

# Inventing a Private School of Public Policy

## An Essay on the Founding of the Hertie School of Governance

Hans N. Weiler





# **Inventing a Private School of Public Policy**

## An Essay on the Founding of the Hertie School of Governance

Hans N. Weiler

# Contents

<b>Preface</b> .....	5
<b>Introduction and Overview</b> .....	8
<b>Part I:</b>	
<b>The Chronicle of Founding a New University: 2000–2005</b> .....	11
<b>1. From a “Hertie Institute for European Integration”         to the “Hertie School of Governance”</b> .....	11
<b>2. Defining the New School’s Mission and Designing         Its Activities</b> .....	12
<b>3. Establishing the Hertie School: Institutional and Structural         Consolidation</b> .....	15
<b>Part II:</b>	
<b>Concepts, Profiles, and Discourses: The Founding of the Hertie School and Its Intellectual Coordinates</b> .....	17
<b>1. Overview</b> .....	17

<b>2. The Discourse on the Changing Nature of the Modern State and the Construct of Governance .....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3. The Central Dimensions of the Founding Concept .....</b>	<b>20</b>
3.1 The professional dimension: A “professional school” for the knowledge and training needs of public actors .....	20
3.2 The international dimension: Global challenges to governance from a European perspective .....	21
3.3 The private dimension: A private initiative for a public good .....	22
3.4 The normative dimension: Inquiring into the ethics of public policy .....	23
3.5 The interdisciplinary dimension: Collaborating across disciplines in a discipline-based world .....	24
3.6 The transsectoral dimension: The governance of different domains of public action – state, economy, civil society .....	25
3.7 The Berlin dimension: The interaction of local, national, and European politics at a special site .....	26
<b>4. Tensions, Controversies, and Open Questions .....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1 Public management, public policy, and governance .....	27
4.2 State and non-state actors in public policy .....	29
4.3 Schools of public policy: European and American models ..	30
4.4 The governance problems of a school of governance .....	31
<b>5. Looking Back and Looking Ahead .....</b>	<b>35</b>
5.1 A success story .....	36
5.2 The open secrets of success .....	37
5.3 Much remains to be done .....	41
<b>Endnotes .....</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>Acknowledgments .....</b>	<b>43</b>

*This text has been prepared as a companion piece to the more detailed German version of the essay on the founding of the Hertie School of Governance in Berlin. While the German version provides, in its first part, a much more detailed account of the pre-history and history of the School's founding, this English version concentrates on briefly summarizing this first part and presenting a more complete rendition of the original essay's second part, which focuses on the intellectual coordinates of the School's creation and on some of the major developments over the first decade of its operation.*

If you would like to receive a copy of the full German essay, you can order it from your local book store (ISBN 978-3-938732-03-8) or contact the Hertie School communications department at [pressooffice@hertie-school.org](mailto:pressooffice@hertie-school.org)

## Preface

Determining the age of an institution is not always as easy as it may seem. Should the starting point be the year when the first students filled the Hertie School of Governance with life, or should it be done as in China, where it is the number of years “lived,” that is to say, the years since the idea of a German school of public policy was first developed? Ultimately the choice fell on the year 2004, when the Hertie School offered the first seminars in its Executive program.

So the School is ten years old already—which is very young for a university institution, but still old enough to cast a first look back. The first courses in the Master of Public Policy program were taught in 2005 with a core of seven faculty members and 25 students. By now eight classes have earned degrees of Masters of Public Policy, and six those of Executive Masters of Public Management. The first students in the PhD program, which was launched in 2012, will earn their doctorate in 2015, and in 2015/16 the new Master’s program in International Affairs will be introduced. In other words, a public policy school was successfully established in a relatively short time that can hold its ground on a national as well as international level.

This remarkable success was not a matter of course. Especially during the School’s foundation phase, the endeavor was met with more than a little skepticism. So the Hertie School initiators’ willingness to take risks is surely worthy of note—especially the tremendous com-

mitment to the School on the part of its founder, the nonprofit Hertie Foundation. This commitment was unwavering, endowing the School with innovative qualities that have proven important and fitting.

What are these innovations? Most importantly, there are the three basic principles of the Hertie School, the “three I’s”: Interdisciplinarity, Intersectorality, and Internationality. They are most impressively revealed in its student body. Half of the students hail from abroad—from all over the world, in fact, and from the start to boot. They previously studied many different fields ranging from social sciences to physics and all the way to medicine, and later they will enter all three sectors: the public sector, private business, and the civil sector.

It is the core faculty, which by now has 20 members and in which seven nationalities are currently represented, that ensures the three I’s. As for interdisciplinarity, among the professors are representatives of political and administrative science, sociology, economics, and law.

In line with these principles, from the beginning the Hertie School set great store by being part of a good international network—one that includes the best public policy schools with an interdisciplinary outlook. Consequently, very early on the School included among its partners such institutions as the London School of Economics, Columbia University, and Sciences Po Paris, but also the German Federal Enterprise for International Cooperation (GIZ).

Despite the Hertie School’s international character, however, it must be pointed out that it is still firmly embedded in a German and European context. Consequently, it endeavors to research and teach a modern concept of governance from a European point of view. The School’s professors and students are to be found in Berlin and Brussels; but they are also present in the state capitals and municipal administrations. At the same time the Hertie School is no ivory tower. Practical relevance is actively pursued, whether in the form of mandatory student internships, the employment of practitioners as teachers, or in the context of many public events which are held at the Hertie School every year and have become an integral part of the culture of debate in Berlin.

After ten years, the Hertie School has outgrown its infancy and evolved into an established entity, with steadily growing numbers of students and a faculty whose research accomplishments hold their own



in an international comparison. In this situation, looking back on the past ten years is a pleasant undertaking on the one hand. On the other, however, it is also a necessity in order to learn from the past ten years how to gear up for the future and prepare the process of reflection on further innovations. We thank Hans Weiler, who played such a pivotal role during the foundation phase of the Hertie School of Governance, for looking back so prudently and intelligently. Reading this history of the foundation of a private university is both a pleasure and instructive. In any event, the next ten years will doubtless bring thrilling projects, more innovations, and new challenges. We look forward to continuing to accompany the development of the School!

Kurt Biedenkopf, first Chairman (2003–2009)  
and Honorary Chairman of the Board of Trustees (since 2009)

Michael Zürn, Founding Dean (2004–2009)  
and First Fellow (since 2009)

Helmut K. Anheier, Dean (2009–2014)  
and President & Dean (since 2014)

## Introduction and Overview

The founding of the Hertie School of Governance, from the earliest deliberations in 2000 through the opening of its Master of Public Policy Program in the fall of 2005, stands out in the recent history of German higher education as a rather remarkable and novel phenomenon. To begin with, it was (and remains) highly unusual in Germany that a private foundation—in this case, the Hertie Foundation—decided to establish, and fully fund, a university of its own. Furthermore, and also quite unusually, the Hertie School was to emulate the model—so far largely unknown in Germany—of a “professional school” designed to combine an applied orientation and an interdisciplinary form of scholarship to serve the knowledge and training needs of a key sector of public activity. And while the new School was to adopt some of the features of leading Anglo-American schools of public policy, such as the Kennedy School at Harvard, the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton, or the London School of Economics, it was to distinguish itself by both an explicit orientation to European problems and perspectives and a clear focus on questions of modern governance. This focus on the generic issues of governance was to allow the School to direct its attention to state as well as non-state, national as well as international actors, and to the decision-making arrangements of the public sector and the economy as well as civil society.

