CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Bureaucracy, which is an institutional device for administering large scale organizations, has become a very dominant feature in modern society. For the achievement of the goals of any organization, be it a government department or private undertaking, business, firm, university or hospital, bureaucracy is recognized as a necessary instrument.

In India, as also in other countries, bureaucracy is a large complex organization designed and developed to run the administration. Basically, bureaucracy in India is a legacy of the British rule, the primary objective of which was to perpetuate the colonial rule. All other objectives were subservient to this ultimate goal. It is nevertheless true that bureaucracy was instrumental in successful execution of certain welfare programmes set out by the Britishers, and a lot of work was done to alleviate the suffering of the masses during famines, draughts, epidemics and other such calamities. Contributions were also made in the field of education, agriculture and communication. But all these activities were tagged to the ultimate objective of retaining the British regime intact, because ultimately India was a
colony of the British. Whatever improvements were introduced had been designed only to prove that the Britishers were better rulers and well-wishers of India.

During British rule the people of India had practically no voice in the matters of its administration. Ills of foreign administration were increasingly perceived by the intelligentsia of the country and a demand for 'Home Rule' was made. After tremendous struggle for a number of years, the country got liberated from the foreign rule in the year 1947. Since then, efforts are being made towards improvement in administrative planning, functioning and efficiency. Despite all the efforts in this direction, the achievements in the area of administration leave much to desire for. The common public, as well as the functionaries show a lot of discontent towards various aspects of administration.

Indian society is a transitional society undergoing a change from traditionally to modernization. Politically, it has had a long tradition of authoritarianism and instability. Culturally, attributes like caste and the feudal heritage have played an important part in the system. Economically also, India remains a poor country. All these handicaps have long term implication on the entire planning and functioning of administration. Thus, the structure, nature and pattern of
bureaucracy is bound to be affected by the social system within which it operates.

The socio-cultural system in which the Indian bureaucracy functions makes it very different from the west. It would be interesting to explore the structural and cultural aspects of Indian bureaucracy in relation to the social milieu within which it exists and functions.

The prime objective of the present study is to make an empirical sociological study of the bureaucracy as it actually functions in a commissioner's headquarters. The study attempts to focus upon the interpersonal relations that develop in government organizations and the ways in which these relations influence operations, communication and decision making in the administration. Throughout this study, the focus has been on the functionaries' own views about the functioning of bureaucracy.

As organizations grow, an important factor which becomes part of the organizational functioning is the formation of certain patterns of informal relations among the functionaries. We have tried to focus on the informal interaction among the bureaucratic personnel. However, since this interaction among them takes place within the formal setting and is shaped by it, it becomes imperative to study the formal structure. Thus the formal structure and functioning have been studied
keeping in view the understanding of informal patterns of interaction and their importance in organizational functioning. And since the objective of the study is to examine the nature, pattern and role of interaction patterns in a bureaucratic set-up, it is necessary to consider briefly how this concept of bureaucracy has been understood by different sociologists, and the significance of this study in relation to the existing theories of bureaucracy.

The Concept of Bureaucracy

Modern society is marked by the predominance of formal organizations regulated by bureaucracy. But much remains to be done towards a better understanding of the concept of bureaucracy. A comprehensive definition of the term bureaucracy has been provided by Blau.¹ According to this definition, "Bureaucracy is a type of hierarchical organization designed to accomplish large scale administrative tasks by rationalistic and systematic coordination of masses of individuals in a multiplicity of occupations".

Some sociologists like Etzioni and Talcott Parsons have used the term organization instead of bureaucracy. Etzioni prefers the term organization to bureaucracy because the term bureaucracy has more negative connotation for beneficiary whereas the term organization is more on the neutral side.² Parsons treats organization as a subsystem of a bigger social
system. These subsystems are constructed and reconstructed to acquire certain goals which are in tune with bigger social system. 3

In this regard, it is difficult to by-pass the systematic contribution made by Max Weber. According to Weber, pure bureaucratic type of administrative organization is capable of attaining the highest degrees of efficiency and is in this sense formally the most rational means of carrying out positive control over human beings, precision, speed, knowledge of the files, continuity, unity, subordination, reduction of friction, and material and personal costs. These are raised to the optimum point in a strictly bureaucratic organization and specially in its monocratic form.

