Principally there are two philosophies that operate behind the establishment of the civil service commissions in the different countries of the world. One of them is what James Watson calls the "protectionist" school of thought. This school believes that politicians are not trustworthy and so they should be kept aside from the public services. To ensure this, the civil service commission are established in such a way that political patronage may not work in the efficient functioning of the commissions on the one hand and favouritism may not be entertained in the appointment of the public officials. The other school is what James Watson calls "management" school of thought which believes that management of services is the "direct executive responsibility". According to this school, the personnel management is one of the important functions of the Chief Executive.

In fact, these two schools have their origin in the views of Lord Macaulay and Mr. Chadwick who opined about the role of the civil service in the democratic countries.
The civil servant, in a totalitarian set up is a member of a self perpetuating oligarchy. His political reliability is much more important than his reliability in carrying out the tasks of the Government. While under the democratic set up the civil servant is genuinely a servant of the people and what counts most is his ability to carry out the responsibilities assigned to him. In the 18th century, we find no clear distinction between political and administrative offices. But in the early 19th century, with the growing volume of administrative business it became necessary to place more responsibilities in the hands of the officials. This development naturally led to the problem of selecting the able and competent personnel for the government offices. With the establishment of parliamentary democracy and political parties, it became also necessary to give permanent tenure to the civil service on the one hand and of selecting competent officials on the other. The granting of the security of tenure reduced the opportunities for patronage.

(1) Northcote-Trevelyan Recommendations

As early as 1831-32, Mr. Hold Mackenzie, before the select Committee on the Affairs of the East India Company,
pointed out that if efficiency of the civil service was a desired goal, it should be recruited "by some system of competition so as to be sure of the selection of the best out of many good men". On this question of selecting the personnel, Macaulay believed in having a selection on general education and giving the candidates free choice to offer the subjects of their likings. While Mr. Chadwick believed in having a special training in subjects relevant to the work to be assigned to the civil servant. Lord Macaulay, in his famous speech on Indian Civil Service recruitment in the House of Commons in 1833, advocated that "whatever be the languages - whatever be the sciences, which it is in any age or country the fashion to teach, those who become the greatest proficients in those languages and those sciences will generally be the flower of the youth - the most acute - the most industrious - the most ambitious of honourable distinctions". Edwin Chadwick, on the other hand took opposite view and thought primarily of specialists and not that of a general administrative class possibly.

The order - in - council of 1870 which was based on the famous Northcote-Trevelyan Report put an end to the system of patronage. The authors of the Report inquired
"whether it is better to train young men for the discharge of the duties which they will afterwards have to perform, or to take men of mature age, who have already acquired experience in other walks of life?" They at last concluded that it is more preferable to train young men because those who have achieved success in other professions will have no interest in the Civil Service positions. So they thought it wiser to try to attract young university graduates than a mature person who may have acquired some knowledge of the particular position. To them, the university trained men, with their broad outlook will succeed in the administrative work assigned to them. "General ability" was much more important than "being possessed of any special requirements". Lord Macaulay brilliantly expressed this philosophy in 1853 in a speech in the House of Commons by saying that "It seems to me that there was a fact proved by a larger mass of evidence, or a more unvaried experience than this that men who distinguish themselves in their youth above their contemporaries almost always keep to the end of their lives the start which they have gained".

The Northcote-Trevelyan Report reflects this philosophy. Its main recommendations are:

(1) There should be a distinction between the 'intellectual
work' to be performed by the graduates and 'mechanical work' to be allocated to a 'lower class' of lesser ability.

(2) Entry to the service should be through the competitive examination and it should be at an early age.

(3) A Central Board should be constituted for conducting the examination of all candidates for the public service. This examination should be in all cases a competing examination. Before that a careful inquiry into the age, health and moral fitness of the candidates should be taken. The examination may be so conducted that the intelligence as well as the attainments of the candidates may be tested. This will serve the double purpose of selecting the fittest person and of avoiding the evils of patronage.

