CHAPTER – I
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

Democracy today is a growing consciousness for recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family. To achieve the fundamental freedom, justice and peace all over the world for all human beings, ensuring human rights through democratic governance has become essential. The constitutional principle of equality, liberty and fraternity is the pre-requisite for establishing a just democratic order, in which development of all without discrimination or oppression could thrive. Hence, social justice, democracy and development are inseparable.

Development is a multi-pronged effort which stands for transformation of society. All societies are subject to change but the societies of developing countries have immensity of tasks before them to complete for the development of their people. No doubt, the developed countries do provide developmental models but those cannot be substituted in developing countries like India. As the people in developing countries have different identities and purposes than those of the developed societies, therefore, these countries have to transform themselves by understanding various efforts like: strengthening the authority of central government, widening the range of public participation in political process and creating new opportunities and satisfying the people’s aspirations for upward mobility.\(^1\) It means that the role of government in initiating, implementing and sustaining development programmes is enormous one. To achieve these goals, there is a need for strengthening of self-governing institutions at the local level as their success strengthens the democracy in the country.

India has a long history of local governance, but it was Mahatma Gandhi who emphasized the role of Village Panchayats as an important instrument of rural development and socio-political transformation of the rural society. The State makes use of these Panchayati Raj Institutions for executing the rural
development programmes almost of all kinds. The involvement of these PRIs at the grass root level is mainly intended to ensure people’s participation in the development process of the rural areas of the country.

A historical examination of the evolution of Panchayati Raj Institutions reveals that the beginning of these institutions dates back to Rig Veda period i.e. 1200 B.C. There are also definite evidences available of the existence of village “Sabha” (Council of assemblies) and “gramins” (senior persons of the village) until about 600 B.C. During the Medieval and Mughal periods “these village bodies .... had been the pivot of administration, the centre of social life, and, above all, a focus of social solidarity”. However, the local self-government of the present day, in the sense of an accountable representative institution, is the creation of British Rule in India. The Mayo’s Resolution (1870) and Lord Ripon’s efforts (1882) provided the much-needed democratic framework to these institutions. By 1926, eight provinces and six native states had passed Panchayat Acts/Laws. However, these statutory Panchayats covered only a number of villages and, had, generally a limited number of functions.

The Government of India Act, 1935 and the inauguration of provincial autonomy under it, marked another important stage in the evolution of panchayats in the country. However, it was Gandhi Ji who set the tone of the nationalist point on the panchayats and declared, “The village panchayats would be now a living force in a special way, and India would almost be enjoying self government suited to its requirements”. He defined his vision of village panchayats as “a complete republic based on perfect democracy and individual freedom”. The village panchayats were given a place in the Indian Constitution under Article 40 of the Directive Principles of State Policy. The article states, “The State shall take steps to organize village panchayats and endow them such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of local self-government”. Consequently, panchayats were organized as per the norms of each state, as the subject of “Local Government” is included in the state list. Further, these panchayats were expected to ensure people’s participation in Community Development Programme launched in the
country in the year 1952. However, somewhat later, it was realized that Community Development Programmes could not bring desired level of participation of people in the development delivery system. Therefore, in Jan. 1957, the Government of India appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Balwant Rai Mehta to study the working of the Community Development Programme and to suggest how best it could be maintained and implemented.

Balwant Rai Mehta Committee realized that “without an agency at the village level which would represent the entire community, assume responsibility and provide the necessary leadership for implementing development programmes, real progress in rural development can not be achieved.” Therefore, the Committee recommended a three tier system of local government called ‘Panchayati Raj’. At the grass root level, were to be formed Village Panchayats, at the middle or block level, Panchayat Samitis and at the apex or district level, Zila Parishads. The recommended system of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) was first adopted in Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh in 1959.

Ashok Mehta Committee (1978) recommended a two tier system, with the district as the point of decentralisation below the State level. It introduced Mandal Panchayats between the erstwhile district and Block Panchayats. Later on, the G.V.K. Rao Committee (1985) suggested to assign important role to PRIs, with respect to planning, implementation and monitoring of rural development programmes at district level. Thereafter, L.M. Singvi Committee (1986) recommended that Panchayati Raj Institutions were to be institutionally recognized, protected and preserved. All these developments led to passing of a bill by Parliament known as 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992 which came into force on 24th April, 1993. In due process, 17 state legislative assemblies also ratified the bill passed by the Parliament.

1.2 Salient features of 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992

The salient features of 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992 are summarized below.
1. Establishment of Gram Sabha in each village comprising all the eligible voters.

2. Creation of three-tier panchayati raj structure for all states having population of over 20 lakh i.e. panchayats at village, intermediate and district levels.

3. Direct elections of the members at all the levels and to the offices of chairpersons of village panchayats.

4. Fixing tenure of five years for all levels of panchayats and fresh elections for the remainder of the period within six months from the date of supersession of any panchayat.

5. Provision of reservations of seats for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in proportion to their population in all panchayats for offices of members and chairpersons and such seats may be allotted by rotation of different constituencies in a panchayat.

6. Provision of reservations of one-third seats for women in all the panchayats for the offices of members and chairpersons.

7. Minimum age to hold any office of a panchayat is fixed at 21 years.

8. Creation of State Election Commission to conduct elections to PRIs regularly for every five years.

9. Creation of a State Finance Commission to review the financial position of PRIs every five years and make recommendations in regard to the financial powers.

10. Provision of ex-officio membership for the concerned MLAs and MPs at intermediate and district level panchayats.

11. Panchayats have been empowered to impose and collect the assigned taxes, duties, tolls, fees, etc., and are entitled to grants-in aid from the consolidated fund of the state.