These different elements in the founding concept of the Hertie School make its creation an unusual and particularly noteworthy event in German higher education. It is this exceptional character of the new School that deserves and invites closer attention to the process through which it was conceived and established, and to the ideas and perspectives that went into defining its mission. Such a review of the School's "founding spirit" may also serve as a point of departure for looking at the trajectory of its development over the first decade of operation.

This review will have to start with charting the rather complex and multi-level chronology of events that led to the creation of the School and to the definition of its major conceptual and organizational parameters. Against the background of this history, it will then have to proceed to an intellectual mapping of the origins, contexts, significance, and interconnections of the constituent elements of the School's identity. These various elements—"private university," "professional school," "school of public policy," "governance"—must be seen within the context of contemporary scholarship and the policies and politics of higher education in Germany and beyond.

These initial elements have played a key role in shaping the early history of the Hertie School, but they have also been expanded upon as the School encountered, and tried to cope with, the realities of teaching and research in the domains of public policy and governance. This is how the School began to look at, among other things, the challenges of a transsectoral approach to the governance of public affairs, the difficulties of genuine interdisciplinarity in teaching and research, and at coming to terms with the increasingly salient and controversial normative aspects of public policy. As the School moved from conceptual blueprints to institutional reality, it also began to acquire a rather unmistakable Berlin identity in both reflecting and addressing the multiple intellectual, cultural, and political facets of this remarkable city.

This essay, commissioned by the Hertie School on the occasion of its tenth anniversary, attempts to chart the emergence of the School's identity over the period 2000 to 2005, and to view it in the context of the contemporary politics of higher education and the current processes of social and political change in Germany, Europe, and beyond. In the course of this process, different actors with different backgrounds and

(personal as well as institutional) interests sought to arrive at a common concept for this new institution while drawing on a variety of institutional models and experiences from both Germany and the international scholarly community; these precedents were carefully studied and assessed, further probed and, eventually, accepted or discarded. All of this occurred under the specific political, structural, financial, and cultural conditions of the early years of this century, which notably included a major expansion of the European Union and its attendant governance challenges. The process of planning the School was not made any less complex by the fact that the principal actors in this development had decided to subject the emerging set of ideas about the new institution to a rather broad and thorough process of international consultation and assessment, which in its turn led to an exponentially expanding influx of further ideas, exemplars, and admonitions.

Against the background of this chronicle of founding the Hertie School (which is laid out in much more detail in the German version of this essay), the analysis proceeds to yet another level, namely, to view the special identity of this new institution in the broader context of scholarly and political concerns with the analysis of public affairs. At this level, one can then begin to identify the specific role that this new School of Governance was expected to play within the overall concert of academic institutions devoted to the study of public policy, and to ask how the School has further shaped, and lived up to, its founding mission over the first decade of its operation.

## **Part I**

### The Chronicle of Founding a New University: 2000–2005

#### **1. From a “Hertie Institute for European Integration” to the “Hertie School of Governance”**

Deliberations within the Hertie Foundation on the creation of an institution in the general area of public affairs go back all the way to 2000, when plans for a “Hertie Institute for European Integration”—devoted to the administrative reform of the European Union in anticipation of its major expansion in 2004—were first discussed and later incorporated into the design for a new “European School of Management and Technology (ESMT)” on Berlin’s Schlossplatz. By the fall of 2002, the discussion had proceeded to the concept of a “Hertie Institute for Public Management,” designed to confront the new challenges for state action and to achieve “a new quality of public management in Europe.” At the same time, the importance of preparing new leadership became a powerful argument for the establishment of a “School” rather than an “Institute,” and for expanding the substantive claims of the new institution from the traditions of “public management” to the challenges of “governance” and “public policy.” Rather than locating this new institution inside a business school, it was decided in 2003 to create it as an entity in its own right; the result was, in late 2003, the formal founding of the Hertie School of Governance by the Hertie Foundation under its CEO, Michael Endres, with Kurt Biedenkopf as Chairman of the Board, Michael Zürn as the first Dean of the School, and Bernhard Lorentz as its first Managing Director.

## **2. Defining the New School's Mission and Designing Its Activities**

Important antecedents of the concept of the new institution had included Zürn's research at Bremen University on changes in the nature of the modern state and its governance and earlier plans of the ZEIT Foundation, developed in consultation with Ralf Dahrendorf, for a "Bucerius School of Governance" that the Foundation ultimately decided not to pursue. The Hertie School also owed a good deal of its original conception to the example of the major public policy schools in the United States and Great Britain (Kennedy School, Woodrow Wilson School, London School of Economics); it adopted the structural model of a "professional school" as particularly suitable to an academic institution with a pronounced applied interest and an interdisciplinary kind of scholarly agenda.

In the process of developing the specific profile of the Hertie School out of these different legacies, Kurt Biedenkopf's paper on the conception and academic mission of the Hertie School in the summer of 2003<sup>1</sup> emerged as a major point of departure for a wide-ranging discussion with a group of international experts and a planning retreat at Vollrads Castle in November of 2003. Biedenkopf identified major changes in the role and functioning of the modern state as a result of both globalization and profound changes in the relationship between state and society, and developed from this analysis ten theses on the governance challenges that the new School should address. The result

of the consultation that centered on the Biedenkopf paper and the Foundation's plans for the new School was a strong endorsement of both the need for such an institution and the major directions the School was to take, but also a significant refinement of the initial premises of the initiative. The conclusions drawn from this process were reflected in the "Mission Statement" of the School's first Dean<sup>2</sup>, which became an important blueprint for designing the structure and content of the new institution and its curricular, research, and personnel specifications. The key elements of the Statement were: good governance for all three sectors at the interface of national and international politics; multidisciplinary and problem orientation; applied scholarship and knowledge transfer; internationality; the European context; care in the selection and counseling of students; academic excellence; a distinguishable research profile; and strategic and academic partnerships.

In terms of its own governance, the initial group of the Foundation's advisers was consolidated into a Board of Trustees ("Kuratorium") in late 2003, which remained the principal supervisory organ for the School until a change of statutes provided for a separate Supervisory Board in early 2006 to more adequately reflect the Foundation's interests and responsibilities as the sole partner in the School's legal structure.

