Presidential Panel discussion, April 15, 2024*

"SICA: The First ASPA Section: Fifty Years of Nostalgia, Looking Forward for the Next 50"
ASPA
Moderator: Kim Moloney, Ph.D.
Panelists: Meghna Sabharwal, Ph.D., Jeanne-Marie Col, Ph.D., Krishna K. Tummala, Ph.D., Edgar Ramirez, Ph.D., and Naim Kapucu, Ph.D.

Kim: Good morning, everyone; my name is Kim Moloney. I will be serving as moderator, something I am very honored to do for today's Presidential Panel on SICA's 50th anniversary. I am going to introduce my distinguished panelists, explain how this session will work, and then we will get started.

On my left is Meghna Sabharwal. She is a Professor at the University of Texas, at Dallas. She is currently the editor of ROPPA, and most recently, she was the Chair of the Section on International and Comparative Administration. To her left is Jeanne-Marie Col, who is a Professor at John Jay College, and who led the section during a really important transition period. The success of SICA today could not have occurred without Jeanne-Marie's persistence. To her left is Krishna K. Tummala, Professor Emeritus, former Chair, and a Riggs Awardee. Our section gives out a lifetime achievement for those who gave distinguished service in comparative and development administration, and Krishna is one of them. To his left is Edgar Ramirez, a professor at the University of Nevada, Los Vegas. He is also a founding leader of ASPA's new Latin American Section. If you have not joined it, please join. To his left is Naim Kapucu, who is a professor at the University of Central Florida and a Riggs Lifetime Achievement awardee. My name is Kim Moloney; I am at Hamad Bin Khalifa University in Doha, Qatar and like several people, I too chaired SICA at one point.

This panel was put together in observation of the 50th anniversary. There was a planning committee that got together to create some questions for this panel. So rather than having a series of lectures, we created a set of 19 questions. We asked our five panelists to choose three, four, or five questions that they wanted to address. I will be calling on them to answer the questions. They know in advance what the questions are. They will have no more than 90 seconds to two minutes to respond and most of the questions have at least one person willing to answer. In the last 15 minutes or so, we will take questions from the audience.

All right, are you ready? Okay, so let us start with, I think, the most obvious question. We are a Section on International and Comparative Administration, and this is for Meghna, followed by Krishna. **In your view, is ASPA international?**

Meghna: I think it is an important question. My first ASPA meeting was in 2007 in Dallas when I was a PhD student. Funnily, I am now in Dallas; it comes around. But when I walked into that conference, I did not find many people looking like me, and it was uncomfortable, to say the least. Look around the room now. Look around ASPA now. I mean, it just makes me proud of how far we have come. I counted seven sections, and I can name them. SICA, the Chinese section, the Korean section, the African section, (the) MENA section, (the) South Asian section, and the newest Latin American section. So that is seven sections out of 31 sections that are international. That is not bad; we are at 23% of the total right now. I would also like to mention that last year, bless his soul, our president, Dr. Alan Rosenbaum, in fact put a committee

together— The President's Committee on International Scholarly Engagement. I was part of it, Kim, you were part of it, Al Roberts headed that, and as part of that, I am very happy that ASPA now has an international engagement policy; if you have not looked at it, it is on their website. And then, we have the International Chapter too. It has been a long running one, Andrew Podger, thank you for all your work. What I feel is that we have made progress, but much remains to be done. And why does much remain to be done? Coming from South Asia, (and) growing up in India, I understand the challenges. The cost of attending ASPA, even for students and faculty already here, can be — and this might be controversial — very expensive. First, there is the issue of cost. Second is the issue of visas and all the travel involved. If one scholar, for example, comes from India — or anywhere in the Global South — the expenses are simply prohibitive. If we truly want to make ASPA global and accessible, we need to meet people where they are. That is why I am suggesting we create regional ASPA branches: ASPA South Asia, ASPA Southeast Asia, ASPA Africa, ASPA Middle East, and ASPA Latin America. This is my vision. Only then would I feel that ASPA has truly arrived and become global. Right now, we are moving in that direction and taking baby steps, but until we meet people where they are — instead of expecting them to come here — I do not believe we will have fully achieved that goal.

Kim: This is a wonderful start to our panel. Now Krishna, you have the same question. In your view, is ASPA international?

Krishna: Yes. It should be. I am an old-timer, so I will take you back to history for a brief moment. When Dwight Waldo said that public administration is political philosophy, he did not say American philosophy. It was universal he was talking about. And then, if you look at the founding members of ASPA, I will give you some names: Luther Gullick, William Mosher, Charles Asher, Don Stone, and Harold Smith. I do not think any one of them had a parochial bone in his body; they were internationalists to me. When ASPA was founded in 1939, it was not said it was international; neither did anyone say it would be only American. So, I would assume it is international.

Look at it in a different way. ASPA was created in 1939. If we look at American history, we had *America First* group established in 1940. People like Senator Taft, Chester Bowles, Charles Lindbergh were fighting against the Lend-Lease program of President Franklin Roosevelt. They wanted America to be First. Currently, I believe the MAGA crowd takes off from there. But, President Roosevelt prevailed. This *America First* group survived only for one year. When (the) Pearl Harbor catastrophe occurred, they disbanded in 1941. So ASPA is international, I will say emphatically. Well, of course, just as Meghna said, there are many sections of ASPA now. They are not parochial sections; they reflect diversity within ASPA, I would think.

One more point I want to make. Quite some years ago, as I was heavily involved with SICA when David Rosenbloom was the editor-in-chief of *PAR*. We sat down one evening at the ASPA meeting. I asked him, “David, why are you not publishing international and comparative articles”? He responded: “Well, nobody is sending articles to us!” I said, “which is the cause, which is the effect? They are not submitting because you are not publishing. Or, you are not publishing because they are not submitting. What is the story here?” I further urged: “Look here, you do something about it.” He responded: “How would I do that?” My answer was: “Well, I do not know; maybe you would encourage some symposia so that people would get to know your intentions.” “Oh, very good idea, Krishna. You do it,” he said. I blurted out: “Oh good grief, I was just suggesting.” So, we published two symposia in *PAR* (January- February 1998 and

November- December 1999), starting with Fred Riggs' article. From then on, more and more international and comparative articles kept coming in. You see, of late, so many South Asians, Southeast Asians and the rest of the world is represented in the journal. So I believe, excuse me if I am sounding a little boastful, I did contribute a little bit to the international cause. But it so happened, there was another twist here. By the time *PAR* symposia were ready, the editorship changed with Irene Rubin at the helm. I did not know her at that time. So, I sat her down and recalled my discussion and agreement with David with the request that the symposia be published. She was also very kind by acceding my request.