(4) Separate departments should be made part of a unified service, in which transfers and promotions could be made between departments. Promotion should depend on merit assessed by reports from superior officials.

The principles enunciated by the Northcote-Trevelyan Report had been implemented by the end of the 19th century.
By 1855 the competitive examinations were held for vacancies in the Indian Public Service under the supervision of the Board of Control. It was not until 1858 that the British Civil Service Commission, first appointed in 1855, could take the charge of these examinations. But these examinations were only for the higher services of India. In Britain, by an Order-in-Council in 1870, it was laid down that all vacancies, except in the Home Office and Foreign Office, should be filled by open competition. In U.S.A., the Civil Service Commission was established in 1883 under the Pendleton Act. In most of the democratic countries the commissions were thus established with twofold purposes: first, to "keep the rascal out"; and second, to put the best men in. Over and above this function of selection, the commissions in most other commonwealth countries perform the additional functions like disciplinary matters, conditions of services, fixing salaries, training, organisation and methods etc.

It is interesting to note that Britain has followed Macaulay's view which requires that the candidate should attain Honours in any university subject. While U.S.A. has followed Mr. Chadwick's views which requires the candidate to be subjected to a series of
tests and interviews on practical problems. Unlike the commissions in India and Britain, the U.S. civil service commission has a much wider field of operation and performs three kinds of functions: (1) control and enforcement functions, (2) service function, and (3) leadership functions. The U.S. system like that of Britain is designed to produce civil servants responsive to the wishes of the public but it achieves this goal by different methods. In Britain, the civil servant can serve the government faithfully because he is neutral in politics, while in U.S.A. the theory is that the faithful public servant is one who is a political adherent of the party in power. Unlike Britain, free use is made of recruitment after experience. This means that mature persons may be brought in from outside the service to fill up the higher posts of the U.S. government. The U.S. tradition requires that the public services should be open on a thoroughly democratic basis to all persons without any consideration of age or qualifications. The preference is for examinations to be of the "practical" type, meaning thereby is that they should test for specified knowledges and abilities rather than broad cultural preparation. The belief is that the candidates should be examined on their ability to assume immediately the
duties of the positions for which they are competing.

(2) **Fulton Committee Recommendations**

The problem before Northcote-Trevelyan Committee was that of reconciling the intellectual qualities with loyalty and integrity. After the second world war, the questions were raised about the drive, the breadth of understanding and the technical expertise of administrators who might be required to make far-sighted proposals. The traditional approach of selecting a single "type" of personnel to man a variety of functional positions has become inadequate to meet the demand of the development administration. Now it is being recognized that in government as well as in non-governmental organisations personnel management is essential to and integral with the executive management. But as new requirements appear the old ones are still there - even the 19th century regulatory and office maintenance functions for which Northcote and Trevelyan tried to select the best available personnel.

The Fulton Committee which submitted its report in 1963, has given certain proposals which perhaps is the combination of the views given by Mr. Macaulay and Mr. Chadwick.
This Committee does not suggest that any of the traditional skills and knowledge of the administrator can be dispensed with. The new requirements according to the Fulton Report, are additional:

"It must be accepted that for the administrator to be an expert in running the government machine is not in itself enough. He must in future also have to acquire the basic concepts and knowledge whether social, economic, industrial or financial, relevant to his area of administration and appropriate to his level of responsibility. He must have a real understanding of, and familiarity with, the principles, techniques and trends of development in the subject matter of the field in which he is operating".

The Fulton Committee diagnosed six main inadequacies in the existing system. They are: (1) The service is still based on the philosophy of the amateur (i.e. "all-rounder" or "generalist") - which Northcote-Trevelyan Report envisaged. (2) Horizontal and vertical classes in the services seriously affects its work (3) Specialist classes like scientists, engineers etc. get neither the full responsibilities and authority nor the opportunities they ought to have (4) Too few public servants are skilled managers. (5) There is no contact between the civil
service and the common men (6) Career planning, rational placement and development policies, motivation, incentive system etc. are inadequate.