12. The state would devolve the panchayats powers to prepare plans for economic development and social justice and for the implementation of development schemes.
The Eleventh Schedule has been inserted in Part-IX of the Constitution consisting of 29 subjects assigned to PRIs covering the activities relating to rural areas such as agriculture, land improvement, minor irrigation, animal husbandry, small scale industries, rural housing, drinking water, rural electrification, sanitation, health, family welfare, social welfare, public distribution system, primary and secondary, poverty alleviation programme, non-conventional energy and maintenance of community assets, etc.\textsuperscript{14}

1.3 PRIs in Haryana: A Bird’s Eye View

The subject of local government is in State list of the Federal Constitution. Therefore it is mandatory for the state legislature to enact a law in this regard. The various state legislative assemblies including Haryana have enacted the Panchayati Raj legislation in conformity with the 73\textsuperscript{rd} Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992. It is known as “Haryana Panchayati Raj Act, 1994”. The new act provides for the constitution of Gram Panchayats\textsuperscript{15}, Panchayat Samitis\textsuperscript{16} and Zila Parishads\textsuperscript{17} for better administration of the rural areas. As per the new enactment, the PRIs have been organized at three levels – village, block and district. At village level, the elected body is Gram Panchayat, comprising of Panches and headed by directly elected Sarpanch; at block level, the Panchayat Samiti consists of elected members from various wards and indirectly elected Chairperson; and at the district level, the body is known as Zila Parishad headed by the President and elected members.

In Haryana state, the new Panchayati Raj is composed of Gram Sabha (GS), Gram Panchayat (GP), Panchayat Samiti (PS) and Zila Parishad (ZP). Gram Sabha is a body consisting of persons registered as voters in the electoral rolls of a village comprised within the area of the Panchayat at the village level. It shall consider the budget prepared by the Gram Panchayat, the future development programmes, and progress reports of GP works; and can ask questions to the Sarpanch and Panches of the GP to clarify the particular
activity, income, expenditure, schemes and other matters about their functions and powers assigned by the government. Thus, it is a body, which approves the development policy and controls Gram Panchayat. Whereas GP is an executive component of the Gram Sabha, the Sarpanch acts as the chief executive of the Gram Panchayat. It retains civic, developmental and regulatory functions and also the fiscal powers, which were earlier vested in the Gram Sabha.

At the block level, there is Panchayat Samiti. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the PS are elected indirectly amongst the elected members of Panchayat Samiti. It is endowed with the powers relating to the supervision and control over the performance of all or any of the administrative functions of the GPs within its area or any part thereof as may be specified by the Government by an order issued in this behalf and also render such technical and financial assistance as may be required by the GP within the area of Panchayat Samiti for the implementation of development schemes which are beyond the powers of such GP to execute.\textsuperscript{18}

At the district level there is Zila Parishad, whose members are directly elected from the wards in the district. The President and Vice-President of the ZP are elected amongst the elected members of the Zila Parishad. The President of ZP convenes, presides and conducts meeting of the Zila Parishad and exercises administrative supervision over the Chief Executive Officer for securing implementation of resolutions or decisions of the Zila Parishad. Thus, ZP is an advisory, supervisory and coordinating body over Panchayat Samitis.\textsuperscript{19}

The second component of Panchayati Raj Institutions is bureaucratic apparatus. At the village level, Gram Sachiv functions as secretary of the Panchayat.\textsuperscript{20} At block level, the BDPO is ex-officio secretary and the Chief Executive Officer of the Panchayat Samiti\textsuperscript{21}. At the district level, Additional Deputy Commissioner is the Chief Executive Officer of Zila Parishad\textsuperscript{22}.

These two components of Panchayati Raj Institutions i.e. leaders and administrative officials have to work in co-ordinated manner for the execution of functions assigned to them. The focus of the present research study is to
study the relationship between these two kinds of functionaries of Panchayati Raj Institutions in Haryana State.

1.4 Importance and Relevance of the Study

With the passing of the 73rd Constitutional Amendment, it was felt that the PRIs should be the forefront of development. Accordingly, twenty nine subjects, ranging from agriculture to vocational education and primary health were transferred to local governments. However, most states were reluctant to part with what they felt was their domain. As far as Haryana is concerned, the state government has assigned certain powers and functions concerning rural affairs to these elected bodies. Certain activities relating to sixteen departments have been entrusted to these institutions to enable them to function effectively as the units of local self-government.

In this study, the relationship between two components of Panchayati Raj Institutions i.e. Panchayati Raj leaders and administrative officials is under question. As Panchayat Samiti is the pivot of rural local government, it is necessary to study the relationship between the elected representatives and administrative officials at this level. The effective functioning of the Panchayat Samiti depends upon the healthy and close relationship between Chairman of the Panchayat Samiti and the Block Development and Panchayat Officer. That is why their relationship is the question under consideration. The emergence of Panchayat Samiti has led to a rise of a new class of politicians in India. This class includes sons of the soil, lacking regular schooling, belonging mostly to ordinary and poor families, and having their own characteristic vocabulary and manners. The officials, on the other hand, are university graduates who are recruited on merit by government and thus, have a pronounced feeling of superiority. A wide educational and social gap, thus divides the elected and permanent personnel. It is this class of the elected representatives or politicians that the civil servants or officials posted in the block are obliged to serve today.