Kim: Thank you very much, Krishna.
The next question is for Jeanne-Marie and Edgar. We will start with Jeanne-Marie. In your view do you believe that public administration discipline influences global practice?

Jeanne-Marie: Well, I think the answer is "yes". And, the important issue is "What kinds of mechanisms provide the linkage between the discipline and practice?" I looked up a few dates and significant actions to highlight the progress of discipline and its relationship to practice. Before ASPA was formed, there was the establishment in 1930 of the International Institute of Administrative Sciences (IIAS), which is not a membership organization like ASPA; rather its members are governments. This was a huge signal that governments wanted to share their best practices; they wanted to share their challenges; and they wanted a place to talk about what they were doing in public administration. (The) IIAS Member States looked to scholars and practitioners of public administration for their experiences and perspectives. Practitioners went home to try out timely innovations, and academics gained the latest information on practices in governments. Then, ASPA was established in 1939, and scholars and practitioners since, have a national venue for sharing experiences.

In 1945, the United Nations was founded, and in 1948 it set up its Central Programme for Public Administration and Finance. The Central Programme provided technical assistance in public administration for the many countries that were emerging from colonialism. Independent for the first time, these countries needed information and advice about how various government systems worked so that they could develop systems appropriate to their context. It was felt that countries should have a wider reference point than the public administration style of its former colonial power. For decades, this Programme had a committee of experts from various countries to review changes and trends in public administration. In 2023, this committee was transformed into the Committee of Experts (in Public Administration— CEPA), which meets annually. CEPA reviews current practices, challenges and innovations, as well as make recommendations for issues to study in the following year. Many national governments and international bodies send representatives to participate in CEPA. For example, the International Association of Supreme Audit Institutions always sends a representative, as does ASPA. Since 2000, the UN has produced an annual global report on experience in the field. Since 2003, the UN has organized annual awards for innovative public administration practices. These international fora provide a space for sharing public administration experiences, and uniting theory and practice. Moreover, several UN conferences on topics such as environment, women, and population, have provided venues for sharing sectoral policies and practices. Participants returned home to try out whatever innovations seemed suited to their context. Thus, IIAS, UN, and ASPA, and eventually SICA, have all linked academics to practical public administration.

Kim: Thank you.
Edgar, does the PA discipline influence global practice?

Edgar: Yes. I will say that it is not just an international question, but it is also relevant for every country including the United States. So, in my opinion, it does affect practice in the sense that it documents, for instance, good practices. It advances ideas about how to improve the life of citizens; and there are some international trends. We are all familiar with all this new public management that brought a number of practices such as performance evaluation, that were not common in many countries. So, it was those kinds of efforts definitely impacted practice. Now, the other question is, does that have an impact on the lives of citizens? And that, I would say, depends. Because, sometimes, many of these instruments are adapted without regard for the context. When they are diffused, they do not consider the specific needs of countries. Sometimes, I tell practitioners that one of the worst thing that can happen to a city is that the Mayor goes to a trip to learn best practices in another country. They come back with ideas. Those ideas are solutions to problems that they might not have, but they sound good. Now, I will just close this by saying that it works to the extent that it helps create communities of practitioners and share those experiences. So, in my opinion, it does, but it takes time.

Kim: Great, thank you. So, the next question I am going to direct to Naim first, then Meghna, and Edgar, the three of you. So Naim, you will start. Do you consider the 45 or so public administration journals to be "international"?

Naim: Thank you, Kim. Again, happy birthday to SICA, 50th anniversary and thank you all for organizing this panel. Are journals international? I believe many have "international" in it. For example, the *International Journal of Public Administration*. Are they truly international? I look at it from two different perspectives. One, are people ready to publish in those journals from different countries, from Africa, from China, from other places? I have been working very closely with scholars and students in China and the most critical part of the publication difficulties and challenges— the contextual issues. And 15, 20 years ago we had challenges publishing some of the papers either because they are not well aligned with the mission of the journal or sometimes the contextual challenges that people did not understand whether this is really a public administration issue. But substantial progress was made. One, a lot of people actually trained and educated in the US went back to China, and trained their doctoral students, who now are publishing in major journals. And, I am associated with *Public Management Review*. I process more than 20 articles every single month. It is one of the largest journals. We have close to 1,000 submissions annually, and I have seen probably 30% coming actually from China. And they are really, really good. And so, in terms of publishing and working with scholars to publish in our journals, it is one thing. The other is there are a lot of journals. Some of my students in Pakistan and other places have established their own journals. I think we need to support them, too, to make sure they publish in Pakistan, and India, and other places. It does not need to be the journals we know. You know, there is one new journal published in China on urban governance. I think that is important. There is one just published in Pakistan, *Governments and Management Review*. So, one thing, how can we work with our friends and colleagues in different parts of the world? Explain to them publishing strategies. So, we need to learn from them on publishing our journals as well as support them either being on editorial board reviews

as well as submitting our papers to those journals to make sure we have this exchange of knowledge in different parts of the world.

Kim: Let me follow up with you, Meghna, and then Edgar. What are your thoughts on this? Are our journals international? And you edit a journal. I am associated with the PAR Editorial Board. I agree with a lot of what Naim said.

Meghna: Yes, I have taken on the role with ROPPA, but I am also an associate editor for the past two years. Starting in January, I requested a report from Sage to analyze where the submissions are coming from. Unsurprisingly, most are from the U.S., but the next largest groups are from China and South Korea, followed by submissions from India and other countries. As Naim mentioned, the quality of scholarship coming from places like South Korea is outstanding. I have also collaborated with several Pakistani scholars who are doing fantastic work in the HR space, and their contributions are becoming more visible. When we look at the 49 journals we frequently reference in the social science citation index (used primarily in the U.S.), it is worth noting that 17 of them are international, which accounts for about 35%. Of course, other regions rely on different systems, such as ABDC, which includes more journals. But if we look at the SSCI list of 49, it is clear that important journals like GMR (*Government Management Review*) from Pakistan or IJPA (*International Journal of Public Administration*) are not part of this index. The challenge is that for these journals need to make it onto the list. Another difficulty for young scholars is to know where to publish, and get the recognition they deserve. It might be up to us to start publishing in these journals, as Naim suggested, and engage in that dialogue. While progress is being made, I believe there is still a lot more work to be done.

