decision agenda are called the hidden cluster of policy actors. These include career public administrator; congressional staffers; and interest groups (interest groups, in Kingdon's analysis, are significant actors in both the visible and hidden and clusters).

Phases:- The policy stream moves from the formulation of a decision agenda to a "softening-up phase" in which "trial balloons" are released and a variety of suggestions are made both publicly and privately about how to resolve a particular problem. These ideas survive according to the criteria of whether they are technically feasible; whether they are acceptable to broad social values; and what future constraints- such as budgetary limitations and the prospects of political acceptance and public acquiescence- are anticipated by the actors in the policy stream. Unlike the political stream, consensus (or the "short list" of policy alternatives) is developed not by a bargaining process, but by the use of persuasion and rational argumentation among the participants in the policy stream. As in the political stream, however, a "bandwagon" or "tilt" effect occurs, and this happens when problems can be connected with alternatives solutions and the solutions themselves are not perceived as being "too new" or radical.

Windows and Agendas: when these three streams- problem, politics and policy- meet a public policy can result. Kingdon calls these convergences windows. Windows open when there is a shift in the national mood (usually indicated by transformative elections) or new popular perceptions. When the window opens and results in a restructuring of the governmental agenda, it could be solely the result of occurrences in either the problem stream or the political stream. But for a window to open that results in a restructuring of the decision agenda requires the joining of all three streams. In this latter case, the role of the policy entrepreneur is critical.

In many ways, the organized anarchy model is a very satisfying explanation of how public policy is made. It teases out the process's messiness, disjointedness, humanity, and luck.

The Rationalist Paradigm of Public Policy making and Implementation

Rationalism attempts to be the opposite of incrementalism . As an intellectual endeavor, rationalism tries to learn all the value preferences extant in a society, assign each value a relative weight discover all the policy alternatives available, Know all the consequence of each alternative, calculate how the selection of any one policy will affect the remaining alternatives in terms of opportunity costs, and ultimately select that policy alternative which is the most efficient in terms of the costs and benefits of social values.

Much of the rationalist paradigm deals with the construction of public policies that assure better policies. Yehezkel Dror (as good a representative as any of the rationalists) calls this concern metapolicy, or policy for policymaking procedures.

The rationalist approach offers a variety of intellectual directions. Most notably, it is concerned with the nature of public goods and services, the relationships between formal decision-making structures and human propensities for individual action and for collective action, the requisites of the constitutional government and corresponding patterns of collective action, the interstices between producers, performance, consumer interests, and the provision of public goods and service, and the broad implications of technological innovation.

Diagramed, the rationalist paradigm renders public policy formation into a linear flow chart, as figure -7 demonstrates. There are, of course, subsets, and these include the rational choice model, and the exclusion/consumption model.