At the District level, Additional Deputy Commissioner is the Chief Executive Officer of Zila Parishad. The CEO supervises the execution of all
works of the Zila Parishad and Panchayat Samitis and has administrative control over officers working under him. Every Zila Parishad also has a Deputy Chief Executive Officer-cum-Secretary who is from amongst the Block Development and Panchayat Officers. Besides government also appoints account officer and other officials employed in state services. The plight of the Zila Parishad is even worse as the functions of this body are not clearly defined. The District Rural Development Agency still remains as the separate identity. This is parallel to Zila Parishad. Further what is the relationship of CEO of Zila Parishad and the President of Zila Parishad is the question unexplored in conclusive and comprehensive manner.

The whole difference between efficient and inefficient administration lies in the creative use of officials by the elected representatives. Our attempt to mould the bureaucratic frame work to suit the political processes at the local level took the form of democratic decentralization and setting up of Panchayati Raj. But rural society, with its segmented structures and primitive institutions, unexposed to modern democratic experience could not generate a responsive and creative leadership. The traditional order and the new political and administrative structure only created tensions 26.

Social, economic and political mode of life of the rural people is directly or indirectly linked with PR bodies. In fact, the faith, values and convictions of person, either he is a leader or an official, are very much influenced by his environment 27. Environment is the base of past or present socio-economic background of every community of this world. Social and economic backgrounds of PR leaders and administrative officials working in these institutions have been considered instrumental in shaping their role, behavior and orientation 28.

The relationship between administrative officials and leaders has, however, a behavioral dimension. That is, both interact in concrete situations and their relationship is also influenced by the kinds of problems and demands PR leaders bring to administrators, and the way administrators respond and react to leaders’ demands and pressures. It is, therefore, necessary to explore
the behavioral dimension of interaction between administrative officials and leaders in PRIs.\textsuperscript{29}

Both the administrative officials and leaders have their separate universe of role sets. When they interact, only a part of their role universe becomes relevant for relationship between the administrative officials and leaders. Our focus, therefore, is on that role sector which coincides with the interacting aspects of administrator-leader relationship.\textsuperscript{30}

Therefore, a field based empirical study is needed to understand the relationships between PR leaders and administrative officials at all the three levels of PRIs in the state of Haryana. The present study seeks to address this issue. To accomplish this objective, it will be appropriate and relevant to delve into available literature so that inconsistencies and hiatus of knowledge in the field is understood deeply.

1.5 Review of Literature

The review of literature helps the researcher to find out the location of the research problem. Besides, it gives direction to the study. Therefore, it becomes imperative to review the available and accessible literature pertaining to the study as discussed below.

Kothari and Roy (1969)\textsuperscript{31} study shows that interaction between two groups (officials and non-officials in district administration) is overly characterized by ‘position centric’ considerations, i.e., both give precedence and importance to the requirements of their own role performance. This prevents them from developing their relationship on functional considerations. The officers are now faced with increasing challenge from political leaders which tends to reflect tension, conflict and constant tug of war in their relations.

Ghilayal (1978)\textsuperscript{32} illustrates that democracy is a government of the people but since all people could not be associated with the functioning of the democracy, therefore, it is a government of ruling elites. He emphasizes that the bureaucracy gets subordinated to and substituted by personal loyalties
towards the political executives of these institutions. The value of survival expediency, opportunism and docile acquiescence get an edge over honesty, sincerity, faithfulness, industry and intrinsic work in a new emerging bureaucratic culture at PRIs.

Maheshwari (1984)\textsuperscript{33} reflects that the employment of regulatory administration in developmental functions has not been without confusion, conflict and contradiction and this, has not been resolved till date. In his opinion, rural development is a state subject but in reality, the central Ministry for Rural Development is a nodal agency for formulation of policies, determination of priorities, monitoring, evaluation and control and provision for financial assistance. State is not adequately trained to handle its functions. The bureaucracy at village, sub-district and up to district level does not have innovative values, which is an essential characteristic of developmental administration. The article does not discuss the relationships of the bureaucracy with that of local political representatives in the PRI.

Bakshi (1985)\textsuperscript{34} in his study conducted in Ludhiana and Hoshiarpur PRIs of Punjab, states that politician-bureaucrat friendship is less frequent, their contact is either institutional or a caste-class contact. They do not think alike. As development agents, the politicians feel that their role should be integrated one at all hierarchal levels, whereas, the bureaucrats desire it to be classified. According to them, politicians should limit their role to that of policy makers, while the bureaucrats should be exclusively concerned with the implementation of that policy.

Sadasivan (1985)\textsuperscript{35} emphasizes the need for a democratized district administration. For this purpose, powers should be decentralized to the elected representatives at district level. According to him, concentration of powers in the hands of collector/officials has reduced the efficiency of administration. Therefore, redesigning of district administration, which is conducive to local self-government, is the need of the hour.

Haskar (1987)\textsuperscript{36} is his article “Politicians and Bureaucracy” remarks that the relationship between politicians and administrators is hopelessly entangled
with the game of politics and power. The conflict between these two occurs because of prerogatives of power, personality clashes, self-aggrandizing tendencies etc. He argues that the emergence of ambitions and power-oriented political leadership along with the fact that officials usually do not have faith in the capabilities of these leaders, has compounded this problem. However, a political culture to interfere at the execution stage has developed in the country. But the bureaucracy with conservative attitude has not adjusted to the transformative politics. The scholar illustrates that the relationship between them is complex and this can be improved by streamlining the service conditions of civil servants.

Singh (1994)\textsuperscript{37} states that the concept of Panchayati Raj has undergone change since its inception, expanding to cover area of rural development and economic planning but it is still suffering from a number of shortcomings. First, the present concept does not consider Panchayati Raj bodies as agencies that can play an important role in the overall development of rural areas, i.e., not as planning and implementation agencies for various rural development programmes. Second, there is no clarity about the relations between Panchayati Raj bodies and development administration, because the former has no separate cadre of administration.

