fore answering this question, let us quote some real-life, evidence-based examples of their parallel application to the attention of scholars. I will provide some examples from the Central and Eastern European region, associated with all three dimensions of governance identified above.

2.1 Vertical Layers of Governance and the Neo-Weberian State

The competitive pressure of a globalized market exerts an increasing pressure to nation-states. Confronted with the increasing power of the actors of the globalized market, namely multinational corporations, they are losers of economic globalization in a developmental comparative perspective. They are deprived of some traditional instruments of governing, and are exposed, at the same time, to emerging tasks they are not able to solve alone. Thus, they have to seek efficient alliances with other nation-states to join resources and skills and coordinate their functioning. The process of European integration within the development of the European Union is an example of rational reaction to these pressures. But it is not without controversies:

- In some instances, the European Commission uses its "Europe of Regions" policy to circumvent national administrations by direct collaboration with regional administration;

- There is a switch from direct steering to indirect regulation between the various vertical layers of governance. The European Union applies the Open Method of Coordination in the fields where its regulatory framework does not allow for direct intervention (such as the labour market policy or social protection). There is a considerable pool of passive resistance at the national level of public administration against such forms of informal, "soft" intervention; (Potůček 2006)

- The psychologically and culturally very short historical period between the liberation of Central and Eastern Europe from Soviet dominance, and tasks and duties stemming from the full-fledged EU membership invites old-fashioned nationalist resentments. The European Union is perceived by some strata of the population as an illegitimate new ruler simply replacing an old one, and an enemy of a newly-born sovereign nation-state.

It is safe to say that internationally induced policy tasks are often opposed by a wall of misunderstanding, incompetence, internal strife, and political opportunism both at the national and regional levels. A classic example of this is the fate of three consecutive sustainable development strategies, with only the last of them passed by the Czech government long past the deadline it had pledged to honour. Jabůrková and Mátl (2007: 290) observe from another policy field that "... the execution of the European Employment Strategy in the framework of MLG ... does not implement the principles of good governance, and does not produce the features of strategic planning and management."

2.2 Three Interacting Regulators – Market, State and Civic Sector – and the Neo-Weberian State

The collapse of Soviet-style communism provides us with the empirical example of inefficiency of governance based on an all-embracing administrative system, associated with a highly centralized political power. Experimentation with the recipes of the Washington Consensus of the 1990s, taking for granted virtually all-embracing market regulation with its detrimental social and economic consequences in Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe (Randmaa-Liiv 2008) and elsewhere, could serve as an empirical example of the opposite failure. The modern history of humankind can be viewed as a never-ending effort to reach some productive, dynamic balance between these two core regulators – complemented by the civic sector, which can gain more importance especially in times of historic upheavals (such as a series of revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe in the 1990s). Can the state be separated from the market, or the civic sector, for that matter? It is probably hard to overestimate the relevance of their interactions and interdependencies:

- The market is insatiable, for the sake of its effective functioning, for a supportive institutional and regulatory framework from the state. Economic policies, policies of education, innovation, research and development, tailored policies for small and medium-size enterprises, competition policies, public bail-out of collapsing banks and construction companies, all this can be associated with the functions the state is providing to the business community;

- One can see growing collaboration between the state authorities and the civic sector (deliberation, participation). They share information, pursue common projects, develop and implement common policies; NGOs are required to perform defined public duties. NGOs often have the power to veto some public agendas; they can initiate public policies which would not be launched without their persistence and encouragement;

- There is an increasing variation of institutional hybrids that are neither public authorities nor private (for-profit, non-profit) agencies (such as QUANGOs);

- There are broader opportunities for free-riders to boost illicit profits wherever the neo-Weberian state is non-existent or just inefficient.

It is increasingly difficult to identify "pure" public administration bodies and functions in such an environment; in the societal life, contamination of the state in the regulatory pool market-state-civic sector is on the increase.

2.3 Actors' Networks and Networking and the Neo-Weberian State

It is especially in light of the new possibilities, brought about by the new information and communication technologies, and with the decreasing relevance of traditional national borders, that one can identify non-orthodox, innovative patterns of horizontal co-ordination, co-regulation, co-steering and initiative taking. Associ-

ated with this process are the blurring boundaries of responsibilities between public and private actors, as well as new forms of endangering the public order:

- Ever-spreading issue-specific political networks cross all traditional boundaries, enter public spheres and influence public decision-making processes;

- There are many examples of socially pathological forms of regulation that abuse networking, such as crime chains, the mafia and corruption.

The preliminary findings from the Central and Eastern European region suggest that socially productive networking is not the decisive vehicle of governance there. Two conditions should be met to make networking socially productive:

a) The government must take its partnership with civic sector organizations seriously and create sufficient administrative capacity to interact with them;

b) There must be a competent, cohesive group of professionals and experts to engage in the effort to raise the corresponding agenda.

These conditions are seldom fulfilled. On the other hand, the incidence of socially pathological forms of networking is higher in this region compared to the Western European democracies. (Jenei 2008)

Conclusions

This paper tries to match two theoretical perspectives, one stemming from the public policy stream of reasoning, and the other following the public administration tradition: the juxtaposition of the multidimensional concept of governance and the Neo-Weberian concept of state. This confrontation yields a set of not-yet-fully-answered questions which might be of some interest to scholars from both sides of the First NISPAcee-EGPA Trans-European Dialogue.

It is the right time to come back to the original question. Are the concepts of multidimensional governance and the Neo-Weberian State compatible, complementary or contradictory? My qualified answer, based on the multidimensional compartmentalization of the concept of governance and the association of the three dimensions with the concept of the Neo-Weberian State, is as follows:

1. They are compatible since they operate at various levels of abstraction.

2. They are complementary as the concept of the Neo-Weberian State complements the concept of governance where it deals with the state as an important element of governance.

