Chapter –V

Case of Uttar Pradesh—Microcosm of Indian Example Showcasing
CASE OF UTTAR PRADESH: MICROCOSM OF INDIAN EXAMPLE SHOWCASING BUREAUCRACY’S ROLE IN WELFARE AND DEVELOPMENT.

Uttar Pradesh, the largest state in India in terms of population, is a pre-dominantly agriculture based economy. Agriculture is considered the backbone of the household economy of the people in the state. After independence, successive governments at the centre and state have taken measures to promote industry. Therefore, it has led to gradual negligence of agriculture. Due to the gradual downfall of agriculture and increasing unemployment of the farm labourers and daily wagers, the general condition of most of the common men has gradually deteriorated. The worsening condition of the common man’s industry on which a large population is dependent for its subsistence, and the increasing economic inequality have rendered the common man absolutely dependent on government’s aid and other social security measures (as discussed in the last chapter). A look at the last chapter reveals a very disturbing reality, that is, common man’s increasing dependency after the decline of agriculture has made the general life more miserable. In such a situation when people are getting dependent upon the mercy of government the role of social and political institutions including that of bureaucracy has become very critical. In fact, in the face of this growing poverty and inequality the corrupt bureaucracy has made general life unlivable. As one interact with the common man in the state of Uttar Pradesh, the poor and the miserable who are so dependent on the government for housing, ration, medicine and other necessities and facilities they often complain about the indifferent and unsympathetic attitude of the legislators and government officers. Anyone endowed with good understanding and deep awareness of the social condition of life in the different regions of the state doesn’t require any proof for further verification. The real causes of this miserable condition in fact lied in the bad condition of agriculture. As agricultural occupation has gradually become extremely expensive, unlike the past, today peasants need expensive capitals, tools and other resources for production, small and poor peasants have given up their agricultural life. It has often been seen that with the agricultural life thus destroyed the young generation has migrated to urban areas in search of education and livelihood. Along with this development one can also see, if one is very perceptive, that since industries, which require skilled workers, cannot provide employment like agriculture which can
accommodate more labour force, even after skill and education there is no guarantee that they can easily get jobs in cities or urban areas. In the age of growing competition the suffering of the unskilled labourer has gradually increased and day by day their plight is becoming more severe. If one seriously examines this problem of increasing population, unemployment and poverty one comes to the conclusion that these problems are beyond political, administrative and judicial initiatives; nevertheless, it is the moral responsibility of the state to look into these matters which directly affect a very large number of people particularly in a state like Uttar Pradesh. Although, in a federal state like India state’s responsibility is divided at different levels particularly between the centre and the state, it is the responsibility which cannot be ignored on technical grounds. The very foundation of the origin and the organization of the modern state based on popular consent and social contract, if one sees philosophically, should not remain confined to maintain law and order but it goes beyond to take care the economic security of the people, to add human dignity to the life of the people and to help them realise the life which is possible under the condition of available material resources and their fair distribution by the state. It is on this assumption that the very idea of welfare state is based which John Rawls has discussed in detail under his concept of social justice and which has found serious attention in the works of Amartya Sen, Jean Dreze and other economists who do not separate economic development and human values. In fact not simply state but all its social and political and bureaucratic institutions are supposed to be subjected to fulfill the demands of development and social justice. State may find it extremely difficult rather immoral to justify its existence if it neglects these principles. It has to set its priorities of development in proper order. This emphasis is required in the context of growing inequality and poverty parallel to rapid development. It is important to note that at a time when idea of development has become the most important political agenda for the political parties, which comes to the fore more prominently during the periodic elections the problem which the people face, is emerging ironically from the same. It provides one a profound understanding that if vision, honesty and justice are not the guiding force for the government and its officials while framing laws and setting policies, perhaps no amount of welfare scheme may bring any lasting change to the actual condition of the common man. It further shows that development pursued without vision and justice is not healthy anymore. In certain situation it may have counterproductive result in the society. Therefore, it is the fundamental duty of the
state and its institutional agencies to keep in mind that the pursuit of development should not be divide of justice. This is the line of thinking on which the very idea of society rests, an idea of with which Rawls is so deeply concern: “the primary subject of the principles of social justice is the basic structure of society, the arrangement of major social institutions into one scheme of cooperation. We have seen that these principles are to govern the assignment of rights and duties in these institutions and they are to determine the appropriate distribution of the benefits and burdens of social life. The principles of justice for institutions must not be confused with the principles which apply to individuals and their actions in particular circumstances. These two kinds of principles apply to different subjects and must be discussed separately. Now, by an institution we mean a public system of rules which define offices and positions with their rights and duties, powers and immunities, and the like. These rules specify certain forms of action as permissible, others as forbidden; and they provide for certain penalties and defenses, and so on, when violations occur. As examples of institutions, or more generally social practices, we may think of games and rituals, trials and parliaments, markets and systems of property. An institution may be thought of in two ways: first as an abstract object, that is, as a possible form of conduct expressed by a system of rules; and second, as the realization in the thought and conduct of certain persons at a certain time and place of the actions specified by these rules. There is an ambiguity, then, as to which is just or unjust, the institution as realized or the institution as an abstract object. It seems best to say that it is the institution as realized and effectively and impartially administered which is just or unjust. The institution as an abstract object is just or unjust in the sense that any realization of it would be just or unjust.”