Early discussions about cooperation were held with the London School of Economics, the Institut d'études politiques de Paris (Sciences Po), and the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) at Columbia University; early cooperative arrangements in Berlin included the European School of Management and Technology (ESMT), the Social Science Center Berlin (WZB) and the Free University of Berlin (FUB) as well as a growing network of partners in the world of policy practice.

The newly created Hertie School presented itself to the interested academic and political public in a major symposium in April 2004 on "The Role of the State in the 21st Century," with the help of Gerhard Schröder, Kurt Biedenkopf, Roman Herzog, Ralf Dahrendorf, Otto Schily, Frank Vandenbroucke, Adrian Năstase, and others. The major themes for discussion—already anticipating an important part of the School's agenda—were: Transnational Security, European Integration, and Challenges of the Welfare State<sup>3</sup>.

Since the fall of 2003, and as a more concrete aspect of coming to terms with the School's mission, planning had started for the School's central instructional activity, the Master's Program in Public Policy (MPP); again with the help of outside expertise, the participation of prospective employers of the School's graduates, and a special international workshop in April of 2004, a major curriculum development effort was undertaken in order both to design the program of study and to identify the major competencies needed on the School's faculty. At the same time, a major effort was devoted to identifying, and informing about the new program, a potential pool of highly qualified student applicants from Germany as well as other countries in Europe and beyond.

The core competencies required by the instructional program were then translated into advertising the School's first nine professorial positions, which in the course of 2005 resulted in the recruitment of a founding faculty of nine distinguished international scholars (including a "Professor of Public Policy" with special affinities to policy practice) plus a number of adjunct faculty members. The success of this first round of faculty recruitment proved to be one of the major factors in the School's rapid and successful development.

At the same time, a network of connections to institutions of policy practice was being built up to obtain practical input into the School's executive education programs. Out of the first three Executive Seminars in the summer of 2004 emerged a process of instructional experimentation that eventually generated the Hertie School's "Executive Master of Public Management" program in 2008.



### **3. Establishing the Hertie School: Institutional and Structural Consolidation**

The Hertie School was formally founded in October of 2003 as a nonprofit limited liability company (gGmbH) with the Hertie Foundation as the sole partner, and with a financial commitment of the Foundation in the order of €25.6 million to support the School's budget for the first five or six years. The School's leadership was at hand for a public presentation of the Hertie School on December 2, 2003 at the ESMT campus on Schlossplatz 1, where the School had rented premises until its size required moving to new quarters on Friedrichstrasse in 2008. In order to be able to offer its Master of Public Policy degree program, the School had to be officially chartered by the state government of Berlin; the charter was granted on February 28, 2005.

Under the terms of the Articles of Partnership (“Gesellschaftervertrag”), and under the overall authority of the Foundation as the sole partner, the Board of Trustees assumed its responsibility as governing board for all decisions pertaining to the academic as well as administrative management of the School in the fall of 2003, with the Academic Director (Dean) and the Managing Director as Management. In due course, this governance structure was augmented by the appropriate arrangements for the academic governance of the School under German law. At the behest of the Foundation, the governance structure of the School was changed significantly in 2006, when a Supervisory Board (chaired by the Foundation's CEO) assumed responsibility for

all administrative, financial, and personnel matters, while the Board of Trustees retained overall responsibilities for the programmatic and academic affairs of the School in consultation with the appropriate bodies of the School's academic governance structure.

Thus, by the end of 2003, the original idea of a “Hertie Institute for European Integration” had progressed, over the three years since 2000, to that of a Hertie School of Governance with an explicit mandate to provide the insights and competencies for coping with the multiple challenges that the modern state faces. As a “professional school of public policy” with a European perspective, the initial conception—reflected in the “Mission Statement” of 2004—guided the first phase of the School's development; some adjustments in the strategy for implementing the concept resulted from another retreat in Neuhardenberg in 2007 and in connection with the two accreditations of the School by the German Council of Science and Humanities (“Wissenschaftsrat”) in 2008 and 2011 (for the right of granting doctoral degrees) and the recruitment of the School's second Dean, Helmut K. Anheier, in 2009. That history, however, needs to be written another time.

## **Part II**

# Concepts, Profiles, and Discourses: The Founding of the Hertie School and Its Intellectual Coordinates

## **1. Overview**

An important part of the founding history of the Hertie School were the concepts and ideas that have shaped the creation and initial development of this new institution. The purpose of this second part of the essay is to fit these ideas more systematically into a set of coordinates that reflects their origins, context, and significance and allows for a preliminary assessment of how these ideas have shaped the School's development.

As a first approximation, the discussions about the founding of the Hertie School were shaped by a set of categories which—in a variety of ways and with different weights—have come to make up the institutional identity of the School. These categories had to do with the School's

- professional dimension,
- international dimension,
- private dimension,
- normative dimension,
- interdisciplinary dimension,
- transsectoral dimension, and
- Berlin dimension.

All of these dimensions derive their significance, however, from the School's explicit mandate to deal with the profound changes in the role and governance of the modern state.

## **2. The Discourse on the Changing Nature of the Modern State and the Construct of Governance**

The common denominator of the discussions leading to the idea of the Hertie School was what by the beginning of that first decade of the new century had become a rather widespread perception of major changes in the role and complexion of the modern state. The early emphasis on the challenges of European integration and of the 2004 expansion of the European Union led to including in this focus the particular governance issues at the intersection of national and international decision processes and, more generally, the governance of multi-level systems. At the same time, the focus on “public management” reflected a growing concern with the fact that the changing relationship between state and society had serious implications for the qualifications and the training of the people involved in managing public affairs.

Two strands of argumentation on the changing role of the state stand out in these discussions: on the one hand, the growing embeddedness of the modern state in a complex web of transnational actors and contingencies that reflect globalized patterns of influence and interaction; and on the other hand, the emergence of a new set of relationships between the state, the economy, and civil society that requires different instruments of governance in order to cope with the complex new challenges that modern societies face. The Biedenkopf paper and the expert commentaries on it in the preparation of the Vollrads retreat of 2003 provide a rich documentation of that debate.

With the benefit of hindsight, it seems not surprising that these different elements of the initial discussions converged on the notion of “governance” as their conceptual center of gravity. This was facilitated by the fact that, by then, it was possible to rely on an as yet somewhat fluid, but informative body of scholarship on the modern state and its governance problems.

For arriving at workable terms of reference for the new School, the notion of governance had a number of distinct advantages. By being open for both national and subnational as well as international decision processes and at the same time for decisions by state as well as non-state actors, it was a suitable conceptual vehicle for the widest possible variety of modern forms of directions and decisions in complex societies. At the same time, “governance” would capture both the “external” dimension of setting and legitimating policy goals and the “internal” dimensions of administration and leadership in the managerial implementation of policy.

### **3. The Central Dimensions of the Founding Concept**

Against the background of this debate on the changing role of the state and its convergence on the central construct of governance, the various dimensions of the School's identity acquired meaning and complementarity, even though they were in actual fact implemented to somewhat varying degrees over time.