3. They are not contradictory if applied in a broader cognitive context – the disciplinary perspectives of public policy and public administration.

The main paradox of the contemporary governance and administration is that governments are expected to solve ever more challenging and complex tasks in an increasingly interdependent world with ever less direct power and control at their disposal. The only rational response to this tension is to develop tools of public action that will be more effective but with less direct control and involvement. Let us have some examples: organizing public discussions on important issues of public life; setting up strategic priorities; mutual learning, encouragement and support between public and private bodies and actors; implementing general regulative frameworks and relying on interactive networks. The application of all these approaches is vitally dependent on sound coordination, based on the holistic conception of both social reality – and public action.

References

Abrahamson, P. 1995. Welfare Pluralism: Towards a New Consensus for a European Social Policy? Current Politics and Economics in Europe 5 (1): 29–42.

Benáček, Vladimír. 2005. Three Dimensions of Modern Social Governance: Markets, Hierarchies, and Kinships. Paper presented at the 13th NISPAcee Annual Conference, 19–21 May, in Moscow, Russia.

Bovaird, T. 2005. Public Governance: Balancing Stakeholder Power in a Network Society. International Review of Administrative Sciences 71 (2): 217–229.

Castells, M. 2000. *The Rise of the Network Society.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Citizens as Partners: Information, Consultation and Public Participation in Policy-making. 2001. Paris, OECD.

Drechsler, Wolfgang. 2005. The Re-Emergence of "Weberian" Public Administration: The Infinitive Web of History, Values, and Authority in Administrative Mentalities. Halduskultuur 6: 94–108.

Dror, Yehezkel. 2001. *The Capacity to Govern.* London: Frank Cass.

El Hassan bin Talal 2004. The Challenge of Informed Humanity from "Infosphere" to "Cogitosphere". Paper delivered at the Annual Conference of the Club of Rome, 11–12 October, in Helsinki, Finland.

Governance for Human Development. 2000. UNDP FRY, December.

Jabůrková, Milena, and Ondřej Mátl. 2007. Evropská strategie zaměstnanosti a dobrá veřejná správa ve víceúrovňovém vládnutí v České republice, In *Strategické vládnutí a Česká republika.* Edited by Potůček, Martin et al. Praha: Grada.

Jenei, György. 2008. Reforms in Public Administration and the Transition to Democratic Rechtsstaat. Paper presented at the First NISPAcee-EGPA Trans-European Dialogue, 31 January–1 February, in Tallinn, Estonia.

Kooiman, J. 2003. *Governing as Governance.* London: Sage.

Kovač, P. 2004. The Principles of Good Governance with an Emphasis on Slovenia within European Union. Paper presented at the EGPA Annual Conference "Four months after: Administering the New Europe", Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Neuvonen, Aleksi, ed. 2005. *Hostages of the Horizon. The Twin Challenge of Ignorance and Indifference.* Review on issues raised in the Club of Rome 2004 Annual Conference. Helsinki: Finnish Association for the Club of Rome.

Peters, B. G. n.d. Developing Strategic Policy Capacity in Government. Thinking the Unthinkable: From Thought to Policy. Bratislava: UNDP.

Pierre, J., and G. Peters. 2000. *Governance, Politics, and the State.* New York: St. Martins Press.

Pollitt, Christopher. 2008. TED1: Synthesis Comments on Propositions. Paper presented at the First NISPAcee-EGPA Trans-European Dialogue, 31 January–1 February, in Tallinn, Estonia.

Pollitt, Christopher, and G. Bouckaert. 2004. *Public Management Reform. A Comparative Analysis.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Potůček, Martin, ed. 2008. *Capacities of Governance in the Czech Republic.* Prague: Matfyzpress.

Potůček, Martin. 2007. *Strategické vládnutí a Česká republika.* Praha: Grada. (The English version in print: *Strategic Governance and the Czech Republic.* Prague: Karolinum.)

Potůček, Martin. 2006. Does the Lisbon Strategy matter? The Czech Experience. In *Reforms in Lisbon Strategy Implementation: Economic and Social Dimensions,* Edited by V. Samardžija. Zagreb: IMO & FES.

Potůček, Martin 1999. *Not Only the Market: The Role of the Market, Government, and Civic Sector in the Development of Postcommunist Societies.* Budapest: CEU Press.

Randmaa-Liiv, Tiina. 2008. New Public Management versus Neo-Weberian State in Central and Eastern Europe. Paper presented at the First NISPAcee-EGPA Trans-European Dialogue, 31 January–1 February, in Tallinn, Estonia.

Rhodes, R.A.W. 1996. The New Governance: Governing without Government. Political Studies 44: 652–667.

Salamon, L. M., ed. 2002. *The Tools of Government. A Guide to the New Governance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stolleis, M. 2004. Was kommt nach dem souveränen Nationalstaat? Und was kann die Rechtsgeschichte dazu sagen? In *European and International Regulation after the Nation State,* Edited by A. Héritier, A. M. Stolleis, and F. W. Scharpf. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Strategic Round-Table on Governance Transition in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia Serbia and Montenegro. 2002. Belgrade, UNDP.

Thompson, J. B. 1995. *The Media and Modernity: A Social Theory of the Media.* Oxford: Polity Press and Blackwell.

Veselý, Arnošt. 2004. Governance as Multidimensional Concept. In *Understanding Governance: Theory, Measurement and Practice:* 11–23. Edited by Martin Potůček. CESES Papers 5.

Zürn, M., and St. Liebfried. 2005. Reconfiguring the National Constellation. European Review 13 (Supp. 1): 1–36.