Kim: Edgar, if I can ask you as a dual language scholar, are PA journals international? Is there/would be a motivation for some scholars to publish in a Spanish language journal or Portuguese language journal?

Edgar: I will echo some of what Meghna has said, and I will add to that. Yes, some have this vocation, but some do not. And let me explain a little bit. For instance, for some journals, you do not have to explain why what happened in an agency in the Netherlands is important and relevant to the rest of the world. But you have to explain very hard why an agency in Guadalajara, Jalisco, and what happened there is very relevant for the rest of the world. So that is a problem with publishing international material. Saying that, I will also say that it takes effort to create these regional communities. What Naim was saying, I mean, we have to support these regional communities. And what we have done through ASPA was in the last few years, we have organized three workshops, two sponsored by ASPA and one sponsored by APA in Latin America, to train young scholars who did not have the opportunity to come to the United States. They are graduated from programs in their countries. And, we work with them on their manuscripts, teaching them how to review papers. You know it is very hard to find reviewers because for that agency, the Netherlands, you need someone that at least could tell you, “yeah, that is true”. And there are some scholarly communities, to which, that is not the tradition. The traditions in some of these communities have been publish in books mainly, not journal articles. And that is, we know, a completely different animal. Thank you.

Kim: Jeanne-Marie, I am going to turn to you for a question. In your view, is the public administration discipline methodologically nationalist, in other words, maybe overly focused on the state in some components rather than, maybe, global actors?

Jeanne-Marie: Yes, I think that because of the issue of context, there are always some nationalist tendencies. But I think that there are plenty of examples of people who have tried to bridge that gap. We also have to look at a country's donor program, where you will see that all of the English-speaking countries are supposed to look like Great Britain. If the USAID is there, all of them are supposed to look like the United States. If they are French-speaking, they are all supposed to look like France. And one other thing: when I worked at the UN, I tried to bring a variety of perspectives at every event. For instance, when we were discussing civil service reform in Vietnam, I brought someone from France, someone from the United States, someone from Thailand, and someone from the Philippines. So they had regional examples of how they were trying to adjust their civil service systems. And they had some advice from some major countries that might want to impose their will, but then they probably were not going to do that, or be able to do that. Because countries should be able to combine as they see fit as they are going forward. France, of course, has a career system. The United States, of course, has its position classification system. Thailand has a very interesting combination of the two. And Philippines has also followed the US model for position classification. But countries like Vietnam were trying to modernize and see where they might go. So I think there is a role for having these situations in which a country gets to see a variety of advice and to think about what would match their place.

Kim: OK, thank you. Naim, I am going to turn to you. Is there conceptual or theoretical hegemony in public administration?

Naim: This is a loaded question. And I think there is history in this particular case. And, I am not judging good or bad, but there is substantial development, especially in the United States, when it comes to public administration and certain theories in public administration. And primarily spread to the rest of the world through journals and publications, as well as some of the PhDs trained in the US who went back and tried to publicize those theories, such as public service motivation. We see a lot coming from China, Korea, and other places. Jim Perry's students are trying to promote this idea as an example, right? But does this really fit within the context of those cultures, and how we can develop different types of survey instruments, collecting data, the context, and culture, and language also are to be considered. We have a recent project. This is one of my areas of networks and network governance. We formed an international team from Spain, Europe, the US, and a couple of other places, with the idea of how we can collectively develop a consistent conceptual understanding of networks, and develop variables agreed upon by all participants in different countries, cultures, and contexts. Again, the regimes are also considered as a big picture. And how we can develop consistent survey instruments, shared with the rest of the world, that anyone is interested in this particular topic, collect data from Turkey, from India, from China. But again, this is consistent, not dominated by one culture, or one country, or one context, but open to the rest of the world. Again, this is just an example. I think we can do more in different areas that collectively we identify variables, the larger context, and develop some instruments, we can collect more unified information, and that will help us establish more comparative perspectives. So we collected this unified survey from different

countries. What are the results look like? I do not think we are at the stage to complain and whine that there is too much dominance. Yes, because there is history. It is built already. Is there a way we can bring more perspectives from different countries, and open new ideas, and develop the consistent instrumentation data collections, so we can actually do more systematic comparisons between cultures, contexts, systems, and countries.

Kim: OK, following along with Meghna, do you want to add any thoughts?

Krishna: I would add a few words on the hegemony issue. There was an occasion a few years ago, a young American scholar began talking of public administration as if it was invented by the Americans. I was a little less than happy about it. I asked him whether he heard of Confucius. Or a Kautilya, if he wanted to go back further? He had no clue what I was talking about.
What I am suggesting is there is some primacy, not hegemony. American scholars, American books, are used everywhere. Two examples. Traveling in Australia, I found a fellow who was teaching budgeting which happened to be my specialty. I asked him what books he used? He responded, Wildavsky. That book is a classic on American budgeting! What has that got to do in Australia? "But it is a very good book. I am using it," he said. Similarly, I ran into a scholar in India who was teaching Personal Management. I asked him what material he used? Glenn Stahl, was his response. In fact, I remember studying Stahl when I started on public administration education in India in late 1950s. Glenn Stahl wrote about American personal management! There was no other textbook at that time in India. Stahl had nothing to do with Indian personal management. Yet… So there is some primacy, not hegemony here, I think.
And one more point I want to make. Fred Riggs himself was accused of having exported American thinking to the rest of the world in the name of comparative administration. There is a beautiful conversation between him and a fellow by the name of Daya Krishna from Rajasthan, a philosopher. He attacked Fred like crazy suggesting that Riggs exports western concepts everywhere. Fred responded, "No, no, no: All my life I said, I give you some concepts which we know. These concepts may not be useful to you. If you do not have similar concepts, invent your own." I would recommend this book, *Development Debate*, to you very seriously. It is a wonderful conversation between these two scholars. So, there may be a little primacy. Textbooks keep coming more and more from the American side. But hegemony, I am not sure. I would not accept any. That really is an important distinction.

Kim: Meghna, what do you think can be done to encourage diversity in our methods and public administration? And this speaks to primacy as well, and what is prioritized in where?