Weber's theoretical postulates on bureaucracy typify the essence of legal rational authority. The whole administrative staff under the supreme authority consists, in the purest type, of individual officials who function according to the following criteria. 4

1) They are personally free and subject to the authority only in respect of their impersonal official obligations.

2) They are organized in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices.

3) Each office has a clearly defined sphere of competence in the legal sense.
4) The office is filled by a free contractual relationship. There is free selection.

5) Candidates are selected on the basis of technical qualifications. They are appointed; not elected.

6) They are remunerated through fixed salaries, for the most part with a right to pension. The salary scale is primarily graded according to his rank in the hierarchy, but in addition to this criterion, the responsibility of his position and requirements of the incumbents' social status may also be taken into account.

7) The office is treated as the sole, or at least the primary, occupation of the incumbents.

8) It constitutes a career. There is a system of promotion according to the persons' seniority or achievement. Promotion is dependent upon the judgement of the superiors.

9) The official work is entirely separated from the ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of his position.

10) He is subject to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of the office.

These theoretical postulates evolved by Weber have been the starting point towards the exposition and
formulation of the theory of bureaucracy. After his contributions some of the sociologists have joined issues with him. Some have proposed a number of modifications in his theory, and yet others think entirely on different lines and do not accept his theory. As a matter of fact Weber himself was aware that reaching the ideal type of bureaucratic functioning is a difficult proposition to be arrived at by any society. But at the same time he considered these characteristics desirable for economic, socio-cultural, and political development of any society. It seems that Weber had not foreseen the possibility of political and administrative authority being coalesced into one. Besides, he had not visualised bureaucrats being called upon to perform the task of providing leadership for social transformation, as is evidenced by the demands made on democracies in the Third World Countries. Some of the criticism of the Weberian model stem from the social and political changes that have taken place over the last few decades. Besides these, the theorists have also tried to attack the very attributes proposed by Weber for developing an ideal type of bureaucracy. These issues concerning the Weberian theory need special mention here.

Max Weber treats bureaucracy as the most appropriate means for administrative functioning. One of the characteristics desirable for ideal functioning of
bureaucracy is strict supervision and control over the subordinates and within the system. But it has been felt that in practice it is neither feasible nor necessary anywhere else except in military organizations. Friedrich observes that only an army or a business concern without any sort of employee or labour participation in management, a totalitarian party and its bureaucratic administration would come nearest to the Weberian model of bureaucracy. In order to maintain legal-rational authority, organizations can develop a system which overemphasizes pattern maintenance. Overemphasis on rules and regulations raises the possibility of displacement of goals. Blau argues that bureaucratic system perpetuates ritualism. This tendency of ritualism grows due to a feeling of insecurity and fear of superiors among subordinates. Lippet while discussing bureaucracy observes that bureaucrats have their own vested interest in existing legal order, and therefore are resistant to change. This is where bureaucracy is attacked as an impediment both to democracy, and more particularly to change. Merton also states that while theoretically the Government personnel are expected to serve the people, but they are usually superordinate. Another important point of criticism which emerged in Merton's discussion is that while bureaucracy emphasizes a rational and secondary relationship between functionaries and beneficiaries, the
beneficiaries who are to be served by the bureaucracy wish to establish a primary group relationship with the bureaucrats so that they can get things done. Hence there appears to be an incompatibility between the structural demands and its execution by the primary group. Yet another shortcoming of the bureaucratic system is that very often it is difficult to pin down responsibility on any particular individual. And the irony of it is that bureaucracy can turn down any programme of reform by refusing to act immediately when it does not want to accept the programme. It tries to serve its own interests, and for this a general slackness in the system becomes part of its functioning. 9

In addition to these criticisms on bureaucratic functioning the Weberian model has been questioned for being a theory per se. 10 and Hal observes that it is presented as a finished tool rather than as a set of hypotheses to be verified by empirical findings. 11 These attributes need to be empirically verified before being accepted as a universal model.

