate had a low chance of being elected to the National Assembly when he or she competed with an influential politician from the anti-president parties. However, in the two-member district system, which allowed not only the top vote-getter but also the runner-up to be elected, a pro-president party candidate still had a high chance of being elected even when he or she faced a strong anti-president party candidate. Given the fact that the Chun regime committed massive electoral fraud, manipulated the broadcast media, and mobilized vast financial and administrative resources, it was not difficult for the pro-president party candidate to receive the second largest votes (Baker and West 1988; C. W. Park 1998). As one Korean legal scholar pointed out, “running for office on the ruling party ticket guaranteed success in many districts” (D. K. Yoon 1995, 404).143

Second, a distorted type of proportional representation system also gave a definite advantage to the pro-president party. Under this proportional representation system, the party winning the largest number of local district seats—regardless of the aggregate popular votes—was supposed to receive two-thirds (61 seats) of 92 non-elective national district seats (one-third of the total members) as “a disproportionate bonus” (Baker and West 1988, 142).144 The pro-president party was “the sole beneficiary” of this disproportionate bonus because the two-member district system assured that the pro-president party would always win more local district seats than other parties (B. C. Koh 1985, 888). In sum, the new mixed electoral system that combined a two-member district system with a distorted

143 The two-member district electoral system greatly benefited the pro-president party candidates in two legislative election held in the Fifth Republic. In the 1981 legislative election, the pro-president party nominated 92 candidates for 92 local districts (one candidate for each district). All but two candidates were elected to the National Assembly (D. S. Suh 1982). The 1985 legislative election also showed the similar outcome. 87 out of 92 pro-president party candidates were elected (B. C. Koh 1985).

144 The remaining 31 national district seats were allocated to other parties that won at least five seats in accordance to the share of the local district seats that they won (B. C. Koh 1985).
proportional representation system enabled the pro-president party to enjoy “a comfortable majority in the National Assembly” throughout the Fifth Republic (H. N. Kim 1989, 482). As Table 6-2 shows, the pro-president party, the Democratic Justice Party, easily won the majority seats in the 11th and 12th assemblies.

Table 6-2. Party Division in the Fifth Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Party Division in the National Assembly</th>
<th>Total Seats</th>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Other Parties</th>
<th>Independents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11th National Assembly 5th Republic</td>
<td>Democratic Justice Party (Pro-president)</td>
<td>276 (92)</td>
<td>151(61)</td>
<td>81(24)</td>
<td>33 (7)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th National Assembly 5th Republic</td>
<td>Democratic Justice Party (Pro-president)</td>
<td>276 (92)</td>
<td>148 (61)</td>
<td>67 (17)</td>
<td>57 (14)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: while the former number in each parenthesis is the number of district seats, the latter number is the number of proportional representation seats
Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)

The new mixed electoral system strengthened the power of the President to dominate the National Assembly. Considering the fact that President Chun assumed the role of the head of the pro-president party and exercised overwhelming influence over the way the pro-president party nominated and endorsed candidates for the legislative seats, it came as no surprise that pro-president party assemblymen...
were under his complete control (B. M. Ahn 2002, D. K. Yoon 1995). Since the mixed electoral system enabled the pro-president party to always remain in control of the National Assembly, the President easily pushed pro-president party assemblymen into passing bills that he regarded as essential in pursuing his political and policy agenda (C. W. Park 1998). He also prevented anti-president parties from exercising any constitutional checks on the executive branch that faithfully executed his political and policy agenda because the 1980 Constitution stated that “the attendance of a majority of the total members, and the concurrent vote of a majority of the members present shall be necessary for decisions of the National Assembly” (Article 85). Pro-president legislative members, who accounted for more than one-half of total legislative members, never joined any initiatives to check the President (SKNA 2008). In sum, the new electoral system actually ‘emasculated’ the constitutional powers of the National Assembly to hold the President in check, making it an instrument of legitimating whatever he decided (S. H. Kil 2001).

The Courts

Like the Fourth Republic’s Constitution, the 1980 Constitution failed to provide the judicial branch with strong constitutional measures to protect its independence from the President. Given the fact that there was no fundamental difference between the judicial branch of the Fifth Republic and its counterpart of the Fourth Republic, it was clear that the problem of the presidential encroachment upon the judicial branch would repeat in the Fifth Republic (Healy 2000-01; S. D. Lee 1986).

Although the National Assembly had the power to approve the President’s appointment of the Chief Justice, it was almost impossible for his opponents to effectively exercise that power to block his appointment of his blind follower as the Chief Justice. In the Fifth Republic, the new mixed electoral system assured that the pro-president party would always dominate the National Assembly and, therefore, it was self-evident that the pro-president assembly would automatically approve the President’s appointee

---

146 One Korean legal scholar explained how the pro-president party controlled its assemblymen through the candidate endorsement process as follows:

The [pro-president] party’s endorsement was often more important than the support of the constituency. Once endorsed, the candidate usually enjoyed clear sailing with a properly financed campaign and with the cooperation of public organizations. Then upon entering office, a ruling party legislator had to toe the party line and obey orders. To do otherwise would have been political suicide (D. K. Yoon 1995, 404).
for Chief Justice without examining his or her ethical and professional qualifications. In fact, this automatic approval enabled the President to choose loyalty over competency in appointing the Chief Justice, thereby exercise guiding influence over him behind the scenes (K. W. Ahn 1997-98; D. K. Yoon 1989).

The President’s behind-the-scenes influence greatly undermined the independence of the judicial branch in three ways. First, the President easily packed the Supreme Court with pro-president Justices. Given the fact that the Chief Justice, who the President had appointed based on his loyalty, had the sole power to recommend candidates for the Supreme Court Justices to the President (Article 105-2), it came as no surprise that the “loyal” Chief Justice screened and recommended only candidates who demonstrated unwavering commitment to the President’s political and policy agenda (Healy 2000-01).

Second, the President kept the appellate and trial courts remain under his control. Although the 1980 Constitution restored a provision that authorized the Chief Justice to appoint all the judges of the appellate and trial courts (Article 105), it was not the Chief Justice who had a de facto power to make these appointments, but the President (West and Baker 1988). Because the President maintained complete control of the Chief Justice, he easily encouraged the Chief Justice to fill the appellate and trial courts with pro-president judges (K. Yang 1993).

Lastly, the President disempowered the Constitutional Committee, which was responsible for reviewing the constitutionality of laws. The Committee was composed of nine standing members: three members appointed by the President, three by the National Assembly, and three by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (Article 112). Since the pro-president party always remained in control of the National Assembly and the President appointed his loyal follower as the Chief Justice, the President easily

---

147 The Fourth Republic’s Constitution stripped the Chief Justice of the power to appoint the all the judges of the appellate and trial courts. Instead, it conferred this appointing power upon the President in order to place the judicial branch under the complete control of the President (D. K. Yoon 1989).
148 The 1980 Constitution also failed to restore the pre-Fourth Republic “collegial process,” which required the Chief Justice to gain the consent of the Conference of Supreme Court Justices when he appointed all the judges of the appellate and trial courts (West and Baker 1988, 161). The Third Republic’s Constitution made it clear that “Judges other than the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court Justices shall be appointed by the Chief Justice with the consent of the Conference of Supreme Court Justices” (Article 99-3).
149 The Fifth Republic’s Constitution inherited the Constitutional Committee, which had been introduced in the Fourth Republic’s Constitution (Article 108-1).
manipulated the composition of the Committee, thus packing it with pro-president members. This committee-packing was intended to discourage the Committee from invalidating any laws that were consistent with the President’s political and policy agenda (D. K. Yoon 1988). It is also important to note that the Committee was allowed to decide the constitutionality of a law only when the Supreme Court referred a constitutional question of the law to the Committee. Given the fact that the Supreme Court was filled with the President’s loyal followers, it came as no surprise that it never requested the Committee to exercise constitutional review. As a result, the Committee had no opportunity to review even a single law (K. W. Ahn 1997-98; Healy 2000-01).

The foregoing account of the constitutional powers of three branches in the Fourth and Fifth Constitutions clearly demonstrates that these two “Growth Period” Constitutions amplified the constitutional powers of the president and emasculated those of the legislative and judicial branches. Under the “Growth Period” Constitutions, the legislative and judicial branches were too powerless to check the extraordinarily strong powers of the President (T. S. Kim and S. D. Lee 1992). In fact, an excessive type of executive-centered governing order was fully entrenched as the governing order in the Growth Period.

However, it is important to indicate that the “Growth Period” Constitutions glorified an even more extreme type of executive-centered governing order than the “monarchical” executive-centered governing order that the “Founding Period” Constitutions upheld. Although the “Founding Period” Constitutions tilted the constitutional balance of power in favor of the President, they still granted the legislative and judicial branches several strong powers to hold the President in check. In fact, the “Founding Period” Constitutions did not completely discard the principle of separation of powers and recognized the President as “first among equals” (S. D. Lee 1986; C. Y. Pak 1968). In contrast, the “Growth Period” Constitutions completely abandoned the principle of separation of powers and promoted “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order. As one Korean political scientist put it, “the Constitution became the Constitution of the President, by the President, and for the President” in the Growth Period (H. J. Kim 1992). Under the “Growth Period” Constitutions, the President was indeed
“superior among unequals”: the President was not equal, but superior to the legislative and judicial branches. The “Growth Period” Constitutions not only empowered the President to take complete control of the legislative and judicial branches but also eliminated nearly all constitutional powers of the legislative and judicial branches to check the President. Without any legislative and judicial checks, the president was also allowed to exercise exclusive control over the executive branch. In fact, the legislative and judicial branches were reduced to being subordinate to the President, and the President became the supreme leader standing above the legislative, executive, and judicial branches (Healy 2000-01; C. W. Park 1998).

“Hard-Core” Monarchial Executive-Centered Governing Order, the Authoritarian Developmental State and the Role of Public Administration

As discussed in the previous section, the “Growth Period” Constitutions upheld “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order by conferring nearly “omnipotent” powers upon the President and dismantling almost all constitutional checks on him (B. C. Lee 2003). In the Growth Period, President Park of the Fourth Republic and President Chun of the Fifth Republic abused these “omnipotent” powers in order to consolidate what was later called the “authoritarian developmental state,” which maintained tight control over civil society and market (E. M. Kim 2010). In fact, “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order provided fertile ground for the consolidation of the authoritarian developmental state.

In this section, I will carefully examine how the authoritarian developmental state under the regimes of President Park and President Chun controlled civil society and market. In doing so, I will also investigate the role of public administration in maintaining the authoritarian developmental state. In particular, I will pay special attention to the role of the intelligence agencies in suppressing civil society and the role of the Economic Planning Board in guiding the market.
Since President Park of the Fourth Republic maintained power by declaring martial law and President Chun of the Fifth Republic seized power by launching a military coup, neither of them had democratic legitimacy. Both presidents believed that civil society’s strong demand for democratization would pose an insurmountable threat to their authoritarian regimes. Therefore, they attempted to consolidate their authoritarian rule by harshly suppressing the democratization movement in civil society. This brutal crackdown led beleaguered civic groups to fight against the two authoritarian regimes (B. C. Lee 2003; S. H. Kil 2001). In fact, the state had stood “in constant conflict with civil society” and “an endless cycle of repression and resistance” had repeated in the Growth Period (S. H. Kim 1996, 93).

In the Growth Period, three kinds of civic groups—college student groups, labor unions, and faith-based groups—were active in resisting dictatorship and promoting democracy. Especially, college student groups took the lead in the democratization movement. Their pro-democracy protests often acted as a “catalyst” for sparking nationwide uprisings against the authoritarian regimes and student activists were always at the forefront of such uprisings (Wood 2004, 56). As one Korean scholar noted, “the tradition of the university student-led prodemocracy movement” became fully “enshrined in Korean politics” in the Growth Period (Y. W. Kihl 2005, 277).

Labor unions also played an active role in the democratization movement in the Growth Period. Although the authoritarian regimes maintained hostile policies towards labor unions, ironically, labor unions grew stronger as a result of these regimes’ unbending commitment to economic growth (Koo 2001). Since the authoritarian regimes pursued economic growth by pushing industrialists into building up various manufacturing industries quickly, this rapid build-up drastically increased the number of manufacturing workers. A huge number of new manufacturing workers joined labor unions and sought to bargain together and take collective actions to defend their interests. In fact, the drastic increase in membership enabled labor unions to fight against the oppressive labor policies of the authoritarian regimes more effectively than before (H. R. Kim 2000).
Lastly, the authoritarian regimes faced strong resistance from faith-based groups in the Growth Period—especially, in the Christian community. Their resistance was “unexpected” because they “had hardly been active as an anti-government force” in the Founding Period (S. H. Kim 1996, 89). However, after observing the authoritarian regimes’ bloody crackdown on pro-democracy protesters, many catholic priests and protestant pastors “took on themselves the role of public advocates for human rights and democracy” and their faith-based groups acted as “guardians” of student activists, political dissidents, and labor activists in the Growth Period (S. H. Kim 1996, 89). As one scholar noted, “labor and the church, in close cooperation with students, emerged as integral elements in South Korean civil society and thus in the democratic struggle against . . . dictatorship” in the Growth Period (S. H. Kim 1996, 89).

Civil society came under ruthless attacks in the Growth Period from the Park and Chun regimes on three fronts: citizens’ freedoms of association, expression, and assembly were greatly restricted under both authoritarian regimes. First, both regimes greatly restricted citizens’ right to freedom of association—the right to join any civic group freely and take collective actions to pursue the interests of its members. They continued to abuse the Act on the Registration of Social Organizations (ARSO), which authorized relevant government agencies to approve the establishment of civic groups under their jurisdictions and, if deemed necessary, cancel their approval, in order to prevent the growth of pro-democracy civic groups. In fact, government was compelled to only approve pro-government citizens’ requests to establish civic groups and to disband the existing civic groups perceived to either promote democracy or oppose government policies (H. R. Kim 2013).

The Park regime and the Chun regime also undermined workers’ freedom of association. Although both authoritarian regimes allowed workers to establish labor unions, they greatly restricted them from bargaining together and taking collective actions (J. J. Choi 1989; E. M. Kim 1993).  

---

150 For a concise explanation of the ARSO, see page 64.
151 Since its inception in 1963, the ARSO had been criticized for violating citizens’ constitutional right to form associations freely. As a result of democratization, the ARSO was abolished in 1997 (H. R. Kim 2013).
152 In the Founding Period, major labor laws—for example, the Trade Union Act and the Labor Dispute Adjustment Act—protected three basic labor rights of workers: 1) the right to form labor unions, 2) the right to engage in collective bargaining, 3) the right to launch collective industrial actions such as strike and lockout (J. J. Choi 1989).
first place, the Park regime passed the Act on the Special Measures for Safeguarding National Security (ASMSNS) in 1971, which allowed workers to establish labor unions, but disallowed their engagement in collective bargaining and collective industrial actions. The ASMSNS also stipulated that when labor disputes occurred, they should be “subject to government arbitration (with final and legally binding decisions)” (E. M. Kim 1993, 234). Although government had the final authority to resolve labor disputes, it is important to indicate that such disputes were settled in favor of management and against labor under the Park regime. It disregarded labor unions’ demands for higher wages, shorter working hours, and safer working conditions because pro-labor settlement decisions would increase the production costs of manufactured goods, thus weakening their competitiveness in the world market. When these pro-management settlement decisions often triggered labor unions’ strikes, the Park regime responded by brutally quelling them (J. Y. Song 2014). Although the Chun regime abolished the ASMSNS in 1981, it also took a hostile stance against workers, thus restricting their freedom of association. The Chun regime chose to “politicize” labor unions and discourage them from engaging in collective bargaining and collective actions rather than legally prohibiting labor unions from doing so. For example, by revising the Trade Union Act in 1980, the Chun regime imposed “single unionism,” which allowed only one labor union to exist at one workplace (Y. K. Lee 2001). This implied that once a pro-management labor union was set up at a workplace, workers could not establish another labor union to defend their interests. Taking full advantage of single unionism, industrialists rushed headlong into establishing pro-management labor unions before workers established labor unions to defend their interests. These pro-management unions hardly took actions to defend the interests of workers. Whenever workers at one workplace challenged the leadership of the legally recognized pro-management union and attempted to form another labor union, the Chun regime regarded such attempt as illegal and ruthlessly cracked down on it (Koo 2001; J. Y. Song 2014).

153 The ASMSNS prohibited workers’ collective bargaining and collective actions on the grounds that workers’ collective actions would disrupt social order, thus creating a great threat to national security (Y. K. Lee 2011).
Second, the Park regime and the Chun regime drastically curtailed citizens’ freedom of expression by imposing several draconian laws on them. Under the Park regime, a great number of citizens were arrested, detained, and convicted for the violation of the National Security Law (NSL)\(^\text{154}\) and the Anti-Communist Law (ACL)\(^\text{155}\). For example, while President Park ruled the Fourth Republic (1972-1979), 808 citizens were arrested on charges of violating the NSL and 2,438 citizens were charged with violating the ACL (AFMRD 2003, 23). Although the NSL and the ACL were enacted to protect national security from communism, most of those arrested turned out to be either non-communists or anti-communists. In fact, they were political dissidents and civil society activists who condemned the dictatorship of the Park regime and supported the establishment of a democratic regime (K. Cho 1997). They fell victim to the NSL and the ACL because some clauses of both laws were written “in somewhat vague terms, allowing for broad interpretation that may result in sanctioning acts that may not be truly dangerous for State security” (UN 1994, 123). The Park regime “purposely blurred the distinction between political dissent and real threats to national security” in applying both laws: to criticize the Park regime was “to echo North Korean propaganda and to open oneself to the charge of “pro-communism”” (West and Baker 1988, 138-139). The NSL and the ACL were applied indiscriminately to those who criticized and resisted the Park regime. In fact, both laws actually served to defend the “political security” of the Park regime from its critics and opponents rather than preserve “national security” (Youm 1999, 420).

Although President Park lifted Emergency Decree No. 1 in less than one year\(^\text{156}\), he declared Emergency Decree No. 9 in May, 1975 to forbid anyone from criticizing the Fourth Republic’s Constitution and engaging in discussions on constitutional change. It also banned the “fabrication or dissemination of false rumors or misreported facts” (Jones 2001, 1354). Alleged violators were subject to search and seizure, arrest, and detention without warrant. President Park did not lift Emergency Decree

\(^{154}\) For a concise explanation of the NSL, see footnote 61.

\(^{155}\) For a concise explanation of the ACL, see footnote 60.

\(^{156}\) In August 1974, President Park declared Emergency Decree No. 5 to abolish Emergency Decree No. 1 (M. S. H. Kim 2015).
No. 9 before he was gunned down in October, 1979 (B. Chae 2016). According to Supreme Court statistics, a total of 1,387 citizens were arrested and 974 of them (more than 70 percent) were found guilty in trials on charges of violating this emergency decree, which had been in force for more than four and half years (JHCC 2009, 427-428). In fact, President Park’s emergency decrees “placed a gag order on the citizens,” thus undermining freedom of expression. (M. S. H. Kim 2015, 617).

Although President Chun issued no emergency decrees throughout the Fifth Republic, he was no less brutal than his predecessor, President Park, in suppressing citizens’ freedom of expression. The Chun regime continued to apply the anti-communist NSL “as a political weapon against the regime’s opposition” (N. H. Lee 2002, 49).¹⁵⁷ It aggressively used the vaguely worded NSL to arbitrarily target and punish citizens or civic groups perceived to criticize and oppose its political and policy agenda. For example, while President Chun remained in power in the Fifth Republic (from 1980 to 1987), a total of 2,232 citizens were arrested and 1,535 out of them were convicted for violating the NSL (AFMRD 2003, 32).¹⁵⁸ Most of those convicted were later found to be neither communists nor communist sympathizers. In fact, they were charged with violating the NSL simply because they criticized and resisted the dictatorship of the Chun regime and called for democracy (West and Baker 1988).

In addition to imposing stringent limits on freedom of association and expression, the Park regime and the Chun regime greatly abridged citizens’ freedom of assembly. Both authoritarian regimes regarded the growth of pro-democracy protests as imperiling their survival and, thus, violently clamped down on them. Especially, they continued to mount merciless attacks on student activists who were at the forefront of pro-democracy protests (He 2010; S. H. Kim 1996). Under the Park regime, a series of emergency decrees were declared to impede the rapid spread of student-led pro-democracy demonstrations. In April 1974, the Park regime promulgated Emergency Decree No. 4 to prohibit the anti-

---
¹⁵⁷ The ACL was merged with the NSL in 1981 (N. H. Lee 2007).
¹⁵⁸ The total number of those arrested for violating the NSL did not include the number of those who were arrested and released after being temporarily detained. Many of these temporary detainees were reported to be subject to physical abuse, including torture (AFMRD 2003).
regime activities. Under this emergency decree, “students who missed classes without excuse or refused to sit their exams could be subject to punishment of death, life imprisonment, or imprisonment of five years or more” (M. S. H. Kim 2015, 617). Supreme Court statistics revealed that 180 citizens stood trial on charges of violating Emergency Decree No. 4 (JHCC 2009, 427-428). One hundred and seven of these citizens turned out to be college students (B. Chae 2016, 184). In April 1975, the Park regime also issued Emergency Decree No. 7 to temporarily close down Korea University, which was seen as “the hotbed of student demonstrations” (M. S. H. Kim 2015, 617), and sent troops to seize control of it.

While the Park regime mainly wielded emergency powers to limit citizens’ freedom of assembly, the Chun regime relied heavily on the Assembly and Demonstration Act (ADA) to do so. Although the ADA prohibited assemblies and demonstrations that were likely to undermine “public order,” it did not specify the meaning of “public order” and gave local police departments wide discretion to interpret its meaning. The heads of the departments were also allowed to exercise the final authority to determine whether to permit or deny any request for holding an assembly or a demonstration after examining whether its permission would maintain or undermine “public order.” However, since the heads of local police departments remained under the complete control of President Chun, who saw citizens’ resistance to his oppressive rule as jeopardizing public order, the police granted no permission for pro-democracy assemblies and demonstrations, which were likely to resist the Chun regime. Whenever pro-democracy protesters staged any unpermitted demonstrations, the police subdued and arrested them on charges of violating the ADA (Shaw 1992). According to the Supreme Prosecutors’ Office, 5,645 citizens were investigated for suspected violation of the ADA under the Chun regime (from 1980 to 1987). (SPO 1988).

159 In August 1974, President Park promulgated Emergency Decree No. 5 to abolish both Emergency Decree No. 1 and Emergency Decree No. 4 (M. S. H. Kim 2015).

160 In May 1975, President Park issued Emergency Decree No. 8 to repeal Emergency Decree No. 7 (M. S. H. Kim 2015).

161 The 1988 Prosecution Yearbook indicated that a total of 6,701 citizens faced the police investigation over their violation of the ADA from 1968 to 1987 (SPO, 1988). Given the fact that 5,645 (84.2 %) out of 6,701 citizens were placed under the police investigation in Chun regime, it is fair to say that the Chun regime used the ADA to counter pro-democracy protests much more frequently than its previous regimes.
Behind a spate of merciless attacks on civil society were the intelligence agencies, which were seen as the authoritarian presidents’ “main political instrument” (B. K. Kim 2011, 145): the Korean Central Intelligence Agency (K CIA) under the Park regime and the National Security Planning Agency (NSPA) under the Chun regime. Although the KCIA and the NSPA were empowered to supervise and coordinate all intelligence and investigation activities across the government in order to detect and thwart North Korean espionage effectively (K. Cho 1997; B. K. Kim 2011), they actively harnessed their intelligence and investigation powers to harass and suppress civil society in several ways.

First, the KCIA and the NSPA conducted constant surveillance over civil society activists. Since the intelligence agencies always kept a watchful eye on influential civil society activists, they easily arrested many of them, and beat, intimidated, and tortured them into revealing the information about pro-democracy protests. By taking full advantage of such information, the authoritarian regimes could easily crack down on many pro-democracy protests (Y. W. Kihl 2005; P. Y. Park 2007).

Second, the KCIA and the NSPA “manufactured” a series of espionage cases in order to suppress civil society activists. After fabricating evidence to frame civil society activists as home-grown communists or communist sympathizers in such cases, the intelligence agencies mobilized the police to ferret out and arrest them. The arrested activists were coerced and tortured into making false confessions that they had spied for North Korea. Since prosecutors and judges were under complete control of the intelligence agencies, civil society activists were indicted and convicted on fabricated charges of violating the Anti-Communist Law and the National Security Law (Baker 2014; D. C. Kim 2010). The intelligence agencies concocted “fake” espionage cases not only to punish civil society activists, but also to sway public opinion in favor of the authoritarian regimes. In fact, these “fake” espionage cases greatly helped evoke longstanding communism phobia among many Korean people and misled them into strongly supporting the authoritarian regimes that harshly punished pro-democracy civil society activists and

---

162 Under the Chun regime, the KCIA was renamed the NSPA. The NSPA continued to carry out the same functions that the KCIA had undertaken under the Park regime (West and Baker 1988). For a concise explanation of the KCIA’s functions, see page 65.
maliciously framed them as communists or communist sympathizers (B. C. Lee 2003; West and Baker 1988).