Meghna: Methodological diversity! It is interesting. You all probably know doctoral students in the room and other scholars who have seen this trend in public administration to prioritize very complex and fancy methodologies, sometimes to a point that we do not understand what the article is actually about, what are the implications of the work, and what is being actually tested or sought for, because we are so lost in that fancy methodology and the sophistication, that I think the meaning and implication of the study is lost. I am not against any methodology, but prioritizing one over the other, using just one positivist lens, and not focusing on some qualitative interpretive methodologies can be hurtful. How many of us in our curriculum are teaching qualitative or mixed methodologies? That is very, very important because our students

need to triangulate to get a holistic picture. I was trained in the positivist philosophy, and most of my publications focus on data and using fancy methodologies. Maybe I am not keeping up now, so I am not as fancy anymore. But over time, I have realized that the "why" has always remained important. And how do I get to the "why" unless I dig deeper? I did fieldwork, talked to people, and conducted interviews, but still could not get to it. So, I think that is one thing. You all might be interested in looking at this article I found very interesting.
It is titled "Enhancing Methodological Reporting in Public Administration, the Functional Equivalence Framework", by Valentina Mele *et al*., published in 2020 in *the American Review of Public Administration (ARPA)*. And what they are arguing is there is a need for methodological intelligibility, which means that we as scholars do not do a good job, or a good enough job, to explain our methodology. Why did we choose this to begin with? Sometimes we are working backward. We have this data set, and we are just trying to fit whatever happens, and the framing, and everything around that data. But, technically, your research question should drive everything else. But that does not happen. I have done that myself. We have to get published. We have to get tenure. You know, the systems are such, unfortunately. But that article, I think, was good if somebody wants to go look at it. Another recent special issue, Kaifeng Yang and his team did in 2021 in *PPMR* ("Methodologies toward a New Era of Public Administration: Diversity and Advancement"; Guest Editor: Kaifeng Yang). And I think those eight articles are also arguing for that methodological diversity, and not truly going deeper, digging deeper, not getting lost in just the data. So, your question, definitely, I think people here need to know that your research question should drive your methodology, whether it is exploratory, whether it is a systematic literature review, whether it is a content analysis, whether it is a fancy logistic regression, or SEM, or any of those fixed effects. So you have to go and see what you have. And as editors, it is incumbent upon us to look at those methodologies that are being used. I am not just going to publish something just because it is some fancy econometric modeling!

Kim: I agree with you. As co-editor of the *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, I get excited when I see an article come in with a methodology that has not been used a lot in the discipline. A diary methodology. I was very excited to see that. Thank you. Edgar, the next question is for you. And I think this may be the most controversial question today. Is Public Administration decolonized?

Edgar: Well, I think the question is, has it ever been colonized? We know part of that. And we know that some practices and some concepts and theories have traveled OK to another context. But they traveled to a very specific community or group. For instance, in some countries it is likely that the most elite schools will use textbooks, American textbooks will use those concepts because the elites want to gain legitimacy through these international concepts. And that is what we are now. That is one thing. But what really happens in the rest of the country, and in many other schools and communities that are not the elite, sometimes comes from local textbooks published there. They train the— I am going to use a concept for colonization, which is street level bureaucracy. So, street level bureaucrats are trained with different ideas, models, and texts. So, I would say there is some of this colonization. And one of the problems is that those elites are the ones that usually get the most of the funding for research and also sometimes for testing theories. But the practice in the rest of the pyramid is different. And the training in the rest of the pyramid is different. It is often doing with local production scene. Thank you.

Kim: The next question is for you. Does local context matter in comparative and development PA?

Krishna: Yes. Again, not wanting to become parochial, if you want to understand and reform a particular bureaucracy, you first must understand the culture that you are dealing with. Let me ask you a question. How many of you have seen the movie, *The Quiet Man*? It is a lovely movie with John Wayne and Maureen O'Hara. Maureen encourages John, her husband, to fight her brother physically (Wayne was playing the role of a former boxer who gave up the sport after killing someone in the ring) for the dowry he promised her but did not pay up. Well, you might think what this crazy woman is doing here. But you should approach it within the Irish cultural context. Once you understand the Irish culture, this movie makes sense. Again, Fred Riggs always said that culture and context matter. The word context, of course, is now troublesome. Since it was used by Harvard's president last time before the Congressional Committee, context became a rather difficult issue. (President Claudin Gay was forced to resign.) But both culture and context are important, policy context, in particular. But let me go back. There is another component here, which is "development". When he started the Comparative Administrative Group (CAG), Fred resisted the idea of development. He was talking of comparative and international only. Ford Foundation was giving the money and literally sat on his neck and insisted that "development" be incorporated. Otherwise, they were not going to extend funding. They threatened Fred! So, he very reluctantly accepted development as a part of the scheme of affairs. As you know, the idea of development was hijacked by economists. Everything has to be measured and quantified. I am not too fond of this quantification and measurement. Robert Merton, I am sure you are familiar with his writings, he used an expression. The instrumental value becomes the terminal value. So, you see the numbers. Fine. But tell me the context within which you are using these numbers. Explain this. I will give one more story and I will drop here. When I was a young graduate student, which was in the previous incarnation, a paper came out where the researcher found in England that there is a positive correlation between widows and millet crop output in a village. The greater the number of widows, the greater the yield of millets was. Yeah, so what? Do you want to kill all the husbands here?! But the real explanation here is the greater the number of widows, the larger the number of cats. The greater the number of the cats, the less are rats which are the enemy of millet. That explanation has to be given. So again, quantification is a major issue here. What I am saying is Fred was not very fond of development. He resisted as much as he could, but then, of course, it changed. Till he died, we began talking about it— development, the measurements. That was his way. He was a qualitative man; so am I. So I have a certain bias here, so let me make it clear.

One more point I wish to make very quickly. How many of you are familiar with the name Garth Jones? He died very recently in his 90s. Duke University published in the 1960s volumes on this development business. Garth Jones was the director of AID in Pakistan and Indonesia. Knowing development firsthand, he savaged these books. He said "This is nonsense. You're talking Mickey Mouse stuff in terms of development. Go to the field. The story there is completely different than what you are writing about." I wrote in one article that Garth thus was a "contrarian." Then, as it was being published, I was a little worried because my good friend Garth may not like it. But Garth called me and said, "Krishna, you put your finger on my heart. I am a very contrarian." So I would keep development and international/comparative separate.