Another criticism which appears to be very relevant in the context of present study is that the Weberian model is occupied with only formal instituted aspects of bureaucracy and ignores the informal relations and unofficial patterns which develop within the formal frame work. 12
It has also been felt that it overstates positive functions of bureaucracy such as efficiency, rationality, etc. But it misses to see the dysfunctions like red tapeism, trained incapacity, procedural delays, occupation etc. 13

Thus it is obvious that the Weberian model is not accepted universally. The bureaucratic pattern has been considered to be especially repugnant in a democratic set up. Blau 14 for example has criticised bureaucracy for unduly concentrating power and being responsible for undermining democracy. 14 Similarly Damle 15 observes that it would not be desirable to have a technocratic rule in a democracy, particularly when modernization and social change are the desired goals. The democratic process requires that people are involved in the new changes in all walks of life. As such, apart from the fact that the bureaucrats have to supply the relevant services and facilitates the production of goods and commodities and they also have to educate the people with a view to changing their erstwhile mental attitudes. It is absolutely necessary in a democracy that a bureaucrat plays a role which is wider than that of a mere technocrat. It is because of this that the formulistic model of bureaucracy would not be enough and informal groupings will have to be reckoned with by bureaucrats in their day to day working.
In a democratic set up, it is desirable that bureaucracy is more sensitive to the peoples' needs and criticism. A healthy communication pattern has therefore to be built in within the system, and with the beneficiaries. Under these conditions, the bureaucratic model would be more open and flexible behaviourally. 16

Study of Bureaucracy in India

Some of the attempts which have been made towards a systematic understanding of bureaucratic functioning in the Indian context are being briefly mentioned below.

Among the few excellent endeavours which have been made towards the understanding of socio-economic background of bureaucrats, Trivedi and Rao's contribution has been pioneering. 17 This study probed into the elitist nature of higher civil services and its recruitment pattern. The findings revealed that a marked shift had occurred from the socio-economic background of the ICS recruits but the I.A.S. is still dominated by an urban and higher income background with biases of region and better education. Subramanian in his study, "social background of India's administrators", makes a similar observation. 18 He noted that a large proportion of the recruits come from the middle class having urban background, very few hail from rural areas. However, this over representation of a small section of the country's population in administrative services is not confined to
India but has been found in most of the developed and developing countries. Thus he argues that it would be wrong to attribute administrative malfunction to an unrepresentative bureaucracy alone. The major flaw could be in the type of training that the young I.A.S. recruits undergo after their selection. Their training should equip them to meet their administrative and public demands in a healthier way.

However, in one of the later studies, the entire problem of administrative inefficiency in India has been attributed to conflicting social and administrative values. In this study it has been concluded that there is a great deal of divergence between over values in the social system and those that prevail in the administrative system. Indian society is still a traditional society in which social ranking very much depends upon caste ranking. The difference in social status on the basis of caste persists, whereas the values of the administrative system are guided by some formal laws, codified rules and regulations. In these, there is no discrimination on the basis of caste, religion or sex. The basic problem therefore is that administrative values are not in consonance with social values. And as long as our social values continue to mould our way of thinking, the values of the administrative system will fail to guide the behaviour of the people in the field of
administration. As there will be a direct conflict between the values of the social system and those of the administrative system, there is a likelihood that people in the administrative system may act entirely in self-interest rather than in the interest of the community.