Lastly, the KCIA and NSPA suppressed the activities of labor unions by exercising tight control over the Federation of Korean Trade Unions (FKTU) and the Ministry of Labor (MOL). In the first place, the intelligence agencies extremely interfered in the selection of leaders of the FKTU, the only legally recognized “umbrella” union federation, and filled the leadership of the FKTU with pro-government and pro-business workers.\textsuperscript{163} As a result, they easily pushed their handpicked FKTU leaders into advocating the interests of industrialists rather than representing those of labor unions when labor disputes occurred in the workplace. The intelligence agencies even dispatched their agents to the FKTU to closely monitor its activities (S. S. Kim 2003). In addition, the intelligence agencies placed the Ministry of Labor (MOL), which had jurisdiction over labor disputes, under its complete control and usurped its power to resolve labor disputes. In labor disputes, intelligence agents—not, MOL administrators—“would step in shop floors, call in the top managers of the company, unions leaders, and the local police officer, and simply convey the verdict of how much wages would be increased or not increased and how many union activists would be imprisoned” (Y. K. Lee 2011, 55). In fact, the intelligence agencies acted as the “ultimate judge” of labor disputes under the authoritarian regimes.

Commenting on the role of the intelligence agencies in serving the authoritarian regimes, one Korean public administration scholars spoke critically as follows: “the relationship between political power and public administration under the authoritarian governments showed a typical association between the master and slave. . . When political master as the master spoke to public administrators, public administrators as slaves faithfully served the master” (S. H. Chung 2007, 1351).

\textsuperscript{163} Right after the 1961 military coup, the Park regime approved the FKTU as the sole legally recognized umbrella union federation and prohibited the establishment of its rival federations. It was not until in 1996 that another national umbrella union federation, the Korean Confederation of Trade Unions (KCTU), gained legal recognition from government (J. Y. Song 2014).
State-Market Relations: The Developmental State and the Role of Public Administration

Although the Park regime of the Fourth Republic and the Chun regime of the Fifth Republic brutally cracked down on those in civil society that questioned their legitimacy and pressed for democratization, they astutely recognized that their unbridled repression might engender even stronger resistance from civil society and, without popular support, they would falter soon. As a result, both authoritarian regimes pursued economic development as the most important national goal to win popular support and legitimize their presence (Haggard et al. 1991; E. M. Kim 2010).

In the Growth Period, the Park regime and the Chun regime continued to exercise guiding control over market, thus consolidating the developmental state. Like the Park regime of the Third Republic in the Founding Period, both regimes actively pursued selective industrial policy that designated several industries with high growth potential as the “priority industries” and drove industrialists to make intensive investment into such industries (Chang 2011; Wade 1990). Chang (1993) explained in detail how the Park regime and the Chun regime implemented industrial policy to support the “priority industries” as follows:

The ‘designated’ industries had priority in acquiring rationed (and often subsidised) credits and foreign exchange, state investment funds, preferential tax treatments (e.g. tax holidays, accelerated depreciation allowances) and other supportive measures, including import protection and entry restrictions (141).

Although the Park and Chun regimes provided massive support to the “priority industries,” their support was not unconditional. In return for such strong support, the “priority industries” became subject to the tight performance monitoring. Both regimes could effectively discipline industrialists into increasing the performance of their firms by threatening to withdraw support from underperforming firms (Amsden 1989; Chibber 2002). As Onig (1991) put it, “the discipline imposed by the government on business behavior constituted a crucial component of the industrial policy” (112). In a word, strong state

---

164 The Park regime and the Chun regime took full advantage of state-owned banks in disciplining industrialists. State-owned banks provided industrialists with “policy loans” with subsidized interest rates and industrialists heavily depended on such “policy loans” for their investment. As a result, the two authoritarian regimes could easily discipline industrialists by threatening to refuse their bank loan requests (Chang 1993; Chang 2011).
intervention through industrial policy was a defining feature of the developmental state in the Growth Period.

The industrial policy in the Growth Period stood in stark contrast to that in the Founding Period in terms of industrial targeting. In the Founding Period, the Park regime of the Third Republic focused on supporting labor-intensive light manufacturing industries such as clothing and cheap electronics and promoting the export of manufactured goods to the world market (Chang 2011; Haggard et al. 1991). In contrast, in the Growth Period, the Park regime of the Fourth Republic and the Chun regime of the Fifth Republic concentrated on developing heavy and chemical industries, thus “upgrading the industrial structure” (Chang 1993, 138). For example, both regimes designated non-ferrous metals, shipbuilding, automobile, machinery, and electronics as the “priority industries” and provided massive support to such industries (K. K. Hwang 1996; H. A. Kim 2011).

The heavy and chemical industrialization drive promoted the rise of business conglomerates, also known as chaebols. In the Growth Period, the Park regime and the Chun regime selected a small number of companies—for example, Samsung, Hyundai, LG—as the main agents of “industrial upgrading” and such companies expanded their business into heavy and chemical industries under the two regimes’ strong support and protection (Chang 1993; H. A. Kim 2011). However, it is important to indicate that chaebols sprawled across different industries, rather than remaining in one or two industries. For example, Hyundai came to have firms ranging from automobiles, engineering, shipbuilding, construction, to chemicals (E. M. Kim 1988). This sprawl ultimately led to the extreme concentration of economic power in the hands of chaebols. In 1971, just one year before heavy and chemical industrialization was implemented, the largest five chaebols generated 22.3 percent of gross domestic product (GDP) in manufacturing.165 Mainly due to heavy and chemical industrialization drive, the top five chaebols’ the share of GDP escalated up to 75.2 percent in manufacturing in 1987 (E. M. Kim 1993). In fact, chaebols began to dominate the Korean economy as a result of state-led heavy and chemical industrialization drive in the Growth Period.

---

165 Chaebols accumulated great wealth by joining the heavy and chemical industrialization drive. For example, the total assets of Hyundai, the largest chaebol in the Growth Period, had drastically increased from US$ 17.16 million in 1970 to 7,158.78 million in 1983. Hyundai’s average annual growth rate was 20 percent (E. M. Kim 1988).
Because of the success of the heavy and chemical industrialization drive, the Korean economy had grown rapidly into one of the most powerful economies in Asia. For example, Korea’s per capita income had rocketed from US$ 316 in 1972 to US$ 3248 in 1987 (B. N. Song 1990). Impressed by this rapid economic growth, Amsden (1989) extolled Korea as “Asia’s next giant” who was soon to catch up with Japan. Despite the ten-fold increase in per capita income, however, the benefits of economic growth were not equally distributed among different income groups. For example, while the top 20% of the entire population held 48% of all household income in 1970, the bottom 40% only had 16%. Despite rapid economic growth, this unequal income distribution continued until the end of the Growth Period. While the income share of the highest 20% of the population was 49% of all household income in 1985, that of the lowest 40% was only 15.6% (Bourguignon and Morrisson 1998; Koo 1984). In fact, economic growth failed to alleviate income inequality in the Growth Period.

It is also important to indicate that the spectacular economic growth in the Growth Period came at the sacrifice of Korean workers’ welfare. Although the average wage of workers gradually had increased throughout the Growth Period, such increase was not sufficient to ensure a decent living for workers.166 Despite the low wages of workers, the Park regime and the Chun regime still maintained strict “cheap labor” policy aimed at keeping workers’ wages extremely low on the grounds that the increase in workers’ wages would raise the production costs of export goods, thus reducing their competitiveness in the world market (Y. K. Lee 2011). Both regimes did not even introduce a statutory minimum wage for workers.167 As a result, industrialists arbitrarily determined the wages of workers and paid them lower wages than they deserved (J. Y. Song 2014).


167 It was not until 1987 that the Minimum Wage Act was passed.
Because of this “cheap labor” policy, Korean workers also had to work long hours.\textsuperscript{168} They had no choice but to work beyond normal working hours because, as Koo (2001) pointed out, “the base pay for regular work hours . . . was so low in many factories that workers were compelled to work overtime in order to increase their paychecks” (52).\textsuperscript{169} For example, in 1980, the average workweek of Korean manufacturing workers was 53.1 hours. In the same year, US manufacturing workers worked an average of 39.7 hours a week, Japanese workers 38.8 hours, and Taiwanese workers 51 hours (Koo 2001).

While industrialists maximized their profits by exploiting the cheap labor of Korean workers, they made minimum investment in improving workplace safety. This minimum investment left Korean workers constantly exposed to hazardous working conditions (M. K. Kang 2011; E. M. Kim 2010). As a result, the number of work-related injuries and fatalities dramatically increased over the Growth Period. For example, in 1975, 80,570 workers were injured and 1,006 workers were killed on the job. The number of the work-related injuries increased up to 141,809 in 1985. The number of work-related deaths also dramatically increased up to 1,718 (Katsiaficas 2012).\textsuperscript{170}

Although Korean workers had suffered from low wages, long working hours, and poor working conditions in the Growth Period, there is no denying that the heavy and chemical industrialization drive pulled Korea out of absolute poverty and put it on the road to economic prosperity (Amsden 1989). The success of the heavy and chemical industrialization drive could be attributed mainly to the economic leadership of the Economic Planning Board (EPB), which had been under the auspices of President Park and President Chun in the Growth Period. As an all-powerful pilot agency, the EPB developed the master plan for the heavy and chemical industrialization drive and controlled its budget. Then, the EPB

\textsuperscript{168} Despite the remarkable economic growth, the average workweek of Korean manufacturing workers had gradually increased from 50.3 in 1963 to 54.5 in 1986 (H. K. Kim 1988). As Koo (2001) pointed out, “economic development in South Korea did not bring a reduction of working hours, but actually caused a steady increase until the late 1980s” (48).

\textsuperscript{169} In the 1970s and 1980s, Korean manufacturing workers were reported to earn around one-fifth of their wages from working overtime (H. K. Kim 1988).

\textsuperscript{170} The working conditions of Korean workers were much more dangerous than those of not only developed countries but also developing countries. In 1985, for example, the number of workplace accidents per 10,000 workers was 1.8 in Korea, 0.80 in Mexico and Argentina, 0.57 in Hong Kong, 0.19 in Singapore, 0.11 in the United States, 0.05 in Japan. In fact, workplace accidents occurred in Korea 36 times more frequently than in Japan (M. K. Kang 2011).
distributed resources to the “priority” industries considered vital to economic growth. The EPB also coordinated the policies of different ministries in promoting the heavy and chemical industrialization drive and carefully monitored their implementation and evaluated their performance (Chibber 2002).  

The public administrators in the EPB played a central role in pushing through the heavy and chemical industrialization drive. EPB administrators were strongly encouraged to participate in designing the master plan for heavy and chemical industrialization, allocating the budget, coordinating different policies necessary to attain the heavy and chemical industrialization, and evaluating their performance because they had unparalleled policy expertise and experience. In addition, other “economic” ministries—for example, Commerce, Finance, and Construction—fully harnessed the technical expertise of administrators in implementing the heavy and chemical industrialization drive in line with the EPB’s master plan (C. K. Chung 1989; Y. C. Ha and M. K. Kang 2011). In fact, the policy and technical expertise of public administrators played an essential role in promoting the heavy and chemical industrialization drive.

Conclusion

The “Growth Period” Constitutions glorified “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order by granting nearly “omnipotent” constitutional powers to the President and emasculating the powers of the legislative and judicial branches. The President was constitutionally allowed to take whatever actions he deemed necessary without subjecting himself to any constitutional constraints. In fact, he became the supreme leader standing above three constitutional branches of government: legislative, executive, and judicial (Y. W. Kihl 2005; M. S. H. Kim 2015).

---

171 The official rank of the head of the EPB was higher than those of other economic ministers. He also held the office of deputy prime minister (E. M. Kim 2010).

172 In the Growth Period, the two authoritarian presidents put high emphasis on the expertise of public administrators. The heads of the EPB appointed by the two presidents came from different career backgrounds: for example, economics professors, career administrators, politicians. However, all appointed vice heads of the EPB were career administrators (C. K. Chung 1989).
By taking full advantage of “omnipotent” powers guaranteed in the “Growth Period” Constitutions, President Park of the Fourth Republic and President Chun of the Fifth Republic successfully consolidated the authoritarian developmental state, which maintained tight control over civil society and market. Both the Park regime and the Chun regime were “authoritarian” in that they continued to launch brutal crackdown on civil society activists who pressed for democratization (S. H. Kim 1996); and they were also “developmental” in that they pursued economic development as the most important national goal and strongly intervened in market and imparted “directional thrust” to market in order to accomplish rapid economic growth (Wade 1990, xliii). In a word, “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order created favorable conditions for the consolidation of the authoritarian developmental state.

President Park and President Chun could not manage the authoritarian developmental state without the help of public administrators. Since the “Growth Period” Constitutions dismantled the legislative and judicial checks on the President and allowed the President to maintain exclusive control over the executive branch, both Presidents could easily earn unwavering loyalty from administrators. As a result, administrators were fully committed to maintaining the authoritarian developmental state headed by the authoritarian presidents in the Growth Period–by suppressing civil society and by governing market and steering the state-led economic development (S. H. Chung 1998; W. K. Paik 1995).
CHAPTER VII:
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION SCHOLARSHIP IN THE GROWTH PERIOD

Introduction

In the Growth Period, the Korean Constitution completely discarded the principle of separation of powers and glorified the “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order, thus empowering the President to take complete control of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. In fact, the President was allowed to take whatever actions he deemed necessary (M. S. H. Kim 2015; West and Baker 1988). As a result, President Park of the Fourth Republic and President Chun of the Fifth Republic had wielded omnipotent powers in the Growth Period. Although these “omnipotent” Presidents played an important role in accomplishing economic growth, they constantly abused their constitutional powers to maintain their authoritarian rule. Without being subject to any legislative and judicial checks, they quickly turned into ruthless dictators who trampled upon citizens’ fundamental rights (M. S. H. Kim 2015). As a result, the Growth Period was often described as the “dark age for democracy in Korea” (Chang 2015, 3).

However, the Growth Period was also remembered as “the golden age for academic public administration” (J. H. Kim 2015). In the Growth Period, public administration as a field of study underwent explosive growth. The number of public administration programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels increased on an unprecedented scale (C. B. Lee 1991). In addition, mainstream public administration scholars were invited to “provide a broad range of policy advice and consultation to government officials” in executive ministries and agencies (P. S. Kim 2012, 221) and conduct government-sponsored research (W. T. Kim 1979; Y. C. Oh 1989). In fact, public administration scholars enjoyed privileges of participating in government in the Growth Period.

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how Korean mainstream public administration scholarship ascended to prominence during the period of the “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order and to examine the influence of the executive-centered approach. In the first section, I will carefully examine the rapid growth of public administration as a field of study in the Growth Period.
In the second section, I will discuss how the executive-centered approach to public administration came to be fully entrenched in mainstream public administration scholarship and how mainstream scholars’ single-minded adherence to the executive-centered approach inevitably led them to implicitly or explicitly approve the authoritarian developmental state headed by the powerful presidents, thus bringing about the so-called “golden age” for them. Then, I will conclude this chapter by making several comments on the implications of the full entrenchment of the executive-centered approach in mainstream public administration scholarship.

The Golden Age for Academic Public Administration

In the Growth Period, Korean public administration was in the full blossom. Public administration was one of the fastest growing studies and became “one of the most popular majors studied at universities” (S. H. Chung 2007, 1344) mainly because the authoritarian regimes supported the growth of public administration as a field of study (S. G. Jeung 2000; Y. D. Jung 2001). In this section, I will examine the rapid academic growth of public administration in several aspects: the number of members in the Korean Association for Public Administration, the number of public administration programs, the number of annual issues of the Korean Public Administration Review, and the participation of public administration scholars in government.

Korean Association for Public Administration

Since a handful of “self-conscious” scholars founded the Korean Association for Public Administration (KAPA) in 1959, the KAPA had experienced an explosive growth in terms of its membership in the Growth Period. For example, the number of the members of the KAPA drastically increased from 211 in 1968 to 730 in 1986—more than threefold (C. B. Lee 1991). This tremendous increase of membership led the KAPA to establish five regional chapters in the Growth Period (M. K. Kim 1986). Given the fact that the KAPA is now composed of seven regional chapters, it is fair to say that most regional chapters were established during the Growth Period.\textsuperscript{173}
Public Administration Programs

As Table 7-1 indicates, in the Growth Period, the number of public administration programs soared at the undergraduate and graduate levels.\(^{174}\) In particular, the dramatic increase of the undergraduate public administration programs was noticeable. While 20 universities established public administration programs at the undergraduate level during the Founding Period, 43 universities founded undergraduate public administration programs during the Growth Period.\(^{175}\) As of 1986, a total of 62 universities had undergraduate public administration programs. In terms of the number of undergraduate public administration programs, public administration became “second only to business administration among the social sciences” (C. B. Lee 1991, 228). The drastic increase in the number of public administration programs can be attributed mainly to the authoritarian regimes’ education policy of encouraging universities to create public administration programs. The authoritarian regimes expected that “management-oriented” public administration programs would help produce competent administrators by providing them with “up-to-date” management skills (S. H. Chung 1998).

Table 7-1. Public Administration Programs in the Founding and Growth Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Administration Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founding Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1945 – 1972)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1973 – 1986)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from J. P. Yoon (1986).

\(^{173}\) The KAPA upheld the principle of “one province, one chapter” (M. K. Kim 1986, 329). The first regional chapter (DaeGu-GyeongBuk Province Chapter) was established in 1967 in the Founding Period. Five regional chapters were established in the Growth Period (Busan-GyeongNam Province Chapter in 1972; ChungBuk Province Chapter in 1983; ChungNam Province Chapter in 1984; JeongBuk Province Chapter in 1985; and JeonNam Province Chapter in 1985). The last regional chapter (KangWon Province Chapter) was established in 1989 (M. K. Kim 1986).

\(^{174}\) In addition, 23 two-year vocational colleges established public administration programs during the Growth Period. In contrast, no two-year vocational colleges created public administration programs during the Founding Period (J. P. Yoon 1986).

\(^{175}\) Many public administration programs established in the Founding Period were administrative law-oriented. The actual number of management-oriented public administration programs was less than 21. In contrast, all the programs created in the Growth Period were management-oriented (J. P. Yoon 1986).
As the number of undergraduate public administration programs dramatically increased in the Growth Period, the number of students enrolled in these programs also soared on an unprecedented scale. While the total student enrollment in all undergraduate public administration programs was 2,573 in 1965, it exponentially escalated up to 25,340 in 1986 (C. B. Lee 1991). In fact, the number of undergraduate students who studied public administration as their major in 1986 was almost ten times higher than that in 1965. The rapid increases in undergraduate public administration programs and the subsequent increase in student enrollment created a strong demand for more faculty members. From 1979 to 1985, the number of public administration faculty members in all universities more than doubled from 177 to 363 (J. P. Yoon 1986).

**Korean Public Administration Review**

The dramatic increase in the number of public administration scholars led the KAPA to publish its official journal, Korean Public Administration Review (KPAR), more frequently. From its creation in 1967 to 1983, the KAPA issued KPAR once a year. However, the pronounced increase in submitted articles, which resulted mainly from the increasing number of public administration scholars, led the KAPA to publish KPAR biannually from 1984. By providing public administration scholars with more opportunities to publish their articles, the bi-annual KPAR not only promoted the knowledge accumulation in public administration but also helped more scholars reinforce their intellectual identification with public administration (B. M. Ahn 1986; S. T. Kang 2005).

**The Participation of Public Administration Scholars in Government**

In the Growth Period, many public administration scholars were appointed as advisors in executive ministries and agencies and as members of commissions and committees and, thus, actively participated in running the executive branch (Y. D. Jung 1996; W. K. Paik 2006). The authoritarian regimes urged the active participation of public administration scholars rather than that of political scientists because they had the “archetypical image” that “political scientists tended to agitate resistance

---

176 From 1984 to 1989, KPAR published its issues biannually. However, the ever-increasing number of articles submitted by new scholars soon led KPAR to publish its issues quarterly from 1990 to now.
to their [authoritarian] rules while scholars of public administration were [viewed as] helpful and friendly” (C. H. Lee and K. S. Kim 2008, 5). Moreover, government officials welcomed with enthusiasm the active involvement of public administration scholars because their practical management prescriptions were believed to improve the administrative capacity of the executive branch (Y. D. Jung 1996).

In addition, more government-sponsored research projects were given to public administration scholars in the Growth Period than in the Founding Period. For example, the Institute of Administrative Research (IAR)\(^\text{177}\), which was then seen as one of the most influential public administration research institutes, conducted many more government-backed research projects in the Growth Period than in the Founding Period (W. T. Kim 1979; Y. C. Oh 1989). Table 7-2 shows that while the IAR did a total of 28 government-sponsored research projects in the Founding Period, it carried out a total of 80 government-backed research projects in the Growth Period.

### Table 7-2. Government-sponsored Research Projects Given to the Institute of Administrative Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founding Period</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Growth Period</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{177}\) The Institute of Administrative Research (IAR) was created under the Graduate School of Public Administration at Seoul National University in 1959 (W. T. Kim 1979).
Although many public administration scholars actively participated in government-sponsored research projects and enjoyed opportunities to propose their management and policy recommendations to government officials (Y. D. Jung 1996; W. K. Paik 2006), there was a growing concern that public administration scholars’ active involvement in government-backed research projects would encourage their “subjugation” to government officials (B. Y. Ahn 1982). One Korean public administration scholar spoke directly to this point as follows:

Most grants and research activities are colored by the interests of government agencies. Outcomes of government-backed research projects tend to favor agency policy and its directions; they are largely “bureaucratized research”—research to satisfy the views of bureaucrats and policy-makers (Jun 1983, 417).

Despite the concern that government-backed research projects might turn into the so-called “bureaucratized research,” it was certain that an increasing number of government-sponsored research projects provided public administration scholars with valuable opportunities not only to recommend their management and policy prescriptions to government officials, but also to conduct “expensive” research that they could not otherwise afford financially (Y. D. Jung 2001; S. T. Kang 2005). It is undeniable that, due to government-sponsored research projects, public administration became an “affluent” field of study in the Growth Period.

Firm Entrenchment of the Executive-centered Approach to Public Administration and Its Influence on Public Administration Scholarship in Korea

As discussed in Chapter V (Public Administration Scholarship in the Founding Period), founding scholars fully embraced the executive-centered approach to public administration, which emphasized...
administrators’ unwavering commitment to the President and his political and policy agenda (D. S. Bark 1967b; H. B. Lee 1967). Founding scholars continued to support the executive-centered approach and exercise strong influence over the development of mainstream public administration scholarship in the Growth Period as well (H. K. Ahn 1979; D. S. Bark 1977). In addition, young mainstream scholars inherited the executive centered approach from founding scholars who educated them at the undergraduate and graduate levels and became its chief advocates (W. K. Paik 1983; J. P. Yoon 1979). In fact, the executive-centered approach came to be fully entrenched in mainstream public administration scholarship in the Growth Period.

In the Growth Period, the explosive growth of public administration as a field of study could be attributed mainly to mainstream public administration scholars’ executive-centered approach to public administration. By implicitly or explicitly endorsing “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order, mainstream scholars strongly supported the authoritarian developmental state, which the Presidents had consolidated in the Growth Period. While mainstream scholars repeatedly glorified economic growth as the most important national goal, they remained silent on authoritarian rule (D. S. Bark 1973; B. M. Ahn 1981). Because they raised no disturbing questions about the legitimacy of the authoritarian regimes and their violations of civil rights, mainstream scholars’ research simply focused on how to make administrators serve the President better (C. H. Roh 1981; J. P. Yoon 1979). Given the fact that these scholars committed themselves to defending “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order and emphasized the importance of administrators’ dedication to the President’s political and policy agenda, it comes as no surprise that the authoritarian Presidents provided financial support to mainstream scholars’ executive-centered research in the Growth Period (Jun 1983).

In this section, I will conduct a qualitative content analysis of mainstream scholars’ journal articles to investigate whether the executive-centered approach still maintained its influence on mainstream public administration scholarship in the Growth Period. Then, I will thoroughly examine how the four tenets underpinning the executive-centered approach led mainstream scholars to provide relentless support to extreme executive-centered governing order and to cherish the consolidation of the
authoritarian developmental state.

To systematically examine the influence of the executive-centered approach on mainstream public administration scholarship, I followed the two-stage screening scheme presented in Chapter III (Research Design) and classified all 126 articles authored by mainstream scholars in the Korean Public Administration Review and the Korean Political Science Review in the Growth Period into 73 “relevant” articles, 20 “irrelevant” articles, and 33 “unnecessary” articles as shown in Table 7-3 below.

Table 7-3. The Two-Stage Screening Process for Relevant Articles (Growth Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Academic Articles</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>The First Screening Stage</th>
<th>The Second Screening Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Then, I conducted a qualitative content analysis of the 73 “relevant” articles to examine whether they supported or rejected the following four tenets of the executive-centered approach:

Tenet 1: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be directly and solely under the President’s authority.
Tenet 2: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be the obedient instrument of the President.
Tenet 3: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to privilege managerial values at the expense of political and legal values. Managerial values include 3E (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness); political values mean 3R (responsibility, responsiveness, and representativeness), social equity, and democratic values (including participation); legal values involve individual rights, due process, and the rule of law.
Tenet 4: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to increase the administrative capacity of the executive branch to maximize the attainment of the President’s goals.