#### **3.1 The professional dimension:**

##### **A “professional school” for the knowledge and training needs of public actors**

The structural model of a “professional school,” designed to serve the specific training and knowledge needs of a given sector of societal activity (law, health, business, education), had already proven its utility within the higher education system of the United States and been successfully adapted to the domain of public policy as well. Given its greater affinity (compared to discipline-based academic departments) to the specific, problem-based knowledge needs of the domain it was to serve, an orientation to problem-defined and application-oriented as well as interdisciplinary knowledge came naturally to professional schools, as did a more intimate and open interaction with the operational realities of business, education, or public policy. While the model of a

professional school presented a structural novelty for German higher education at the time, it made eminently good sense for an institution like the Hertie School that was to bring the insights of several different disciplines to bear upon understanding and mastering the real-time problems in the governance of public affairs. A significant part of the effect that the founding of the Hertie School has had within the context of German higher education was to have demonstrated the utility and feasibility of such a “professional school” model. It is worth noting that, in the meantime, the model has seen some further experimentation in Germany not only in public policy, but in fields like business and education as well.

### **3.2 The international dimension:**

#### **Global challenges to governance from a European perspective**

One of the central and particularly rapid dimensions of change in the nature of the modern state has been the emergence of international structures and processes of decision-making within the framework of increasingly globalized economic, cultural, and political conditions. From the point of view of a school of governance, this opened up a whole new set of issues: the decisions of national governments were increasingly encumbered and conditioned by international and interstate agreements; international financial and trade markets had a growing influence on the politics of regulation and allocation (and vice versa); international governmental as well as nongovernmental organizations posed new and complex governance problems; internationally comparative analyses of governance issues were becoming more and more significant as tools for research as well as teaching; and then there were, of course, the specific governance challenges resulting from the growing integration of Europe. It was thus from the outset understood that this new School of Governance had to be “international” in orientation, but it was a matter of some debate and experimentation to determine exactly what that was supposed to mean. Some elements of internationality were easy and non-controversial: an international student body and faculty, English as the medium of instruction, the importance of international partner

institutions and networks. More difficult was the question of how to deal with international issues, actors, and institutions in the content of the School's training and research programs, how to deal with issues of governance outside and beyond the nation state, and how to develop a culture of public debate and interaction at the Hertie School that was truly international in scope and content.

In all of these respects, the Hertie School has succeeded in living up to, and exceeding, its initial claims; today, the School represents intellectually and socially a living international organism in the middle of Berlin, and the forthcoming program of a Master of International Affairs (MIA), which will enroll its first students in the fall of 2015 and focus on the governance of international organizations and multi-level systems, provides a logical further step along these lines.

These achievements notwithstanding, there is certainly room for further creative developments. The implications of modern technologies for the governance of international relations and security, the cross-national management of epidemics, and the future of international exchanges in education and cultural work are cases in point. Even more importantly, a truly outstanding School of Governance can ill afford not to devote a good deal more attention to the growing problems of failed and failing states in different regions of the world.

### **3.3 The private dimension:**

#### **A private initiative for a public good**

It was a particularly delicate and, especially in the German context, unusual idea to devote a private institution to the study of public affairs; most private initiatives in higher education had thus far centered—in the form of private business schools—on enhancing corporate management and profit generation. On closer inspection, however, this unusual initiative turned out to be rather fortunate; especially in a somewhat contentious field such as public policy, public universities often run the risk of getting entangled in assorted political and academic tensions, while the independence of a private institution tended to open up quite a few new options. This was true for rather tangible issues like not being



tied to the rather strict employment rules of the public service (thus allowing, for example, the recruitment of faculty on relatively flexible terms) and in handling international cooperation and the continuing adjustment of programs of study more flexibly. It also allowed the School to respond much more expeditiously to the emergence of new issues and themes such as the crisis of the euro.

It still is, however, an open and worthwhile question whether the Hertie School has made the best possible use of its institutional independence. The question needs to remain on the School's permanent agenda for self-assessment; it will have to be answered, however, in the context of the counter-question of how much a private institution can afford too much of a profile of its own in the midst of a system of higher education that is dominated by public institutions.

Altogether, however, one will have to consider the Hertie School as a successful and effective exemplar of the usefulness and feasibility of a private institution in as critical a field as public policy. Both its focus on the core construct of governance as a way of pulling together such a diverse field, and the way in which—as a professional school—it has brought together problem-orientation and an interdisciplinary approach to the study of public affairs have had a significant influence on the recent German discourse of a “more differentiated” system of higher education.

### **3.4 The normative dimension:**

#### **Inquiring into the ethics of public policy**

Given the controversial and value-laden nature of many of the issues in public policy, it is not surprising that some of the preliminary discussions of the School's mission include references to the need for addressing the normative issues in public policy, and to make the ethics of public policy a fairly central theme of both scholarly inquiry and professional training. Clearly, the ethical dilemmas in such issues as generational justice, sustainability, immigration, protection of privacy, or the evolving debates about the meaning of “citizenship” would provide ample occasion for such an approach. While one finds general

references to the importance of this dimension in programmatic statements of earlier and later years, concrete instances of including it in the School's programs of inquiry and training remain relatively scarce or at best implicit. The MPP program contains an elective field "Ethics and Democracy," and some of the School's public symposia have addressed important normative issues, but given the increasingly salient role that normative controversies play in public policy, one could well imagine the Hertie School adopting a much more explicit strategy for developing the ethics of public policy in terms of both programs and personnel.

### **3.5 The interdisciplinary dimension: Collaborating across disciplines in a discipline-based world**

Bringing the theoretical and methodological tools of different disciplines to bear on the understanding of real-world problems is one of the hallmarks of the professional school model, and a precondition for successfully dealing with the reality of public policy that does not yield to the analytical capacity of any one discipline. This much was clear from the start of planning the Hertie School; what was much less clear was how to achieve a high degree of interdisciplinary work in an academic world that, especially in Germany, continues to be structured and reproduced predominantly in disciplinary terms. It was relatively easy to agree on the disciplines that should form part of the Hertie School's core: political scientists, sociologists, economists, and scholars of law and of public administration were set, but already the relative weight and mixture of each disciplinary cohort was a matter of some controversy. In a discipline-based system, faculty recruitment had to proceed along lines of disciplinary reputation, but had to be held to the added task of ascertaining candidates' willingness and ability to engage in a context of intense interdisciplinary cooperation in both teaching and research.

It is quite remarkable that, in its initial recruitment efforts as well as later, the Hertie School was able to attract an impressive group of scholars that was not only fully recognized in their respective fields, but also proved capable of a substantial degree of cooperation across

disciplinary lines. Not being able, at least at the outset, to offer terms of employment comparable to tenured appointments at public universities made this task not exactly easier, but its achievement all the more noteworthy.