In addition to these studies, some contributions examine the attitudes of bureaucrats towards various aspects of decision making, towards politicians, peer group, clients and the job per se. Taub in an indepth study has tried to identify on-the-job sources of stress and strains on Indian administrators. One of the conclusions which he arrived at was that "no bureaucratic organization can carry so heavy a load and acquit itself under democratic conditions". This probably meant that under the existing conditions, greater effort is required on the part of the administrators to let the administrative machinery run in a proper manner. This study, however, had its limitations. It confined itself to the higher bureaucrats in the capital city of Orissa.

Mathur tried to examine individual bureaucrats keeping in view their role performance as an agent of change. Quite unlike the studies mentioned so far, his sample was confined to Block Development Officers as respondents. The study concludes that beliefs in efficacy and trust in government are to a great extent moulded by these B.D.O.s. They are very important
components of the whole system. The problem of running the administration is not so much of competent bureaucrats at the top but administrators at the bottom. Beautiful plans and schemes can be laid out but failure lies at the implementation stages. Thus Mathur strongly emphasizes the need to turn research attention to local administrators from that to the higher civil services.

Prasad's study examines the structural attributes of bureaucracy with a view to identify their functional and dysfunctional aspects. The major findings of this study are: The multiplicity of services, cadres, ranks and grades is perhaps the chief source of conflict and tension within the structure; it encourages status and rank consciousness. It certainly does not serve to develop personnel resources. The senior and the junior civil services, the gazetted and non-gazetted categories deepen this process of conflict and strain within the structure. Added to this, there is a tension between the generalist and the technical staff and this tension is also a part of the wider conflict within the structure. The real consequence of rules, procedures and precedents is that they provide defence for the civil servants and create conditions for the survival of the structure. Further, the bureaucrats working in the world of rules develop a general tendency to play safe which in turn leads to the erosion of the authority
at various levels of the structure, and to the gradual decrease in the delegation of powers. Moreover, rules and procedures make the structure rigid and allow little scope for initiative and adventure on the part of the individual civil servant.

Prasad also observes that there are no checks and balances to ensure correct implementation. In addition, the administration of the human part of the structure, namely, the staff, supported by elaborate rules and procedures tends to dominate the structure so much that the goals of the structure themselves are displaced by the means to achieve those goals. These bureaucratic characteristics not only produce an ever increasing tension and conflict but also a feeling of mutual distrust and jealousy among the functionaries.

Singhi's study centres around some specific questions. He has tried to find out how far a developing society like India with its colonial history, bureaucracy has grown and developed as a rational administrative system. In what ways do the indigenous tradition, culture and the social structure of India influence the structure of bureaucracy and its functioning? Whether the Indian bureaucracy conforms to the ideal-typical characteristics of Weber, or varies from it in adaptive pattern? Can an administrative structure which has been developed and nurtured in a colonial setting play an appropriate role in a free
democratic nation committed to a socialistic pattern of society? What has been the nature and process of adjustment of bureaucrats after independence with the politicians. This study not only emphasizes the formal and organizational aspects of bureaucracy but its actual process of functioning in terms of the individual actors who function within the bureaucratic system. Thus in this sense, the coverage has been very extensive and it has been one of the most comprehensive studies of its trend.

Jain and Chawdhari have examined the relationship between bureaucracy and development on the basis of four structural attributes. These structural attributes included hierarchy, division of labour, system of rules and impersonality. A crucial finding of this study is that a large proportion of the officials has a bureaucratic attitude, which apparently hinders the process of change and development. The study emphasizes the need to inculcate a constellation of values other than the strictly bureaucratic one. It has been argued that the pace of development cannot be accelerated through a very rigid adherence of Weberian characteristics of bureaucracy, but at the same time a rapid programme of debureaucratization would not be the solution.

Of late, a few studies have been made for understanding the role and functions of bureaucracy in agricultural development in rural areas. One of the
aspects probed into, is the effectiveness of the communication system in terms of frequency and forms of communication media in use in the official and non-official fields, effectiveness and regularity of the method, and instances of delay and above all, factors responsible for delay. It was found that less than the generalist, the specialist resorted to rigid and formalized methods of communication in the development programme. The Panchayat secretaries and the village level workers use informal methods in their communication, whereas the engineers, experts in agriculture, etc. more frequently communicate formally, in writing. In this context it could be noted that Prasad has made a similar observation in his study of higher level bureaucrats. He suggests that greater rigidity and sticking to the rules is observed by the officials in order to keep them on the safer side.