Having constructed three relevant categories for determining which articles were relevant in examining each tenet’s influence on mainstream scholarship and assigned all 73 relevant articles into the three categories in Chapter III (see Table 7-3), I will focus on analyzing each category’s “target” articles rather than all 73 articles in investigating how each tenet influenced mainstream public administration scholarship. The following table 7-4 shows the number of “target” articles belonging in each category.
Table 7-4. Target Articles for Qualitative Content Analysis (Growth Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Category I Public administration &amp; Three Constitutional Branches</th>
<th>Category II Administrative Values</th>
<th>Category III Management &amp; Policy Prescriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corresponding Tenet</td>
<td>Tenet 1 &amp; Tenet 2</td>
<td>Tenet 3</td>
<td>Tenet 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Articles</td>
<td>37/73 (50.7 %)</td>
<td>71/73 (97.3 %)</td>
<td>47/73 (64.4 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-5 below shows the detailed outcome of my qualitative content analysis of mainstream scholars’ articles. In this table, first, mainstream scholars are listed and then classified broadly into two groups: “reform-oriented” scholars whose academic interest was to “furnish various [reform] strategies for the improvement of administrative capabilities” (Jun 1983, 416)\(^{179}\) and 2) “policy-oriented” scholars who regarded “the policy process as central to the operation of government” (Denhardt 1984, 117) and stressed the ideal of value-free policy research. In this dissertation, I classified each scholar as reform-oriented or policy-oriented, depending on whether he headed the “reform-oriented” Korean Association for Public Administration (KAPA) or the “policy-oriented” Korean Association of Policy Studies (KAPS).\(^{180}\) Then, the table’s focus is on whether each article reflects the four tenets underpinning the executive-centered approach. In Table 7-5, I assigned the “Emphasis” (E) marker to an article if it either explicitly stated or implicitly implied its endorsement of a tenet. In contrast, I gave the “Non-Emphasis” (NE) marker to an article if it was either critical of a tenet or indifferent to it.

\(^{179}\) In the Growth Period, there were two groups of reform-oriented scholars: old and new. “Founding” scholars, most of whom were classified as “old” reform-oriented scholars, had played an active role in making reform recommendation on how to improve administrative institutions, but did not see administrative reform as a separate sub-field of public administration (D. S. Bark 1979; S. B. Kim 1977). In contrast, “young” reform-oriented scholars, who had been “old” reform-oriented scholars’ students, identified administrative reform as a distinctive sub-field of public administration and specialized in formulating administrative reform strategies (Y. D. Jung 1982; K. W. Kim 1979).

\(^{180}\) The KAPA and the KAPS are considered to be the two most influential academic associations in the field of public administration in Korea.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scholar</th>
<th>Academic Orientation</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Tenet 1 President as Sole Master</th>
<th>Tenet 2 PA as Instrument</th>
<th>Tenet 3 Managerial Values</th>
<th>Tenet 3 Political Values</th>
<th>Tenet 3 Legal Values</th>
<th>Tenet 4 Administrative Capacity as Main Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon, W. K.</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon, J. P.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu, B.</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon, W. K.</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paik, W. K.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu, B.</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, S. B.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, C. B.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahn, W. W.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, H. D.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paik, W. K.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paik, W. K.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon, J. P.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, B. Y.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, H. K.</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung, C. K.</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, K. W.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee, C. B.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paik, W. K.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Y. H.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roh, C. H.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon, J. P.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, B. Y.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, D. H.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, M. K. et al.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. S. et al.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paik, W. K.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, B. M.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bark, D. S.</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholar</td>
<td>Academic Orientation</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Tenet 1</td>
<td>Tenet 2</td>
<td>Tenet 3</td>
<td>Tenet 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, D. H. (1981)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. S. (1981)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung, Y. D. (1982a)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung, Y. D. (1982b)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, M. S. (1982)</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon, J. P. et al. (1982)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, B. M. (1983a)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, B. M. (1983b)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, M. S. (1983)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung, Y. D. (1983)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, D. H. (1983a)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, D. H. (1983b)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, W. K. (1983)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roh, W. J. (1983)</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jung, Y. D. (1984)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. P. (1985)</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, J. C. (1984)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoo, J. H. (1984)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho, S. C. (1985)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chung, C. K. et al. (1985)</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, D. H. (1985)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim, Y. P. (1985)</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park, Y. H. (1985)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoon, W. K. (1985)</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahn, B. M. (1986)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koo, K. M. (1986)</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paik, W. K. (1986)</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roh, W. J. (1986)</td>
<td>Policy-Oriented</td>
<td>KPAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-6 below presents the major findings of my qualitative content analysis. First, Tenet 1 and Tenet 2 are wholeheartedly endorsed in 35 (94.6 percent) out of 37 “target” articles. In other words, 35 articles support the ideal of executive-centered public administration, which sees the president as the sole master of public administration, and emphasize public administration’s unwavering loyalty to the president. Only two articles contend that public administration should be responsive not only to the president but also to the legislative branch (J. C. Park 1984; Y. H. Park 1987). Not a single article discusses the relationship between the judicial branch and public administration. However, it is worth noting that only 37 (50.7 percent) out of all 73 relevant articles were analyzed to examine whether Tenet 1 and Tenet 2 influenced mainstream public administration scholarship in the Growth Period. In fact, 50.7 percent is much lower than 76.7 percent (23 out of all 30 relevant articles) in the Founding Period (see Table 5-4). This lower percent of “target” articles could be attributed to the fact that policy-oriented scholars, who stressed the importance of “value-free” policy-research, shied away from addressing Tenet 1 and Tenet 2, which are inextricably linked to the “normative” question of how public administration should be positioned in relation to three constitutional branches (the president, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch) (S. H. Chung 1998). While 37 (69.8 percent) out of 53 articles written by reform-oriented scholars explicitly or implicitly addressed Tenet 1 and Tenet 2, none of 20 articles authored by policy-oriented scholars did so. However, policy-oriented scholars’ articles did not reject Tenet 1 and Tenet 2, but simply avoided addressing them. Later in this section, I will explain how the ideal of value-neutral research inescapably led policy-oriented scholars to implicitly approve Tenet 1 and Tenet 2.
Second, Tenet 3 is strongly upheld in 59 (83.1 percent) of 71 “target” articles. While these 59 articles cherish managerial values, only 18 (25.4 percent) of 71 “target” articles uphold political values. Interestingly enough, no articles address legal values. Both reform-oriented and policy-oriented scholars emphasize managerial values at the expense of political and legal values. While 51 out of the 71 target articles were written by reform-oriented scholars, the remaining 20 articles were authored by policy-oriented scholars. Out of reform-oriented scholars’ 51 articles, 39 articles (76.5 percent) uphold managerial values and only 18 articles (35.3 percent) champion political ones. Policy-oriented scholars put more emphasis on managerial values than reform-scholars did. All of policy-oriented scholars’ 20 articles glorify managerial values without discussing the importance of political and legal ones.

Third, Tenet 4 is fully approved in 40 (85.1 percent) out of the 47 “target” articles. Out of these 47 target articles, 35 articles were written by reform-oriented scholars and the remaining 12 articles were authored by policy-oriented scholars. Twenty eight (80.0 percent) out of reform-oriented scholars’ 35 articles and all of policy-oriented scholars’ 12 articles provide management and policy recommendations that focus on building the administrative capacity of the executive branch in order to improve the accomplishment of the President’s goals rather than those of the legislative and judicial branches. The remaining seven articles (14.9 percent) present management and policy prescriptions that mainly aim at promoting the legislative control over the executive branch (J. C. Park 1984; Y. H. Park 1987) and democratizing the administrative process in the executive branch (J. P. Yoon 1979; W. K. Paik 1979).

These findings clearly show that the four tenets underlying the executive-centered approach were fully entrenched as unassailable normative beliefs in mainstream public administration scholarship in the Growth Period. In fact, the executive-centered approach rose to intellectual prominence in the Growth Period. Using the categorization of mainstream scholars as 1) reform-oriented scholars and 2) policy-oriented scholars, I will further explain below how the executive-centered approach shaped the development of reform-oriented scholarship and policy-oriented scholarship separately in the Growth Period.

---

181 Six out of the 71 “target” articles emphasize the importance of both managerial and political values. All of these six articles were written by reform-oriented scholars (see Table 7-5). They place more emphasis on managerial values than political ones.
Period through examining more thoroughly the four tenets of the executive-centered approach.

Table 7-6. Finding of Qualitative Content Analysis (Growth Period)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four Tenets</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>The Number of Mainstream Scholars’ Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Reform-Oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 1 President as Sole Master</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>035 (94.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Emphasis</td>
<td>02 (05.4 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 2 PA as Instrument</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>035 (94.6 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Emphasis</td>
<td>02 (05.4 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 3 Managerial Values as Primary Values</td>
<td>Emphasis on Managerial Values</td>
<td>059 (83.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on Political Values</td>
<td>018 (25.4 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on Legal Values</td>
<td>00 (0.0 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenet 4 Administrative Capacity as Main Concern</td>
<td>Emphasis</td>
<td>040 (85.1 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Emphasis</td>
<td>07 (14.9 %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47 (100.0 %)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tenet 1: The President as the Sole Master of Public Administration**

*Reform-oriented Scholars*

In the Growth Period, reform-oriented scholars still glorified executive-centered governing order and took for granted Tenet 1, which identified the President as the sole master of public administration (D. S. Bark 1977; W. K. Paik 1986). This total acceptance of executive-centered governing order is clearly demonstrated in the fact that reform-oriented scholars hardly discussed the legislative and judicial control or oversight of public administration. For example, only two scholars leveled criticism of executive-centered governing order and contended that public administrators should be responsive not only to the President but to the legislative branch (J. C. Park 1984; Y. H. Park 1987). In addition, no scholars raised the issue of administrators’ responsiveness to the judicial branch. In fact, reform-oriented scholars

---

182 However, both scholars pointed out that the legislative branch lacked sufficient policy expertise to control “expert” administrators in the executive branch and, therefore, administrators were unresponsive to the legislative branch. In order to ensure administrators’ responsiveness to the legislative branch, they contended, the legislative branch should drastically increase the number of legislative staff with substantive policy expertise and, by taking full advantage of their expertise, exercise strict oversight over public administrators in the executive branch (J. C. Park 1984; Y. H. Park 1987).
remained steadfast in the belief that the President should exercise “exclusive” control over public administration and, therefore, they paid almost no attention to how to ensure administrators’ responsiveness to the legislative and judicial branches (Y. P. Kim 1985; C. H. Roh 1979).

Reform-oriented scholars’ abiding belief in Tenet 1, which highlighted public administration’s complete subordination to the President, could be attributed to their strong commitment to executive-centered governing order. They repeatedly emphasized the importance of the strong leadership of the President in promoting economic development and contended that public administrators should devote themselves to the successful accomplishment of his economic development agenda (Y. P. Kim 1985; J. P. Yoon 1978). For example, one scholar insisted that administrators should be the “main driving force” of the President’s economic development strategy (W. K. Paik 1980). Another scholar even went so far as to state that administrators’ strict adherence to the President’s developmental agenda should be their moral duty (D. S. Bark 1973). In fact, reform-oriented scholars celebrated administrators’ dedication to the President and his development agenda.

Reform-oriented scholars’ enthusiastic endorsement of the President’s economic development agenda is most clearly manifested in their discussion of how to tackle the economic inequality created by the President’s growth-oriented economic development strategy (D. S. Bark 1977; Y. D. Jung 1982; W. K. Paik 1986). In the Founding Period, founding scholars stressed the importance of the President’s growth-oriented economic development strategy, but they remained silent on economic inequality arising in the developmental process. However, founding scholars were not indifferent to the issue of economic inequality; they rather believed that the President’s growth-oriented strategy was the only option available. In fact, founding scholars predicted that the benefits of the President’s growth-oriented economic development strategy would ultimately trickle down to the low-income segments of the population, thus alleviating economic inequality in the long run (D. S. Bark 1965; D. S. Bark 1970).

Contrary to this optimistic prediction, however, reform-oriented scholars soon found out that there existed a trade-off between economic growth and economic inequality. As Caiden (1991) noted, as a result of tremendous economic growth in the 1970s and 1980s, “the pie has been increased but it has not
been shared evenly” (xvi). One Korean scholar succinctly explained the problem of economic inequality created by growth-oriented economic development strategy as follows:

[A] substantial part of development gains has been clustered at the thin upper crust of society, consisting mostly of those who control the means of production and those who are immediately connected to them. While the core that directs economic activities reaps tremendous advantages, the periphery that comprises the masses remains poor and untouched . . . In Korea, the gap between the rich and the poor widened, the problems of poverty remained unsolved (D. H. Kim 1991, 9-10).

Because economic inequality continued unabated in the Growth Period, reform-oriented scholars began to turn their attention to economic inequality. However, reform-oriented scholars’ commitment to the President’s growth-oriented economic development strategy led them to concentrate their attention not on providing appropriate policy prescriptions needed to reduce economic inequality, but on temporarily appeasing the popular discontent with it (B. Y. Ahn 1979; D. H. Kim 1980; Y. S. Kim and H. K. Cho 1980).

As discussed in Chapter 6 (Governing Order in the Growth Period), in the Growth Period, the President’s growth-oriented economic development strategy upheld “cheap labor” policy designed to keep workers’ wages extremely low and encouraged industrialists to “penetrate world markets on the basis of low wages rather than a technological edge” (Amsden 1989, v). While industrialists accumulated a great deal of wealth by taking full advantage of “cheap labor” in selling their goods in the world market, workers earned much lower wages than they deserved and suffered from poverty. In fact, the “cheap labor” policy was believed to be one of the fundamental causes of economic inequality (J. J. Choi 1989; B. C. Lee 2003).

In addressing the issue of how to reduce economic inequality, however, reform-oriented scholars hardly discussed the importance of raising workers’ wages to such a level that they could afford a decent standard of living because they strongly supported the “cheap labor” policy underpinning the President’s growth-oriented economic development strategy. Reform-oriented scholars still held a firm belief that low labor costs helped to boost the price competitiveness of the Korean exports in the world market, thus
promoting economic growth (H. K. Ahn 1979; W. W. Hahn 1978). For example, only one out of 53 articles authored by reform-oriented scholars pointed out that workers’ wages fell behind their basic costs of living and contended that “reasonable” wages should be paid to workers (M. K. Kim et al. 1980).

However, reform-oriented scholars’ strong belief in “cheap labor” policy did not necessarily mean that they completely ignored economic inequality. Observing low-income workers’ growing discontent with economic inequality, they astutely recognized that it was impossible to sustain economic growth without addressing their discontent. Since reform-oriented scholars were the chief advocates of the President’s cheap labor policy, they concentrated their academic attention on simply improving the living conditions of low-income workers rather than developing redistribution policies intended to supplement the low incomes of workers (B. Y. Ahn 1979; D. H. Kim 1980; M. K. Kim et al. 1980). For example, reform-oriented scholars recommended that government should be actively involved in increasing the number of social welfare facilities (Y. S. Kim and H. K. Cho 1980), improving housing conditions (M. K. Kim et al. 1980), and building and maintaining adequate water and sanitation facilities (D. H. Kim 1981). However, no scholars expressed any interest in how to redistribute wealth from rich industrialists to poor workers. In a word, reform-oriented scholars’ full endorsement of the President’s economic development strategy led them to focus on how to temporarily appease low-income workers’ discontent with economic inequality rather than how to actually reduce economic inequality itself.

Given the fact that reform-oriented scholars enthusiastically supported the President’s economic development strategy, it comes as no surprise that they expected public administrators to demonstrate their unwavering commitment to the President’s economic development agenda. As a result, they directed strong attention to ways of ensuring administrators’ commitment to the President’s development agenda. After discovering that many administrators still held apathetic or skeptical attitudes towards the President’s development agenda and that they were not faithfully fulfilling their duties required to

---

183 In addressing the issue of economic inequality, one reform-oriented scholars expressed a strong interest in redistribution policy and reviewed the main theories of distributional justice, including John Rawls’ theory of justice, in his articles. However, he did not discuss how to redistribute wealth from the rich to the poor in Korea (Y. D. Jung 1982a; Y. D. Jung 1982b).
accomplish it, several reform-oriented scholars argued that so-called “mental reform” programs should be established to inspire administrators to make voluntary efforts to fulfill the President’s development agenda.\textsuperscript{184} They proposed “mental reform” training programs that would focus on encouraging administrators to increase their understanding of the appropriateness of the President’s development agenda, recognize the importance of public administration in implementing it, and commit themselves to accomplishing it. Furthermore, reform-oriented scholars recommended that government should make it mandatory for all high ranking administrators to take these “mental reform” programs. In a word, reform-oriented scholars glorified administrators’ steadfast commitment to the President’s development agenda (D. S. Bark 1973; J. P. Yoon 1978).

\textit{Policy-oriented Scholars}

Unlike reform-oriented scholars who strongly supported Tenet 1, which saw the President as the sole master of public administration, policy-oriented scholars seemed to be indifferent to the question of who should be the master of public administration largely because they emphasized “value-free” research, from which normative concerns were intentionally excluded (K. M. Koo 1984; W. K. Yoon 1974).\textsuperscript{185} In fact, not a single policy-oriented scholar examined the normative question of how to position public administration in relation to the three constitutional branches—the President, the National Assembly, and the courts.

However, policy-oriented scholars who claimed to conduct “value-free” research ended up tacitly approving Tenet 1, which emphasized the President’s exclusive control of public administration. Their tacit approval of Tenet 1 is clearly demonstrated in their uncritical acceptance of the existing governing order, i.e. the “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order. By firmly adhering

\textsuperscript{184} One reform-oriented scholar complained that the existing training programs were “too technical.” Even though he did not deny the positive influence of technical training programs on the performance of administrators, he pointed out that such technical training programs focused on equipping administrators with up-to-date technical skills rather than inspiring them to fully harness these technical skills in performing their duties (D. S. Bark 1973).

\textsuperscript{185} By fully embracing the “Simonian scientism” (S. H. Chung 1998, 326), policy-oriented scholars distinguished between facts and values and contended that policy research should be oriented to facts because facts alone were amenable to empirical observation, measurement, and verification. However, they pointed out that values were beyond the bounds of policy research because they were not subjected to empirical investigation. By focusing their attention on facts rather than values, science-oriented scholars championed the value-free ideal of policy research (S. T. Kang 1987; W. K. Yoon 1974; W. K. Paik 1978; W. J. Roh 1986).
to the ideal of value-free policy research, policy-oriented scholars believed that they should see the world as it is and not discuss how it ought to be (Y. P. Kim 1984; W. K. Paik 1983). As a result, they shied from addressing the normative question of whether or not the existing governing order was desirable. In the Growth Period, policy-oriented scholars never questioned the appropriateness of the “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order, in which the President exercised complete control of public administration, and they never engaged in discussion of how to build a better governing order (S. H. Chung 2007).

Instead, policy-oriented scholars uncritically accepted the “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order as “given” and focused their attention on improving administrators’ policy decisions that would maximize the attainment of the President’s political and policy agenda (Y. P. Kim 1983; K. M. Koo 1986). Given the fact that policy-oriented scholars paid strong attention to ways to make public administrators better serve the President, it is clear that they—at least implicitly—endorsed the fact that the President positioned himself as the sole master of public administration in the Growth Period.

**Tenet 2: Public Administration as the Obedient Instrument of the President**

**Reform-oriented Scholars**

Since reform-oriented scholars identified the President as the sole master of public administration by ruling out the possibility that the legislative and judicial branches might exercise control over public administration, they naturally proceeded to emphasize administrators’ responsiveness only to the President. This emphasis, in turn, led reform-oriented scholars to treat public administration as the obedient instrument of the President (B. Y. Ahn 1979; S. H. Chung 1998; W. K. Paik 2006).

This instrumental view of public administration is most clearly demonstrated in reform-oriented scholars’ discussion of political neutrality. Before proceeding, it is important to clarify what politics—or, political—stood for in their discussion because reform-oriented scholars did not stress the importance of making administration neutral in relation to all types of politics, but only in relation to a particular type of politics. In examining the meaning of politics, reform-oriented scholars astutely recognized that there existed two different types of politics: “partisan politics” whose “stakes are the powers to make
decisions” and “policy politics,” whose “stakes are the contents of those decisions” (Overeem 2005, 321). When engaging in discussion of political neutrality, they responded differently to these two kinds of politics (B. M. Ahn 1981; D. S. Bark 1975; W. K. Paik 1980).

Upon examination, it becomes apparent that reform-oriented scholars used the term politics—or, political—to mean “partisan politics”—or, “partisan”—when dealing with the issue of political neutrality. Reform-oriented scholars emphasized the importance of ensuring the political neutrality of public administrators by contending that politicians should not interfere in the work activities of administrators in order to promote their partisan interests. For example, one scholar severely charged that administrators had been mobilized to provide electoral support to the pro-president candidates in presidential and legislative elections and emphasized the importance of insulating administrators from improper “partisan interference” (B. M. Ahn 1981; J. H. Yoo 1984). Another scholar also attacked the pervasiveness of patronage-based appointments in the executive branch on the grounds that such appointments had undermined the competence of civil service (D. S. Bark 1975). Indeed, reform-oriented scholars’ commitment to political neutrality was intended to detach public administration from electoral politics and partisan patronage, promoting the ideal of non-partisan administrators.

However, a careful examination of reform-oriented scholars’ work clearly suggests that they stressed not only politicians’ non-interference in administration but also administrators’ complete non-involvement in partisan politics. Reform-oriented scholars expressed deep concern that administrators’ strong partisan commitment might bring the President’s policy initiatives to a halt, thus creating a disloyalty problem for the President if administrators and the President had different partisan beliefs. In their eyes, administrators’ non-partisanship was necessary to ensure that administrators could be counted on in formulating and implementing policies in a manner that the President found adequate. As a result, they asserted that administrators should be prohibited from any partisan political activities except voting in elections (B. M. Ahn 1981; Y. P. Kim 1985). For example, one scholar strongly supported Korea’s National Civil Service Act (NCSA) that restricted administrators from exercising their rights to join political parties, campaign for or against candidates in partisan elections, and openly express their
political opinions concerning political issues. Then, he praised the NCSA for contributing to establishing the principle of political neutrality in civil service (B. M. Ahn 1981). In a word, reform-oriented scholars believed that “neutral” administrators should not only be defended from partisan manipulations but also they should stay far away from partisan politics.

Although reform-oriented scholars championed the importance of insulating administrators from “partisan politics,” their discussion of the politics-administration dichotomy clearly indicate that they strongly advocated administrators’ active participation in “policy politics.” When discussing the politics-administration dichotomy, reform-oriented scholars narrowly conceptualized politics as “policy politics” and completely rejected the politics-administration dichotomy as “anachronistic” (D. S. Bark 1973, 115), “artificial” (B. M. Ahn 1981, 11), and “self-contradictory” (D. S. Bark 1973, 115) because they astutely recognized the active role of administrators in making policies in Korea. In fact, reform-oriented scholars believed that the politics-administration dichotomy was unrealistic (D. S. Bark 1973; B. M. Ahn 1981). Reform-oriented scholars found it not only empirically untenable but also normatively undesirable to separate administration from “policy politics.” They cherished the policy expertise of experienced administrators as an important asset of government and strongly contended that “expert” administrators—especially, high-ranking administrators—should play a central role in formulating policies (D. S. Bark 1975; W. K. Paik 1980; C. H. Roh 1979). This emphasis on the policy-making role of administrators implied that reform-oriented scholars’ ideal of political neutrality was not intended to separate administration from “policy politics,” but from “partisan politics.” In a word, what reform-oriented scholars meant by political neutrality was partisan neutrality.

Reform-oriented scholars contended that the increasingly active role of administrators in making policies required them to be more committed to maintaining partisan neutrality than ever. By recognizing that the President and his political appointees could not make good policies without the help of administrators, they pointed out that if administrators were completely committed to their own political beliefs and they disagreed with the President’s political views, they would not bring necessary enthusiasm, energy, and expertise to formulating policies that the President wanted to pursue. Responding
negatively to administrators’ partisan loyalty, they strongly argued that administrators should uphold the ideal of partisan neutrality by making the best possible effort to formulate and implement policies in line with the President’s wishes—regardless of their own partisan beliefs (B. M. Ahn 1981; D. S. Bark 1975). In a word, reform-oriented scholars believed that administrators’ partisan neutrality was necessary to accomplish the President’s political and policy agenda.

However, reform-oriented scholars’ ideal of partisan neutrality turned out to be problematic because they simply contended that “neutral” administrators, irrespective of their own political beliefs, should serve the President to the best of their ability without considering whether or not the President legitimately ascended to power. In fact, reform-oriented scholars never addressed the issue of legitimacy (B. Y. Ahn and M. K. Chung 2007; S. H. Chung 2007). In the Growth Period, the Korean people repeatedly questioned the legitimacy of the Park and Chun regimes because the two authoritarian regimes held indirect presidential elections, in which a handful of electors—rather than eligible citizens—cast votes to elect the President. In fact, the Korean people were deprived of the right to elect the President and both authoritarian regimes fell far short of deriving their legitimacy from the consent of the governed (Y. W. Kihl 2005). Although presidential elections were held periodically under the Park regime and the Chun regime, they were not competitive at all. Under both regimes, the incumbent President had the de facto power to appoint electors who were to elect the next President and such electors had the power to recommend candidates for the presidential election (B. M. Ahn 2002; C. P. Chung 2003). As a result, the incumbent President handpicked electors from his faithful supporters and these handpicked electors

186 Electoral competition is considered as one of main criteria in determining whether a political system is democratic or authoritarian (Diamond 2002; Hadenius and Teorell 2007). For example, Schumpeter (1950) defines democracy as “that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people’s vote” (269). Popper (1988) concurs and contends that democracy is based on “the principle that the government can be dismissed by a majority vote.” In a similar vein, Huntington (1991) points out that in any democratic regime, “its most powerful collective decision makers are selected through fair, honest, and periodic elections in which candidates freely compete for votes” (7).