Mukharji (1995)\textsuperscript{38} explains that Panchayats must be free from interference both from the centre and the states. The Panchayats must give to the deprived sections, especially the poor and the women, effective governing voice. Real Panchayat autonomy can come about only if there is a measure of accountability.

Balarammalu and Rao (1995)\textsuperscript{39} in their study about PR leadership in Andhra Pradesh conclude that PRIs do not have sufficient autonomy from higher level bodies. The Zila praja parishads and state government exercise excessive control over mandal praja parishads. In the absence of sufficient power to mandal praja parishad presidents, these institutions cannot perform their role effectively.
Gangrade (1995)\textsuperscript{40} explores that with an exception to a couple of states, no state act says that its objective is to establish the institution of self-government. The Punjab Panchayati Raj Act empowers the Director, Panchayats to remove or reinstate any Sarpanch. As far as Haryana is concerned, the order of the Director or Deputy Director is final and not justifiable. Even the power of delimitation of territorial constituencies of the Panchayat Samiti and Zila Parishad has been retained by the state. He opines that bureaucrats must understand the meaning of democratic decentralization which means delegation of authority to elected representatives. This will mean that officials will lose powers and will have to work as subordinates of these representatives. Motivating the bureaucrats to participate in the Panchayati Raj system is very crucial because a motivated bureaucracy is a necessary condition for making PRIs a success.

Jain (1995)\textsuperscript{41} illustrates that the establishment of PR structure was the beginning of a phase of ‘democratic decentralization’ in the late fifties. But the initial enthusiasm of setting up this system in different states could not be sustained for long due to a variety of reasons. These institutions were denied resources, responsibilities and power. The main reason, he feels is that the bureaucracy does not appear to be too willing to lend a helping hand to decentralize the administrative structure. The success of this system depends much on the commitment of political leadership, bureaucracy and people themselves.

Joshi (1998)\textsuperscript{42} investigates the inadequacies of present system despite the constitutionalisation of PR in India. He emphasizes the need to create a healthy and positive atmosphere for natural growth of PR, and also gives suggestions for the improvement and strengthening of the system provided that the states have political will to devolve powers and authority to PR Institutions.

Malik (2002)\textsuperscript{43} in a field based study carried out in Jind District divulges that there is excessive administrative control over PR Institutions in the state. The bureaucrats are reluctant to devolve meaningful powers to these bodies. The elected representatives of PRIs are considered rivals by state political
leaders as well as by the officials. The incidence of bureaucratic tendencies to control elected leaders of these institutions is more, and often officials suggest the development works to be undertaken. Transferring the officials working with PR Institutions on political considerations is a common practice in the state.

Mishra and Mishra (2002)\textsuperscript{44} observed that in Haryana there is a provision for an additional Deputy Commissioner as the ex-officio Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the Zila Parishad. But unlike the Panchayat Samiti Executive Officer, he is not under the administrative control of the President of the Zila Parishad. Further, the Government also deputes the officials of DRDA in the Zila Parishad to help it in discharging its obligations. Therefore, Zila Parishad is overshadowed by A.D.C. or DRDA officials. Thus, the dominance of officials is observed in PRIs.

Kumar and Sudhakar (2003)\textsuperscript{45} discussed the role of Panchayat Secretary in Andhra Pradesh. According to them, the Panchayat Secretary has to play a vital role in discharging various duties assigned to him and implementing the policy decisions taken by the Panchayat Secretariat Legislature. But it has been realized that Panchayat Secretaries erode the powers and position of Sarpanchs and hinder the process of decentralization of powers at grass root level. According to the study, the village administration was facing new challenges from the bureaucracy with all its ill effects like red-tapism, favoritism, nepotism, authoritarianism and corruption. According to the authors, it further discouraged the local leadership and curbed the local talent and initiative. The authors stressed the need for the encouragement of village people for more active participation in the village administration and the strengthening of Gram Panchayats by the devolution of more powers. The system of Panchayat Raj has brought two partners (officials and elected representatives) in close relationship with each other. So the elected leaders and officials in the Gram Panchayats should be motivated and trained to suit the changing needs of village life and administration.
Sharma (2003)\textsuperscript{46} is of the view that people lack faith in the elected representatives and officials, and as a result, their participation in the institution of ‘Gram Sabha’ is very low. The earlier studies have shown that neither the bureaucrats nor the Panchayati Raj representatives are interested in making Gram Sabha really an effective institution. There is an ongoing tug-of-war between bureaucrats and the elected representatives for larger share of the power cake. The politicians, bureaucrats and local level leadership show indifference towards strengthening of effective functioning of Gram Sabha, as this may threaten their power.

Singh (2003)\textsuperscript{47} reveals that the 73\textsuperscript{rd} constitutional Amendment Act, 1992 has noble intentions for providing more powers to the people in the Gram Panchayats. This major landmark has revolutionized and transformed representative democracy into participatory models. In Haryana, as many as 16 functions pertaining to different development departments have been assigned to Panchayati Raj Institutions. The process of transferring more powers and functions to the PRIs is going on. But there exists a strong nexus between rural bureaucracy and heads of Panchayat, which leads to manipulation of funds left at their disposal. So transparency must be there to check the mis-utilization of funds. Corruption and poor quality of goods and services must also be checked. This can be achieved by the proper functioning of the institution of Gram Sabha.