The established world of German academia continues to draw relatively narrow boundaries around experiments of this kind, however, and the absence of the kind of interdisciplinary tradition that is such a strong feature of professional schools in the U.S. does not help either. It was therefore not surprising that, in its two thorough (and, on the whole, rather favorable) evaluations of the Hertie School (in 2008 and 2011), the German Council of Science and Humanities made a point of criticizing the relatively weak “disciplinary bases” in the School’s work. Looking back at the evolution of the School, however, one has to come to the conclusion that both the analytical strengths of the participating disciplines and the perspectives opened up by cross-disciplinary collaboration have found a very hospitable home at the Hertie School, and have flourished to the advantage of research, teaching, and the public transfer of knowledge. As the “Bologna process” keeps maturing, one should also hope that—in due course—German graduates of Bachelor programs will have acquired a sufficiently solid disciplinary basis to be better prepared for interdisciplinary work at the Master’s level.

### **3.6 The transsectoral dimension:**

#### **The governance of different domains of public action—state, economy, civil society**

The emphasis on “governance” as the key element in the School’s identity only made sense within a perspective that cuts across the different sectors of public life—state, economy, civil society—and that made both the variations in governance across these sectors and problems of governance arising from the interaction of the sectors a central focus of inquiry. While this idea played an important role in many of the preparatory discussions and writings, its implementation became a matter of somewhat variant emphasis. In the initial phase of the School’s operation, the governance problems of the state—including interstate relations

as in the European Union—took center stage, with those of the business sector a somewhat distant second. The “third sector,” encompassing the structures of civil society and including nongovernmental as well as nonprofit organizations, did not find adequate attention until later. Having remedied this shortcoming was largely due to the influence and interests of the second Dean of the Hertie School, Helmut K. Anheier (2009–), whose own pioneering work on the governance problems of philanthropic organizations helped in advancing the significance of the third sector in the School’s scholarly agenda.

### **3.7 The Berlin dimension: The interaction of local, national, and European politics at a special site**

From the earliest discussions on, the choice of Berlin as the ideal location for the Hertie Foundation’s project was never in doubt; at one point in 2003, even the name of a “Berlin School of Governance” briefly surfaced, but was dropped in favor of a clearer identification with the School’s founder and sponsor. In its actual development, the Hertie School has developed a very interactive relationship with its Berlin environment. Among its principal academic partners are three of Berlin’s leading institutions of research and higher education; students in the School’s programs address Berlin-specific issues in their work; and in the School’s important role as a public forum for important current issues, Berlin topics and personalities feature prominently. The Hertie Foundation shares the School’s commitment to Berlin, as demonstrated in its support for two major studies of life in Berlin (2008 and 2014) on the basis of representative data. In sum, it is quite obvious how Berlin in its modern incarnation serves a School of Governance as an ideal laboratory, whose institutions reflect both the different levels of public life—local, national, international—and its different sectors—state, economy, civil society—in real time.

## **4. Tensions, Controversies, and Open Questions**

It would have been surprising if the discussions and deliberations that led to the creation of as new and unique an institution as the Hertie School had been without their share of tensions, fault lines, and conflicts. This was new and uncharted territory, the stakes were high, the issues both important and inherently controversial, the strategies for shaping and managing such an institution without much precedent. At the same time, one could well conclude that, given all of these imponderables, the founding history of the Hertie School has been remarkably straightforward; to be sure, there was quite a bit of friction, but other institutions did a lot worse. Be that as it may, however, it should be worth reflecting on where this history reveals tensions and controversies that may still linger in the School's inner fabric, and seeing where such tensions may hold, as they often do, the seeds for new and interesting developments in the School's further growth.

### **4.1 Public management, public policy, and governance**

One of the more persistent tensions in the genesis of the School had to do with the question of what its principal purpose was supposed to be. The scope of options was broad and varied; it ranged from a major early emphasis on the need to reform public service in Germany, through a

concern with the structural and managerial challenges of the European integration process and a more broadly conceived preoccupation with the full set of issues and political configurations on the agenda of public policy, all the way to a very specific and novel focus on governance as a directive and decision-oriented activity in all institutional contexts and sectors of public life. Different participants in the discussions tended to favor different elements of this agenda; at some point, the Hertie Foundation seemed to be particularly concerned with the need to modernize the structures and personnel of public administration in both Germany and the European institutions and to overcome the traditional monopoly of legal training for key positions in the public service. Other participants in the process, while sharing these concerns, saw a unique role for the new institution in further developing the notion of governance into a more encompassing and open-ended framework for the study of public policy; they found support for this perspective in the School's new leadership team (Biedenkopf, Zürn, Lorentz) and in the prior deliberations of the ZEIT Foundation.

This range of views has stayed with the Hertie School for at least some part of its early history. Renate Mayntz's insistence, at the Vollrads retreat of 2003, that the School should make up its mind as to whether it should deal with public policy or, as its name suggested, governance has not really been heeded in the actual development of the institution; for her, the significance of the governance concept lay in marking an explicit alternative to a conception of politics that relies solely on the superior directive capacities of the market. Similarly, the rather serious proposal made at Vollrads by George Sørensen that one of the first things the new School should do ought to be writing a book about "the dilemmas of governance" has remained unanswered. This is not meant to disregard the School's rich and varied scholarly contributions to specific aspects of governance over the years, including the chapters of the recent second volume of "The Governance Report" (2014); this volume deals with various facets of the relationship between administrative capacity and governance readiness and indeed reconnects, in so doing, some of the different strands of the earlier discussions on the difference between "public administration" and "governance." In this context it is significant that, once the School was granted the

right to award doctoral degrees in 2012, the new doctoral program was unequivocally devoted to research on governance.

This debate on the purposes and foci of the Hertie School has yet another dimension that has opened up different possible answers over time. Here the question is whether and to what degree certain domains of policy and their specific governance problems require an explicit role and place in the School's programmatic and personnel structure, or whether priority belongs to the generic study of governance issues that transcend specific policy areas. Conceptually, there are good reasons on either side of this argument; in practice, the question has over the years been apparently decided less on grounds of principle, but more as a function of both the availability of competent personnel and the macro-political trends of the times. Thus, within the School's faculty new centers of gravitation seem to have emerged around interests in specific policy areas, such as education and health, energy, economic and fiscal policy, communication, technology and infrastructure, democratization, European integration, to name but a few. This division of labor has certainly enriched the School's instructional programs; it has also at least opened up the possibility of pursuing the question—of great theoretical interest in governance research—of whether the specific content and issues of a policy domain require (and perhaps produce) their own configurations of governance. It is difficult to say how far the chance of this kind of meta-analysis has as yet been fully utilized at the Hertie School; it certainly belongs on the agenda of a distinguished School of Governance.

## **4.2 State and non-state actors in public policy**

From early on, the tenet that “governance” was not limited to the state and its agencies was one of the premises of the planning process and one of the advantages of the governance concept. There are needs and modes for directive action by the state as well as by other politically salient agents; every one of the three sectors of public life—state, economy, civil society—is in need of processes of direction and decision that are appropriate to their functions and tasks.