187 The Fourth Republic Constitution granted the National Conference for Unification (NCU) the power to elect the President. The NCU was composed of around 2,500 members. Anyone who wanted to run for the President was required to receive more than 200 letters of recommendation from the NCU’s members (B. M. Ahn 2002; C. I. E. Kim 1973). Similarly, the Fifth Republic Constitution authorized the Presidential Electoral College (PEC), which was made up of 5,271 electors, to elect the President. A presidential candidate was required to have more than 300 letters of recommendation from the PEC’s electors or members of a political party (C. P. Chung 2003).
either allowed him to run as the sole candidate for the presidential election or allowed only weak candidates to compete with him to assure that he would easily win the presidential election. In a word, the Park regime and the Chun regime held presidential elections to “mask . . . the reality of authoritarian dominance” (Diamond 2002, 24) and “provide a façade of democratic legitimacy” (Heo and Stockton 2005, 675).

Although the Korean people cast doubt on the legitimacy of the Park regime and the Chun regime, reform-oriented scholars remained silent on it. They never distinguished between “genuine legitimacy,” which was created by the consent of citizens, and “spurious legitimacy,” which was manufactured by the President’s handpicked electors. Without discussing how administrators should respond differently to a legitimately elected President and an illegitimately elected President, reform-oriented scholars simply insisted that administrators should faithfully serve whoever happened to be in power (B. M. Ahn 1981; D. S. Bark 1975; C. H. Roh 1979). From the reform-oriented scholars’ viewpoint, the proper role of “neutral” administrators was to serve an illegitimately elected dictator as faithfully as a legitimately elected leader. As a result, reform-oriented scholars’ ideal of political neutrality quickly degenerated into what Norton Long (1952) called “docile neutrality” (808), which made public administration a “neutral instrument solely devoted to . . . the docile execution of orders from” whoever happened to be the President (Long 1954, 27).

**Policy-oriented Scholars**

Like reform-oriented scholars, policy-oriented scholars conceptualized public administration as the obedient instrument of the President. Their instrumental view of public administration could be

---

188 The President remained uncontested in most of “indirect” presidential elections held under the Park regime and the Chun regime. Both authoritarian regimes held a total of five presidential elections. In four out of five presidential elections, only one candidate—the incumbent President or the leader of a military coup—ran for the President. In only one presidential election, the incumbent President competed with three other candidates who were perceived as having no chance of winning (B. M. Ahn 2002; D. S. Suh 1982).

189 While both reform-oriented and policy-oriented scholars supported the instrumental view of public administration, they defined the role of public administration differently. Although reform-oriented scholars championed the active participation of public administrators in policy-making, policy-oriented scholars supported administrators’ non-involvement in policy-making and restricted the role of public administration to the faithful implementation of policies. In fact, policy-oriented scholars conceptualized the role of public administration more narrowly than reform-oriented scholars did (D. S. Bark 1977; K. M. Koo 1986).
attributed mainly to their obsession with the ends-means dualism. Policy-oriented scholars’ following discussion of the ends-means dualism clearly demonstrates how they came to uphold the instrumental view of public administration.

In the Growth Period, inspired by Hebert Simon’s decision-making approach, policy-oriented scholars identified the decision as the basic unit of public administration. Drawing a sharp distinction between normative and factual decisions, they pointed out that factual decisions dealt with questions of means, while normative decisions addressed those of ends (K. M. Koo 1984; W. K. Yoon 1974). Policy-oriented scholars strongly believed that “elected” politicians should set political ends and “unelected” administrators should develop the best administrative means to accomplish these ends. Thus, they contended that administrators should be involved only in making factual decisions regarding the best means to accomplish given ends. In contrast, they made it clear that normative decisions should be left up to politicians because they focused on ends themselves (C. K. Chung 1979; W. J. Roh 1986). For example, after examining Hempel’s concepts of “instrumental judgment,” which deals with the most rational means to accomplish a given end, and “categorical judgment,” which addresses the question of whether the given end should be pursued, one policy-oriented scholar asserted that public administrators should make only “instrumental judgment” while leaving “categorical judgment” to politicians (W. K. Paik 1978).

Given the fact that the President took complete control of legislators and he was the only politician that could make important normative decisions concerning political ends in the Growth Period, it is clear that, from the policy-oriented scholars’ standpoint, administrators should be committed to selecting the best possible means to accomplish the President’s political ends without raising any questions about their appropriateness (Y. P. Kim 1984; K. M. Koo 1984). It implied that they conceptualized public administration as the President’s faithful instrument.

190 Hempel (1965) noted that an instrumental judgment “states that a certain kind of action, M, is good (or that it is better than a given M’) if a specified goal G is to be attained; or more accurately, that M is good, or appropriate, for the attainment of goal G (84-85).” However, this instrumental judgment does not solve the fundamental question of whether the goal G ought to be pursued. Hempel called this kind of question a “categorical judgment.”
Policy-oriented scholars’ instrumental view of public administration is also reflected in their discussion of delegation. They strongly argued that the President should not delegate broad policy-making authority to administrators because policy-making inevitably involved normative decisions. Since the “elected” officials had the sole authority to determine the priorities among competing values in making policies, policy-oriented scholars maintained that the President should not unwittingly shift his policy-making authority to “unelected” administrators who should only be required to make “factual decisions” (C. K. Chung 1979; W. K. Yoon 1974). In fact, policy-oriented scholars believed that policy-making authority should be in the exclusive domain of the President and administrators should remain uninvolved in policy-making.\textsuperscript{191}

Instead, policy-oriented scholars emphasized administrators’ unwavering commitment to the successful implementation of policies made by the President and his political appointees (D. H. Kim 1984; K. M. Koo 1986). Astutely recognizing that administrators defined the exact terms for implementing policies that the President wanted to pursue, policy-oriented scholars asserted that they should develop the best possible implementation path in terms of technical feasibility (W. J. Roh 1986), legal restrictions (C. K. Chung and M. S. Kim 1985), and budget constraints (Y. H. Park 1985). They also stressed the importance of improving administrators’ quantitative data analysis skills on the grounds that these skills would help administrators systematically collect and analyze policy information and, thus, lead them to make better (factual) decisions in implementing policies (C. K. Chung 1979; K. M. Koo 1986). In a word, policy-oriented scholars believed that the role of public administrators should be limited to the faithful implementation of policies made by the President and his political appointees.

Given the fact that policy-oriented scholars glorified the President’s monopolization of policy-making and administrators’ faithful implementation of his policies, it is clear that their conception of what public administration should be was that of the faithful instrument of the President.

\textsuperscript{191} However, policy-oriented scholars’ strong objection to broad delegation did not necessarily mean that they completely opposed the participation of administrators in policy-making. They contended that, rather than directly making value-laden policy decisions, administrators should indirectly participate in policy-making by providing the President and his political appointees with the relevant and reliable factual information needed to make good policies (K. M. Koo 1986; W. J. Roh 1986).
Tenet 3: Managerial Values as the Main Values of Public Administration

Reform-oriented Scholars

Reform-oriented scholars emphasized managerial values at the expense of political and legal values because they fully embraced an executive-centered view of public administration as the obedient instrument of the President. Given the fact that this instrumental view promoted public administrators’ unwavering commitment to the President’s political and policy agenda, it is natural that reform-oriented scholars held managerial values in high esteem because administrators’ pursuit of managerial values would greatly contribute to the attainment of the President’s agenda. In contrast, they held in low esteem political and legal values because administrators’ commitment to such non-managerial values might lead administrators to question the appropriateness of the President’s agenda (W. K. Paik 1986; J. H. Yoo 1984).

Managerial Values. Before proceeding, it is important to note that reform-oriented scholars did not pay equal attention to all of the 3Es (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness) in the Growth Period. While they repeatedly stressed the importance of efficiency and effectiveness, they hardly addressed that of economy. Reform-oriented scholars’ lack of attention to economy could be attributed to their realization that belt-tightening did not necessarily improve the performance of the executive branch (H. K. Ahn 1979; D. S. Bark 1975).

Reform-oriented scholars’ strong emphasis on efficiency and effectiveness is clearly demonstrated in their passionate discussion of the importation of foreign administrative institutions. They expressed strong interest in the importation of the western countries’ well-established administrative institutions—in most cases, the U.S. administrative institutions—because these administrative institutions were believed to improve the performance of the executive branch (Y. D. Jung 1984; D. S. Bark 1979; J. Y. Yoon 1979). For example, after carefully examining the U.S. federal personnel classification system (D. S. Bark 1979), the U.S. federal wage system (C. H. Roh 1981), the U.S. Management-by-Objectives initiatives (J. H. Yoo 1984), the U.S. federal regulative system (Y. D. Jung 1984), and other western
administrative institutions, reform-oriented scholars recommended that the Korean government should bring in and set up these administrative institutions in the executive branch.192

Although reform-oriented scholars deserve praise for their endless efforts to search for western administrative institutions that could increase the performance of the executive branch, they placed heavy stress on whether the imported administrative institution could help the executive branch operate in an efficient and effective manner, and if so, how much. In fact, efficiency and effectiveness became the main criteria for the adoption of a foreign administrative institution (D. S. Bark 1979; C. H. Roh 1981; J. H. Yoo 1984). In contrast, reform-oriented scholars were rather indifferent to whether a foreign administrative institution, if implanted in the Korean executive branch, could foster political and legal values. As a result, they hardly considered these non-managerial values in deciding whether a foreign administrative institution should be adopted or not. For example, only two scholars proposed the adoption of the European Ombudsman system on the grounds that it would promote one political value, citizen participation, in the executive branch (J. P. Yoon 1979; W. K. Paik 1979). Not a single scholar regarded legal values as the main adoption criteria.

In addition, a careful examination of reform-oriented scholars’ discussion of Korea’s traditional administrative virtues reveals that they put managerial values ahead of political and legal values. They castigated Korea’s traditional administrative virtues on the grounds that administrators’ adherence to such virtues prevented them from behaving in an efficient and effective manner. For example, reform-oriented scholars denounced such traditional administrative virtues as familism (H. D. Kim 1978), ritualism (W. K. Paik 1978), formalism (C. B. Lee 1979), and authoritarianism (W. K. Yoon 1973) and treated them as a main obstacle to increasing efficiency and effectiveness in the executive branch.193 Furthermore,

192 However, reform-oriented scholars emphasized the importance of modifying foreign administrative institutions to the Korean executive branch (B. Y. Ahn 1979; C. B. Lee 1977).
193 However, it is still controversial whether Korea’s traditional administrative virtues tend to increase or undermine the managerial performance of the executive branch. For example, one scholar directly challenged reform-oriented scholars’ argument that Korea’s traditional administrative virtues had a negative impact on the managerial performance of executive ministries or agencies. He contended that such traditional administrative virtues as “industriousness” and “harmony among members” tended to encourage administrators to make full commitment to accomplishing the goals of their ministries or agencies (B. S. Kim 1994).
reform-oriented scholars recommended that the Korean government launch a massive campaign in order to uproot Korea’s traditional administrative virtues (W. K. Paik 1978; J. P. Yoon 1978).\footnote{One critic pointed out that reform-oriented scholars’ harsh criticism of Korea’s traditional administrative virtues was guided by their blind pursuit of westernization. He severely charged reform-oriented scholars with upholding an untested a priori assumption that while Korean traditional administrative virtues were “insular, inferior, and retarded,” western administrative virtues such as rationality and impartiality were “universal, superior, and developed” (S. H. Chung 2007, 1354).}

When judging the worth of traditional administrative virtues, reform-oriented scholars mainly investigated whether administrators’ pursuit of such virtues promoted or undermined efficiency and effectiveness in their executive ministries or agencies. In contrast, they never examined whether or not administrators’ commitment to Korea’s traditional administrative virtues encouraged them to uphold political and legal values (S. H. Chung 2001; D. H. Lee 1991).\footnote{Some scholars countered reform-oriented scholars’ negative interpretations of Korea’s traditional administrative virtues by arguing that if administrators adhered to such traditional administrative virtues as “humanitarianism” (C. S. Kim 1992), “public officials’ ethical consciousness” (J. S. Kim 1992), and “the common good” (D. H. Lee 1991), they would exercise their power in a more democratic manner.} In a word, effectiveness and efficiency became the absolute criteria for judging the goodness or badness of Korea’s traditional administrative virtues.

*Political Values.* Although reform-oriented scholars devoted a great deal of attention to managerial values, they directed far less attention to political values, such as accountability, responsiveness, and representation (Rosenbloom 1983). A close examination of reform-oriented scholarship shows that the most often mentioned political value was public administrators’ strict political accountability to the President. Since reform-oriented scholars perceived the President as the sole master of public administration, they inevitably stressed public administration’s complete subordination to the President (D. S. Bark 1977; C. H. Roh 1979; J. P. Yoon 1978). In contrast, they deemphasized public administration’s political accountability to the legislative and judicial branches. For example, only two scholars contended that administrators should be held accountable to the National Assembly and no scholars mentioned the relationship between public administration and the courts (J. C. Park 1984; Y. H. Park 1987).
Most of all, reform-oriented scholars’ discussion of the policy-making role of public administrators clearly indicates that they emphasized administrators’ strict political accountability to the President. After blaming many political appointees for having little or no expertise in making policies, reform-oriented scholars contended that the President should delegate broad policy-making authority to high-ranking administrators—not to political appointees—and that administrators should be given more opportunities to use their policy expertise in formulating policies (D. S. Bark 1977; W. K. Paik 1986). Although their emphasis on policy expertise seemed to suggest that administrators should be politically insulated, reform-oriented scholars actually stressed administrators’ political commitment to the President’s development agenda. They supported the President’s delegation of policy-making authority to high-ranking administrators because “expert” career administrators were perceived to be more competent than “amateur” political appointees in translating the President’s abstract development agenda into concrete policies. For example, one scholar asserted that, after delegating policy-making authority to administrators, the President should exercise strict oversight of them in order to make them develop policies in accordance with his development agenda (D. S. Bark 1977). Another scholar concurred and stated that the policy-making role of administrators could be legitimate only to the extent that they exercised their delegated policy-making authority in line with the President’s wishes (C. K. Chung 1983).

In fact, reform-oriented scholars stressed administrators’ strict political accountability to the President by contending that administrators should make policies in a manner consistent with the President’s development agenda.

When discussing the role of administration in the implementation of policies, however, reform-oriented scholars give primacy to professional accountability, which emphasized administrators’ commitment to their technical expertise and political superiors’ deference to such expertise (Mulgan 2000; Romzek and Dubnik 1987), over political accountability. After observing that “amateur” political appointees interfered to an excessive degree in the detailed implementation of public policies, reform-oriented scholars expressed deep concern that their meddlesome interference often served to impede, rather than facilitate, the successful implementation of these policies. Reform-oriented scholars contended
that political appointees should defer to the expertise of administrators in the technical details of implementation and empower them to exercise broad discretion in implementing policies (D. S. Bark 1977; C. H. Roh 1979). This implied that, in the reform-oriented scholars’ viewpoint, administrators should uphold professional accountability by relying solely on their professional expertise in implementing policies. However, reform-oriented scholars emphasized administrators’ commitment to professional accountability because such commitment was believed to promote the successful implementation of policies in accordance with the President’s development agenda. They believed that, if “amateur” political appointees paid a great deal of deference to the expertise of administrators, then administrators, freed from having to deal with the occasional whims of political appointees, could fully harness their expertise to implementing policies that the President regarded as necessary to accomplish his development agenda (W. K. Paik 1979; J. H. Yoo 1984). In their viewpoint, administrators’ strict adherence to technical expertise would never come into conflict with their political accountability to the President.

Several reform-oriented scholars also touched upon the issue of public administration’s responsiveness to citizens’ demands. After pointing out that administrators failed to respond effectively to the demands citizens placed on them, they contended that citizens’ active participation in government would encourage administrators to be more responsive to citizens’ demands and to develop public policies that were intended to address their demands (B. M. Ahn 1983b; B. Y. Ahn 1979; C. B. Lee 1977). Responding to skeptics who believed that the Korean people were unwilling to engage in making policies, one scholar even examined their willingness to participate in policy-making by measuring their feelings of political efficacy. He found out that the Korean people had a high sense of political

---

196 Political efficacy is an individual’s view about the “self” in the existing political arrangement and is used to examine the extent to which an individual feels he or she can influence the way the government works (Almond and Verba 1965; Gamson 1968). Paige (1971) explains how political efficacy influences the political activities of an individual as follows:

Individuals with strong subjective feelings of efficacy have been found to be more likely to vote, to take an interest in political campaigns and to participate in party. Alienated or apathetic individuals who lack such feelings of efficacy are less inclined to participate in all forms of conventional politics (810).
efficacy—the feeling that they can influence the way government works—and wanted to participate in making policies (B. M. Ahn 1983a; B. M. Ahn 1983b).

However, reform-oriented scholars fell far short of advocating the importance of directly engaging citizens in making actual policy decisions; they rather contended that administrators should invite citizens to present their demands and that administrators should incorporate these demands in public policies. Reform-oriented scholars still believed that citizens did not share the policy-making authority with administrators (W. K. Paik 1986; C. H. Roh 1979). In their eyes, administrators had the final authority to decide whether or not to take into account citizens’ voices in making policies.197

Although several reform-oriented scholars paid attention to responsiveness, only two scholars addressed the issue of representativeness. These two scholars emphasized the importance of making executive ministries and agencies more representative of diverse social groups, especially in terms of their family income (C. H. Roh 1979) and their province (D. S. Bark 1977). Strongly influenced by the theory of representative bureaucracy, they assumed that administrators from a particular social group would advocate the interests of their social group. Then, these scholars contended that, if executive ministries and agencies were filled with administrators with diverse social backgrounds, they would represent the diverse social interests in making policies (D. S. Bark 1977; C. H. Roh 1979). Furthermore, they examined the social backgrounds of administrators working in the Korean executive branch in order to determine whether or not it was demographically representative of diverse social groups. For example, one scholar investigated administrators’ family income and praised the Korean executive branch for being demographically representative of diverse income groups (C. H. Roh 1979). However, another scholar pointed out that those who were born in two provinces had been overrepresented in the executive branch and stressed the importance of recruiting more administrators from other disadvantaged provinces (D. S. Bark 1977).

Although these two scholars could be credited for raising the scholarly interests in how to make

197 Given the fact that founding scholars were rather critical of citizen participation in the Founding Period, however, it is fair to say that reform-oriented scholars held a much more favorable attitude towards citizen participation in the Growth Period. For an explanation of why founding scholars were critical of citizen participation, see page 110-111.
the increasingly powerful executive branch represent the interests of diverse social groups, they were too quick to conclude that administrators from a particular social group would automatically represent the interests of their social group in the executive branch. According to them, administrators from low-income families should be willing to enthusiastically represent the interests of economically disadvantaged people. However, many critics pointed out that administrators, regardless of whether they were from rich families or poor families, remained indifferent to the economic hardship of economically disadvantaged people in the Growth Period (Y. C. Ha and M. K. Kang 2001; B. C. Lee 2003). They mentioned that packing the executive branch with administrators with different social backgrounds would not necessarily make the executive branch more representative.

In addition to the 3Rs (responsibility (accountability), responsiveness, and representativeness), several reform-oriented scholars were more specific in urging administrators to take seriously social equity in making and implementing policies (B. Y. Ahn 1979; Y. D. Jung 1982a; J. H. Yoo 1984). For example, after observing extreme economic inequality created by growth-oriented development policies, one scholar blamed administrators for having ignored distributional justice. In order to achieve distributional justice, he contended, administrators should take social equity as a primary value in making policies (B. Y. Ahn 1979). Another scholar carefully examined the New Public Administration movement in the U.S., which stressed social equity, and encouraged Korean public administrators to consider not only efficiency and effectiveness, but also social equity as the main criteria for their actions (J. H. Yoo 1984). However, the concern of these scholars for social equity failed to attract strong attention from most reform-oriented scholars, who were obsessed with growth in the Growth Period—as discussed in Tenet 1. Because they felt that administrators’ commitment to social equity might threaten the successful accomplishment of growth-oriented economic development, growth-obsessed scholars hesitated to emphasize the importance of social equity (S. H. Chung 2001).

*Legal Values.* Although reform-oriented scholars placed more emphasis on managerial values than political values, it is nevertheless fair to state that they devoted a good deal of attention to political values. Yet, not a single scholar addressed what legal values administrators should uphold. Given the fact
that these reform-oriented scholars implicitly or explicitly endorsed the authoritarian regimes which trampled upon the basic rights of citizens and remained silent on civil rights violations in the Growth Period, it is inevitable that they avoided championing legal values, which were inextricably linked to the protection of civil rights (S. H. Jeung 2000; B. C. Lee 2003).

**Policy-oriented Scholars**

Like reform-oriented scholars, policy-oriented scholars upheld managerial values as the primary values of public administration. However, they were more indifferent to non-managerial values than reform-oriented scholars. Policy-oriented scholars’ obsession with rationality led them to completely discount the importance of political and legal values in their work.

**Managerial Values.** Policy-oriented scholars’ strong emphasis on managerial values arose mainly from their preoccupation with rationality. However, while they repeatedly contended that administrators should seek rationality, what they meant by rationality was limited only to “instrumental rationality,” which “implies the appropriateness of means to ends” (Mouzelis 1973, 51). Given the fact that policy-oriented scholars saw the relationship between the President and administrators in terms of ends and means, it is clear that they expected administrators to develop the best means to accomplish the ends set by the President. In fact, policy-oriented scholars supported administrators’ commitment to instrumental rationality. However, their ends-means dualism inevitably led them to draw their attention from “substantive rationality,” which is concerned with the appropriateness of ends themselves (C. K. Chung 1979; W. J. Roh 1986). One scholar even cherished (instrumental) rationality as an administrative ideal toward which administrators should strive (W. K. Yoon 1974).

Policy-oriented scholars’ single-minded pursuit of instrumental rationality inescapably led them to glorify the 3Es (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness) as the primary values of public administration because, from their standpoint, administrators could be instrumentally rational only by accomplishing the President’s goals in an economical, efficient, and effective manner without questioning their desirability.
Before proceeding, it is important to note that several policy-oriented scholars did not distinguish among the 3Es and preferred to use “(instrumental) rationality” as a more inclusive concept to refer to all 3Es. In their usage, to seek “(instrumental) rationality” was to pursue all of the 3Es (Y. P. Kim 1983; K. M. Koo 1984).

Policy-oriented scholars’ heavy stress on the 3Es—or, instrumental rationality as the inclusive concept for the 3Es—is most obviously demonstrated in their discussion of decision criteria. Almost every policy-oriented scholar implicitly or explicitly touched upon the issue of decision criteria at least once in their academic work. Strongly influenced by Herbert Simon’s decision-making approach, policy-oriented scholars devoted their attention to identifying the main criteria that should guide administrators’ policy decisions (Y. P. Kim 1984; K. M. Koo 1984).

Some scholars insisted that administrators should give priority to one or two managerial values as the main criteria for determining the goodness or badness of their policy decisions: economy and efficiency (W. K. Yoon 1974), efficiency and effectiveness (D. H. Kim 1985), and efficiency (Y. P. Kim 1984). However, policy-oriented scholars perceived the 3Es as value-neutral decision criteria. By championing the 3Es as venerable “value-free” criteria, they contended that administrators should not use value-laden criteria for evaluating administrators’ policy decisions (W. K. Yoon 1974; K. M. Koo 1984). From policy-oriented scholars’ viewpoint, political and legal values should not take on the same status as managerial values as decision criteria to which administrators should adhere. In fact, policy-oriented scholars unconsciously championed the 3Es as main values of public administration.

Rather than focusing on separate managerial values, other scholars maintained that administrators should apply (instrumental) rationality, which they believed encompassed all 3Es, as the main criterion for judging whether their decisions were appropriate or not. For example, one policy-oriented scholar

---

198 Only one policy-oriented scholar contended that administrators should pursue not only instrumental rationality but also substantive rationality. This scholar predicted that administrators would play an increasingly important role in executive ministries and agencies because their appointed superiors would have to rely heavily on “expert” administrators in making and implementing policies (B. Hu 1974; B. Hu 1981). He argued that administrators were required to seek not only “narrow rationality,” which stresses “effectiveness, feasibility, and efficiency,” in implementing policies, but also “broad rationality,” which is concerned with the normative “desirability” of policies themselves, in making policies (B. Hu 1974, 114-116).
made it clear that “technical rationality” should be the “sole criteria” for evaluating the appropriateness of administrators’ decisions and “political rationality” should not creep into their decisions (K. M. Koo 1984, 116). Another scholar contended that administrators should not inject their own political views into their decisions because their political bias would undermine the (instrumental) rationality of their decisions (W. K. Paik 1978b). In sum, managerial values—or, (instrumental) rationality—rose to prominence in policy-oriented scholars’ work in the Growth Period.