Rawls is one of those economic philosophers who think that justice is one of the most important concepts on which the very idea of economic development and social welfare should be based. In this respect he seems to think that political and social institutions have some important role to play. He seems to suggest that institutions are not supposed to make formal laws and monitor their implementation rather they have to be dynamically engaged with the welfare of the people: “an institution exists at a certain time and place when the actions specified by it are regularly carried out in accordance with a public understanding that the system of rules defining the institution is to be followed. Thus parliamentary institutions are defined by a certain
system of rules (or family of such systems to allow for variations). These rules enumerate certain forms of action ranging from holding a session of parliament to taking a vote on a bill to raising a point of order. Various kinds of general norms are organized into a coherent scheme. A parliamentary institution exists at a certain time and place when certain people perform the appropriate actions, engage in these activities in the required way, with a reciprocal recognition of one another’s understanding that their conduct accords with the rules they are to comply with. In saying that an institution, and therefore the basic structure of society, is a public system of rules, I mean then that everyone engaged in it knows what he would know if these rules and his participation in the activity they define were the result of an agreement. A person taking part in an institution knows what the rules demand of him and of the others. He also knows that the others know this and that they know that he knows this, and so on. To be sure, this condition is not always fulfilled in the case of actual institutions, but it is a reasonable simplifying assumption. The principles of justice are to apply to social arrangements understood to be public in this sense.\(^1\)

Rawls in fact sees state and its institutions from the moral point of view. The idea of a welfare state can be understood in the light of this assumption and bureaucracy as an important institution, which plays fundamental role in the preparation of agenda, formulation of policies, execution of law and their implementation through which many developmental and welfare programmes reach the people, cannot overlook this ethical responsibility. Therefore, it is important to explore the structural role of bureaucracy in the mode and manner of formulation of policies and their implementation in the welfare of the people with particular reference to the state of Uttar Pradesh in India. The social scientist like R.B. Jain who has extensively written on bureaucracy has clearly outlined the different aspects of its role in the following word in one of his important papers: “The role and performance of bureaucracy in a country as vast and varied as India is a controversial subject of considerable concern. There is a widely held belief that in India the role of bureaucracy is not only dominant in the implementation of public policies but is also pervasive in respect of policy formulation. Since the British times, bureaucracy has no doubt played a very decisive and important role in the administrative system of India, but after independence the role expectations and actual performances of the Indian bureaucracy have changed considerably. In the context of the goals of a welfare state and development
administration, bureaucracy has certainly emerged as one of the key elements in the politico-administrative processes in India. However, it is wrong to assert that the institution of bureaucracy has a predominant role in policy-making and policy development in India. The two extreme views that the policy is essentially the concern of the Government, is set by the political executive and the bureaucracy simply implements it; and that it is the bureaucracy who settles the policy and the ministers simply articulate it are both of course erroneous. Government policies are the outcome of a continuous interaction between the political executive, the senior echelons of bureaucracy and many other governmental or non-governmental actors. Although there may not be more than a thousand persons at the top level of bureaucracy in India both at the Centre and the States who may be directly involved in the policy-making, but a majority of all of them are in one way or the other engaged in policy implementation.3