This rather explicit premise notwithstanding, the early history of the Hertie School has been marked by a rather strong focus on the institutions and activities of state (and interstate) authority and a relative neglect of non-state actors in the economy and civil society. Some exceptions could be noticed where, among other influences, the Hertie Foundation prompted some attention by the School to the governance problems of corporate actors.

A more systematic and intensive concern with the governance issues in civil society came about in connection with the initiatives undertaken by the School's second Dean, Helmut K. Anheier, in the context of his own scholarly interests in the organization of philanthropy and "cultural policy"; in a variety of ways, this has led to giving the notion of governance a broader and rather productive reach into the "third sector."

### **4.3 Schools of public policy: European and American models**

The Anglo-American models of Schools of Public Policy have without doubt played an important role in the discussions preceding the establishment of the Hertie School; many of the participants in these discussions knew them from personal experience, they were visited and consulted in the course of laying the groundwork for the Hertie School, and they provided many of the experts for evaluating the ideas for the new School. At the same time, their importance was always moderated by the desire to insert an identifiably "European" dimension into the Hertie School's profile and to have that profile also reflect some of the German intellectual traditions of analyzing public life and institutions.

Exactly what this was supposed to mean remained, and perhaps remains, a matter of some debate. There was no question but that the grand project of European integration was to be one of the School's priorities. Indeed, the School has—in teaching, research, and public debate—made a major contribution to this theme over the years; the "Dahrendorf Symposia" in cooperation with the London School of Economics and the Mercator Foundation and the "European Week" on the occasion of the School's tenth anniversary are but some of the more



prominent examples. As an important addition to the Hertie School's close affiliates, the recently inaugurated "Jacques Delors Institute—Berlin" under the direction of Henrik Enderlein promises to be another catalyst for the Hertie School's European agenda. By the same token, the configuration of the School's international cooperative network has a strong European core with the London School of Economics and the Institut d'études politiques de Paris (Sciences Po), in addition to their partner, the School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) of Columbia University.

With all due respect for these important achievements, however, the sharpening of an unmistakably European intellectual identity might well belong on the continuing agenda of the Hertie School. This may be particularly important with regard to cultivating a healthy diversity of intellectual and epistemological references for scholarly work on governance issues. The unmistakable and seemingly irresistible international homogenization of the social sciences makes such an effort fairly difficult, but at the same time even more indispensable.

#### **4.4 The governance problems of a school of governance**

There is something rather delicate and, quite possibly, frivolous about discussing the governance problems of a School of Governance. One should assume that an institution that is devoted to understanding and enhancing the structures and processes of making decisions should have few difficulties designing appropriate governance models for its own in-house use. Considering, however, that no topic commanded as much time and attention in the early years of the School as the governance of the institution itself, this assumption is rendered somewhat questionable.

In some respects, this is not really surprising. First of all, there is only a very limited (and mostly idiosyncratic) amount of experience with the governance and direction of private institutions of higher education in Germany; very little of what there is was germane to an institution such as the Hertie School. Furthermore, any new institution needs a certain degree of trial and error in the conception and design

of an appropriate set of governance arrangements; in the case of the Hertie School, however, the participants in the planning process had subjected themselves to an extremely ambitious schedule for launching the project, and the resulting time pressure left little room for leisurely reflection and experimentation with different governance models.

Beyond these general problems, however, the creation of the decision and supervisory structures for the Hertie School was shaped by the special nature of this project. In a structural sense, the potential areas of friction were twofold: on the one hand, in determining the concrete role of the founder and sponsor—the Hertie Foundation—in the School’s decision and direction processes, as exemplified by the creation of a separate Supervisory Board in 2006 and, on the other hand, in sorting out the respective relationships and responsibilities of the corporate organs prescribed by the Articles of Partnership (Partner, Board, Management) and those emanating from the legal norms pertaining to the organization of universities as academic institutions (Dean, Senate, Commissions).

The first of these points of friction played a fairly significant role in the early years of the School’s governance; it reached some solution, at least in a formal sense, through the revision of the Articles of Partnership in early 2006 and the separation of the functions of the Board of Trustees and those of the newly created Supervisory Board, which was controlled by the Foundation’s executive. While this did not entirely eliminate friction, it helped to moderate the tension between the interests of the Foundation in monitoring the development of its project and the interests of the Board in seeing the School achieve its academic goals and maintain the autonomy of its academic governance.

The second domain of potential friction arose between the corporate governance of the School (which followed the legal norms incorporated into the Articles of Partnership) and its academic governance, which was determined by German legislation on higher education and designed to preserve the autonomy of a university’s decision-making about its academic pursuits. In this regard, serious controversies remained the exception, especially during the early years, when the structures of academic governance were still *in statu nascendi*. It was one of the functions of the Board of Trustees, especially after the creation of a separate Supervisory Board, to mediate these kinds of

tensions, in particular with regard to academic personnel decisions, the qualitative and quantitative development of the MPP program, the admission and support of students, and the School's public relations. It should be noted that the (otherwise rather favorable) accreditation evaluations of the Hertie School by the German Council of Science and Humanities in both 2008 and 2011 still directed some critical attention to deficiencies in the participation of the Academic Senate in decisions on the School's development.

In a parallel to this coexistence of different legal frameworks in the governance of the Hertie School, the School's leaders had to assume—not always without difficulty—a dual function: that of “management” under the Articles of Partnership (where they occupy the role of academic and administrative director) and that of the heads of the School's academic hierarchy (as Dean, Associate Dean, and Head of Administration). While there is potential for friction in these kinds of arrangement, they seem not to have caused serious damage.

The result of this varied set of regulations and responsibilities was, in the end, a rather complex governance arrangement for a relatively small institution. Depending on one's position in these arrangements, one would either have to consider them remarkably—and perhaps surprisingly—effective or deplore them as a rather heavy burden on the conduct of the School's day-to-day affairs and its medium-term planning. Those conflicting perceptions have been, and continue to be, part of the School's institutional culture.

In the process of developing these governance arrangements, the one institution that underwent the most significant changes was the School's Board of Trustees, or “Kuratorium.” Having emerged out of an informal advisory body and having formally started out in 2003 as the principal decision-making and supervisory instrument for the School under the authority of the Foundation as the sole partner, it found itself acquiring two important new actors in the overall system of governance: the Supervisory Board established at the behest of the Foundation in 2006, and the gradually emerging system of academic governance inside the School around the Academic Senate and its commissions. While there were good and compelling reasons for these changes, they did quite significantly alter the role the Board played in the School's

development, and gave it, in addition to its remaining decision domains on academic matters, much more of an advisory function.