**Political and Legal Values.** Given the fact that policy-oriented scholars perceived managerial values as value-free decision criteria and expressed hostility towards value-laden decision criteria, it comes as no surprise that not a single scholar directed intellectual attention to cultivating political and legal values that public administrators should pursue. From policy-oriented scholars’ standpoint, administrators’ commitment to political and legal values was detrimental to the (instrumental) rationality of their policy decisions.

**Tenet 4: Building the Administrative Capacity of the Executive Branch as the Main Concern of Public Administration**

**Reform-oriented Scholars**

Since reform-oriented scholars perceived public administration as the President’s obedient instrument, they enthusiastically examined how to reform the administrative apparatus of the executive branch in order to make it more capable of accomplishing the President’s political and policy agenda. Especially, they believed the existence of competent administrators to be among the most important factors in improving the administrative capacity of the executive branch. As a result, reform-oriented scholars proposed several personnel reform recommendations that were intended to produce competent administrators (D. S. Bark 1975; Y. P. Kim 1985; C. H. Roh 1981).

First of all, they emphasized the importance of what is now known as “human resource planning” by contending that the central government suffered from a chronic manpower shortage because the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA), which had authority over personnel matters in the executive branch,

---

199 This scholar used the term “technical rationality” to refer to “instrumental rationality” and the term “political rationality” to mean “substantive rationality” (K. M. Koo 1984).
arbitrarily set the number of new entrants to civil service every year without considering the number of retirees (D. S. Bark 1981; Y. S. Kim and H. K. Cho 1980). For example, one scholar pointed out that, in the case of one executive ministry, 13 percent of the total positions in one Grade were left vacant because the number of its retirees was much greater than that of its new entrants (D. S. Bark 1975). Reform-oriented scholars expressed deep concern that this manpower shortage had created excessive workload for public administrators, thus greatly reducing the performance of the executive branch. As a result, they strongly urged the MOHA to come up with a long-term recruitment plan that could provide sufficient manpower for the executive branch to push through the President’s political and policy agenda (Y. S. Kim and H. K. Cho 1980). Furthermore, they recommended that the MOHA should take into account not only internal factors such as the retirement rate of incumbent administrators and the recruitment rate of new administrators but also external factors such as population growth rate, economic growth rate, and the extent of government growth in forecasting the demand and supply of public administrators (D. S. Bark 1981).

Second, reform-oriented scholars paid strong attention to how to attract scientific and technical experts into civil service because they astutely acknowledged the importance of science and technology (S&T) in promoting economic growth. Reform-oriented scholars held a firm belief that high-ranking administrators with substantive scientific and technical expertise should play a central role in formulating S&T policies (Y. P. Kim 1985; W. K. Paik 1986). After pointing out that non-expert administrators held high-ranking positions in S&T-related executive ministries, they castigated the Korean civil service’s “closed” personnel system for offering a sterile ground for scientific and technical experts to pursue their career in executive branch. Since this “closed” personnel system emphasized the principle of internal promotion at the expense of that of external recruitment, reform-oriented scholars contended, it was very difficult to recruit scientific and technical experts as high-ranking administrators from outside the executive branch. Responding critically to the “exclusivity” of these internal recruitment practices,

---

200 This scholar did not specify the name of the executive ministry troubled by the problem of position vacancies.
201 One scholar even cherished science and technology as “the most important factor in breaking away from [economic] backwardness” (W. K. Paik 1986, 21).
reform-oriented scholars emphasized the importance of making the personnel system more open. They recommended that the MOHA identify high-ranking positions that required substantial scientific and technical expertise in the executive branch and create a special recruitment program that could fill these positions with outside scientific and technical experts (D. S. Bark 1981; Y. P. Kim 1985).

Third, after observing that the morale of public administrators had declined to a dangerously low level that could impair the performance of the executive branch, reform-oriented scholars focused their attention on how to raise the morale of administrators—in other words, how to motivate them to work hard (D. S. Bark 1975; C. H. Roh 1981). Reform-oriented scholars attributed the main causes of the declining morale of administrators to their low salaries and the Korean civil service’s seniority-based promotion principle. In the first place, they pointed out that administrators earned relatively lower salaries when compared with their counterparts in private firms and contended that these low salaries led administrators to lose enthusiasm for their work and, thus, become indolent and neglectful of their official duties. As a result, reform-oriented scholars recommended that administrators’ salaries should be dramatically increased to promote their morale and ultimately improve their performance (D. S. Bark 1975; C. H. Roh 1981). Reform-oriented scholars also regarded the seniority-based promotion principle as a main obstacle to boosting the morale of administrators. They condemned the seniority-based promotion principle for enabling low-performing administrators to be automatically promoted, thus undermining the morale of high-performing administrators (D. S. Bark 1975; D. S. Bark 1981). One scholar even deplored the fact that many competent administrators settled for mediocrity because excellent performance did not guarantee that they would move up the career ladder faster than their mediocre colleagues (C. H. Roh 1981). In order to raise the morale of administrators, reform-oriented scholars contended that not only seniority, but also performance, should be used as the main promotion criteria in

---

202 One scholar cast a sympathetic eye upon the economic hardship of administrators—especially, low-ranking and mid-ranking ones—by pointing out their salaries barely covered their families’ living expenses. Then, he contended that poorly paid administrators often indulged in corruption in order to supplement their poor salaries and predicted that the increase in their salaries would greatly help reduce corruption in the executive branch (D. S. Bark 1975).

203 One scholar noted that patronage-based promotion practices also greatly hurt the morale of administrators by giving promotional advantages to incompetent administrators who had strong patrons over competent administrators who had no patrons. (D. S. Bark 1975).
the executive branch. They predicted that the application of performance as the main promotion criteria would motivate administrators to work hard to excel in their jobs by rewarding their performance in terms of promotion prospectus (D. S. Bark 1975; D. S. Bark 1981).

**Policy-oriented Scholars**

Although reform-oriented scholars emphasized the importance of personnel reform in increasing the administrative capacity of the executive branch, policy-oriented scholars paid strong attention to improving administrators’ quantitative data analysis skills needed to systematically collect and analyze policy information. They believed that, in terms of data analysis, technically proficient administrators could help politicians make good policies by providing them with relevant and reliable information (C. K. Chung 1979; K. M. Koo 1986). One scholar even argued that quality information provided by administrators would prevent politicians from falling into “moral dogmatism” when they made important policies (W. K. Paik 1978, 85). Policy-oriented scholars also claimed that advanced quantitative skills enabled administrators to collect and analyze necessary policy information to accomplish the successful implementation of public policies (D. H. Kim 1984). In policy-oriented scholars’ viewpoint, the proficiency of administrators in quantitative data analysis skills was a key factor in determining the capacity of the executive branch to make and implement public policies.

Therefore, policy-oriented scholars stressed the importance of establishing technical training programs that could provide administrators with necessary quantitative skills to systematically analyze policy information. They criticized administrators for attaching little importance to quantitative skills and attributed administrators’ underestimation of such skills to the generalist philosophy underlying the Korean civil service. While the generalist philosophy cherished administrators’ broad-based knowledge as an essential virtue, policy-oriented scholars maintained that administrators’ focus on building a broad range of knowledge made them indifferent to developing quantitative skills. According to policy-oriented scholars, this lack of attention to quantitative skills had led administrators to rely on intuition, rather than systematic analysis, in making decisions, thus impairing their rationality (D. S. Bark 1973; W. K. Paik 1983). Recognizing the importance of quantitative skills, policy-oriented scholars strongly recommended
that new training programs should be created to strengthen administrators’ quantitative analysis ability. In particular, they contended that new technical training programs should focus on providing administrators with such quantitative techniques as statistical analysis (K. M. Koo 1984; W. J. Roh 1983), systems analysis (W. K. Yoon 1974), operational research (K. M. Koo 1984; W. K. Yoon 1974), and cost-benefit analysis (C. K. Chung and M. S. Kim 1985; Y. P. Kim 1984).

Conclusion

My qualitative content analysis of mainstream scholarship (reform-oriented scholarship and policy-oriented scholarship) clearly indicates that the four tenets underlying the executive-centered approach to public administration became fully entrenched in mainstream public administration scholarship in the Growth Period. Mainstream scholars’ implicit or explicit endorsement of “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order led them to perceive the President as the sole master of public administration (Tenet 1) and emphasize administrators’ unquestioning obedience to the President (Tenet 2). Furthermore, by implicitly or explicitly approving “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order, mainstream scholars privileged managerial values as the dominant values of public administration at the expense of broader political and legal values (Tenet 3) and focused their academic attention on increasing the administrative apparatus of the executive branch headed by the President (Tenet 4). In a word, the executive-centered approach continued to prevail among mainstream scholars in the Growth Period.

However, if carried to an extreme, the executive-centered approach might justify the role of public administration in maintaining the authoritarian regime. By championing administrators’

---

204 Policy-oriented scholars’ strong emphasis on quantitative data analysis skills is also demonstrated in their discussion of the development of a model curriculum for undergraduate public administration programs. They strongly insisted on including many “quantitative methods” courses in the model curriculum. This model curriculum was believed to equip undergraduate public administration students with strong quantitative skills even before they entered the public service (C. K. Chung and M. S. Kim 1985; J. P. Yoon and M. S. Kim 1982).

205 Several scholars also contended that since administrators were required to use computers to perform a variety of quantitative analysis, government should offer computer training programs to administrators (M. S. Ahn 1983; W. K. Yoon 1974).
unflinching loyalty to the President, it might encourage them to serve him faithfully, whether he is a democratic leader or a brutal dictator (Fry 1989). Unfortunately, Korean mainstream public administration scholars’ strict adherence to the executive-centered approach led them to emphasize administrators’ unwavering commitment to the “authoritarian” President and to devote their academic attention to how to make administrators serve him better (S. H. Chung 2007). Given the fact that mainstream scholars did not question the legitimacy of the authoritarian regimes and simply focused on how to make the executive branch more capable of accomplishing the President’s political and policy agenda, it comes as no surprise that mainstream scholars enjoyed the so-called “golden age” by actively participating in the making and implementation of policies in executive ministries and agencies and carrying out many government-sponsored research projects under the auspices of the authoritarian regimes throughout the Growth Period (Jun 1983).

However, mainstream scholars’ active involvement in the authoritarian regimes badly tarnished the image of mainstream scholars as “pro-authoritarian” (M. G. Kang 2008). This heavily tarnished image arose mainly from the fact that, as one critic adequately noted, “either by being active supporters of the authoritarian . . . government or by avoiding political issues, . . . [Korean mainstream public administration] researchers were essentially oriented to [defending] the status quo”—in particular, to maintaining the “hardcore” monarchial executive-centered governing order (S. H. Chung 2007, 1351).

As the Growth Period drew near its end, nationwide pro-democracy protests were staged against the authoritarian regime and the government responded by brutally cracking down on them. However, the brutal crackdown precipitated even stronger resistance from citizens, thus creating political turmoil (West and Baker 1988). Amidst this political chaos, mainstream scholars began to criticize the authoritarian regime for severely suppressing pro-democracy protesters (D. H. Kim 1985; W. K. Paik 1986). However, their critiques were aimed at the authoritarian regime’s oppressive practices, but not at executive-centered governing order per se. Although mainstream scholars became increasingly critical of the “hard-core” monarchial executive-centered governing order, which amplified the constitutional powers of the President and emasculated those of the legislative and judicial branches, they still perceived the President
as “first among equals” and remained steadfast in the belief that the President should exercise complete control of the executive branch and its administrators should be accountable only to the President (W. J. Roh 1986; J. P. Yoon 1987). As a result, mainstream scholars’ abiding belief in executive-centered governing order foreclosed any further discussion not only of how to increase administrators’ responsiveness to the legislative and judicial branches, but also of how to build a better governing order.

Given mainstream scholars’ full commitment to executive-centered governing order, it is no surprise that the executive-centered approach was so deeply ingrained in mainstream scholarship that mainstream scholars came to take it for granted and never questioned its appropriateness in the Growth Period. In fact, the executive-centered approach became incontestable in the field of public administration in the Growth Period. However, this “taken-for-granted” executive-centered approach came to stand in essential tension with the new governing order of separation of powers arising in the Post-Growth Period. The executive-centered approach identified the President as the sole master of public administration and stressed administrators’ complete responsiveness only to the President. However, the new governing order of separation of powers introduced multiple masters for public administration and required administrators to remain responsive not only to the President, but also to the legislative and judicial branches. In the next chapter (Conclusion), I will examine how the mainstream scholars’ blind adherence to the executive-centered approach created an intellectual dilemma for public administration scholars under the governing order of separation of powers in the Post-Growth Period and will propose how they should resolve this dilemma.
CHAPTER VIII:

In this chapter, I will first describe how the separation of powers was fully institutionalized as a new governing order in the Post-Growth Period. Next, I will explain how the single-minded adherence to the executive-centered approach prevented mainstream public administration scholars from responding appropriately to the new governing order, thus creating an intellectual dilemma in the field of Korean public administration. Then, I will conclude this chapter by making brief comments on how to overcome the dilemma and suggest future research.

Governing Order in the Post-Growth Period

The Rise of Separation of Powers as a New Governing Order

As West and Baker (1988) noted, “1987 was a year of momentous political change” in Korean history (135). In June 1987, millions of people participated in nationwide pro-democracy protests against the dictatorship of President Chun of the Fifth Republic and demanded the immediate revision of the Fifth Republic’s Constitution, which allowed the President to wield extraordinarily strong powers. Overwhelmed by an unprecedented wave of pro-democracy protests, the Chun regime finally surrendered to the people’s strong demand for the constitutional revision. Following a series of negotiations between pro-president and anti-president parties, a constitutional amendment was passed in the National Assembly and approved in a national referendum in October 1987 (West and Baker 1988; D. K. Yoon 1995). 206 This constitutional amendment ushered in the era of the Sixth Republic.

The most distinctive characteristic of the Sixth Republic’s Constitution was its strong commitment to root out the executive domination of the legislative and judicial branches and “introduce an authentic separation of powers” (West and Baker 1988, 139). To establish a more balanced distribution

---

206 The turnout for the referendum was 78 percent, and 93 percent of the voters approved the proposed constitutional amendment (B. M. Ahn 2002).
of powers among three constitutional branches (the President, the National Assembly, and the courts), the Sixth Republic’s Constitution drastically scaled down the constitutional powers of the President while dramatically scaling up those of the other two branches (K. W. Ahn 1997-98; Healy 2000-01).

The President

The Constitution of the Sixth Republic still granted the President several strong constitutional powers that made him the chief of the state (Article 66-1), the chief legislator (Article 52),207 the chief policy-maker,208 the chief administrator (Article 66-4),209 and the commander-in-chief of armed forces (Article 74-1). However, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution provided many constitutional measures that could check the strong powers of the President. First of all, it restored the direct presidential election system “after 15 years’ aberration of indirect vote” (D. K. Yoon 1988, 10). The Sixth Republic’s Constitution abolished the indirect system of presidential election, which allowed the incumbent president’s hand-picked delegates to elect the next president in the Fourth and Fifth Republics, and provided that the President should be elected directly by the people (Article 67-1). In addition, the new Constitution prohibited the President from running for a second term and reduced the presidential tenure from the seven-year term to the five-year term in order to prevent the recurrence of the dictatorship (Article 70).

Second, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution drastically reduced the emergency power of the President. Although the Fifth Republic’s Constitution authorized the President to use his emergency measures that could temporarily suspend the rights of people in times of crisis, the Sixth Republic’s

207 The executive branch headed by the President enjoyed the constitutional power to propose legislative bills to the National Assembly (Article 52) and the President also had the constitutional power to veto legislative bills (Article 53-2).
208 The President held the constitutional power to make “important national policies” with the help of the State Council, which was composed of the President, the Prime Minister, the Executive Ministers (Article 88). The scope of these “important national policies” in the Sixth Republic’s Constitution was similar to that in the previous Constitutions. For the scope of these policies, see footnote 39.
209 The Sixth Republic’s Constitution authorized the President to appoint the heads of most executive departments and agencies without the consent of the National Assembly. However, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution required the President to gain the consent of the National Assembly in appointing the Prime Minister (Article 86-1) and the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection (Article 98-2).
Constitution did not allow the President to do so (Article 76-1).

Third, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution weakened the influence of the President over the judicial branch by making it mandatory for the President to obtain the consent of the National Assembly in appointing all Justices of the Supreme Court (Article 104) and the President of the newly created Constitutional Court (Article 111-4). In contrast, the Fifth Republic’s Constitution had only required the President to gain the National Assembly’s consent only when he appointed the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The power of the National Assembly to approve the presidential appointments to the Supreme Court and the Constitutional Court was introduced to promote judicial independence (Healy 2000-01; West and Yoon 1992).

Last, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution abolished a provision of the Fifth Republic’s Constitution that authorized the President to dissolve the National Assembly if the President believed the dissolution to promote the “national stability” and advance the “interests of the entire people” (West and Baker 1988). This abolition was intended to prevent the President from arbitrarily interpreting the meanings of the “national stability” and the “interests of the entire people” and disbanding the legislative branch whenever he deemed it necessary to do so (C. W. Park 2000).

The National Assembly

While the Constitution of the Sixth Republic stripped the President of several constitutional powers, which were often abused under the authoritarian regimes, it also “set the National Assembly free from the shackles placed by the previous authoritarian regimes” (C. W. Park 2000, 40). In fact, the National Assembly regained all of the powers that it had lost under the Fourth and Fifth Republics.

In the Sixth Republic’s Constitution, the National Assembly had the power to propose and pass bills (Article 40 and 52); to approve the annual budget (Article 54); the power to approve the presidential appointments of the Prime Minister (Article 86), the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection (Article 98-2), all Justices of the Supreme Court, including the Chief Justice (Article 104), and the President of the Constitutional Court (Article 111-4); the power to override a presidential veto (Article
the power to recommend a removal of the prime minister or an individual cabinet member from office (Article 63); the power to pass a motion to impeach high ranking officials, including the President (Article 65); the power to conduct an annual inspection of the executive branch and investigate the particular wrongdoings of executive branch (Article 61); the power to appoint three out of nine Constitutional Court Justices (Article 111-3).

Although the Sixth Republic’s Constitution restored the constitutional powers of the legislative branch, it did not necessarily mean that the legislative branch would actively exercise its powers to hold the President in check because the existing electoral system “as a whole favored the government party, assuring it a comfortable majority in the National Assembly” (H. N. Kim 1989, 482). If pro-government legislators took full advantage of the existing unfair electoral system and won a comfortable majority in the National Assembly, the pro-government assembly would not seek to exercise legislative checks on the President (S. M. Lee 2006).

As a result, a series of electoral reforms were launched to eliminate the unfair electoral system. Although these electoral reforms often encountered the strong resistance from conservative politicians who benefitted from the unfair electoral system, they gradually improved the fairness of the electoral system, thus finally creating a relatively “level playing ground” on which no candidate holds an unfair advantage over others (S. M. Lee 2006). The establishment of the fair electoral system greatly helped bring to an end the decades-long one-party hegemony in the legislative branch (Heo and Stockton 2005).

**The Courts**

The Constitution of the Sixth Republic also introduced several constitutional safeguards to “secure judicial independence by precluding or minimizing political interference by the executive, which has been the chief agent for hindering the functions of the court system in Korea” (D. K. Yoon 1989, 133).

---

First, as previously noted, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution required the President to obtain the consent of the National Assembly in appointing all Justices of the Supreme Court, including the Chief Justice (Article 104). This legislative check on the President’s judicial appointments was intended to prevent the President from packing the Supreme Court with his loyal supporters, thus promoting the independence of the Supreme Court (Healy 2000-01).

Second, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution greatly reduced the power of the Chief Justice to appoint the judges of the appellate and trial courts. In the Fifth Republic’s Constitution, the Chief Justice held the exclusive constitutional authority to appoint all inferior court judges. As a result, the authoritarian president appointed his faithful follower as the Chief Justice and the Chief Justice filled the appellate and trial courts with pro-president judges (K. Yang 1993). In order to prevent such improper court-packing, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution made it necessary for the Chief Justice to gain the consent of the Conference of the Supreme Court Justices in appointing all judges of the appellate and trial courts (Article 104-3). This “collegial” process was believed to “help put an end to screening of judicial appointments based on loyalty” to the President (West and Baker 1988, 161).

Third, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution abolished the Constitutional Committee, which did not review the constitutionality of even a single law under the authoritarian regimes of the Fourth and Fifth Republics, and created the Constitutional Court. The Constitutional Court was composed of nine Justices who served a six-year renewable term (Article 112-1). Three Justice each were appointed by the President, and the National Assembly, and the Supreme Court (Article 111-5). The Sixth Republic’s Constitution empowered the Constitutional Court to review the constitutionality of laws and required at least six of the nine Justices to concur in declaring a law unconstitutional.

---

211 In the Sixth Republic’s Constitution, the jurisdiction to review the constitutionality of administrative decrees, regulations and actions remained with the Supreme Court (Article 107-2).
212 The Sixth Republic’s Constitution granted the President the power to appoint the President of the Constitutional Court with the consent of the National Assembly (Article 111-4).
213 In addition to the power to review the constitutionality of laws, the Constitutional Court has the constitutional power to (1) decide cases of impeachment of the President, Supreme Court Justices, judges, and other high-ranking officials, (2) to dissolve political parties, (3) to decide intragovernmental jurisdictional controversies, and (4) to adjudicate petitions relating to the Constitution as prescribed by law (Article 111-1).
The Constitutional Court was believed to exercise judicial review actively mainly on two grounds. First, not only the Supreme Court but also the appellate and trial courts were allowed to refer the constitutional questions of laws to the Constitutional Court (D. K. Yoon 1995). Under the Fourth and Fifth Republcs, the Supreme Court enjoyed “the final authority whether or not to refer the constitutional question to the Constitutional Committee” (K. Yang 1993, 4). Although the lower courts brought up 11 cases involving constitutional questions before the Supreme Court in the Fourth and Fifth Republics, the Supreme Court refused to refer these questions to the Constitutional Committee (West and Yoon 1992). However, in the Sixth Republic, the appellate and trial courts were empowered to refer the constitutional questions of laws directly—not through the Supreme Court—to the Constitutional Court. This judicial empowerment was believed to prevent the Supreme Court from disregarding the inferior courts’ requests for judicial review, thus promoting the Constitutional Court’s active use of judicial review (West and Yoon 1992).

Second, the Constitutional Court’s new “constitutional petition” system, which was later described as “an epoch-making development for constitutional justice” (K. Yang 1993, 5), created fertile ground for the active exercise of judicial review. The Constitutional Court Act (1988) clearly stated that “Any person who alleges that his fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution have been infringed upon by the exercise of or non-exercise of public power . . . may petition for relief or remedy to the Constitutional Court” (Article 68-1). By providing a new avenue for citizens to mount a direct challenge to the constitutionality of laws, the “constitutional petition” system was believed to encourage the Constitutional Court to actively review the constitutionality of laws that were alleged to violate the constitutional rights of citizens (Healy 2000-01).

**The Advent of Separation of Powers and the Demise of the Authoritarian Developmental State**

Before the Sixth Republic was established in 1987, the Korean Constitution was “a sleeping
document” (K. W. Ahn 1997-98, 75). From the Third Republic to the Fifth Republic, the authoritarian presidents trampled down the spirit of the Constitution, which is to “protect liberty through the establishment of internal and external checks on government power” (Heywood 2012, 38), and amended the Constitution in order to extend their rule and legitimize their unlimited powers (B. C. Lee 2003; D. K. Yoon 1989). However, the 1987 pro-democracy protests awakened the “sleeping” Constitution and, since 1987, the Constitution has served as a “working document” that “defines the extent of government power and limits its exercise” (Heywood 2012, 38). Especially, the Sixth Republic’s Constitution upholds the separation of powers as the appropriate governing order in order to realize the ideal of limited government (West and Baker 1988).

The governing order of separation of powers realigned the relations between the President, the legislative branch, and the judicial branch in the Sixth Republic. In terms of the executive-legislative relations, the President could no longer look down on the National Assembly as “the automatic ratifier of [the President’s] policy” (H. N. Kim 1988, 481) because the fair electoral system resulting from a series of electoral reforms often created divided government in which the presidency and the National Assembly were controlled by different parties. In the Sixth Republic, a total of seven presidents have been elected and five of these seven presidents have been faced with divided government. In the five instances of divided government, the anti-president legislative branch actively exercised its constitutional powers to hold the President in check. In most cases, the President could not push through any legislation that he thought was essential to accomplishing his political and policy agenda without winning the support of the hostile legislative branch (H. W. Kim 2016). In addition, the legislative branch effectively checked the president’s appointing power by holding confirmation hearings for his political appointees. Since the legislative branch passed the Confirmation Hearing Act in 2000, it gradually increased the number of political appointees who needed their confirmation hearings (H. W. Kim 2016). As of 2017, a total of 35
political appointees are required to undergo their confirmation hearings. Because the legislative branch questioned the ethical and professional qualifications of the President’s appointees in their confirmation hearings, from 2000 to 2017, a total of 27 political appointees failed to pass the confirmation hearings or resigned soon after the hearings. In fact, the holding of confirmation hearings served to curb the appointing power of the president.