Malik (2004)\textsuperscript{48} illustrates that in the Gandhian framework, Panchayati Raj was visualized as the base level of decentralization. The Panchayati Raj system was established on the recommendations of Balwant Rai Mehta study team. Gandhi stood for Gram Swaraj at the local level and the village was to be nucleus of all activities limiting the role of state government only to those functions which could not be handled by village panchayat.

Jha (2004)\textsuperscript{49} states that PRIs are being looked upon as instruments for strengthening the democratic framework of administration, for bringing transparency in government functioning and for voicing the needs of people
and for greater participatory development. Devolution of functions, funds and functionaries has been an important feature of PRIs in Haryana.

Pal (2004) stresses and concludes that state government is not interested in devolution of Function, Finance and Functionaries to PRIs. Further political leadership of the state sees leaders of Panchayat as their rival and does not impart them with knowledge of rules and procedures. As a result, with some exceptions, Panchayats from Gram Panchayats to Zila Parishad are official-centric. The bureaucracy, like well trained horse, has not been ridden well by these representatives. Therefore, capacity building of the elected representatives has to be ensured and enhanced and they have to be skilled and erudite, then only they will be able to plan for economic development and social justice in the real sense.

Chahar (2005) highlights that PRIs have been constitutionalized through the historical enactment of the 73rd Amendment Act and thus a third tier of federal polity has emerged. But even after a decade the working of PRIs suffers from many flaws like lack of political will, non-co-operative attitude of officials and inadequate financial resources. These are hampering the progress of these institutions.

Malik (2005) observes that the gram panchayats established after 73rd Amendment are no doubt more empowered, but there is an urgent need on the part of polity to devolve the powers to these institutions so that they can be established as the real local self government in the country.

Palanthurai (2005) stresses the necessity of mind shift from the age-old bureaucratic red tapism to new, transparent, positive and facilitating administration. He emphasizes that there is misunderstanding/conflict between the officials and non-officials over the non-adherence of rules and regulations by non-officials and the pressure exerted by them on officials for speedy execution of development programmes. Moreover there is a lack of technical knowledge among non-officials. Village Panchayat members and President Zila Parishads have preference on caste, political party and religion, which
results in favoritism in planning and allocation of various schemes. Due to these reasons people show indifference towards these PR institutions.

Kumar (2006)\textsuperscript{54} concludes that PR leaders are unaware of their roles and responsibilities; and perform routine functions such as beneficiary selections, minor repair and construction works etc. PR leaders are better aware of the needs and priorities of local people but they have limited resources at their disposal.

Pal (2006)\textsuperscript{55} opines that all the six components (i.e. Irrigation, Roads, Water Supply, Housing, Rural Electrification and Rural Telecom Connectivity) of Bharat Nirman, except Telecom Connectivity, are under the domain of the PRIs. But more than a decade has lapsed after the amendment to the constitution under which, these subjects were given to the panchayats but not much in concrete term has been devolved to these bodies. In other words, had the central role these bodies been given, there would have not been any need to start programme named as Bharat Nirman. He also emphasizes the need to activate the Gram Sabhas as an important body for proper monitoring and evaluation of projects under Bharat Nirman.

Singh (2008)\textsuperscript{56} points out that under the Panchayati Raj Act (1994), the Gram Panchayats have been given far more powers than the Panchayat Samiti and Zila Parishad. There is a lack of clear cut demarcation of functions between the Gram Panchayat and the Panchayat Samiti. The Zila Parishad has not been given any powers. The Gram Sabha merely exists in law but not in fact. The author suggests that there is a need for changing the mindset of the political leadership, PRI representatives, officials of the Panchayat department, revenue department and the police administration.

Mathew (2008)\textsuperscript{57} opines that the role of political parties has been apathetic to the idea of making every village a little republic. By creating a separate ‘Ministry for Panchayati Raj’ the government has taken a right step. But those committed to decentralization and grassroot democracy will agree that it is only a half hearted measure. The author suggests that today panchayats need a new deal, which will open a new chapter for 800 million people living
in our villages. The new deal must ensure ways and means to make panchayats the third tier of government.

Pal (2009)\textsuperscript{58} has investigated the initiative taken by district administration, Sirsa to assess the level of participation of the people in the meetings of Gram Sabha in the presence of key officials of the district. The study explores that Gram Sabha could be responsive, accountable and efficient, if district and sub-district level politicians and bureaucrats allow this institution to function as viable and energetic body. The main reason for not making this institution strong is the apprehension of a big risk involved in promotion of this body because it has inherit potential to expose their misdeeds in the works related to rural development and poverty alleviation. There is a silver lining in the dark scenario in the form of campaign that took place in Sirsa, as pioneering efforts taken by the bureaucracy itself with sincere commitment and dedication.

Srinivasulu \textit{et al} (2009)\textsuperscript{59} opine that PRIs in Andhra Pradesh play a vital role in the socio and cultural life of people. But the system is not free from the daunting problems, such as lack of finances, unsound recruitment policy, inadequate training facilities both for officials and non-officials, undue political interference, over population and lack of active and effective working relationship between the officials and non-officials.

Ambedkar (2009)\textsuperscript{60} has attempted to apply the concept of good governance in Panchayati Raj Institutions in Rajasthan state. He highlights that the problem of corruption affects PRI functioning. The lack of clear demarcation of the spheres of action of Pardhans and the B.D.O. also leads to ineffectiveness. In case of friction between the two, the extension personnel are found to align themselves, some with the pardhans and other with the B.D.O.