As a footnote to the concepts of "culture" and "context", it must be noted that they are not altogether new. This is not to diminish the contribution of Fred Riggs, but only to show their ancestry, and universality. In fact, comparative administrative studies may be traced back to Aristotle who was supposed to have studied over 150 different constitutions. While searching for a job, Machiavelli traveled through several Italian cities. His advice in his *"Prince"* was informed by those studies, more so in his "*Discourses*". As to the emphasis on culture, one only need to note the admonition by Plato that States are not made of "oak and stock", but by men. Among modern writers, John M. Gaus wrote on comparative studies. But it was Fred Riggs who popularized and propagated these concepts.

Kim: Thank you. Thank you, Krishna. I am next going to turn to the topic of crisis, which we are going to go to Naim first and then Meghna. The Section on International and Comparative Administration was ASPA's first section. And this was in 1973. And in 1973, at least in the United States, we had the OPEC oil crisis, which was not simply a U.S. crisis, it was a global crisis. Around then, we had our discussions about Watergate, potentially the impeachment later of Nixon. We had Vietnam protests. We had discussions about women and race. But today, the crisis looks similar but also different. So, in today's sort of environment, is there an increased constancy of crisis, whether it is health, the environment, national security, social inequity, or artificial intelligence? And then most importantly, how does this relate to comparative public administration? Naim, please.

Naim: Thank you, Kim. Yes, I like to highlight that real quick. I am trying to manage time here. And I will go to the other topic, which is also one of my main areas. But the context: I know something about Turkey, my home country, I know something about the U.S. I have been in this country about 30 years. I visited Eastern Europe and other places. The most critical example is Australia. I got the Fulbright Distinguished Chair Position to visit for five months. And that was during COVID. And the State Department got back to me. The country is open. You have to go within two weeks. I did not have too much time to prepare. I sent an email to Kim, you know, you have been in Australia, any recommendations in terms of local knowledge, the people. And of course, Andrew Podger was one of my hosts. I had lots of conversations. It took a month for me to understand what SES (State Emergency Services) is. You know, it is emergency management. Is it a bureaucracy? Is this something else? I talked to one of the persons, the only person in South Australia with certified emergency management credential. I said, what is this SES? He responded, SES is CERT (Community Emergency Response Team) in the US. It clicked. You know, having this understanding, the local perspective, it makes a huge difference for us too, again, similar names but completely different perspectives and meaning. And of course, I was thinking, "Oh, this is wonderful". I'm going from one federal government to another. My job is going to be very easy. I was completely wrong. I can spend two hours on this, but we do not have time. Back to the other question, my dissertation in 2003 was on crisis coordination in response to 9/11. And I moved to Orlando in 2003. I said, I am not going to touch this emergency management topic anymore. Then we had hurricanes, disaster after disaster, terrorist events globally, unfortunately. I have done a lot of research in this area. I was not able to get away from researching emergencies and crises. And of course, we all went through COVID. And everybody experienced it. And everybody becomes an expert in emergency and crisis management. And that became a new normal for public administration, for public policy. And I have been invited to many places like Japan, China, and recently Australia,

and Kazakhstan, not because of what I do in public administration, but mostly because of what I have done in emergency and crisis management, which is 30% to 40% of my scholarship and research. But I think what is critical in here is that we need to integrate not because what we have seen during COVID, what we have seen because of 9/11, Katrina, or so many other disasters around the world. But this is the quintessential role of government. How can we integrate both teaching and research, so people will understand? Not everyone needs to be an expert in emergency crisis management. But the way I approach it, it is part of our scholarship, regardless what we do, policy, performance, networks. That needs to be part of our scholarship. But I think that needs to be integrated. So we prepare a next generation of scholars, as well as practitioners, addressing critical issues, when the system is tested at every level.

Kim: Thank you, Naim.
Meghna, the same question that you chose as well. Crisis integration and to compare to PA.

Meghna: Definitely, I think crises that happen in any part of the world now can have ripple effects and can impact everyone. COVID being the latest crisis. We had the 2008 financial crisis. And that had a ripple effect around the world, maybe in some countries more than the others. But now with technology and the internet, anything that happens in one part of the world can resonate across countries very quickly. Think about the Black Lives movement. That resonated with many parts of the world, including India, including Latin America and Africa. And so I think that we are no more living in isolation, in this day of technology. When COVID happened, we had a similar crisis 100 years ago. But that probably did not have that kind of effect. The amount of scholarships that have come out, amount of special issues we have seen on COVID and still ongoing, I think. Think about the climate crisis. What happens in, say, India or Bangladesh or Pakistan, the floods, for instance, the South Asian floods, Australian wildfires, right? While what I would like to emphasize is that despite the differences in these events, they are happening in different parts of the world, but there is a common feature there. These crises transcend national boundaries. So no more can I say it is just their problem. I do not have to deal with it. So we all are in it together. It is our planet here. So, I think we are in a very interconnected world, and if the challenges are interconnected, the solutions have to be interconnected too. And those working toward these solutions also need to be interconnected. I cannot just sit here as a public administrator; I have to work with policymakers, I have to work with the community, nonprofits, and citizens. I need to take a real, network governance approach, as you say, Naim, a holistic approach to counter these challenges. So, I would say yes. As they say, think globally, act locally. And that's very, very important in this context because local actions can have global implications and vice versa. So we have to keep thinking about all these challenges and how do we collectively foster the knowledge and create these resilient systems that then are, in a way that all countries can come together and work towards. Otherwise it is going to impact us all.

Kim: Great, continuing with this trend, Edgar, what are the links between migration and comparative and development administration?

Edgar: Yeah, absolutely. There is a direct link. So, these crises often create this flow of migrants going through developed, sometimes developing countries. And I think it is creating two challenges. One is for the practice to understand and have cultural competencies for serving the

people and for serving another kind of, or for serving citizens, residents, or people with different ways of thinking about life. So that is one thing, and I believe that we are doing that, at least trying to move in that direction. But the other is the polarization and nationalism that are emerging again in many countries that have experienced this. And that creates an important challenge for the practice because now practitioners and public servants will have these different constituents to serve. And I think we need to pay attention to how to train public servants to navigate better these polarized environments. - Thank you.

Kim: The next question is for Jeanne-Marie and Naim. And thinking about this presidential panel, which voices, global voices are not being heard here?