In terms of the executive-judicial relations, the judicial branch was no longer under the President’s tight control in the Sixth Republic. Especially, the Constitutional Court played a central role in promoting judicial independence by actively reviewing the constitutionality of laws that the President believed to be important to accomplishing his political and policy agenda (West and Yoon 1992). In the Fourth and Fifth Republics, the authoritarian presidents filled the Constitutional Committee with their loyal supporters and the pro-president Constitutional Committee did not overturn a single law (Healy 2000-01). However, in the Sixth Republic, the Constitutional Court has actively exercised judicial review of laws to check the President. The President became no longer superior to the judicial branch. From its inception in 1988 to November 2017, the Constitutional Court declared laws unconstitutional in a total of 476 cases (CCK 2017). Given the fact that most of these 476 cases involved so-called “executive-originative” laws that had been proposed by the executive branch headed by the President, it is clear that the Constitutional Court actively used judicial review in holding the President in check (S. I. Pyo 2005). In fact, the Constitutional Court’s active use of judicial review marked the rise of judicial

---

214 These 35 political appointees include the Prime Minister, 18 Executive Ministers, three commissioners of the National Election Committee, the Chairman of the Board of Audit and Inspection, the Director of the National Information Service, the Commissioner General of the National Tax Service, the Prosecutor General of the Supreme Prosecutors’ Office, the Commissioner General of the National Police Agency, the Chairperson of Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chairperson of the Communication Commission, the Chairperson of the Fair Trade Commission, the Chairperson of the Financial Services Commission, the Chairperson of the National Human Rights Commission, the Independent Inspector General, the Governor of the Bank of Korea, the President of the Korean Broadcasting System.

215 From the First Republic to the Third Republic, the judicial branch—the Constitutional Committee in the First Republic, the Constitutional Court in the Second Republic, and the Supreme Court in the Third Republic—also shied from exercising judicial review of legislation. It struck down laws in only three cases (D. K. Yoon 1989).

216 While the courts brought 274 out of these 476 “judicial review” cases to the Constitutional Court, the remaining 202 cases were requested through constitutional petitions (CCK 2017)
activism in the Sixth Republic.

The advent of separation of powers as a new governing order served to accelerate the demise of the authoritarian developmental state, in which the president maintained a firm grip over civil society and market, mainly in two aspects. First, the frequent rise of divided government prevented the president from exercising exclusive control of civil society and market, especially when the conservative party controlled the presidency and the liberal party dominated the legislative branch. Although seven presidents have been elected since 1987, not all of them attempted to dismantle the authoritarian developmental state. While four “conservative” presidents have been relatively sympathetic to the authoritarian developmental state, three “liberal” presidents have been highly critical of it. The split control of government served to block the conservative presidents’ attempts to restore the authoritarian developmental state. Two out of the four conservative presidents encountered the opposition-controlled legislative branch and, in two instances of divided government, the conservative president often attempted to illegally take control of civil society and market. For example, under the president’s guideline, the nation’s top intelligence agency conducted illegal surveillance of civil society activists deemed unfriendly to the president’s political and policy agenda and such activists were excluded from government support programs (D. C. Kim 2014). In addition, many business leaders were forced to make illegal political donations to the president and the executive officials in return for government favors such as subsidies, tax breaks, and low-interest business loans (E. M. Kim 2010). However, this illegal control of civil society and market was often frustrated by the opposition-controlled legislative branch. Especially, the hostile legislative

---

217 In Korea, there are two main political parties: the conservative Liberty Korea Party (LKP) and the liberal Democratic Party (DP). The conservative LKP is what Loxton (2015) calls the “authoritarian successor party.” Loxton (2015) defines “authoritarian successor parties” as “parties that emerge from authoritarian regimes, but that operate after a transition to democracy” (158). The LKP, which was the ruling party under the authoritarian regimes, stresses economic growth and national security. In contrast, the liberal DP, which fought against the authoritarian regimes, emphasizes social equity and individual rights (H. W. Kim 2016).

218 The seven presidents elected in the Sixth Republic include Tae-Woo Roh (1988-1993), Young-Sam Kim (1993-1998), Dae-Jung Kim (1998-2003), Moo-Hyun Roh (2003-2008), Myung-Bak Lee (2008-2013), Geun-Hye Park (2013-2017), and Jae-In Moon (2017-present). While four (Tae-Woo Roh, Young-Sam Kim, Myung-Bak Lee, and Geun-Hye Park) out of the seven presidents were conservative, three presidents (Dae-Jung Kim, Moo-Hyun Roh, and Jae-In Moon) were liberal.

219 All of the three liberal presidents confronted divided government.
branch fully harnessed its constitutional power to investigate the particular wrongdoings of the executive branch (Article 61) and probed into government scandals in which conservative presidents tried to illegally control civil society and market (T. H. Kim 2002; S. Y. Oh 2004). The legislative branch also appointed an independent special prosecutor to investigate some of such scandals. The special prosecutor’s investigation led to the arrest and imprisonment of many executive officials and influential politicians. In fact, the split-control of government made it difficult for the president to control civil society and market in the way he or she wanted.

Second, the independent judicial branch no longer allowed the executive branch headed by the president to arbitrarily encroach upon the basic rights of citizens in civil society. Especially, the Constitutional Court actively defended citizens’ rights to freedom of expression, association, and assembly by “striking down undemocratic laws promulgated by the previous authoritarian regimes” (Healy 2000-01, 234). For example, the Constitutional Court overturned several provisions of the Assembly and Demonstration Act, which was criticized for restricting the citizens’ right to freedom of assembly under the authoritarian regimes. This judicial activism made the executive branch respect citizens’ basic rights, thus promoting the growth of vibrant civil society (CCK 2008).

---

220 In the Sixth Republic, the legislative branch exercised its investigative power in a total of 28 cases to check the executive branch headed by the president.
221 The legislative branch introduced the special prosecutor system in 1999 in order to investigate politically sensitive cases largely because Korean prosecutors “have been criticized for their reluctance to investigate corruption cases involving powerful politicians and high-ranking government officials, or for their politically biased investigations of the cases” (K. Cho 2001-02, 386). From 1999 to 2017, the legislative branch authorized the special prosecutor to investigate a total of 12 politically sensitive cases, thus fostering the fair investigation into government officials and politicians.
222 As a recent example, in November 2016, the opposition-dominated legislative branch passed a bill to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate the power abuse of “conservative” President Geun-Hye Park and her political appointees. After President Park was impeached on charge of power abuse and corruption in March 2017, the special prosecutor indicted the ousted president and her appointees for taking bribes from the owner of Samsung in return for helping him cement his control of Samsung and “blacklisting” anti-president cultural figures and civil society activists and disadvantaging them in various ways (S. H. Choi 2017).
223 For a detailed explanation of the Constitutional Court’s major decisions to protect citizens’ rights to freedom of expression, association, and assembly, see Appendix C.
Separation of Powers and Public Administration

The rise of the separation of powers also reshaped the relation between public administration and three constitutional branches—the president, the National Assembly, and the courts—because the president could no longer exercise the exclusive control of public administrators in the executive branch. In a government of separation of powers, not only the president but also the legislative and judicial branches attempted to exercise control over public administration and infuse their priorities and values into it (H. W. Kim 2016; K. H. Youm 1994).

The legislative branch tried to tighten its oversight of executive departments and agencies by scrutinizing their policies. Especially, by actively using its constitutional power to conduct an annual inspection of the executive branch (Article 61), the legislative branch carefully examined whether executive ministries and agencies developed and implemented policies according to the original intent of laws passed in the legislative branch (H. W. Kim 2016; C. W. Park 1998). In fact, the legislature’s annual inspection of the executive branch greatly improved administrators’ responsiveness to the legislative branch.

The judicial branch also increased its control of public administration by exercising judicial review of administrative action. By strengthening citizens’ constitutional rights vis-à-vis public agencies, it no longer allowed public agencies to arbitrarily infringe upon citizens’ rights. For example, in 1989, the Constitutional Court reviewed a constitutional petition, in which a government agency arbitrarily denied a petitioner access to a public document. The Court held that the government agency’s arbitrary denial violated the petitioner’s constitutional “right to know” because government should grant the people access to any public documents as long as such access was not clearly detrimental to the public interest.224

The Court’s 1989 decision drastically changed the authoritarian management practices of government

224 This decision came as a surprise given the fact that the Constitutional Court “created” the people’s “right to know” although the Constitution did not have explicit textual basis for such a right (K. W. Ahn 1997-98). The Court reasoned that the people’s “right to know” was “an aspect of the right of freedom of expression and specific implementing legislation to define the contours of the right was not a prerequisite to its enforcement” (CCK 2008, 426).
agencies, which often refused to grant the people access to public documents without any reasons under the authoritarian regimes, and urged government agencies to respect the people’s “right to know” (K. W. Ahn 1997-98; K. H. Youm 1994).

In sum, unlike the old executive-centered governing order, which emphasized the president as the sole master of public administrators, the rise of separation of powers as a new governing order introduced “multiple principals for the same agent” (Aberbach and Rockman 2000, 16) and made administrators responsive to three constitutional masters who often had different priorities and values. As a result, administrators were often cross-pressured between competing demands of the three masters and they were required to deal simultaneously with such demands. Under the governing order of separation of powers, the proper role of administrators was no longer to faithfully follow the president’s demands, but rather to balance and optimize the conflicting demands of the president, the National Assembly, and the courts.

The Intellectual Dilemma of Korean Public Administration Scholarship in the Post-Growth Period

In previous chapters, I have examined how the executive-centered approach to public administration intellectually shaped the founding and growth of Korean “mainstream” public administration in the 1962-1987 period. To systematically examine the extent to which the executive-centered approach influenced the intellectual development of mainstream public administration in Korea, I identified the following four tenets undergirding the executive-centered approach and investigated how such tenets were endorsed in mainstream public administration scholarship through conducting comprehensive qualitative content analysis of journal articles and book chapters authored by mainstream scholars.

---

225 This 1989 decision led the legislative branch to codify the people’s right to know in the Act on Disclosure of Information by Public Agencies in 1996. The Act made it clear that its purpose is to “ensure the people’s right to know and to secure participation of the people in state affairs, and transparency in the operation of state affairs, by providing for the necessary matters concerning the obligation to disclose information possessed and managed by public agencies and the people’s request for the disclosure of such information” (Article 1).
scholars in the 1962-1987 period:

Tenet 1: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be directly and solely under the President’s authority.
Tenet 2: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to be the obedient instrument of the President.
Tenet 3: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to privilege managerial values at the expense of political and legal values. Managerial values include 3E (economy, efficiency, and effectiveness); political values mean 3R (responsibility, responsiveness, and representativeness), social equity, and democratic values (including participation); legal values involve individual rights, due process, and the rule of law.
Tenet 4: Public administration in the executive branch is expected to increase the administrative capacity of the executive branch to maximize the attainment of the President’s goals.

The findings of my qualitative content analysis indicated that Korean mainstream public administration was intellectually founded upon the four tenets of the executive-centered approach in the Founding Period (1962-1972) and the four tenets became fully entrenched as the unassailable normative foundations in mainstream public administration scholarship in the Growth Period (1973-1987). These fully entrenched tenets led mainstream scholars to champion executive-centered governing order, in which the authoritarian president stood over the executive, legislative, and judicial branches and exercised exclusive control of public administrators, and advocate the authoritarian developmental state, in which the proper role of public administrators was to control civil society and market in accordance with the authoritarian president’s political and policy agenda, in the Founding and Growth Periods (S. H. Chung 2007; D. G. Lee 2005; Y. J. Soh 2003). In sum, Korean mainstream public administration scholars had a strong belief in the normative of executive-centered public administration in the Founding and Growth Periods.

However, the belief in the ideal of executive-centered public administration was so deeply ingrained in the field of public administration in Korea that it prevented mainstream scholars from correctly interpreting and responding to the new governing order of separation of powers created by democratization in the post-growth period (1987–present). The rise of separation of powers as a new governing order rearranged the relationship between public administration and three constitutional
branches—the President, the National Assembly, and the courts. Unlike the old governing order of “monarchial” executive-centered governing order, in which the president maintained exclusive control of public administrators and made them exclusively responsive to his demands, the new governing order of separation of powers enabled three constitutional branches to share control over administrators and to cross-pressure administrators into being responsive to their competing demands (CCK 2008; H. W. Kim 2016). However, by holding on to the executive-centered approach, mainstream public administration scholars still cherished administrators’ unflinching loyalty to the president and hardly touched upon their responsiveness to the legislature and the courts (D. S. Bark 1998; K. W. Kim 1998). In fact, although the executive-centered approach became increasingly irrelevant under the governing order of separated powers, it persevered even in the face of widespread contradictory governing practices in which administrators were required to be simultaneously responsive to their three constitutional masters.

Mainstream scholars’ blind adherence to the executive-centered approach is clearly demonstrated in my topical analysis of academic articles published by mainstream reform-oriented and policy-oriented scholars in the two most influential public administration journals (the “reform-oriented” Korean Public Administration Review (KPAR) and the “policy-oriented” Korean Policy Studies Review (KPSR)) in the post-growth period.226 I carefully read the abstracts of such articles to examine how often mainstream scholars addressed the relation between public administration and each of its three constitutional masters as their research topics in the 1988-2008 period.

During the 1988-2008 period, mainstream scholars authored a total of 191 articles. Forty four (23 percent) out of these 191 articles directly or indirectly addressed the relation between public administration and its three constitutional masters. Out of the 44 articles, 42 articles (95.5 percent) maintained that public administration should be fully responsive to the president. These 42 articles focused mainly on increasing the president’s control of administrators in the executive branch through

---

226 In 1992, policy-oriented scholars established the Korean Association for Policy Studies (KAPS), the second largest public administration association, and began to publish its official journal, the Korean Policy Studies Review (KPSR). The KPSR became the most influential journal among policy-oriented scholars in the post-growth period.
administrative reform (D. S. Bark 1998; B. Hu 1993; H. J. Song 2002) and reorganization (Y. D. Jung 1995; H. K. Kim 1993; K. W. Kim 1998). In contrast, only two articles (4.5 percent) examined how to make administrators responsive to the legislature’s demands (H. K. Kim 1990; M. S. Kim 1989) and no articles discussed administrators’ responsiveness to the courts. These findings clearly indicate that mainstream scholars were still preoccupied with the ideal of executive-centered public administration. Table 8-1 shows the detailed outcome of my topical analysis of mainstream scholars’ articles published in the 1988-2008 period.

Table 8-1. Topical Analysis of Mainstream Scholars’ Articles in the 1988-2008 Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Korean Public Administration Review</th>
<th>Korean Policy Studies Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA &amp; President</td>
<td>PA &amp; Legislature</td>
<td>PA &amp; Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mainstream scholars’ indifference to administrators’ responsiveness to the legislative and judicial branches in the post-growth period arose mainly from their blind adherence to the executive-centered approach, which emphasized executive-centered governing order. Mainstream scholars no longer championed an “authoritarian” version of executive-centered governing order as appropriate in the post-growth period. Although mainstream scholars were often criticized for being “pro-authoritarian” in the Founding and Development Periods, they strongly supported democratization in the post-growth period (D. S. Bark et al. 1992; B. Hu 1993; M. K. Kim 1990). Their strong support of democratization could be attributed to the fact that mainstream scholars did not endorse an “authoritarian” version of executive-centered governing order as desirable, but as inevitable in the Founding and Development Periods. Mainstreams scholars explicitly or implicitly supported “authoritarian” executive-centered governing order in the Founding and Development Periods because it was believed to be inevitable for

However, mainstream scholars’ single-minded adherence to the executive-centered approach led them to misinterpret a new governing order emerging in the post-growth period as a “democratic” version of executive-centered governing order rather than as the separation of powers. By misinterpreting the new governing order, mainstream scholars contended that, unlike the former authoritarian presidents, whose exclusive control of public administration was often challenged in terms of their legitimacy, the “democratically elected” presidents enjoyed the exclusive legitimate authority to demand unwavering loyalty from public administration (Y. D. Jung 1998; C. B. Lee 1995). In other words, even in the post-growth period, mainstream scholars still believed that public administration should not be responsive to the legislative and judicial branches because the democratically elected president was seen as the sole master of public administration.

Mainstream scholars’ reconceptualization of the “democratically elected” president as the sole master of public administration is clearly demonstrated in their discussion on the role of the democratically elected president in dismantling the authoritarian developmental state. Mainstream scholars severely attacked the authoritarian developmental state on the two fronts. First, the authoritarian developmental state was criticized for cracking down on civil society in the Third to the Fifth Republic. Mainstream scholars pointed out that, because the president regarded civil society, in which citizens often launched pro-democracy protests against his dictatorship, as posing a great threat to his authoritarian regime, the authoritarian developmental state headed by the authoritarian president brutally suppressed and completely controlled civil society. (B. Y. Ahn and M. K. Chung 2007; D. S. Bark et al. 1992; S. J. Kim 2000). Second, mainstream scholars condemned the authoritarian developmental state for undermining market efficiency from the Third Republic to the Fifth Republic by making unnecessary
interventions into the market and performing functions that should be performed by the market (B. S. Choi 1992; Y. W. Hahn and S. R. Lee 2002; W. J. Roh 2002; H. J. Song 2002).

Then, mainstream scholars asserted that the democratically elected president in the Sixth Republic had the “historical mission” to redefine the role of the state in relation to civil society and market (B. Hu 1993, 9). The president should launch massive reforms in order to promote the growth of civil society, roll back the frontier of the state from the market and, instead, create favorable conditions for the market to work efficiently (M. S. Ahn 1995; W. J. Roh 2002). Although mainstream scholars emphasized the leadership of the democratically elected president in dismantling the authoritarian developmental state, they never touched on the role of the legislature and the courts in doing so.

Because mainstream scholars astutely recognized that the “democratically elected” president had no choice but to rely on public administrators in developing and carrying out concrete reform programs, they recommended that the president should tighten control of administrators and push them into formulating and implementing such reform programs in a way consistent with his or her reform vision (Y. P. Kim 1993; K. W. Kim 1998). Mainstream scholars also contended that administrators should enthusiastically embrace the president’s reform vision and dedicate themselves to turning his or her reform vision into reality because the president through the democratic electoral process earned the “legitimate” authority to demand administrators’ unwavering commitment to his or her political and policy agenda (D. S. Bark 1998; Y. D. Jung 1998). One scholar even went so far as to state that it was the “moral duty” of administrators to be committed to the “democratically elected” president’s reform agenda (D. G. Lee 2005). In fact, by newly conceptualizing the “democratically elected” president as the sole master of public administration, mainstream scholars still upheld the executive-centered approach, which stressed administrators’ complete responsiveness to the president.

Although mainstream scholars “democratized” the executive-centered approach through conceptualizing the “democratically elected” president as the sole master of public administration, the executive-centered approach was still problematic under the governing order of separation of powers on
two grounds. First, mainstream scholars’ unswerving adherence to the executive-centered approach created a wide gap between their executive-centered scholarship and the new governing practices in which the advent of separation of powers made even the “democratically elected” president share control over public administration with the legislative and judicial branches. In the government of separated powers, as explained in the previous section (Governing Order in the Post-Growth Period), not only the president but also the legislative and judicial branches scrambled to control and impose their own priorities on public administration in practice (Healy 2000-01; H. W. Kim 2016). In fact, the president was no longer the sole master of public administration, but only one among the three masters. However, mainstream scholars preoccupied with the executive-centered approach still focused on examining how public administrators responded to the president’s political and policy agenda without discussing how administrators reacted to the oversight of the legislative branch and how they complied with the legal standards set by the judicial branch (D. S. Bark et al. 1992; B. S. Choi 1992; S. H. Oh 1995) As a result, mainstream scholars’ academic research provided only an incomplete picture of the new governing practices in which administrators were required to be simultaneously responsive to their three constitutional masters. In fact, the executive-centered approach acted as an intellectual straightjacket, limiting scholarly attention only to administrators’ responsiveness to the president in the post-growth period.

Second, mainstream scholars’ unwavering commitment to the executive-centered approach not only created a huge gap between their executive-centered research and the new governing order of separation of powers but also led them to misconceive the proper role of public administration under the new governing order. In the government of separated powers, in which three constitutional masters wanted public administrators to respond to their own demands, administrators often faced the conflicting demands from the three masters and wrestled with the moral dilemma of how they should respond to their competing demands in practice (B. M. Ahn 2002; H. W. Kim 2016). However, mainstream scholars still maintained the ideal of executive-centered public administration and believed that the legislative and
judicial branches had no legitimate authority to share control over public administration with the president (C. K. Chung 1993; D. G. Lee 2005; H. J. Song 2002). In their viewpoint, the proper role of administrators was to be fully responsive to the president’s demands. As a result, they paid no attention to administrators’ dilemma of multiple masters and never discussed how to solve such a dilemma. In fact, mainstream scholars failed to provide the normative guidance about how administrators should manage the different demands from their multiple masters in the government of separated powers.

Especially, mainstream scholars’ strict adherence to the executive-centered approach created an intellectual dilemma for them when the president, once democratically elected, proceeded to push public administrators into pursuing whatever he or she wanted—often to the detriment of democracy itself. Although mainstream scholars fully endorsed the assumption of the executive-centered approach that the democratically elected president would exercise his or her power in a democratic manner and, thus, emphasized administrators’ complete responsiveness to the president, it was not always the case (Gulick 1933; Fry 1989). For example, although mainstream scholars expected that the democratically elected president would be committed to dismantling the authoritarian developmental state, the conservative president in some instances attempted to restore the authoritarian developmental state and pressured administrators into pushing through his or her undemocratic policies even when they either encountered strong resistance from the legislative branch or ran counter to the courts’ previous decisions (T. H. Kim 2002; S. Y. Oh 2004). Mainstream scholars had an intellectual dilemma in addressing the appropriate role of public administration in such instances because they knew that their strong commitment to the executive-centered approach might lead them to emphasize administrators’ complete responsiveness to the president who exercised his or her power in an undemocratic manner. Simultaneously, mainstream scholars who upheld the executive-centered approach could not advocate administrators’ responsiveness to the legislative and judicial branches that tried to block the president’ undemocratic policies because they still regarded the president as the sole master of public administration. In fact, mainstream scholars’ strong commitment to the executive-centered approach prevented them from prescribing the appropriate
role of public administration under the government of separated powers, thus creating the intellectual
dilemma for them.

In order to resolve such dilemma, it is necessary to make a fundamental break with the executive-
centered approach because it is at odds with the new governing order of separation of powers that
introduces multiple masters for public administration. Only by accepting the fact that public
administrators are constitutionally required to serve the multiple masters in the government of separated
powers can public administration scholars correctly describe, explain, and predict the new administrative
practices in which administrators often encounter the different demands from their multiple masters. This
recognition is necessary for mainstream scholars to discuss how administrators should balance and
optimize such competing demands and to give guidance on extreme cases in which administrators must
choose one of the three masters to defend the democratic republic. In a word, without refounding the field
of public administration upon the constitutional principle of separation of powers, the executive-centered
approach would continue to haunt the field, creating the intellectual dilemma for public administration
scholars.

Limitations and Future Research

This dissertation has several limitations worth noting and such limitations at the same time open
some opportunities for future research. First, because this dissertation focused attention on investigating
how the executive-centered approach influenced Korean mainstream public administration scholarship in
the 1962-1987 period in my dissertation, it paid far little attention to the perdurability of the executive-
centered approach in the post-1987 period. Although I conducted a topical analysis of academic articles
written by mainstream scholars in the post-1987 period to demonstrate that mainstream scholars are still
under the strong influence of the normative ideal of executive-centered public administration, such topical
analysis was not comprehensive enough. As a result, a more comprehensive qualitative content analysis of
mainstream scholars’ academic publications in the post-1987 period will help increase the understanding
of executive-centered approach’s enduring influence on mainstream public administration scholarship.

Second, although this dissertation demonstrated that the executive-centered approach became increasingly irrelevant under the new governing order of separation of powers, it did not comprehensively address how to move beyond the executive-centered approach. As a result, there is a strong academic need to examine how to build a more relevant approach to public administration, which can help public administration scholars correctly understand the administrative practices under the new governing order of separation of powers and prescribe the appropriate role of public administration under such governing order. I believe that the refounding movement, which was initiated by prominent public administration scholars such as Gary Wamsley, John Rohr, and Charles Goodsell at Virginia Tech’s Center for Public Administration and Policy, can be a good place to start. A careful examination of the refounding movement, which wrestled with developing a positive and legitimate role for public administration in the government of separated powers, can provide an important insight about how to develop a relevant approach to public administration, which is compatible with the constitutional principle of separation of powers and a resulting redefinition of the role of public administration in a government of separation of powers.
APPENDIX A:
THE KOREAN CONSTITUTION
IN THE FIRST REPUBLIC AND THE SECOND REPUBLIC

The First Republic (1948-1960)

The First Republic’s Original Constitution (July 17, 1948)

The First Republic’s Constitution—hereinafter referred to as the 1948 Constitution—, which was promulgated in July 1948, adopted a presidential system. However, in the original draft, the Constitution Drafting Committee recommended the adoption of a bicameral parliamentary system (H. K. Suh 2004).

The Committee offered two primary reasons why a parliamentary system should be established. First, a parliamentary system was believed to maintain political stability because it could resolve any constitutional conflict between the executive and legislative branches. Second, a parliamentary system was said to be less likely than a presidential system to end up undermining democracy (J. O. Yu 1980). In the Committee’s view, a powerful president had a strong tendency to usurp the power of the other two branches, easily descending into dictatorship.