Singh and Yadav (2010)\textsuperscript{61} in their study related to Panchayati Raj Institutions in Bihar identify the dominance of richer strata and bureaucracy and also highlight the hostility from higher level political leaders like MPs, MLAs etc. They opine that PRIs remain sandwiched between political leaders and bureaucrats and the poor have little say in the activities of PRIs. Traditional
leadership entrenched in caste and land ownership still dominates. Vested interests like corruption, groupism, unhealthy rivalry and other factors like inefficiency, illiteracy, male dominated society and misuse of power etc. have adversely affected the functioning of PRIs. It has limited the utility of PRIs for the average villagers.

Palekar (2010)\textsuperscript{62} in his paper about Panchayati Raj Institutions illustrates that there is a dominance of bureaucracy in PRIs. Cases of bureaucracy dominating the rural development scene abound. The district, block and village panchayat bodies are controlled by the bureaucrats at the corresponding levels of administration. With the enhancement of its powers, the bureaucracy develops, as has been highlighted by Fred Riggs and other scholars, bureaucrats try to retain power in their own hands. Besides they develop alliance patterns in order to strengthen their own position and power.

Gopalappa (2010)\textsuperscript{63} highlights the worst situation of the Shahapur and Chitapur Taluka panchayats in District Gulbarga (Karnataka). He observes that although the elected leaders are strong and plans have to be executed as per their will yet the officials try to manipulate certain issues as they have the possession of all the official files. They are the first ones to know about government programmes and policies, about which sometimes they do not inform the elected leaders. Though the leaders decide everything about the programme; implementation has been through the officials. And finally the cheque signing authority rests with the concerned executive officer which hampers the effective functioning of PRIs.

Rajasekharan (2011)\textsuperscript{64} illustrates that both the elected leaders and officials are indispensable and need to be positioned in tandem so as to work cordially in a democratic system of governance. The difference in terms of tenure, expectations and capabilities of both make them distinctly different in their functional path. Creating and enforcing a code of conduct for both is a means to streamline their individual behavior, joint functioning and bilateral relationships. The need of such code of behavior is more evident in the sphere of local governance as compared to other tiers of governance.
Malik (2012) in his empirical study conducted in the state of Haryana illustrates that PR leaders before 73rd Amendment were used to be rich, influential, party workers and having closeness with mainstream political leadership of the state. But, the PR leaders elected after amendment are, no doubt, from different classes of people but maximum of them are still rich, influential and active in politics. The author opines that gram panchayat leaders now are coming from all classes of rural people and the dominance of earlier dominant class has diluted to the extent that the base of recruiting leaders in local politics has widened to include more common and poor people. The author further concludes that many of the local leaders are competent enough to decide village priorities and have necessary strength of enthusiasm and wisdom to perform the panchayat’s responsibilities. The study also suggests various ways to strengthen democratic decentralization in the state.

The review of literature is a never ending task. It starts from identification of the research problem and continuously up to the writing of thesis. In this study, an attempt has been made to review the available and accessible literature which appeared in the research journals, books, magazines and newspapers. This has enabled the researcher to broaden the theoretical background of the study and contextualize the reported findings.

Although there is enough literature on leaders and administrative-officials relationship but a comprehensive and conclusive study particularly after 73rd Constitutional Amendment is missing. Therefore, the present study is proposed to be undertaken in this area to fill up the gaps in the existing literature.

1.6 Objectives of the Study

It is important to emphasize that both the leaders and administrative-officials have their separate universe of role sets. When they interact, only a part of their role universe becomes relevant for their relationship. Therefore, the focus of the present research study is that role sector which coincides with
the interacting aspects of leaders-administrative-officials relationship. Keeping in view the above stated fact, the objectives for the present study are:

1. To study the socio-economic background of the administrative officials and leaders at all the three levels of PRIs in the state.
2. To study the impact of the variables of caste, gender, education, political affiliations (in terms of political party etc.) on the relationship between leaders and officials.
3. To study the relationships between leaders and officials particularly while discharging the role of planning and financial allocations for the development projects.
4. To study the impact of political intervention on the morale, motivation and efficiency of administrative officials of PRIs.
5. To find out the ways and means to reform and improve cordial relationships between leaders and administrative officials.

1.7 Statement of the Problem

Politics-administration relationship has been an old theme since the beginning of intellectual inquiry into the structures and processes of administration. Earlier writings on public administration make a clear distinction between ‘Politics’ and ‘Administration’. The distinction was made in terms of ends and means. Politics being concerned with the processes connected with shaping and uses of state power has been understood as the foundation of value laden policy decisions. Administration is the means for the fulfillment of policy objectives. It is basically an activity concerning the execution of policy decisions in practice as is evident from the statement made by Woodrow Wilson. He states, “The field of administration is a field of business. It is removed from the hurry and strife of politics; it in most points stands apart even from the debatable ground of constitutional study. It is a part of political life only as the methods of the counting house are part of the life of society; only as machinery is part of the manufactured product. Administration lies outside the proper sphere of politics. Administrative questions are not
political questions. Although politics sets the task for administration, it should not be suffered to manipulate its offices.” (1887) 66.

As a consequence of the waves of “modernization” of the public sector, administrators are increasingly asked to wear the hat of managers. 67 Once again, however, politicians and administrators are seen as actors with separate functions, where the former are supposed to play a strategic role, deciding on broad policies and setting targets for managers 68. The later expect to attain such targets efficiently and effectively.