As regards the existence of corruption in administrative system, Tewari and his colleagues have affirmed that it does prevail in the system. The causes attributed to corruption are: lack of moral sense among the people, administrative system that protects the offender and does not reward the honest worker, limited supply of infinite demands, insufficient income of officials, cumbersome administrative procedure, and lack of awareness among people etc.
Saksena has dealt with the role of bureaucracy in the process of economic development. The study centres around two broad objectives: (a) The extent of effectiveness of government officials involved in the developmental activity as agents of change, and (b) the working of institutional framework at the District, the Block and the Village levels.

A very revealing aspect which emerged from this study was that the development programmes have failed mostly in their implementation; and therefore streamlining the administrative machinery is both urgent and vital. The second major stage of failure is that of preparation for action, and the formulation of the actual programmes.

One of the pioneering attempts to study the role of bureaucracy in economic development was made by Dube. Desai and Jamashray Roy have studied the role of bureaucracy in agricultural development at district level. Chaturvedi while studying the dynamics of rural development has discussed various aspects and complexities of the interaction between bureaucracy, the politician and the people in rural areas with special reference to Panchayati Raj Institutions.34

Shrivastava in his study has discussed the attitudes and motives of bureaucrats in relation to development. Dale has studied the functioning of bureaucracy in the District of Maharashtra with special
reference to the agricultural development. The study highlights the attitudes and motives of the bureaucrats in relation to development. 36

Muttalib has dealt with administration of development programmes at District, Block and Village levels. 37 Singh and Ashraf Ali have dealt with District bureaucracy with reference to planning and development. 38 Shanti Kothari and Ramashraya Roy in their study have discussed the relations between politician and administrators at the District level. 39

Jain in his study highlights the orientation and behaviour of bureaucracy engaged in development and non-development task. 40 Kobro has made a contribution on bureaucracy, weaker sections and development process. 41 Bhattacharya’s study highlights the bureaucracy and development administration. 42

Pannanidikar studied the values, attitude and motivation of a group of 113 government offices. 43 Junjar’s work is based on bureaucracy in Indian industry. 44 Jagganadham and Bakshi have made a study of citizen and municipal bureaucracy. 45 Varma’s Book emphasizes various aspects of bureaucracy in India. 46

Based on these studies one can conclude that (a) a number of studies have tried to analyse the socio-economic traits of bureaucrats and have found them relevant for understanding the attitudes and values of
bureaucracy; and (b) attempts have also been made to study the role performance, attitudes and perception of bureaucrats at higher levels.

The Present Study

A review of the existing literature on bureaucracy in India tends to indicate that much more work needs to be done on bureaucratic functioning in its entirety, involving the personnel of all categories and the interaction pattern among them. Much remains to be understood about how the different class categories of the personnel relate with each other. Do formal relationships as perceived by Weber exist in the structure, or do the relationships go beyond a formal level? While efficiency can be enhanced through cooperation within the system, to what extent is it practiced in actual administrative functioning? Besides this, functionaries at different levels hailing from different social, educational and economic backgrounds, could differ in their value orientation, attitudes and role perceptions.

Another important aspect which is linked with socio-economic attributes is the policy of protective discrimination towards backward communities particularly the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. There has been a heated controversy about the concessions given to them in public services, including the so-
called elite service like the I.A.S. Relaxations given to them are often questioned. The attitudes of the functionaries on this issue are also worth probing further. The present study is an attempt towards the filling up of these crucial gaps.