The fact that questions of the School's governance occupied so much time and energy in both the design stage and the actual operation of the Hertie School had much to do with the special and novel nature of this institution. It also reflects, however, the fact that the governance of academic institutions is still one of the most poorly understood aspects of higher education in Germany. Issues such as the definition and ramifications of universities' autonomy, the relationship between financing and governance in higher education, quality assurance as a matter of governance, the efficiency of leadership structures and the transparency of decision-making arrangements, the role of both the users of a university's "products" and of its graduates in the structures of governance—these and many other questions have so far largely escaped serious scholarly attention. At one point, around 2005–2006, some promising discussions were held at the Hertie School about making "the governance of science" into a more explicit priority for addressing the kinds of issues mentioned here; while the matter was not pursued at the time, the challenge remains, and still would be a worthy target of the School's inquiries.

## 5. Looking Back and Looking Ahead

The “Mission Statement” by the first Dean of the Hertie School, Michael Zürn, concluded in December of 2003 with a rather ambitious vision of what might become of this as yet rather modest seedling of a private university over the next ten years:

*Our institutional goal should be that, ten years from now, the name “Hertie School of Governance” stands for a place where German and international personnel is being prepared for leadership roles in serving the public realm, where we have reached the standards of our American peers in terms of scholarly excellence, commitment to solving problems, and international orientation, and where all this is rooted in the middle of Europe, with a commitment to a European order of values and perspectives and cognizant of the needs of the European labor market. Within a decade, we want to be known as a Professional School for Public Policy that matches the quality of the best international schools but has developed its own European profile. In the heart of Europe, the Hertie School of Governance should identifiably remain a European institution, but one whose intellectual energy is felt beyond Europe’s borders.<sup>4</sup>*

## 5.1 A success story

Looking back not only at the founding of the Hertie School, but at what it has accomplished over the first ten years of its operation, does appear amply to bear out Zürn's prognosis. The record is one of considerable success—in the School's scholarly reputation, in the quality of, and the demand for admission to, its instructional programs, in the professional achievements of its graduates, and in the School's role as a forum for a lively dialogue between scholarship and politics—speaking truth to power, as it were.

The School's scholarly reputation is reflected not only in the coveted right to award doctoral degrees, but also in the School's acceptance into its branch of the "scientific community" and as a full partner by that community's outstanding members—notably the London School of Economics, Sciences Po in Paris, and the School of International and Public Affairs of Columbia University. It is a remarkable achievement that the Hertie School was granted full membership in the prestigious "Global Public Policy Network" before it even reached the tender age of ten. This acceptance acknowledges the quality and productivity of the scholars working at the Hertie School, but also the coherence of its intellectual profile and the logic of its translation into the training and knowledge transfer activities of the School.

The Hertie School's instructional programs have earned a similarly favorable assessment in further developing the initial instructional concept of combining disciplinary, interdisciplinary, and problem-oriented components while maintaining the flexibility of constantly adjusting both its content and didactics and preserving the key role of a practical internship, the Master's Thesis project, and—for about a third of the MPP students now—a "dual degree" or other international component of their program.

What remains as a constant challenge is the balancing of high selectivity among applicants with the need to expand the size of the program and the efforts needed to provide appropriate professional placement for the growing number of graduates of the program. A consolidated Executive Master of Public Management and the introduction of a new Master of International Affairs seem to succeed in meeting the demand

for new and advanced professional training in a manner consistent with the School's basic mission.

Recalling the early criticisms of the School's work in the field of public relations and knowledge transfer, it is with some satisfaction that one can refer to the rather notable success of the School in this regard. The richness and caliber of the School's public events over any given period of time is nothing short of impressive; the newsletter for the summer of 2014 lists, among the participants in the School's programs, the likes of Wolfgang Schäuble, Mario Monti, George Papandreou, Volker Schlöndorff, Javier Solana, Angela Merkel, Cem Özdemir, Arianna Huffington, John Emerson, Norbert Röttgen, László Andor, Egon Bahr—to name but a few. What is at least as remarkable is the fact that this variety of events—as well as the presence of the School's scholars in the media—is clearly and recognizably related to the School's mission. That, incidentally, is true as well of the contribution that the School's students regularly make through their own journal *Schlossplatz*<sup>3</sup>—most recently with a special issue devoted to the theme of “sustainability.”

## 5.2 The open secrets of success

To conclude that the Hertie School largely succeeded in living up to the expectations of its founders is one thing. From the point of view of reflecting on the broader significance of this story for higher education, however, the more interesting question is the one about the secrets of this success, i.e., the factors that contributed to making the Hertie School such a widely respected institution for the study of public policy. The answers to this question should be useful not only for assessing the future development of the Hertie School, but also the chances of success for similar institutions in German higher education.

The review of the Hertie School's founding and early history in this essay provides a useful background for answering this question. The answer, in brief, points to the interaction between a solid, future-oriented concept, the active and generous support of the Hertie Foundation, a competent and motivated group of faculty and students, able and inspiring leadership, and excellent and supportive partner institutions.

All of these elements were needed, and all of them materialized with sufficient strength and durability.

As this essay has shown, the strength of the School's concept has a substantive and a structural side; in both respects, the concept was up to the task and at the forefront of important intellectual and organizational developments. Substantively, concentrating on the notion of governance was an important decision that provided analytical focus for dealing with the somewhat diffuse territory of public policy; it was the concept of governance that provided the common denominator for the various dimensions of the School's identity in that it both demanded and justified an approach that was international, interdisciplinary, intersectoral, and normatively alert. Institutionally, the model of a professional school was a perfect match for an institution that sought to bring together a problem-based conception of knowledge and the collaboration of different disciplines. The time was ripe for both elements of the School's concept: the scholarly discourse on governance had moved sufficiently far along, and the model of the professional school had proven itself.

The history of higher education in Germany and elsewhere provides plenty of examples that even the best of institutional concepts has little chance of success without dependable support and financing. Where, as in the case of private institutions, the state does not provide such backing, other sources of such support are needed. The Hertie School was most fortunate in that the Hertie Foundation had the courage, the foresight, and the resources to generously support both the School's founding and its further development. This is much to the credit of the Foundation's CEO at the time, Michael Endres, who accompanied the founding of the School with a great deal of critical attention and a mixture of skepticism and enthusiasm. Relations between sponsors and sponsored institutions are rarely easy, but in this case, and quite a few tensions notwithstanding, a strong commonality of purpose prevailed in the end.

One of the main concerns in the early discussions about the new School was whether it would be possible to attract a faculty that was both competent and willing to identify with the School's new and novel mission—and to do this without (at least at first) being able to offer the kinds of benefits that came with professorships at public universities.



It is one of the principal secrets of the School's success that it managed to do that, and that the faculty that was recruited demonstrated an exceptional degree of commitment to the development and success of "their" School. Centrifugal tendencies in professorial circles are a well-known phenomenon for many deans and university presidents; professors typically and understandably attach a great deal of importance to the priority of their own research interests over the common purposes of a department or a university. While the Hertie School was never entirely free of such tendencies, the convergence of energies and commitments for the benefit of the School's good was unusual and impressive; to maintain this convergence will be indispensable for the School's long-term success.