However, the Constitution Drafting Committee’s original draft faced strong objection from Syngman Rhee, the speaker of the Constituent Assembly, and his faithful followers. Rhee voiced his strong opposition to the original draft on the grounds that a parliamentary system would be an inadequate institutional design for accomplishing the tasks of a new government, and insisted on the adoption of a presidential system. One political scientist explained why Rhee supported a presidential system as follows:

Rhee presented his argument in favor of a presidential system as follows: First, the Republic of Korea needed a stable government with viable political leadership to achieve the task of nation-building; Second, a strong government was absolutely necessary for the successful struggle against communism in Korea, and with a divided Korea, it would be unthinkable to adopt a parliamentary system which would invite political chaos and instability; third, a parliamentary system, which would result in encouraging factional struggle, should not be adopted, since Korean history was full of examples of internecine factional strife that had eventually led to the Japanese rule in 1910 (C. Y. Pak 1968, 111).

227 In Korea, the first-ever election was held in May 1948 to establish a Constituent Assembly. Soon after the election, the Constituent Assembly was convened to create a new constitution and it began its historic task by establishing the Constitution Drafting Committee, which consisted of thirty members of the Assembly and ten other experts (H. K. Suh 2004).
However, lying behind Rhee’s argument for a presidential system was his ambition to be the first-ever president in Korea. He wanted to become “George Washington of Korea” (Gibney 1954, 31). Therefore, Rhee threatened the Constitution Drafting Committee that if the original draft should be sent for the approval of the Constituent Assembly, he would launch a nationwide movement opposing it. He even went so far as to state that he would refuse to accept an offer of any position under a parliamentary system. As a result of Rhee’s stiff opposition, the Committee drastically modified the original draft by introducing a presidential system and a unicameral legislature which was to elect the president (C. Y. Pak 1968; H. K. Suh 2004). The modified draft was debated at the regular session of the Constituent Assembly, and quickly passed and promulgated without serious objection. Then, the Constituent Assembly elected Rhee as President and he announced the founding of the Republic of Korea on October 15, 1948.

Because the drastic shift from a parliamentary system to a presidential system “was based, not on any consideration of principles or any long-term effect, but on a short-term interest of ensuring the presidency for one individual” (D. K. Yoon 1988, 2), the institutional design in the 1948 Korean Constitution had many inherent defects. Although the presidential system in the 1948 Constitution was modeled on the U.S. presidency, it placed “unusual” powers in the President and failed to institutionalize the key principle of separation of powers underlying the U.S. system (S. D. Lee 1986; C. Y. Pak 1968; D. K. Yoon 1988). In a word, the 1948 Constitution had many provisions that encouraged the fledgling Korean government to “evolve into government by a strong man” (Dull 1948, 207).

The President

Under the 1948 Constitution, the President was elected indirectly by the National Assembly for a

---

228 It is important to explain how it was possible for one strong political leader to change the original constitutional design of government—from a parliamentary government to a presidential government. When the Korean Constitution was drafted and ratified in 1948, Rhee was the most powerful politician in Korea. He was venerated as an anti-Japanese patriot and received overwhelming popular support. One opinion poll conducted in 1945 asked respondents to answer the question “who is the most qualified to be the first president in Korea?” According to the results of the opinion poll, 44% of respondents believed that Rhee was the most qualified for the president; 30% of respondents stated that his arch-rival, Koo Kim, was the most qualified (J. S. Lee 2006). In addition, although Rhee agreed to set up a separate government in the southern half of Korea, Kim was strongly opposed to the establishment of a separate government in the South, refusing to hold any position under the separate government (B. Y. Choy 1971). As a result of his popularity among Korean people and the absence of any strong political rivals, Rhee could exert unlimited influence over the constitution-making process in the separate government in the South.
four-year term (Article 53), and he was allowed to be reelected for a second term (Article 54). He had “usual” constitutional powers of representing the state in foreign relations as the chief of the state (Article 51), executing laws as the chief administrator (Article 51), and standing as the commander-in-chief of armed forces (Article 61). In addition, the President had the power to propose an annual budget to the legislative branch and to execute it (Article 91).

However, the 1948 Constitution had several provisions that made the Korean President unusually strong. First, the President had the power to issue emergency decrees and to make the necessary financial and economic disposition. Article 57 stated this power as follows:

> When in time of civil war, or in a dangerous situation arising from foreign relations, or in case of a natural calamity, or on account of a grave economic or financial crisis, it is necessary to take urgent measures for the maintenance of public order and security, the President shall have the right to issue orders having the effect of law or make necessary financial dispositions; provided, however, that the President shall exercise such powers exclusively if time is lacking for the convocation of the National Assembly.

Although the 1948 Constitution required the President to immediately gain the approval of National Assembly once he issued an emergency decree, it is important to note that the President, when using the emergency power, was constitutionally allowed to circumvent the National Assembly. One foreign observer expressed his concern about this provision by stating that the President’s emergency power could be “a strong weapon in the hands of those impatient with democratic process and dubious of the wisdom of legislative decisions” (Dull 1948, 206). Second, unlike the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the exclusive authority to “formally

---

229 The very fact that the 1948 Constitution conferred upon the National Assembly the power to elect the President shows that the 1948 Constitution provided for a deformed version of the genuine presidential system. In the face of Rhee’s strong demand for a presidential system, the Constitutional Drafting Committee had no choice but to compromise its original plan to introduce a parliamentary system because it was impossible for the Constituent Assembly to pass a new constitution without Rhee’s consent. However, in order to restrain the strong powers of the President, the Committee in its modified final draft empowered the National Assembly to elect the President—just as the legislature elected the Prime Minister in the parliamentary system (H. K. Suh 2004). As a result, the Korean presidential system in the 1948 Constitution became a “hodgepodge of two different constitutional systems” (C. Y. Pak 1968, 111).

230 During the First Republic, President Rhee issued 15 emergency decrees. Given the fact that 14 out of 15 decrees were issued to address the urgent problems created by the Korean War, it is fair to say that he did not abuse his emergency power.
submit a bill for consideration” (Edwards et al. 2004, 375), the 1948 Constitution of Korea allowed not only the legislative branch but also the executive branch headed by the President to propose a legislative bill for consideration (Article 39). The President also had the veto power to send a bill back to the National Assembly (Article 40).

Third, the President could preside over the State Council (Article 70). The purpose of creating the State Council was to help the President decide “important national policies which come within the scope of the powers of the President.” These important policies included fundamental plans and policies on state affairs; foreign policy; proposed constitutional amendments; bills and proposed orders of the President; budgets and other financial matters; extraordinary sessions of the National Assembly; state of siege; military affairs; appointment and removal of justice of the Supreme Court; and other matters presented by the Prime Minister or other ministers (Article 72). In the State Council, the President could not only receive assistance from the council members in making important policy decisions, but also push each council member—or, the head of each executive ministry—to formulate and implement laws and regulations in line with the

---

The power of the executive branch to propose bills strengthened executive-centered governing order in the First Republic. As the following table shows, the executive branch outperformed the legislative branch in terms of legislative activities. First, the number of executive-proposed bills was much higher than that of legislative-originative bills in all four assemblies of the First Republic. Second, the number of executive-proposed bills approved in the legislative branch was also higher than that of legislative-originative bills approved in the legislative branch (SKNA 2008). As a result, the President, who exercised full control of the executive branch, became the de facto chief legislator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republic</th>
<th>National Assembly</th>
<th>Total Number of Bills</th>
<th>Total Number of Passed Bills</th>
<th>Passage Rate</th>
<th>Legislative-Originative Bills</th>
<th>Executive-Originative Bills</th>
<th>Passage Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Proposed Bills</td>
<td>Number of Passed Bills</td>
<td>Passage Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st National Assembly</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2nd National Assembly</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3rd National Assembly</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4th National Assembly</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td>595</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)

However, the National Assembly could override a presidential veto. In order to pass a vetoed bill, it required two-thirds or more of its members to be present. Then, two-thirds or more of members present at the National Assembly were required to cast votes in support of the veto override (Article 40).

The State Council was composed of the President, the Prime Minister, and executive ministers (Article 68).
President’s policy agenda. By taking advantage of the State Council, the President could maintain his control over the executive branch (I. K. Park 1962).

Fourth, the President enjoyed the right to appoint high-ranking officials without the consent of the legislature (Article 62). There were only two exceptions of the Prime Minister and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, whose appointments required the consent of the National Assembly. As a result, the president was allowed to appoint his faithful followers to important positions in the executive branch—cabinet, subcabinet, and agency heads (Y. C. Paik 1995).

**The National Assembly**

The 1948 Constitution provided that “The legislative power shall be vested in the National Assembly” (Article 31). It also stated that the members of the National Assembly should be elected by the people for a four-year term (Article 32). In contrast to the unusually strong powers of the President, the National Assembly did not have sufficient powers to check the strong President. Its powers were too restricted in nature and scope in several aspects. First, although the National Assembly had the power to approve the annual budget submitted by the executive branch (Article 41), it was unlikely to control the purse strings of the executive branch because it could not add new items or increase the amount of items of expense (I. K. Park, 1962).

Second, while the National Assembly had the power to approve the presidential appointment of

---

234 Except in the Second Republic, which adopted a parliamentary system, the role of the Prime Minister in the Korean presidential system has been similar to that of an executive secretary to the President. He or she has performed the role of supervising the executive branch under the direction of the President (B. M. Ahn 2002).

235 However, the First Republic’s Constitution limited the term of members of the Constituent Assembly to two years (Article 102).

236 These constitutional limits led the National Assembly to play only a marginal role in the budget process. The following table shows that, in the First Republic, the assembly neither sufficiently increased nor greatly reduced the original budget, which was proposed by the executive branch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Republic</th>
<th>National Assembly</th>
<th>Number of Budget Bills Proposed by the President</th>
<th>Number of Budget Bills Approved by the National Assembly</th>
<th>Approval Ratio Of Budget Bills</th>
<th>Budget Increase/Decrease Rate after the Process of Budget Consideration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Republic</td>
<td>1st Assembly</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>- 2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2nd Assembly</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>+ 0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3rd Assembly</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4th Assembly</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>+ 0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)
the Prime Minister (Article 69), this power was not strong enough to check the President because he was allowed to remove the Prime Minister without the consent of the legislature. As a result, once the Prime Minister was appointed, he became largely susceptible to presidential control. In addition, the National Assembly had no power to influence the other high ranking officials in the executive branch because their appointment and removal did not require the consent of the National Assembly (B. M. Ahn 2002).

Third, although the power to pass motions for the impeachment of the President, the Vice-President, Prime Minister, and executive ministers was given to the National Assembly (Article 46), this power was unlikely to provide any constitutional check on the President in two aspects. First, the 1948 Constitution established a strict and high threshold requirement for the impeachment of the President. In order to pass a motion for impeachment, the 1948 Constitution required two-thirds or more of members of the National Assembly to be present and then two-thirds or more of those members present at the Assembly to approve the motion (Article 46). Second, the Impeachment Court, which had the final authority to remove the President, remained under his strong influence. The 1948 Constitution provided that, after the National Assembly approved a motion for the impeachment of the President, the Impeachment Court should finally decide whether or not to uphold the impeachment motion (Article 47). The Impeachment Court was composed of five justices of the Supreme Court and five members of the National Assembly (Article 47). Because the five justices were the President’s appointees, they were more likely to overturn the impeachment motion directed at him. In addition, the decision as to which assemblymen would be on the Impeachment Court was a matter for negotiation between pro-president and anti-president parties. As a result, out of five Impeachment Court members recommended by the National Assembly, at least two or three members would be pro-president and, therefore, be less likely to uphold the impeachment motion for the President. In fact, the composition of the Impeachment Court clearly indicated that it would be very

---

237 During the First Republic, no members of the National Assembly brought impeachment motions against President Rhee and his political appointees because opposition leaders well recognized the limitation of this impeachment power. In fact, it was almost impossible to impeach Rhee and his executive ministers, considering the fact that, in the first two assemblies, where President Rhee was not affiliated with any party, pro-president assemblymen occupied at least more than one-third seats and, in the latter two assemblies, the Liberty Party, Rhee’s own handiwork, held more than a majority (Y. C. Paik 1995).
difficult for the Impeachment Court to reach a two-thirds quorum for the removal of the President (C. Y. Pak 1968).

However, the National Assembly had a unique power to control the executive branch: its power to inspect and investigate the administration of the executive branch (Article 43). The National Assembly had the power to conduct its inspection of the executive branch during the period of annual budget approval. In addition to its power to inspect the executive branch, which was regularly exercised once a year, the National Assembly had the power to investigate particular problems of the executive branch when the Assembly found it necessary to do so (Y. C. Paik 1995).238

Courts

The 1948 Constitution emphasized the principle of the independence of the judicial branch by providing that “the judicial power shall be vested in courts composed of judges” (Article 76), and that “the judges shall judge independently according to the constitution and law” (Article 77). This principle was manifested in the mode of appointing judges. The President had two legal hurdles to overcome in appointing the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The President was required to appoint him only with the approval with the National Assembly upon the recommendation of the Judge Council, which was composed of the Chief Justice and the other Justices of the Supreme Court and the chief judge of each appellate court (Article 78).239 The President was also required to appoint the other Justices of the Supreme Court only upon the recommendation of the Judge Council, and the judges only on the recommendation of the Chief Justice through the decision of the Judge Council (Judicial Organization Act of 1949).

In addition, the constitutional provision concerning the removal of the judges emphasized the

---

238 During the First Republic, the National Assembly inspected the administration of the executive branch every year and conducted 137 investigations of particular wrongdoings committed by the executive branch (1st assembly, 15; 2nd assembly, 39; 3rd assembly, 66; 4th assembly, 17). In particular, the National Assembly’s frequent use of investigation power indicates the fact that many government officials were involved in mismanaging government policies, committing electoral fraud, and engaging in corruption. These investigations led the Korean people to withdraw their support for the Rhee regime. In a word, the National Assembly’s active exercise of investigation power greatly helped “de-legitimate” and bring down Rhee’s regime (Y. C. Paik 1995, 250).

239 Under the First Republic, the Korean judicial system was based on the three-tiered court system, which was composed of the supreme, appellate, and trial courts.
independence of the judicial branch by providing that “No judge shall be removed from office except by impeachment or a sentence of imprisonment without prison labor or heavier punishment, nor shall he be suspended from office, have his salary reduced except by disciplinary action” (Article 80).240

However, the 1948 Constitution had several defects that might undermine the judicial independence. First, the Constitution did not guarantee life tenure for the judges and provided that “the term of office of judges shall be ten years and they may be reappointed as prescribed by Act” (Article 79).241 Given the fact that the President had the power to reappoint the judges periodically, he might “pack” the courts by removing the judges who did not share his political and policy views and instead appointing those who displayed a great deal of deference to the President (Healy 2000-01; D. K. Yoon 1995).242 Therefore, the judges were not completely insulated “from the vagaries of political whim” (Healy 2000-01, 228).243

Second, while the 1948 Constitution conferred upon the Supreme Court the power to review the constitutionality of administrative decrees, regulations, or actions, it granted the power to test the constitutionality of laws to the Constitutional Committee (Article 81). Given the fact that the courts were required to refer the questions of the constitutionality of laws to the Constitutional Committee whenever the resolution of such questions was a prerequisite to a trial, it is clear that the Constitutional Committee had the “final voice” to determine whether legislative acts, proposed by the legislative and executive branches, were consistent with the Constitution (D. K. Yoon 1995, 406).

However, the composition of the Constitutional Committee left room for undermining the independence of the judicial branch. The Committee was composed of the Vice-President, five members of

240 The National Assembly had the power to pass the motion for the impeachment of the judges (Article 46).
241 The 1948 Constitution did not set a limit on the number of times the Justices could be elected.
242 Comiskey (1993-94) defines the term “pack” as “to influence the composition of [the Court] and thereby bring about a desired result” (1044).
243 Under the 1948 Constitution, there was a constitutional safeguard to check the President’s power to reappoint the Justices of the Supreme Court. The constitutional two-term limit on the President ensured that the Justices would not face reappointment by the same President that initially appointed them because while the maximum tenure of the president, if reelected, was eight years, the tenure of the Justices was ten years. It was believed to “prevent the Justices from being “beholden” to the President that appointed them” (Healy 2000-01, 228). However, President Rhee of the First Republic eliminated presidential term limit by amending the Constitution and, therefore, he acquired the power to reappoint the Justices that he had appointed. This greatly undermined the independence of the judicial branch (S. D. Lee 1986).
the National Assembly, and five Justices of the Supreme Court (Article 81). Since the Committee represented all three branches, its judicial review might easily turn into a “political compromise among the three branches” (D. K. Yoon 1995, 407). As a result, the Committee was unlikely to actively exercise its power of judicial review in order to check the powers of the legislative and executive branches.

In its more than decade-long history, the Constitutional Committee reviewed only seven laws. Out of these laws, it declared two laws unconstitutional. As one Korean legal scholar pointed out, “the small number of cases reviewed is symbolic of the Committee’s limited role” (D. K. Yoon 1995, 407). The Committee struck down the Agricultural Land Reform Act and the Special Decree for Criminal Punishment under Emergency on the grounds that they denied defendants the right to appeal to the Supreme Court. The Committee made it clear that the right to be tried under the Constitution should include the right to be tried before the Supreme Court (Healy 2000-01).

The foregoing analysis of the powers of three constitutional branches clearly demonstrates that while the 1948 Constitution maintained the appearance of separation of powers, it glorified executive-centered governing order by concentrating important constitutional powers into the hands of the President. In fact, the legislative and judicial branches fell far short of restraining the extraordinarily strong powers of the President. Commenting on the 1948 Constitution, one American political scientist expressed his deep concern about “unusual presidential powers” by stating that “whether they will destroy democracy in Korea, only time will tell” (Dull 1948, 206). Unfortunately, his concern came true—President Rhee amended the Constitution twice to perpetuate his personal power. Without the legislative and judicial checks, President Rhee surrendered to the temptation to abuse his strong powers, thus undermining democracy. The Korean presidential system without separation of powers turned into what is called the “monarchial version of the presidential system” (C. Y. Pak 1968, 112).

---

244 Healy (2000-01) explained why the composition of the Constitutional Committee represented all three branches as follows:

The composition of the Committee . . . addressed the concern that the judges of the time lacked experiences in the fields of constitutional and administrative law. The composition of the Committee also reflected the widespread distrust of judges who had been subservient to the Japanese colonial authorities (214-215).
The 1952 Constitutional Amendment (July 7, 1952)

In July 1952, President Rhee pushed through the first constitutional amendment, which came to be known as the First Constitutional Amendment, to change the method of electing the President from indirect election by the National Assembly to direct election by the people. This amendment was meant to ensure the reelection of President Rhee. As one observer put it, “President Rhee was so unpopular among members of the National Assembly that the only possibility for his reelection lay in direct election by the people” (S. D. Lee 1986, 17).

As Table 1 shows, the pro-president party fell far short of a majority in the second assembly, which was scheduled to elect the President in August 1952, and the Independents had full control of the second assembly. Since only a small number of the Independents were identified as supporters of President Rhee, President Rhee faced a hostile environment in which the anti-president assembly was unlikely to re-elect him as President (Henderson 1968; J. K. Oh 1968).

Table 1. Party Division in the National Assembly in the First Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Party Division in the National Assembly</th>
<th>Total Seats</th>
<th>Majority</th>
<th>Minority</th>
<th>Other Parties</th>
<th>Independents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st National Assembly</td>
<td>19th</td>
<td>National Party for Promoting Korean Independence (Pro-president)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd National Assembly</td>
<td>20th</td>
<td>Korean Nationalist Party (Pro-president)</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd National Assembly</td>
<td>21st</td>
<td>Liberal Party (Pro-president)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th National Assembly</td>
<td>22nd</td>
<td>Liberal Party (Pro-president)</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: modified from the Secretariat of the Korean National Assembly (2008)

---

245 The 1948 Constitution provided that the President or one-third or more of the total members of the National Assembly could propose an amendment to the Constitution. Passing a proposed amendment required the consent of two-thirds or more of the total members of the National Assembly (Article 98).

246 President Rhee was not affiliated with any political party in the first two assemblies. Before he became president, he was highly critical of political parties, “sharing George Washington’s opinion that factionalism could harm the development of the nation” (J. B. Lee 2001, 155). However, his policy initiatives often faced strong resistance from the first two assemblies, which were dominated by anti-president legislators and he felt it necessary to secure an institutionalized legislative support for his policies. As a result, President Rhee created his own party, the Liberty Party, in 1951 (Y. C. Paik 1995).
President Rhee declared martial law right before the 1952 constitutional amendment was proposed. One Korean political scientist described how President Rhee abused his powers to intimidate anti-president assembly into passing the amendment as follows:

[I]n the middle of the [Korean] war, . . . Rhee declared martial law on the ground that some assemblymen had connections with the Northern regime, and arrested the fourteen assemblymen who had led in opposing the constitutional amendment. At the same time, he ordered the police to jail all anti-administration elements throughout South Korea; he banned all anti-Rhee newspapers and foreign news media, such as Voice of America broadcasts and distribution of Time and Newsweek magazines—on the charge of news distortion. Pro-Rhee “youth groups” broke up mass meetings sponsored by civic leaders to protest Rhee’s illegal actions, and many of the leaders were beaten up by these hoodlums (B. Y. Choy 1971, 261-262).

Even on the day when the final vote was taken in the National Assembly to decide whether the proposed amendment would be passed or not, President Rhee mobilized the police to press anti-president legislators into voting for the amendment. For example, the police did not allow all the assemblymen to get out of the assembly hall until the proposed amendment was passed. In an atmosphere of fear, the National Assembly passed the proposed amendment without a dissenting voice. President Rhee was reelected for a second term by direct popular vote in August 1952 (B. Y. Choy 1971; J. K. Oh 1968).

Although the main goal of the 1952 constitutional amendment was to change the method of electing the President, it also added several minor changes that were intended to strengthen the powers of the legislative branch. In fact, President Rhee had to make some concessions to the anti-president assembly to pass the amendment quickly. First, this amendment conferred upon the National Assembly the power to cast no-confidence votes *en bloc* against the State Council. Second, it required the President to follow the suggestions of the Prime Minister in appointing the cabinet members.247 Third, it replaced the unicameral

---

247 The anti-president legislators expected the new provision, which emphasized the President’s constitutional obligation to follow the suggestions of the prime minister in using his appointing power, to shift the appointing power from the President to the Prime Minister. The 1948 Constitution granted the National Assembly the power to approve the President’s appointment of the Prime Minister. Since the anti-president legislators dominated the first two assemblies, they could restrain the President from appointing his faithful follower as Prime Minister by disapproving his appointment. These legislators believed that if the anti-president assembly succeeded in pushing the President into appointing the Prime Minister who was relatively free from the President’s influence, the Prime Minister would recommend qualified candidates for the cabinet members, based on their competence, not on their loyalty to the President (B. M. Ahn 2002; C. Y. Pak 1968).
legislature with the bicameral one (B. M. Ahn 2002; C. Y. Pak 1968).

The 1954 Constitutional Amendment (November 29, 1954)

In 1954, another constitutional amendment was proposed to perpetuate President Rhee in power. Since the Constitution imposed a two-term limit on the President, he could not run for a third term unless the Constitution was amended. Therefore, the 1954 constitutional amendment was introduced to repeal this restriction (S. D. Lee 1986). However, the 1954 amendment failed to receive the approval of two-thirds or more of the total members of the National Assembly as required by the Constitution. In order to pass the two-thirds majority requirement, it needed to receive the consent from at least 136 out of the total 203 members. However, the proposed amendment was defeated with 135 affirmative votes, 60 negative votes, 7 abstentions, and 1 absentee. It was one vote short of the required two-thirds majority and was officially announced as being defeated (C. Y. Pak 1968).

However, the Rhee regime immediately overruled the National Assembly’s original decision to defeat the 1954 amendment and made a surprising announcement that it was passed in the National Assembly because the two-thirds majority was 135 and not 136 (J. K. Oh 1968). The Rhee regime issued an official statement in order to explain why the proposed amendment was not defeated, but passed as follows:

It turns out that Vice-speaker Ch’oe’s announcement that the amendment bill failed to pass, was erroneous. An error was made in counting the votes. The exact figure for a two-thirds majority for 203, the total number, is 135.33 . . . Since a human cannot be a decimal, the required figure should be 135, an integer closest to 135 . . . with the fraction rounded off. The amendment is accordingly considered to have passed (quoted in D. K. Yoon 1988, 4).

By rejecting the decision of the National Assembly, President Rhee acquired the constitutional privilege of being reelected for an unlimited terms. By taking full advantage of this privilege, President Rhee was reelected for his third term in 1956 and then his fourth term in 1960 (D. K. Yoon 1988).

248 However, the turmoil of the Korean War prevented the actual formation of the upper house. The election, which intended to create the upper house, was never held until the Rhee regime collapsed in 1960 (B. M. Ahn et al. 1988).

249 The unlimited term for the President applied only to the First President. This constitutional privilege greatly undermined the principle that everyone is equal before the law (D. K. Yoon 1988).
The 1954 amendment also included several changes, which aimed at dismantling the constitutional safeguards against presidential dictatorship. First, it abolished the office of the Prime Minister. This was intended to get rid of the National Assembly’s power to approve the presidential nomination of the Prime Minister. In fact, the National Assembly’s approval power had been a great distress to President Rhee in the first two assemblies because anti-president legislators had actively exercised this approval power in order to frustrate the President’s attempt to appoint his faithful follower as the Prime Minister. By abolishing the office of the Prime Minister, the President disarmed the legislative branch’s constitutional power to check the President’s appointments (B. Y. Choy 1971).