To remedy these defects, the Committee observed that the scale, character and conduct of the new tasks of the modern government call for new skills and different kinds of men and women in the civil service. In fact, the committee called for the professionalism of the civil service. Accordingly, there are two types of professionalism. In the first place, there are specialists like doctors and scientists who are experts in their own field. Secondly, there are draughtmen and technicians who acquire their skill after joining the service. The Committee recommended that administrative specialisation should be based on categorisation by subject matter and not by departments-wise. The administrative jobs fall within two broad categories: (1) The first consists of economic, financial and social specialisms such as economic planning, international trade, industries etc. (2) The second group comprises the broad administrative jobs where the basis is essentially social such as housing, town planning, social security, industrial
relations etc. These categorisation may be called 'specialist' and 'administrative' posts respectively.

The Fulton Committee recommended that recruitment, training and career management should be closely integrated. Recruitment should be in the hands of those who also share a direct responsibility for the candidate's subsequent training, deployment and development. It recommended that the civil service commission should cease to be a separate and independent organisation and should become a part of the new civil service department. It should take into consideration the 'need' of the various departments. The competition should be restricted to such administrative posts as are limited in number, but for which qualified candidates are available, specialist staff should be recruited directly by the department on the basis of an interview before a Board.

In the non-specialist group, the service should recruit the graduates with the best qualifications, aptitudes, qualities and experience for the jobs falling into one of the broad categories of administration. This emphasis on "preference for relevance" does not mean that those who have studied - "irrelevant disciplines" are to be rejected. The personnel appointed to the
service without a 'relevant' qualification should be required either to take a special training course at the new civil service college, or take a relevant postgraduate degree at the service's expense at some university or other institution. These non-specialist should be recruited centrally by the civil service department.

In the professional civil service of the future, the Committee thought, it will not be enough for the civil servants to be skilled in the techniques of administration, they should acquire a thorough knowledge of the subject matter of their field of administration. Similarly, specialists need to be equipped to a certain degree for administration and management in addition to their normal skills and specialisation.

The Committee also recommended that in the early years of a man's career, he should remain within his specialised field for which he is trained. This is not to say that he should stay in one job, he may move between jobs and also between departments, but usually within the area of his broad specialization.

The authors of this report also recommended for 'late entry' into the service, both in the specialized and administrative side. They thought that there are
people in business, professions, nationalized industry, local government and universities whose experience would be invaluable to the service. A steady inflow of suitably, qualified older entrants with new ideas and experience would be advantageous. At the same time, the Committee suggested for temporary interchange of staff with other employment - both of specialist and administrative staff.

The British Government immediately accepted some of the recommendations and established a new civil service department to take over the responsibility from treasury for managing the Home Civil Service. The new department is under the Control of the Prime Minister.

(3) The Administrative Reforms Commission Recommendations

Like the Fulton Report, the Administrative Reforms Commission in its Report on Personnel Administration recognises the need for professionalism in the Indian Civil Services. The Commission recognises that the work of modern government has become more technical and complex in the wake of the scientific and technological progress. The goals of the Government has radically changed now. To-day the role of the Government has
changed from a law-and-order to the promotion of a modernising process. It is a giant leap forward from warfare to welfare, from 'agraria' to 'industria' or from 'night watchmanship' to positive 'state-manship'. Yet the Indian personnel system is in the old mould.

The Commission regrets that "There is still too great a reliance on the generalist. The technical, scientific and other specialist personnel who have now appeared on the scene are not participating directly in policy formation. The top posts have not been brought within the reach of all those who have the capacity to hold them. Above all there is no clearly conceived and articulated policy of personnel management".