Jeanne-Marie: Well, I think that by definition, it is really difficult to find those voices that are not currently being heard. That means that if we imagine a public service that is going to be for everyone, the bureaucracies need to use extraordinary methods to find people who are not currently being heard. In the year 2000, I helped organize a UN-UNDP Conference called "Governance for All". What we meant by that was, "How do you get to the last person who has not been served?" And, more recently with respect to the Sustainable Development Goals, one of the key issues is to "leave no one behind". That means, again, look for that last person that your program should be serving in order to say that you are really serving the country. In a panel yesterday, I heard something extraordinary that is completely relevant here. A researcher in Ghana notices that one part of the focal city was not in the city plan. And this part of the city was literally "off limits"; the police did not go there; service providers did not go there. The people in that portion of the city did not exist. The team's research methodology required them to enter all parts of the city. This research intervention led to engagement of the area with the government and its services. I think that the main lesson is that many of our public administrators, as well as our research scholars, need to make extraordinary efforts to reach those voices that have not been heard.

Kim: Thank you, Jeanne-Marie. Naim, how would you address this?

Naim: Thank you. Just following up on what Jeanne-Marie said, I think it is because of the theme of this year's conference, we have really seen a lot of different types of communities that are actually addressed and presented at the conference. As a conference chair, I have been in so many panels, and the public service recognition panels, we have heard a lot of disabled communities and under-served communities. I think the relevance to community resilience and community building made a substantial difference in terms of the way the points you have been highlighting. But I think for the global voices, I would really like to see more from Africa. I would really like to see more from Central Asia and Turkey. Probably more Central/South America too. And ASPA is global, we have seen a lot of Chinese, a lot of Korean, and some from Europe, too. But the other point, we cannot simply expect them to come here, we need to go visit their places. How can we utilize the Fulbright program, the state department programs, other funding opportunities, sabbatical opportunities, to go and be in those countries and learn about and learn from them and be part of this global community? Not necessarily they come and visit us, we go visit them and they will have these international exchanges. I just visited Kazakhstan as I mentioned briefly. The Astana Civil Service Hub came here to ASPA Conference. What did they do in their regional collaboration civil service reform? Amazing, I

think. We need to hear more from them. They come and present, but we can also visit and do some research collaborating with them as well.

Kim: Okay, so we're running out of time, at nine O'clock I want to turn to questions from the audience. With the panel's permission, I am going to have two questions, and we are going to do it very rapid fire. Only a few words, Okay? And the first question: You can choose which one or both that you want to do. What are the two biggest challenges or one challenge facing comparative and development public administration today? And then secondly, what challenges will face us in our next 50 years? So I am just going to go left to right. Some of you chose these questions, some of you did not. But given that we are short on time, we cannot get to everything. I ask for permission that we do these last two. So challenges today, challenges in 50 years. Meghna and then Jeane-Marie.

Meghna: Okay, sitting next to Kim has advantages or disadvantages. Two challenges currently, I thought about it. One is just the wicked nature of these problems, we were talking about the crisis and how interconnected they are, yet we are working in our silos. As a discipline, as governments, as cities, whatever we may, I think we are in our silos. So that is the big problem, because if you think about immigration, if you think about water crisis, food insecurity, migration issues, health issues, emergency issues, all of these are so interconnected. So that is one thing I think we need, really a global thinking of how to come collaboratively to work on these. The second challenge I think is adapting these traditional models. I feel of course, like we were talking about, Krishna was saying, most of the textbooks, most of the models, most of the research is coming out from America or the West. Now just taking these and just copy pasting it in different contexts does not work. Your work, you presented on say, social equity. What does social equity mean in different contexts, in different parts of the world? It is not just limited to RJR, as you say, Rawls and Rousseau and John Locke; it goes way beyond that, right? If you think about cultures, as even Krishna said, go back to Kautilya's *Arthashastra.* They were talking about administrative reforms. The Egyptians were building these big structures. A merit system goes back to Confucius, 300 BC. So in that sense, I think again, rethinking, maybe I would give a metaphor about food. There are some old, well-tested recipes we like from our grandma and others and we want to keep using it, but some recipes are like, ah, we need to change these. We need to spice it up or we need, our palate has changed or just enlarged, the world menu has changed, right? So that I think we need to think about what is that menu? How do we change that? Because again, I think some things work, some may not, especially in the context.

Kim: Thank you. So down the line now, Jeanne-Marie.

Jeanne-Marie: I think two things need to be strengthened right now. First, strengthening state capacity is very important. We need to have governments do what people are expecting them to do. But at the same time, we need to strengthen citizen engagement, so that there is adequate voice from civil society. So I suggest strengthening both the state and citizen engagement. Both need to function well so that society does the right things, and does them well. The state and civil society often have a tense relationship, often attacking each other. Instead they need to nurture each other for a productive society. In the longer-term future, I think there are two issues we have to pay attention to that threaten the ability of our citizens and our governments to flourish.

One is the issue of the environment. The other is the issue of corruption. Corruption threatens both the state and society. The environment threatens our futures. So those are my quick ideas.

Kim: Okay, again, on the quick, Krishna, any ideas?

Krishna: Well, I see a conflict between two ways of thinking. One is a global village that we are all familiar with. And the other one is the populist, nationalist, to the point of being fascist. This conflict has consequences for the scholar and for research. For example, recently, a lady by the name Nitasha Kaul, a Professor at the University of Westminster, was invited to a conference by a State government in India, Karnataka— a State controlled by the Congress Party, opposed to the federal BJP government. She landed in Bengaluru (formerly Bangalore) Kempegowda International Airport. Despite the invitation of the government of the State, the immigration authorities said, "You can't go in." And she was put on the next flight back to England. That is all because of the conflict between the federal and State governments. She was not given any reason, besides stating that the central government, which controls immigration, does not want her in. Moreover, she was a Kashmiri who wrote against BJP policies in the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which was actually broken up into two Union Territories, enabling the federal government more control. That is one consequence here. The second consequence is self-censoring. Now, you would like to get funding for your research. You want to flourish as a scholar. Then if you are going to argue against the current regime, whatever party it is, then you are in trouble because you do not have much funding coming in. So we are prone to self-censoring. I had gone through it myself; I will say, *mea culpa*. Two examples I will give. In 2006, Modi government demonetized all higher denomination currencies overnight. I landed in Delhi just then, and wanted to exchange dollars into Indian Rupees. The fellow at the bank in the airport said that he could provide only 24,000 Rupees worth. Given inflation, that is a paltry sum. You can imagine my struggle, initially. I was to give a lecture in one University in North India. And as I was being led to the lecture hall, the host catches my hand and suggests that I refrain from commenting upon demonetization. I agreed, because he was a friend, and the University depends upon lots of grants from the government, via the University Grants Commission (UGC). And I was very guarded, but in the Question and Answer session somebody really asked what I thought of demonetization. I blurted out that it was a “disaster”. But then I had to step back. I got out of the situation by stating that it was devastating to me because I was allowed only 24,000 Rupees in the airport to cover my own expenses. Self-censoring. So these are the issues here, and the conflict. But Fred provided a way out, let me say; he had the concept of glocalization. Think globally, but act locally. So there! A conflict can be resolved to an extent, but the conflict is real. The more and more the leaders are populist, the less and less the tolerance for the opposing views, and that is where I think one needs gumption. Stand up, show some spine. I was denied funding in India a few times by the Indian Council of Social Science Research, which initially was very generous. In any case, I was advised as a foreigner I was not eligible for any support. This is the conflict, as I see.