The main objectives of the study, broadly speaking are (a) to enquire into the nature and pattern of interaction (formal and informal) in the bureaucratic set up; (b) to probe into the attributes which are perceived as related to the functioning (and malfunctioning) of the system; and (c) to examine the attitudes and perceptions of the functionaries towards administrative functioning. These broad objectives have been broken down further into specific objectives which are as follows:

- to examine the socio-economic background of respondents keeping in view their position in the administrative hierarchy (class categories);
- to identify, if any, the classwise difference in interaction patterns, perception and attitudes of bureaucrats;
- to understand the nature and pattern of functioning and communication (both formal and informal) that exists in the organization; and lastly
- to probe into the attributes perceived as related to dysfunctioning of bureaucracy.
Most of the studies of bureaucracy whether in the field of public administration or those made by sociologists generally concern themselves with bureaucracy either at the State and Central levels or that of the District. There are some studies also of the bureaucracy at the Block level. However, there are not many studies of bureaucracy at the level of a Commissioner's headquarters, particularly in the Madhya Pradesh.

The focus on a Commissioner's headquarters enables us to study the pattern of hierarchical interaction from a vertical perspective right from the Commissioner to the administrators at the district level.

**Method of Study**

In the present study an attempt has been made to study the interaction pattern of the bureaucratic personnel located in the Raipur town. Raipur is the seat of the Commissioner's headquarters as well as the District headquarters. The present work attempts to study the bureaucratic personnel at all levels in the offices dealing with general administration, and also the officials engaged in various specialized services.

In order to arrive at a fair sample of bureaucratic personnel which would represent all the major sectors of administration, the government offices were selected in such a way that they would represent all the
major aspects of governmental functioning. Thus the offices in which the interaction pattern and culture of bureaucratic personnel was intensively studied included the Commissioner's office, the Collectorate, the Police, the Department of Agriculture, the Public Works Department and the largest government Hospital (the D.K. Hospital) at Raipur.

The total population of personnel in the above offices at Raipur, was 1034 (on regular pay roll). From this population a stratified random sample was drawn in such a way that each level of bureaucratic personnel (i.e. of Class I, Class II, Class III and Class IV) will be represented in the sample in proportion to their population in each of these offices. Thus a sample of 353 respondents was arrived at. Out of these 21 belong to Class I category, 42 to Class II, 229 to Class III and 66 to Class IV. The difference in the number of respondents from various classes reflects an actual difference in their number in the offices studied.

The reason for selecting some offices of each major type, instead of taking a random or stratified sample from the total population of government employees working in Raipur was to make available for study the entire hierarchical structures for systematic intensive study. This enabled us to study the whole chain of the rank and file in a particular organizational sub-system, so that the pattern of its interaction could be studied and brought out.
The field work for the present study was started in 1976 and at that time data about various aspects of administration was gathered in detail. Since then I have been in touch with the field throughout and I have tried to gauge all the major changes that have taken place in the size of the administrative apparatus. This process of field work has been carried out till 1984. Even though there has been an expansion in the number of administrative personnel at various levels this does not seem to have affected the general nature of interaction among them.

Since the focus of this study is on informal interaction, it would not have sufficed to gather data only through the survey method. It is well known that responses to questions in an interview schedule, do not generally reveal the full complexity of social reality and attitudes. For a deeper understanding, besides structured interviews through schedules, I also had many informal interviews, discussion and chats not only with personnel at various levels, but also with members of the public who went to various offices.

In addition to this, I got many insights through the actual observation of interaction between personnel of various categories and their dealings with the public. During long hours of my stay in various offices, often while I was waiting for the official concerned to give me some time for the formal interview, I had the
occasion to see how the officers of higher levels deal with their subordinates and how the later react to the former. As the field work was spread over a long period such observation gave me extensive opportunities of first hand non-participant observation of informal interaction among bureaucratic personnel.

The researcher often joined informal groups of bureaucratic personnel at various levels and intently listened to their conversation without intervening too much. This provided many insights into their interaction pattern which would be very difficult to get through formal interviews. The long hours spent in various offices enabled the researcher also to observe the pattern of behaviour in administration.