If the recruitment of the right kind of faculty was not easy, neither was the recruitment of the right kinds of students. It is probably true that a good part of the success of the Hertie School had to do with creating a market for its own instructional product, and it became a market that kept reproducing itself as it expanded through consecutive cohorts of students. The students' enthusiasm for what the School both offered and demanded was contagious, and the early success of the School's alumni work seems to suggest that lasting connections were formed. It will be very important to continue to pay close attention to the professional biographies of the School's graduates as a basis for ongoing adjustments in the curricular and practical components of the program and for the selection of applicants.

The care and competence of the School's leadership in its founding years and over the first decade of its operation rank as another indispensable element in the School's success. There are faces and names to this part of the story. The search for the School's first dean was facing the problem that the field of governance research was relatively new and had as yet produced only a few outstanding scholars. Michael Zürn was one of them, and it is to the credit of the Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin (WZB) and its president at the time, Jürgen Kocka, that it was possible to put together, with the help of the Hertie Foundation, a sufficiently attractive joint appointment and to compete successfully with an attractive competing offer. Zürn directed the founding of the Hertie School and the initial development of its academic reputation with exceptional

energy and skill. In finding his replacement, the School was similarly fortunate in that Helmut Anheier, coming as he did out of a different intellectual tradition and environment, was able both to continue the strengths of the School and to steer it into new directions of concern with the governance problems of non-state actors in civil society. Both Züri and Anheier have enjoyed the support of able and experienced administrators—from Bernhard Lorentz to Christiane Neumann, Sven Schütt and Anna Sophie Herken—and of an impressive cast of associate deans—Jobst Fiedler, Henrik Enderlein, and Gerhard Hammerschmid.

As a relatively small institution, the Hertie School was from the beginning dependent on congenial and supportive partners that were willing and able to contribute complementary competencies, experiences, and perspectives. Even before the actual founding of the School, the search for suitable partners was already underway; the involvement of a large group of distinguished international experts in the course of defining the School's mission paved the way to many such partnerships. As a result, the Hertie School has over the years assembled a concentric network of institutional partners, ranging from neighboring centers of scholarship in Berlin to the Global Public Policy Network. Without this set of partners, such successful developments as the growing number of “joint degrees” and “dual degrees” for the MPP program, the many cooperative research projects, jointly organized scholarly conferences such as the Dahrendorf Symposia, or the many public debates involving scholarship and politics would just not have been possible.

This catalogue of what it took to make the Hertie School into a success story would be incomplete without mentioning the many contributions, often rendered behind the scenes, by the School's and the Foundation's staff, the assistance provided by the higher education authorities of the Berlin state government, the critical but fundamentally supportive assessment by the German Council of Science and Humanities, and the growing circle of the School's sponsors and supporters.

### 5.3 Much remains to be done

By coming into being and over the ten years of its operation, the Hertie School has created a new model for the scholarly analysis of the governance problems of modern statehood, and has set new standards for pursuing this analysis in research, teaching, and knowledge transfer. Adopting the central concept of governance has allowed it to deal with problems in directing social processes both within and across specific policy domains, and to make the results of these analyses available for both its training programs and its program of public debate. The constantly growing complexity of political decision-making in all sectors of modern societies will continue to confront this work with increasingly important and difficult challenges in the years ahead.

At the same time, the Hertie School has gradually moved into areas where the modern state faces ever more serious deficiencies (as in the work of Alina Mungiu-Pippidi on corruption) or outright crises (as in Henrik Enderlein's work on the euro crisis or Mark Hallerberg's work on fiscal policy). There is every indication that serious threats to functioning state authority may well assume a much more important role in the work of a school of governance and will raise new questions about the legitimacy of state as well as non-state institutions and power relations. The "central normative achievements of the successful construction of the state" to which the School's initial Mission Statement of 2004 refers seem increasingly at risk from such developments as state-less, religiously or ethnically denominated extremist groups, the potential abuse of social networks, the effects of organized xenophobia, the self-referential aims of secret intelligence services, or the machinations of unstable banking systems.

Already, the Hertie School has started tracking some of these developments—as in a recent workshop devoted to the work of Peter Mair on the "hollowing" of democratic traditions, and on ways of countering it. It is quite possible, however, that the progressing threat to the functioning and the legitimacy of public action in many different political and social organizations will turn into an even greater challenge for a school of governance that has earned for itself the right to take the long view.

In other words: if the Hertie School didn't already exist, it should promptly be invented.

## Endnotes

- 1 Kurt Biedenkopf, "Notes on the conception and academic mission of the Hertie School of Governance" (HSoG Paper Series: Paper Number 1), Berlin: Hertie School of Governance, n.d. (2004)
- 2 Michael Zürn, "Mission Statement of the Academic Director of the Hertie School of Governance" (HSoG Paper Series: Paper Number 2), Berlin: Hertie School of Governance, n.d. (2004).
- 3 Hertie School of Governance (ed.), *Die Rolle des Staates im 21. Jahrhundert – The Role of the State in the 21st Century*. Berlin: HSoG Publishing, 2005.
- 4 Zürn, *Mission Statement* (2004), op. cit.

## Acknowledgments

Writing a history that one has participated in shaping is not without risk. The advantage is that one knows the history rather well; after all, one was part of it. The disadvantage is, of course, that in the process of bringing about the events that make up the history, one invariably has held views and advocated positions that may well, in retrospect, selectively affect one's perceptions and memory and move one's judgments and assessments in a certain direction.

In my work on this essay, I have done my best to maximize the utility of having been an active participant in the founding of the Hertie School, and to minimize the danger of bringing a biased view to bear on dealing with its significance. In both respects, I was greatly helped by the fact that, over the years of my involvement, I was able to accumulate a fairly complete electronic and paper archive—which, except for some personal items, I intend to make available to the Hertie School at the conclusion of this project. Wherever in the course of my work some gaps emerged in my information, the wonderful staff of the Hertie School was always helpful in tracking down what I needed. I thank them profusely.

I have also tried to reduce the risk of having my own biases interfere unduly with my judgment by spending a great deal of time communicating with many of my fellow participants in the early history of the Hertie School in order to check my own recollections and

perceptions. This has often led me to reflect on, and reconsider, my own view of things. I owe all of them a great debt of gratitude for their time and good humor and for freely sharing of their own insights and reflections. Whatever remains in the way of errors of fact or judgment, however, is exclusively my fault.

Stanford, CA (USA), August 2014

Hans N. Weiler

## **Impressum**

Hans N. Weiler  
Die Erfindung einer privaten Hochschule  
für öffentliches Handeln  
Inventing a Private School of Public Policy

Herausgeber:  
Hertie School of Governance  
Friedrichstraße 180 | 10117 Berlin

Lektorat:  
Thomas Thornton | Berlin

Gestaltung:  
Christian Mathis | Berlin

Druck:  
trigger.medien.gmbh | Berlin

Printed in Germany 2014  
ISBN 978-3-938732-03-8

[www.hertie-school.org](http://www.hertie-school.org)