Kim: Real quickly to Edgar and Naim, please, go ahead. - Three sentences.

Edgar: Keeping the relevance of the knowledge that we produce. I mean, we need students and we need resources, right? We need students who want to take a course in comparative public administration. So why students want to take a course? What can they learn? What can they get

from that? We need also to bring resources, to bring students, we need to be relevant. And as I mentioned, it is particularly complicated in a world polarized and where nationalism is growing. So this relevance is something that, it is a current issue and will be in the future.

Naim: Just to follow up this relevance, I think, how can we keep foundational issues, theories and concepts and methods, and still address some of the current topics? So students want to study crises. In what context, right? I mentioned this is the role of government. That is why we want to study, not because it is a hot topic. We want to study artificial intelligence. Why? Because it is important for government capacity and performance. It is important for democratic governance. We need to keep those fundamental elements in mind, when we address the current challenges as well as opportunities.

Kim: Thank you. So now I want to open up to questions from the audience. I have some help with the mic. Why do not we take three questions at the start. If you want a specific person, please say their name. Can we just start left to right? Start with Peter in the back, and then Sabina, and then we can go from there.

Audience Question from Peter: Thank you, Kim. We are talking about SICA at 50, so the international in SICA, what exactly do we mean by international? I know your own work, Kim, you have addressed that issue. And I know your panelists have addressed in various ways what they understand by the international. But as I look at the panelists, I think somehow I see Africa is not represented somehow. Yesterday I attended another Presidential Panel. Somehow Africa was not represented. They made reference to African countries, to be sure, just like what you have done. So it is the international consciousness that we probably need to be thinking more about, or, otherwise we have to think more about our own thinking?

Kim: Thank you, Peter. - Thank you. – We are going to take three questions, and then I will look the panel's feet. So Sebina, I think you're next.

Audience Question from Sebina: Okay, thank you very much. Very interesting panel. I have a slightly similar question. It is about the comparative in SICA. So it is a two-part question, I hope it is OK. One question is what do you think are, let us say, avenue opportunities and needs for theory building in comparative public administration? Which theories do we rely on? Which theories do we need to do more actual comparative work as opposed to kind of a collection of, you know, let us say vignettes or information from different countries. And the second question, I am not sure if this is the management equivalent of that, but I am a little bit curious if you have thoughts about the relationship between SICA and the many regional and international sections in ASPA. Are there any thoughts or plans on how to bring them together, work together, how does SICA relate to these sessions? Thank you.

Kim: There was another question somewhere here in the middle. This young lady here, sorry.

Audience Question: Yeah, I study donor advised funds and what it means for American democracy. And I have been sort of alarmed to see that donor advised funds are spreading. In the last five years, they spread to South Africa, but there is nothing that has been published and

nobody has written news articles, nothing. And so I have been like cold calling universities and emailing people saying, who should I be talking to? What private conversations am I not privy to? How do I partner with somebody locally? And how do I get someone to say "Oh, this is important and alarming that it is spread here, and what does it mean for your democracy?" So the question is, how do you, who does not already have relationships, build those if that makes sense? So how do I start being a comparative scholar when that was not originally my intention?

Kim: OK. We have a series of questions here on, what do we mean by international in SICA? What are the avenues for theory building and public administration? If you do not mind I will take the question on SICA and the different sections, and then how do we start building our relationships internationally? So, anyone want to sort of start volunteering themselves for one of those questions?

Naim: Just quickly, so I do not think we need theory necessarily, we need research programs. So that is what we need, to create a research program. And that ties to this point of how do we start a research program? You are in the right place. So go to the panel, find people from other countries doing similar things that would do that or have similar interests and just talk to them, that is it. Just a follow up. I think this is relevant for all of us. Take initiatives. If you see something is missing, take the initiative. No one will stop you doing this. When I came to US to graduate school at the University of Pittsburgh, you all probably know Jay Shafritz, they have a comparative public policy book. And there was nothing from region in like Ottoman, the history and Turkey and some other places. I told Jay. I was taking one of his classes. There is nothing from that region. He said that he did not know anyone. "Can you write something next time?" So take initiative if something is missing, organize a panel, and bring people together. So again, I think this is an open community. Take some initiatives, in terms of publications and books and research programs, and you will really find the strong support for all of you.

I would like to add to Sabina's question on theory. It is interesting you mentioned that because I was collaborating with a scholar in the Caribbean. And there is not much research we have seen from the Caribbean and the small island nations. And so we said, let us do something on public service motivation. Again, everybody has been talking about PSM. It has been replicated in so many parts of the world. But when we ran the models there, we found opposite results. Those with high motivations actually wanted to leave the government! There was high turnover. We are like, what is going on here? But to publish that piece, just like Edgar was saying, we have to justify so many. Who is interested in your Caribbean small 200 sample or 300 sample, right? That thinking has to change. And that is how we do that work. Another quick example I will give. I just recently did an article, a book chapter, actually, in a book on comparative teaching pedagogies. The idea was not to do comparative national things or international. It was more kind of local. But we ended up-- Jyoti is here-- my doctoral student. And some professors from India contacted me on LinkedIn. She was looking to do a project. And I said, would you be interested to do this? It came at that time. And I never met that professor. But three of us got together, and we wrote a chapter on how truly comparative social equity is taught in the US, and what does social equity mean in India. They do not even use that word. It is social justice, mostly. And then we talked about pedagogies and things. So that was a great learning experience for the two of us. And of course, Sunana, the professor, learned there. So I think these

opportunities come. We have to take it. And then as scholars, that is our job. I do not know if I answered your question.