The researcher made it a point to wait patiently while the interviewees were busy with their administrative and office work. This not only helped the researcher to get ample response from them when they are really free but also made it possible to watch their actual interaction from close quarters.

However, most of the structured primary information from functionaries has been elicited through a carefully designed interview schedule. This method of enquiry was preferred to the questionnaire since it was felt that a face to face interview with each one of the respondents will help us to establish greater rapport with the functionaries which ultimately will help us in
understanding even some subtle aspects of bureaucratic behaviour.

The tables given in various chapters give the absolute numbers of various kinds of responses. In order to facilitate comprehension of the proportion of different alternate responses, the approximate percentage has been given in brackets along with the absolute numbers. The percentages have been rounded off so as to give a clearer idea of the proportion of each kind of response at a glance.

The tables present separately the response of the personnel of various levels, i.e. of Class I, Class II, Class III and Class IV. This enables us to have a comparative picture of the viewpoint and attitudes of the personnel at various levels in the administrative hierarchy. Moreover in the study of interaction between the personnel of various strata we get an insight as to how the superior's look upon their subordinates, and what the subordinate's feel about their superiors. However in Chapters IV, V, VI which concern decision making and other aspects of administration in which the Class IV employees do not have any significant role to play, their responses have not been included in the tables.

Responses to the open-ended question seeking the opinions and attitudes of the respondents were coded after the collection of data. In many cases the opinions
expressed by the respondent contained several elements. These have been shown in the tables as multiple responses. It will be noted that in many of the tables, the total exceeds the number of respondents. This is because of multiple responses given by the same respondent.

Raipur — The Division and the Town

The Raipur Division covers an area of 40,922 sq. km. Its total population according to the census 1971 was 50,75,432 and according to unpublished statistics of the census of 1981 it is 61,37,444. According to the available figures of 1981 census the rural population is around 48,62,353 and the urban around 12,74,581. The population of literates in the Division in 1971 was 12,29,997 and 13,65,074 in the year 1981.

The Raipur division constitutes the major part of the Chhattisgarh region which is traditionally known as a rice bowl (Jhan-ke-Katora). The Chhattisgarhi language and culture have a distinct identity of their own. One often hears the demand for the creation of a separate State of Chhattisgarh. Whether the State is formed or not, Raipur undoubtedly remains the central town of this whole region.

The District of Raipur covers an area of 145 sq. km. The total population according to 1971 census was 26,13,531 and in 1981 it is 30,79,476. The
population of literates in the year 1971 was 6,21,099 and 9,41,565 in 1981.

The Raipur town is situated in 21-25 North and 81-30 East on the South Eastern Railway and is 528 Kms from Calcutta to its west and 300 Kms from Nagpur to its East. This region is fast industrialising, with the Bhilai Steel plant about twenty five Km. away, and a number of industrial and mining areas such as Korba and Railadila not very far off.

The total population of Raipur town in the year 1981 was 3,38,245. Besides being a Railway junction, Raipur is on the air map also. There are daily flights to Delhi and Bombay; and one can go to Madras two days in a week. Raipur had a T.V. station of its own as far back as 1977.

In the culture of this town one can witness a unique blending of diverse cultural elements. The well known Eastern region which still preserves the tribal way of life has surely made a distinctive contribution to its cultural pattern. The rich peasant culture not only surrounds this town but can also be seen throbbing in some of the pangs (neighbourhood) of Raipur. And because of the Bhilai Steel Plant and numerous cement factories and diverse ancillary industrial units, the inroads made by the industrial way of life are too conspicuous to be missed. Thus in the socio-cultural
fabric of Raipur there are strands from the tribal, the peasant and the industrial cultures intricately interwoven with each other. The bureaucratic personnel, particularly of the higher levels, often comes from outside the town and the cultural region which it administers. But apart from the government employees, there is a sizeable population of common people in various walks of life hailing from all parts of India.
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