The traditional model of public administration, based on the primacy of politicians and on the neutrality and professionalism of administrators, is reversed in the model proposed by New Public Management (NPM) reforms, started all over the world in the Nineties. The NPM advocates strive to transform bureaucrats into managers, seen as central actors in the process of change, since their focus on efficiency, effectiveness and results embodies economic rationality. 69 The role of administrators as managers is supposed to be concerned less with the neutral use of professional competencies and more with the definition and the attainment of goals, as well as with the good management of financial and human resources. In this new model, the normative division of roles between politicians and managers is resumed, but the primacy of politics gives way to the primacy of management. The managerial sphere is granted greater autonomy from the political one, under the manifesto “letting the managers manage.” 70

It has been pointed out that the division between politicians and administrators is not clear-cut. Both politicians and administrators can fill their roles with a mix of activities ranging from management and administration to policy and mission definition. In some cases, the idea of complementarity rather than dichotomy has been put forward to better depict their complex relationship, characterized by distinctions and overlaps, interdependencies and reciprocal influences. 71

Parliamentary democracy brings into operation a particular political arrangement, which entrusts the country’s administrative system including its
resources, both human and material, to the people’s elected representatives who, thus mandated, carry on the tasks of governance for the period for which they are elected. This group of people, the political executive, is under an obligation to ensure the continued performance of current functions and enforcement of existing laws and rules, and, in addition, the accomplishment of goals and objectives it had itself outlined before the electorate.

In addition, the political executive gets the legacy of the administrative system which indeed becomes automatically the instrument for the implementation of its programmes and policies. The term ‘administrative system’ refers to all those institutions and offices created under the government and quasi-governmental control as well as personnel manning and operating them. The administrative system is called permanent because while the members of political executive are temporary, coming into public office and going out of it depending upon the electoral verdict; they are recruited on the basis of a set of objective criteria and, besides, are expected to serve the political executive with utmost devotion, competence and impartiality.

Democracy postulates a kind of hierarchical arrangement placing the political executive at the top of the administrative system or the Civil Service, which is obliged to function as an instrument of the former to carry out its policies and programmes. The relationship between the political executive and the permanent executive depends upon the form of democracy the society has opted for. The parliamentary democracy postulates a particular kind of relationship, which is unlike that obtaining under presidential system of government. In India, the political executive is the council of ministers with Prime Minister as its head, but in reality it is the cabinet, a smaller body consisting of the more senior members of the council of ministers. The cabinet, functioning on the principle of collective responsibility, is the top policy making body in the government and exercises control over the entire machinery of government and public personnel. Thus ministers have major role in general policy making but in India, they are increasingly interested in particular cases at central as well as at state level.72
The functions of permanent executive, the civil service, are broadly two fold. One is the ‘staff function’ which, for instance is performed in the secretariat where the civil servants’ responsibilities consist in assisting the minister in policy making. It may be pointed out that a political party, when it comes into power, has with it only general ideas of the policies it wishes to follow. The expert knowledge required for transforming such policies into actionable programmes backed by necessary laws, rules, regulations and directives is as a rule made available by the civil servants working in the secretariat. It is their professional duty to tender the advice to the minister without fear and based on the highest standards of competence and integrity. They must point out to the minister the implications and consequences of the policy he proposes to adopt. However, once the policy is decided by him, they must conduct themselves within the four corners of the laws of the land. Besides the civil service has the ‘line function’ also, which is performed by what is called the attached and sub-ordinate offices in the union government and directorates and district administration in the states. The civil service implements the laws and executes the various plans and programmes.73

Jones Morris (1964)74 regarding official-politician relations rightly states, “No one who has met a class of probationers can fail to be impressed by their keenness and awareness. The valuable part of the ICS ‘ethos’ has been astonishingly preserved. Their job is honest administration without fear or favour… At least the same time, they know that the facts of political life are new. Their predecessors were themselves the government; the IAS are servants. Their masters are politician-ministers often innocent of administration and its requirements, responsible to an elected assembly and sensitive to all kind of pressures…..”

Kothari and Roy (1969)75 study rightly assumes that there is occasionally a very thin line between policy determination and policy implementation resulting in overlap between the two in a very confusing and complicated manner. The study inter-alia points out that although the administrators do not perceive their role as sub-servient to political leaders yet
they have to reconcile themselves to the pre-requisites of representative political leaders. On the contrary, politicians seem to be more alive to the operational conditions of representative politics.

In all systems, according to Peter Self\textsuperscript{76} there are certain typical forms of interaction between the politicians and administrators, which result from the distinctive style, and interests of the two groups of participants. Important areas of interaction include policy making, arbitration of interests, treatment of individual and local claims, and balancing between political accountability and administrative discretion. In the first two areas, politicians have formal responsibility but administrators supply the missing elements of political decisions. In the third area, administrators defend their distinctive methods or uniformity and impartiality against politicians’ frequent interest in influencing particular decisions. The fourth area represents an inevitable point of conflict between the needs and interests of the groups.

The Administrative Reforms Commission laid down the following norms for minister-civil servant relationship:-(i) The obligation of every public servant to implement faithfully all policies and decisions of the ministers even if these be contrary to the advice tendered by him; (ii) The freedom of public servants to express themselves frankly in tendering advice to their superiors including the minister; and (iii) The observance by public servants of the principles of political neutrality, impartiality and anonymity. It expressed the view that due to differing backgrounds and interests of ministers and their secretaries the desired emotional unison and unity of purpose is still to be realized.

It is the minister who remains constitutionally responsible for his department to the Parliament. If something goes wrong in his department he alone has to give a satisfactory account of it to the Parliament. This implies that even in cases where he is not personally responsible, he has to take responsibility for any act of omission and commission of his official subordinates.
However, the traditional concept of civil service neutrality is undergoing a change, particularly in the developing countries, under the impact of many factors. The doctrine of civil service neutrality represents a particular stage in the development of party system of government. An important fact bearing on this question is pivotal role the civil servants are being called upon to play in the developing countries. The successful implementation of developmental tasks requires on the part of the administrators, not only qualities of initiative and leadership but emotional and intellectual commitment to the social welfare values adhered to by the state as well.