Kim: But let me just give an unsatisfactory answer on how we work together. We need to remember that SICA is 50 years old, and I would say only in the last seven years, have we had these other sections (from other parts of the world) and not even seven years for many of them. And so the second thing I would say is that we are all running on volunteer labor. And at least for SICA, the Chair does a two-year term. And it is largely focused around the conference and a few events per year. Same thing with SAPA. They have an annual symposium. It was a wonderful symposium, the Africa section, on Friday of this week.

But we also have scheduling difficulties. So the SAPA symposium is at the same time as the SICA symposium. And I am like, what? The SICA board meeting was at the same time as the International Chapter meeting. And the SASPA meeting. And so we have such great internationalism compared to, say, 2005, when we were meeting in Jeanne-Marie's hotel room because we did not have space to have these conversations, like five of us, right, going maybe this thing can survive? So this is a good problem to have.

ASPA has had an international director in the past. But only in the last cycle was this International Director elected exclusively by the International Chapter. And to be a part of the International Chapter, you have to be like me, you have to be working abroad and not have a US address. And so you have a lot of factors going on.

We had an international assembly yesterday with the international director. And there is a lot of moving parts on volunteer labor. It is a good problem to have. And it is really, I think, up to either the international director or the chapter-- not to put Andrew Podger on the spot, but-- or the section leaders to kind of work together if they wish in advance of ASPA conferences.

Kim: Krishna, you wanted to say something?

Krishna: I would like to pick up on the question of theory. The caution here is not to think of high-theory building that is something universally applicable. I fall back again on Fred who said there is no consensus in terms of what we should be doing, what type of theory building and whatever it is. He used the other term— there can only be "dissensus". So again, the point I was making about context and culture. So do not go into the theory building thinking that there will be a universally acceptable theory, because it might lead to hegemony and all sorts of other issues. Think of the world. But think of you first. Make the connection – the local connection, again, as Fred was talking about. We have been friends for a long, long time. I live in his shadow, so to speak. I am not willing to accept any universal theory.

Kim: It is not just making the collaborations— actively listening. I think Americans do in general a bad job at listening. And we need to listen more and just stop talking and let the other person tell us about their context. But I could be biased. So, I am left-handed. I will now go to the right-hand side of the room. Andrew, you had a question? By the way, he is the head of the International Chapter, and a former civil service commissioner equivalent in Australia.

Andrew Podger: Really was more a comment— and maybe, Kim, you could respond. I think the panel has been excellent and very enjoyable. But what hit me more than anything else was this issue of context and the distinction between international and national activities. And I think what's important for all of us is while we want to have a lot more international interaction, we need to be encouraging national groups, national institutes, national journals, which can allow each country to talk about themselves. And we can learn from them. I can remember somebody saying that to learn from, you need to learn about. You have to learn about first before you can learn from. So this context issue, I think, was to me the big message that came out here.

Kim: Yes. Thank you. Aroon. You had a question. Aroon Manoharan is the Chair of SICA. Please mob him afterwards with all your ideas. Thank you.

Aroon: Thank you again, Kim. And thank you everybody for the great panel. I want to ask about a couple of things, actually. One thing is about "development". I just want to know everybody's thoughts on that, how Fred Riggs started. Even earlier, we called countries developing, developed. You are already setting an expectation. And many of the developing countries actually were pre-colonial countries. So sometimes, as soon as they became pre-colonial administration, you are just setting a marker and saying, "Oh, you are developing." So that always had to wish we could have really looked at it. So wanted to know everybody's thoughts. And also, Edgar's point on the journals. I have also experienced sometimes when you have cases from the global south, you need to have to give— and is that something that we can address in the departments? Even if you look at it like the tenure process, and the vigor that is needed. What can we do from a department that we can address that?

Kim: You can address specifically, and then we can go to the others.

Edgar: By department you mean the one that needs one work, or something like that? Yeah, in the department. So when you are setting tenure requirements and all that, the expectations and all that. Is there something that we can start from there? OK, yeah. I think it is important for the leadership in our schools to understand the difficulties and complications of publishing comparative and international. I absolutely agree. I will not know how to talk to my dean and explain that. And not because he is not open. They are recording, right? He is a great dean. He is a spectacular dean. He is fantastic. No, it is because I do not know exactly what it takes. But the other— it is something that Meghna said. Editors need to be more open and sensible to cases in developing regions, I am going to put it like that. And how we can learn from them, and why we do not need to explain what that is relevant as much as— yeah, I will leave it there. I go back to your point. I am in a school, which is School of Economic Political Policy Sciences. It is not just that they have criminologists, and they have other disciplines. And the tenure is held at the school, not at the program level. So now everybody gets to vote on your case. And that is then encumbered upon somebody going up for, say, PA program, to then the ad hoc committee chair to really go and explain to all these colleagues why this work is important and relevant. It is a battle. But the economists in the room may feel like, ah, this is not— you know, it is good enough, or the political scientists have these terms. Although it is not— they only think of J-PAE and PAR. Those are the only two journals they know. So, if it is not in those, it is not good enough. So, we have had to consistently educate our faculty and keep pushing it. No, this is great

stuff. It is PAD, or is it— you know, an IJP or any GM, any other journal, it is all good work. Can I also train them, but not train them. You have to train them.

Naim: Educate them. Educate them.

Edgar: Yes, educate them.

Kim: Thank you, Edgar and Naim. All right. So one last small comment, because we are over time. And I want to be responsible.

Krishna: I will go back to the idea of developing and developed here. The distinction is I do not like that. Because when you say developed and developing, you are implicitly saying some countries have already reached *nirvana*, reached the top of development; they do not need any more development. All I am saying is that all countries are in it, on a continuum, going from A to B. There is no country which is, again, the A or a B or a C. So think of it as a continual process for each country, how they develop. It must be an on-going process. There is no end point here; that is what I am saying.

Naim: I would use capacity building instead of development. I think that is what we do in public administration. And it is not as loaded as developing, or underdeveloped.

Kim: Great, so on behalf of myself and Meghna, Jeanne-Marie, Krishna, Edgar, Naim, thank you very much for your time. Thank you all. I just want to quickly mention, since I have a captive audience, Aisha has a special issue in *Asian Journal of PA* on this topic of Global South. And so she has information. It is a special issue. Send your abstracts out. Thank you so much. Thank you, Aisha.

**With inputs from panelists, edited from conversational style and for clarity by Krishna K. Tummala, Past SICA Chair (1997-1998), and recipient of Fred Riggs Life-Time Achievement Award (2008).*