The 1954 amendment also removed the power of the National Assembly to cast no-confidence votes against the State Council en bloc. Instead, it allowed the National Assembly to pass a motion of no-confidence against the individual members of the State Council. This constitutional change made it impossible for the National Assembly to dismiss all council members through one vote of no-confidence, thus weakening its power to check the presidential control over the State Council (C. Y. Pak 1968).

In addition to pushing through the 1954 constitutional amendment that strengthened the presidential powers, but weakened the legislative powers, President Rhee even tried to exercise direct influence over the legislative branch by creating his own political party. With President Rhee’s enthusiastic support, his faithful followers created the Liberty Party in 1951. The Liberty Party nominated its candidates for the third and fourth assemblies. As demonstrated in Table 1, the Liberty Party maintained a majority in the third and fourth assemblies largely because the Rhee regime illegally helped the pro-president Liberty Party candidates to be elected in the legislative elections for both assemblies. For example, government officials provided the pro-president candidates with campaign funds, campaign facilities in public buildings for

---

250 The 1954 amendment also provided for 1) the national referendum on constitutional amendments and 2) the amendment of economic provisions of the constitution to promote the scope of the free economic system.

251 For example, in 1948, President Rhee nominated his faithful follower, Youn-Young Lee, as the first Prime Minister, but the National Assembly rejected the nomination because a large number of assemblymen favored the head of an anti-president party, Sung-Soo Kim, who was believed to restrain President Rhee from abusing his powers (B. Y. Choy 1971). Including this rejection, the first and second assemblies refused to consent to the five presidential nominations of the Prime Minister (H. W. Kim 2016).
speeches and meetings, free transportation, and police protection. In contrast, anti-president party candidates were not even free to make campaign speeches because of police intimidation. In a word, this massive electoral fraud greatly helped the Liberal Party to dominate the third and fourth assemblies (B. M. Ahn et al. 1988; J. S. Lee 2006).

In the third and fourth assemblies, President Rhee, as the head of the Liberal Party, exercised unlimited influence over the Liberal Party’s incumbent legislators mainly because he wielded exclusive authority to nominate candidates for the legislative elections. In order to gain their re-nomination for the following election, the Liberal Party’s incumbent legislators remained faithful to President Rhee. Given the fact that the Liberal Party dominated the third and fourth assemblies, it comes as no surprise that President Rhee could easily control the legislative process by making the Liberty Party’s incumbent legislators toe the President’s line. They never voted against executive-originated bills that president or his political appointees sponsored (B. M. Ahn et al. 1988; Y. C. Paik 1995).

President Rhee’s complete control of the Liberal Party also made worthless the legislative branch’s constitutional power to check the President’s political appointees. For example, in the third assembly, the legislative branch had the constitutional right to pass a motion of no-confidence against any member of the State Council. Although anti-president assemblymen in the third assembly brought 14 no-confidence motions on the grounds that the concerned council members were explicitly involved in mismanaging government policies, committing electoral fraud, and engaging in corruption, 13 out of 14 motions were defeated largely because the Liberty Party’s assemblymen, who were under the strong influence of the President, hesitated to cast no-confidence votes against the President’s appointees (Y. C. Paik 1995; SKNA 2008). In a word, the legislative branch increasingly became “a subordinate agent of executive authority” (D. K. Yoon 1995, 404).

In sum, by passing the two constitutional amendments, President Rhee almost dismantled the constitutional safeguards, which were intended to check the extraordinarily strong powers of the President. As a result, President Rhee became free from any restrictions on his powers and turned into a *de facto* monarch who concentrated all important powers in his hands. This concentration of powers led him to be
an “ironfisted ruler” who abused his constitutional powers to oppress dissenting voices (B. Y. Choy 1971, 261).

Second Republic (1960-61)

Lord Acton’s famous dictum that “the absolute power corrupts absolutely” held true in the First Republic. The absolute power of President Rhee, which was free from any institutional check, corrupted absolutely. This absolute corruption led to the massive anti-government protest led by students in April 1960. This anti-government protest finally brought down the First Republic. The presidential dictatorship was said to be the main cause of the collapse of the First Republic. The immediate response of political leaders was to abolish the presidential system. As an alternative system, they introduced a parliamentary system of government in the Second Republic and launched a new constitutional experiment to concentrate all important powers in the National Assembly. In fact, the Second Republic glorified the principle of legislative supremacy (B. M. Ahn 2002; J. K. Oh 1968).

The Second Republic’s Constitution (June 15, 1960)

About two months after the collapse of the First Republic, the Third Constitutional Amendment was passed in June 1960, which was intended to remedy the weaknesses of the First Republic’s Constitution. This amendment dramatically modified the First Republic’s Constitution and, therefore, the modified constitution was called the Second Republic’s Constitution—hereinafter referred to as the 1960 Constitution—to emphasize the differences between the two constitutions. As one Korean legal scholar pointed out, the “highlight of the Second Republic’s Constitution was the introduction of a parliamentary system” (D. K. Yoon 1988, 5). The parliamentary system was adopted to prevent the recurrence of executive dictatorship by making the Prime Minister and his Cabinet directly accountable to the legislature (S. D. Lee

---

252 The immediate cause of the 1960 anti-government protest was the presidential election in March 1960, which was so systematically rigged by the Rhee regime. The massive protest eventually led to the resignation of President Rhee and the fall of the First Republic.

253 In November 1960, another constitutional amendment was promulgated, which provided the constitutional basis for a series of ex post facto laws designed to punish “anti-democratic” officials who were guilty of election irregularities, corruption, and appropriation of public property committed under the First Republic.
The 1960 Constitution introduced a bicameral legislature, which was composed of two Houses: the House of Representatives and the House of Councilors (Article 31). The Prime Minister—the head of a majority party—became the real head of the executive branch. He had the power to select the Cabinet members from the legislative members of his own party or from outside it. To make the Prime Minister and his Cabinet responsible to the National Assembly for their policies and actions, the 1960 Constitution granted the House of Representatives the power to cast no-confidence votes against the Cabinet. In the event of a vote of no-confidence, the Cabinet must resign en bloc or the Prime Minister must dissolve the House of Representatives within ten days (Article 71).

The 1960 Constitution also emphasized the independence of the judicial branch by establishing the Constitutional Court (Article 83). The Constitutional Court of the Second Republic was different from the Constitutional Committee of the First Republic mainly in two aspects. First, the new Constitutional Court was a “permanent and independent body” designed to review the constitutionality of laws while the Constitutional Committee exercised the power of judicial review on an ad hoc basis (Healy 2000-01, 215). Second, the Constitutional Court was composed only of members who were qualified as judges, as contrasted with the Constitutional Committee in which only five out of 11 members qualified as judges. As a result of these changes, the Constitutional Court was believed to enhance the judicial independence, thereby holding the legislative and executive branches in check (H. J. Kim 1992; D. K. Yoon 1989).

---

254 While the members of the House of Representatives were elected by the people for a four-year term, those of the House of Councilors were elected by the people for a six-year term. One Korean political scientist explained the difference between two houses as follows: The House of Representatives was given more or less exclusive legislative power; the House of Councilors was a consultative body in the legislative process . . . If two houses disagreed on a bill the House of Representatives had the final decision (B. Y. Choy 1971, 317).

255 The president still existed in the Second Republic. He was elected for a five-year term in a joint session of both houses of the National Assembly. However, the President was no longer the head of the executive branch; he had no power to veto bills passed by the legislative branch; he was not allowed to belong to a political party after he was elected; he had no power to appoint the cabinet members; and he confirmed the Prime Minister’s appointment of cabinet members only as a matter of formality (B. Y. Choy 1971; J. K. Oh 1968). In fact, the president was the “symbolic” leader of state.

256 The Constitutional Court was composed of nine justices (Article 83). Three out of nine justices were appointed by the President, three by the National Assembly, and three by the Supreme Court.
In addition to the establishment of the Constitutional Court, the 1960 Constitution provided for the direct election of the Chief Justice and the other Justices of the Supreme Court (Article 78) to promote the judicial independence. Drawing upon a constitutional experience in which President Rhee abused his power to appoint and reappoint the Chief Justice and the other Justices of the Supreme Court in the First Republic, political leaders introduced into the Supreme Court a direct election system that made all the Justices directly accountable to the people (B. Y. Choy 1971; Healy 2000-01).

However, the Second Republic’s Constitution, which aimed to introduce a parliamentary system of government and strengthen the judicial branch, did not come into full effect because a military coup in May 1961 put a sudden end to it (B. M. Ahn 2002). One Korean legal scholar explained the main cause of the sudden fall of the Second Republic as follows:

The Second Republic survived less than a year because of the fragile government led by Prime Minister Chang Myun. The governmental and political processes under the parliamentary system were democratic but failed to establish much needed social order. In the midst of political and social turmoil, a coup d’etat led by Major General Park Chung Hee overthrew the government on May 16, 1961(S. D. Lee 1986, 18).
APPENDIX B: 
ELECTORAL REFORM IN THE SIXTH REPUBLIC

The Constitution of the Sixth Republic stated that “the constituencies of members of the National Assembly, proportional representation and other matters pertaining to National Assembly elections shall be determined by Act” (Article 41-3). As a result, the task of establishing a fair electoral system fell into the hands of the National Assembly. In the Sixth Republic, electoral reform was gradual rather than revolutionary largely because many conservative politicians who benefitted from the existing unfair electoral system strongly resisted reform-oriented politicians’ sweeping electoral reform initiatives. Despite this strong conservative resistance, however, reform-minded legislators—sometimes, with the help of the activist Constitutional Court—gradually dismantled the existing unfair electoral scheme by launching a series of electoral reforms (CCK 2001; Heo and Stockton 2005).

The 1988 Electoral Reform

In 1988, the National Assembly made the first attempt to reform the unfair electoral system. The 1988 electoral reform drastically changed the Fifth Republic’s electoral system in two ways. First, this electoral reform replaced the two-member district system with the single-member district system. The two-member district system was often criticized for privileging the “pro-president” candidates at the expense of the “anti-president” candidates under the authoritarian regimes. Because the old two-member district system assured many “pro-president” candidates who had low support in the anti-government, urban districts of being elected as the second-highest vote-getters, it greatly contributed to “easing the shock of urban voters’ support for the opposition party” (Heo and Stockton 2005, 683), thus helping such pro-president legislators maintain a comfortable majority in the National Assembly (K. S. Ho 2006). By introducing the single-member district system, the 1988 electoral reform could prevent unpopular candidates from being elected in their electoral districts, thus preventing the recurrence of so-called “manufactured majority” (Rae 1967, 74) in the National Assembly (Croissant 2002).
Second, the 1988 electoral reform alleviated the problem of what Edwards and Baker (1988) called the “disproportionate bonus” (142) inherent in the proportional representation system of the Fifth Republic—it did not completely eliminate it. Under the Fifth Republic’s electoral system, 92 “national district” seats—one-third of all 276 legislative seats—were distributed in accordance to a distorted proportional representation system. Two-thirds of 92 “national district” seats were awarded to the party winning the largest number of “local district” seats—out of a total of 184 “local district” seats (B. M. Ahn 2002; B. C. Koh 1985)

Because the “pro-president” party, due mainly to the authoritarian government’s illegal electoral support, earned the largest number of “local district” seats in the two legislative elections held in the Fifth Republic (see Table 6-2), it enjoyed the disproportionate bonus, which played a decisive role in making it dominate the legislative branch (H. W. Lee 2016). In order to reduce such disproportionality, the 1988 electoral reform introduced the following proportional representation system:

If a party wins a majority of 224 [local] district seats, the 75 . . . [national district] seats must be allocated in proportion to the share of the [local] district seats won by each party. If no party wins a majority of the [local] district seats, the party with the largest number of [local district] seats is entitled to 38 of the 75 . . . [national district] seats. The remaining 37 [national district] seats are then allocated to other parties winning 5 or more [local] district seats in proportion to each party’s share (H. N. Kim 1989, 482).257

Although the 1988 proportional representation system helped alleviate the problem of disproportionality, it fell far short of establishing a fair proportional representation system. Critics charged the 1988 proportional representation system on the grounds that the party with the largest number of “local district” seats always received more than half of “national district” seats regardless of how many “local district” seats were earned by the largest party (J. Y. Shim and M. G. Kim 2002).

257 The 1988 electoral reform increased the number of the total legislative seats from 276 to 299. While the number of “local district” seats increased from 184 to 224, the number of “national district” seats decreased from 92 to 75 (H. N. Kim 1989).
The 1991 Electoral Reform

In responding to this criticism, in 1991, the National Assembly went one step further in reforming the existing proportional representation system. The 1991 electoral reform introduced a relatively fair proportional representation system that could eliminate the “disproportionate bonus” enjoyed by the party with a largest number of “local district” seats (K. S. Ho 2006). The 1991 proportional representation system allocated 62 “national district” seats to all political parties that won more than five out of 237 “local district” seats or received more than three percent of the votes cast in all “local district” seats. Sixty two “national district” seats were distributed in proportion to the share of the “local district” seats won by each party. Although “the special seat bonus for the largest party was abolished” in the 1991 proportional representation system (Croissant 2002, 244), this proportional representation system was not free from criticism. Critics contended that the 1991 proportional representation system still failed to meet the original goal of proportional representation, which is to “give each party a share of the seats more or less equal to its share of the votes” (Blais 1991, 243), because “national district” seats were allocated in proportion to the share of “local district” seats won by each party, not by the share of popular votes received by each party (J. Y. Shim and M. G. Kim 2002).

The 1996 Electoral Reform

To translate the proportion of the popular votes received by each political party correctly into the proportion of legislative seats won by each party, the National Assembly launched another electoral reform in 1996 and instituted a new proportional representation system. The 1996 proportional representation system, in proportion to the share of popular votes won by each party, distributed “national district” seats

---

258 Since the 1988 electoral reform, the single-member district system has remained unchanged.
259 In the 1991 electoral reform, the total number of legislative seats remained unchanged at 299. However, while the 1991 electoral reform increased the number of “local district” seats from 224 to 237, it reduced the number of “national district” seats from 75 to 62 (J. Y. Shim and M. G. Kim 2002).
260 The total number of legislative seats in the 1996 electoral reform was 299, which was same as that in the 1991 electoral reform. However, in the 1996 electoral reform, while the number of “local district” seats increased from 237 to 253, the number of “national district” seats decreased from 62 to 46 (Heo and Stockton 2005).
to political parties that obtained either a minimum of five seats in all “local district” seats or a minimum of five percent of the total valid votes. In addition, the 1996 proportional representation system granted one “national district” seat to any political party that gained three to five percent of the total popular votes (Croissant 2002).

The 2000 Electoral Reform

The 2000 electoral reform was intended to alleviate the problem of gerrymandering. Interestingly enough, this electoral reform was not initiated by the National Assembly, but by the Constitutional Court. In 1994, the National Assembly passed a redistricting plan, which allowed the largest (urban) district to be around six times larger than the smallest (rural) district in terms of the number of voters (Y. S. Kim 2002). In 1995, the Constitutional Court declared the 1994 redistricting plan unconstitutional by stating that the existing redistricting promoted the “intentional discrimination of electors in a particular region through the arbitrary division of electoral districts” and that it thus “violated the constitutional mandate of equal weight of votes” (CCK 2001, 58). Furthermore, the Constitutional Court set the permissible maximum ratio between the least populous district and the most populous district at 1:4 and ordered the legislative branch to revise its redistricting scheme by May 2000. The Constitutional Court’s 1995 decision was the first step to dismantling the authoritarian regimes’ intentional malapportionment scheme, which drew electoral districts in order to “over-represent” the voters in the pro-government, rural districts and “under-represent” those in the anti-government, urban districts (W. T. Kang 2002, 141). Complying with the Constitutional Court’s 1995 decision, the National Assembly passed so-called “1:4 population ratio” redistricting plan in January 2000.

261 In drafting the 1994 redistricting plan, the incumbent legislators did not drastically change the existing redistricting plan with a high level of malapportionment largely because they wanted to keep their own legislative seats safe from a sweeping redistricting reform (Y. S. Kim 2002).
262 The Constitutional Court made it clear that “the Court will not distinguish between an urban electoral district from a rural electoral district” (CCK 2001, 61).
263 As a result of the 2000 electoral reform, the number of “local district” seats decreased from 253 to 227. The number of “national district” seats was 46, which was same as that in the 1996 electoral reform. In total, the number of the legislative seats diminished from 299 to 273 (Y. S. Kim 2002).
The 2004 Electoral Reform

In 2004, the National Assembly launched two electoral reforms, which were stimulated by two prominent decisions made by the Constitutional Court in 2001. In 2001, the Constitutional Court re-examined the existing “1:4 population ratio” redistricting scheme, which allowed the least populous district to be four times smaller than the most populous district. It ruled that the existing “1:4 population ratio” redistricting scheme was unacceptable and furthermore set a new maximum population ratio between the smallest district and the largest district at 1:3. Then, the Constitutional Court ordered the National Assembly to revise the existing redistricting scheme by May 2004 (S. M. Lee 2006).264

Furthermore, the Constitutional Court made it clear that it would review the districting plan by using a much stricter “1:2 population ratio” standard in the near future by stating that “the legislature should remedy the existing population disparities among electoral districts to ensure that the largest electoral district does not have a population more than twice that of the smallest electoral district” (CCK 2001, 64).265

In 2001, the Constitutional Court made another influential decision, which required the legislative branch to introduce the “one man, two votes” principle into the existing electoral system (W. S. Kim 2005, 96). After examining the constitutionality of the existing proportional representation system, which “assumes that the voter’s choice of a candidate in the electoral district is the same as his or her support for a particular political party and does not allow a separate vote for the slate of party nominees for the seats of the proportional representatives” (CCK 2001, 40), the Constitutional Court (2001) unanimously declared the “one man, one vote” principle unconstitutional on the following grounds:

Under the present proportional representative system, when an elector supports either a candidate or a political party, but not both, half of the value of his or her vote is either misused or wasted whether he or she votes for his or her favorite candidate or for the political party of his or her choice . . . This is contrary to democratic principles which call for the accurate reflection of people’s opinions and guarantee people’s freedom of choice in public elections (17).

---

264 The 2004 electoral reform increased the number of “local district” seats from 227 to 243. It also raised the number of “national district” seats from 46 to 56. As a result, the total number of legislative seats grew up to 299 (S. M. Lee 2006).

265 In October 2014, the Constitutional Court ruled that the population ratio between the smallest to largest districts should be raised from 1:4 to 1:2. Responding to its ruling, the legislative branch proposed a new “1:2 population ratio” redistricting plan in February 2016.
The Constitutional Court (2001) concluded that “the present election system employs an unreasonable yardstick to assess people’s support for a particular party” (43) and ordered that the legislative branch incorporate the “one man, two votes” principle into the existing electoral system by May 2004. Following the Constitutional Court’s two decisions mentioned above, the National Assembly passed an electoral reform package, including the new “3:1 maximum ratio” redistricting plan and the “one man, two votes” scheme, in March 2004.
“National Security Law” Case

The National Security Law (NSL), which was enacted in 1948 to protect national security from the threat of communism, has been frequently criticized as a means of the authoritarian regimes to oppress the democratic opposition. In 1992, the Constitutional Court tested the constitutionality of Article 19 of the NSL, which created “an exception to the period of detention mandated by the Korean Criminal Procedure Code (CPC)” (K. Cho 1997, 161). Under the CPC, suspects could be detained during investigations for a maximum period of 30 days (10 days under the police and 20 days under the prosecution before being charged). However, under Article 19 of the NSL, suspects, who were investigated under suspicion of violating the NSL, could be detained for a maximum of 50 days in total (20 days by the police and 30 days by the prosecution). In the authoritarian regimes, the police officers and the prosecutors often detained pro-democracy activists for 50 days without later filing charges against them (Ginsburg 2010).

In 1992, the Constitutional Court held the extended detention period for an alleged violator of the National Security Act to be unconstitutional. The Court stated as follows:

Because . . . [the] collection of evidences [on whether a suspect violated the NSL or not] is not so difficult, the extension up to fifty days by article 19 of the National Security Law . . . is to balance wrongly the mutually conflicting relation between the state's power of punishment and the nation’s basic rights, and permit unnecessarily long detention, then apparently violate the principle of prohibition of excessiveness in article 37(2) of the Constitution . . . and infringe personal liberty of the suspect, in dubio pro reo and right of speedy trial (quoted in K. Cho 1997, 161-162).

In this decision, the Constitutional Court “balanced the government’s interest in maintaining national security against the need to guarantee the fundamental rights of the individual” (Healy 2000-01) and delivered a blunt warning that it would monitor the government’s enforcement of the NSL and government should not impose any arbitrary restrictions on the fundamental rights of citizens—even in the name of national security (K. Cho 2002; Ginsburg 2010).
“Assembly and Demonstration Act” Cases

In October 2002, the Constitutional Court examined the constitutionality of several provisions of the Assembly and Demonstration Act (ADA), which completely prohibited outdoor assemblies within one hundred meters of the boundaries of foreign diplomatic missions in order to prevent such assemblies from posing a danger to “the physical safety of the diplomats” (CCK 2008, 245). In this case, even if constitutional petitioners submitted a notice of their demonstration to the police which had the authority to grant a demonstration permit, they were denied a permit to hold their demonstration because it was supposed to be held in within one hundred meters of the boundaries of foreign diplomatic missions. These petitioners contended that the ADA’s “blanket ban” provisions violated their right to freedom of assembly guaranteed in the Constitution (S. H. Han 2007).

The Constitutional Court declared so-called “blanket ban” provisions unconstitutional on the grounds that they “imposed a general ban without exceptions in cases where the danger presupposed by the provision does not actually exist” (CCK 2008, 245) and, thus, such general ban constituted excessive restrictions on citizens’ right to freedom of assembly. By emphasizing the freedom of assembly as “a core component of democracy” (CCK 2008, 244), the Court made it clear that it would “prohibit state action designed to interfere with . . . the individual’s participation in an assembly” unless the assembly posed any “clear and present” danger to the existing social order (CCK 2008, 244).

In September 2009, the Constitutional Court also reviewed the Article 10 of the ADA, which stipulated that “No one may hold any outdoor assembly or stage any demonstration either before sunrise or after sunset.” In order to hold a nighttime outdoor assembly or demonstration, the ADA’s Article 10 required the citizens to get a permit for the assembly or demonstration from the police. In this case, the defendant was indicted for organizing a nighttime outdoor demonstration without getting a permit in advance in a trial court. He claimed that the ADA’s Article 10 infringed upon his right to freedom of assembly, which was enshrined in the Article 21 of the Constitution. The defendant filed a motion for judicial review of the ADA. The trial court granted the motion and requested the Constitutional Court to review the constitutionality of the ADA (CCK 2010).
The Constitutional Court ruled that the ADA’s Article 10 did not conform to the Constitution on the grounds that it violated the Article 21 Section 2 of the Constitution, which upheld the citizen’s right to freedom of assembly and prohibited the administrative authority from granting a permit to hold an assembly or demonstration. The Court stated as follows:

Under the Constitution, Article 21 Section 2, the permit system for assembly is prohibited . . . Under this provision, the Constitution sets a clear limitation on restricting the basic rights and, therefore, this provision should be the standard of review with a higher priority. . . The ‘permit’ system prohibited by the Article 21 Section 2 of the Constitution means a permit system under which an administrative authority may permit assemblies in certain cases by reviewing the contents, the time, the place of reported assemblies. . . [The Article 10 of] the Assembly and Demonstration Act prescribes that . . . an administrative authority . . . may ban an outdoor assembly scheduled either before sunrise or after sunset . . . as a general rule with an exception that the authority may decide not to ban it based on the review of the contents of an assembly in advance. Evidently, the Article 10 prescribes a permit system for nighttime outdoor assembly . . . Therefore, it is against the Article 21 Section 2 of the Constitution (CCK 2010, 334-335).

“Motion Pictures Act” Case

In the authoritarian regimes, the Motion Pictures Act was enacted to authorize the Public Performance Ethics Commission (PPEC) to regulate and censor the content of motion pictures. This censorship was intended to prevent the showing of motion pictures that criticized the political and policy agenda of the authoritarian regimes (Paquet 2005). One Korea scholars briefly explained the functions of the PPEC as follows:

The Motion Pictures Act required submission of all motion pictures for "examination" by the Public Performance Ethics Commission prior to their public exhibition. When the Commission found a film falling under specified standards, it was to prohibit the showing of the film. The Commission, composed of members appointed by the government, was also empowered to grant a permit of exhibition on condition of deleting portions of a motion picture in question (K. Yang 1998, 165).

In October 1996, the Constitutional Court unanimously struck down the Motion Pictures Act as unconstitutional on the grounds that the PPEC’s censorship greatly undermined citizens’ right to freedom of expression. After pointing out that government censorship might “suppress in advance the ideas adverse to the government or the ruler, leaving . . . [their] opinions controlled by the government” (CCK 2001, 152), the Court stated that “a motion picture is a form of expression and its production and showing should be
protected” through the constitutional principle of freedom of expression (CCK 2001, 152). Then, the Court emphasized that government should “assist and promote, rather than, regulate the film industry” (Paquet 2005, 44).
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