However, the Commission has tried to grapple with the generalist-specialist controversy. While it clearly recognises the importance of the generalist in administration, it also makes a plea to end the existing practice which has tended to exclude specialists from higher administrative policy positions in government. Commenting upon this problem, the Commission has stated:

"The generalist has his place and an important one at that, in the scheme of things; but so has the specialist, the scientist and the technologist. In a growing
democracy, committed to rapid socio-economic development, the administration has to be good no less than it has to be effective; if a good administration is imperative for the happiness and welfare of the people, an effective administration is a pre-requisite for the strength and prosperity of the country. This twin purpose needs the devoted services of the specialist no less than those of the generalist. The problem is one of harnessing their talents and capabilities through a purposive symbiosis in the larger interest of the common good, and of ending a practice which has tended to exclude the one in favour of the other, with its concomitant milieu of mutual sullen antipathy supercilious snobbery".

The A.R.C. Report has made a proposal for professionalism in the higher civil service by dividing the work of government into the 'functional areas' and the 'non-functional areas'. The basis of the Report is given in this statement: "where the post requires a particular academic qualification, or in which a particular specialized experience is essential, it would be in the public interest to draw from the respective - technical or specialised functional services for manning even the highest positions. Where, however, these are
not the necessary requirements, and the needed specialisation can be acquired by training and experience, it would be in the public interest to cast the net wide and choose the best material from generalist as well as specialist sources". The Commission recommended that there should be a 'functional service' for each 'function' of government and officers holding various functional services will develop professionalism by occupying all posts in their respective areas. The posts outside the functional areas have been divided into eight 'areas of specialism'. They are: Economic Administration, Industrial Administration, Agricultural and Rural Development Administration, Social and Education Administration, Personnel Administration, Finance Administration, Defence Administration and Internal Security and Planning.

The Commission envisages that a functional service could be technical or non-technical. In other words, the personnel of a functional service can be either specialists or generalists. The authors of the A.R.C. Report thought that it is the knowledge of the function which is relevant and not the general administrative skill. Each post has to be examined in the context of its work-content in terms of subject-matter, competence and relation to the service. By this, the Commission has emphasised the
job-analysis approach. Moreover, the Commission contemplated that there will be a number of posts at headquarters which are of such a nature that no one particular service can claim to be uniquely fitted to hold it. To these posts, personnel should be taken on the basis of a free and fair competition, from all the functional cadres. The technical services like scientists, engineers etc. fall under the category of 'specialists' and they play an important role in the formation of government policies.

On the recommendation of the Study Team Report, the A.R.C. recommended for the setting up of a Department of Personnel under the charge of a secretary who would work under the guidance of the cabinet secretary. The Cabinet Secretary is to be regarded as Secretary-General of the new department of personnel and he will have to involve himself in the development of and selection for "senior management". The new Department of Personnel is to be placed under the Prime Minister. The Government of India accepted these recommendations and under the new Allocation of Business Rules, announced in a Presidential Order on 27th June 1970, a Department of Personnel was constituted within the cabinet Secretariat. Moreover, by a notification issued on 1st August 1970, the Department of
Personnel was assigned with the new responsibilities.

The new set up of personnel management in Britain and India are sound enough to achieve the cherished goals. In Britain, although the independence of the Civil Service Commission has been merged with the Civil Service Department, the traditions and the 'merit' system is so entrenched that under the new set up patronage is not likely to endanger the civil service. Regarding this aspect Prof. R.B. Jain remarks "The abolition of the 'independent' status of the Civil Service Commission and its merger with the Civil Service Department reflects the maturity of the personnel management practices and is the product of a rich and strong tradition of upholding 'merit' principle - which to a certain extent, is still lacking in the U.S. Government". However, the peculiar position in India do not permit us the merger of Civil Service Commissions with the personnel departments. Such a step is likely to lead to the system of patronage and nepotism.

Recent developments in personnel management clearly indicates that the new tasks of the Government calls for professionalism. However, Shri P.R. Dubhashi gives us a word of caution when he writes that "professionalism based on merit, flexibility, accountability and openness is important for Indian administration also. But before any steps could be taken to introduce reforms on these lines here, there must be an all-round inclination, attitude and outlook to accept the basic idea of objectivity and efficiency. Professionalism is incompatible with subjective favouritism. Unless the latter is completely eliminated from our political and administrative system, reforms calculated to introduce professionalism will open the floodgates for the worst kind of particularism in our civil service".  