Sir Josia Stamp remarks, “I am quite clear in my mind that the official must be the main spring of the new society suggesting, promoting and advising at every stage”77 Thus the civil servants occupy a crucial position in the functioning of a state or government. Once policies have been laid down and the course of action in each policy area has been determined, the performance of the governmental functions rests squarely on administrators. This is stated for the central government. Are similar things expected to be there in the PRIs? It has been a long debatable question in India.

The relationship between elected and permanent personnel in PRIs is significantly different from that between the minister and the civil servant at the state or the Union levels. At the level of block or district a civil servant can seldom retain his attribute of anonymity; his contact with elected representatives and people is direct, face to face, close pervasive, and many faceted. Demands on him are numerous and exacting and on occasions he as a defense mechanism aligns himself with factions in the Samiti or Zila Parishad and having once tasted blood some civil servants start dabbling in local politics to promote their selfish ends.78

These discoursed works point towards the nature of research problem, which needs further elucidation in the context of objectives of the present study. The main aim of the present work is to analyze the equations between PR leaders and officials. Thus, all the variables emanating from their interactions and relationships at the local level in selected districts of Haryana
shall be examined. Therefore, the study shall make endeavors to discuss and scrutinize the norms and rules governing the patterns of relationship between leaders and officials in PRIs of the selected districts.

1.8 Hypotheses of the Study

On the basis of statement of problem, the following hypotheses of the study are framed:-

1. There is not any significant difference in socio-economic background of leaders and administrative officials of PRIs in the state.
2. There is not any impact of caste, educational achievement, political affiliations on the relationships between leaders and officials.
3. There is no significant difference of opinion between leaders and officials in the matter of administrative issues such as planning and allocation of finances for development projects etc.
4. There is no significant dominance of administrative officials on the leaders in PRIs.
5. There is no significant impact on the efficiency, morale and motivation of administrative officials due to political intervention in the functioning of PRIs.

1.9 Research Methodology

The present study was conducted in Haryana State. The administrative officials and elected leaders at three levels of Panchayati Raj constituted the population of the present study. Two districts – Sirsa and Panchkula were selected for the study on purposive basis. The two districts have an important place in socio-economic scenario of the state. The districts are different from each other in matter of development, the number of urbanites and literacy level.

The universe of research study includes both the Zila Parishads – Sirsa and Panchkula, two Panchayat Samitis – Rania and Nathusari Chopta from Sirsa district and two Panchayat Samitis – Barwala and Morni from Panchkula district and two Gram Panchayats – Dhotar and Kharian from block Rania and
Ludesar and Rampura Dhillon from Nathusari Chopta block. Two Gram Panchayats – Barwala and Bunga from block Barwala and Badalwala and Bhojdharti from Morni block have been selected purposively for conducting empirical investigation.

The data collection was undertaken with the help of a set of pre-structured interview schedules prepared by the investigator himself keeping in view the objectives and hypotheses of the study. Besides this, other methods of data collection like case study, observation and discussion have also been utilized to test the hypotheses.

The Primary data has been collected from:

1. The Panchayati Raj officials (government officials) working at village level and interacting with the Gram Panchayats; Panchayat Raj officials of Panchayat Samitis and Zila Parishads which include District Development and Panchayat Officer (DDPO), X-En. (PR), Programme officer-ICDS (Integrated Child Development Scheme), LCS, BDPOs, SDOs (PR), JEs, SEPOs, CDPOs, Secretary (Panchayat) etc.

2. The Panchayati Raj leaders i.e. elected members of the Gram Panchayats, Panchayat Samitis and Zila Parishads.

The secondary data was collected from various books, reports and research studies. The appropriate statistical tools of data analysis were applied to the analyze the information collected during the empirical investigation of the study. Since the study is having explorative-descriptive characteristics, therefore, research design is kept flexible to incorporate every pertinent information relating to the research topic.

1.10 Chapterization

The chapterization of the study is as follows:-

1. **Introduction**: The Chapter incorporates a discussion on the Panchayati Raj Institutions in Haryana, Importance and Relevance of the study, Review of existing Literature, Objectives of the study, Statement of the Problem, Hypothesis and Research Methodology.
2. **Profile of the Study Area and Setting of Sample:** This chapter includes the Profile of the study area, Status of Panchayats in Haryana and Sampling of Panchayati Raj leaders and officials.

3. **Socio-economic profile of Panchayati Raj leaders and officials:** The discussion in this chapter includes socio-economic background of Panchayati Raj leaders and officials with diverse variables like age, gender, residential background, caste, religion, educational qualifications, size of land holdings and gross annual income etc.

4. **Relationship between leaders and administrative officials of PRIs:** This chapter illustrates the effect of caste, gender, educational achievements, political affiliations and political activism on the relationships between leaders and officials at all the three levels of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

5. **Operational Parameters of Relationships Between leaders and officials of PRIs:** The discussion in this chapter includes democratic and administrative decentralization with respect to planning and allocation of resources for development works and the extent of bureaucratic intervention.

6. **Leaders vis-à-vis Officials: Impact of political intervention:** This chapter discusses various dimensions of political intervention, its nature and the impact of political intervention on the relationship of Panchayati Raj leaders and officials.

7. **Conclusions and Suggestions:** Major findings and suggestions on synchronizing the relationship between the two components of Panchayati Raj Institutions have been elaborated in this chapter. The chapter forwards certain measures to develop better understanding and reciprocal respect between PR leaders and officials.
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