When one assesses the role of bureaucracy in the conception and execution of the policies of development, it is necessary to see how and where it plays its role. Moreover, it’s also necessary to explore historically the emergence of bureaucracy (for further details see chapter one) in the historical and political background of India. Bureaucracy in India is a product of two different set of condition and influence. It is a direct outcome of industrialization, democracy, British traditions and its strong faith in the values of liberal education as Lord Macaulay had expounded in his vision. From the time of Max Weber, Bentham and Macaulay political thinkers and social scientists have seen the role of bureaucracy in its present form as a direct necessity of capitalist economy and democracy to manage the production and distribution at a large industrial scale that requires knowledge, skills and expertise to formulate laws and policies and also to implement and assess their final outcomes. Similarly on the other hand, in political sphere, which is greatly influenced by the behavior of economic production, a society requires a large number of officials who are properly trained to frame policies and implement then so as to ensure distribution of resources of the state in the welfare of the people. If one critically examines the role of bureaucracy on finds it as a factor to run economic and political institutions and to regulate their behavior on which every sphere of the life of the people in modern democracy entirely depends. The other observation is not difficult to verify if one relates it to the actual conditions of the Indian society. At the same time given the
power and privilege the attitude of the officers towards the services of the common man is of fundamental importance. Unlike the past, that is, the pre-independent India when the officers had to show their absolute loyalty to their imperial masters, at present it is often assume that their selection, appointment are fair but it has also been found out by scholars and observers that their condition is very critical due to the politics of promotion, which exercises its immense pressure, and their duties to the welfare of the common man. The ground reality shows that the mixture of such conditions have led to many types of invisible corruptions. Today there is a growing concern about the way politicians exercise their influence over them and the administrators in different ways neglect the interest of the common man. Critics have also suggested that this problem has to do with a variety of social and economic factors, as R.B. Jain writes, “It is difficult to say, however, that there is any direct correlation between the socio economic status of the civil servants and their orientation on the job. Grave doubts have also been expressed about the original proposition that civil servants sympathise only with the interests of the class of their origin. The hypothesis has not been proved conclusively. A question arises regarding whether the over-representation of urban middle class recruits in the services could be compensated by a better understanding on their part of the problems of other classes. There is prima facie no reason why this understanding cannot be developed as a part of the official ethos. Subramaniam's (1971) inquiry suggests that the social and political attitudes of government recruits are not very different from those of the rest of the society. However, new sophisticated training techniques based on research are needed to improve social understanding amongst the bureaucrats. Richard Taub's (1969) study of the bureaucracy in the state of Orissa proves this, for he discovered that an overwhelming number of civil service members seemed to like developmental programmes relating to industrialization, power, irrigation, flood-control, dam’s technology and mineral resources, and some were more interested in agriculture and land reforms. The initial attitudes of recruits can certainly undergo substantial changes during the course of their service, if the training programmes are suitably designed to make them aware of the socio-economic conditions of the society and the ethos of its environment. Exposure to new experiences in the field can also bring about a change in their attitudes. Since the overall effectiveness of the bureaucracy in fulfilling the demands of a developing society depends upon the attitudes, skills, values and other
professional qualities of its members, the administrative system in India needs a veritable revolution in the change of outlook and value systems of its élites.\textsuperscript{4}

It is in fact very difficult to change the mentality of an individual. Education is no doubt supposed to inculcate in the individual officer certain humanistic values and he is administered an oath to serve the people for whom he is appointed but it has also been emphasized that no amount of education perhaps can change the attitude of a person which is determine by so many factors or if education modifies individual’s behavior it doesn’t do so with all the people equally. This is one of the reasons that this case study of the state of Uttar Pradesh on the role of the administrators in framing and implementing the policies and programmes of social development and public welfare has discovered that despite all the education, skills and training those who serve in the name of the people should not serve themselves. It applies not only to administrators but to everyone including politicians whose decisions and actions affect the life of the people. It has been observed by the scholars who have worked on the functioning of Indian bureaucracy in different states that there are many factors which control the actual working of this institution. Along with the interference of different political parties at the centre and state levels with divergent and diametrically opposed political, social, economic, regional, caste and religious ideologies, the background of the officers also conditions the actual working of bureaucracy which largely hampers development in urban as well as rural areas. Richard P. Taub who has worked on the functioning of the bureaucracy and its role in the development of the state of Orissa has noted down certain points which seems to be applicable to the working of this institution in the state of Uttar Pradesh in India.

**Bureaucracy in Uttar Pradesh: Theory and Practice**

Uttar Pradesh, located in North India, is the fourth largest (240,928 Km.Sq.) state of India and in terms of demography the largest one 199,581,477 as per the 2011 census. The state is economically the second largest contributor to the national GDP 8.24%, after the state of Maharashtra in the year 2013-14.\textsuperscript{5} The state’s economy supported primarily by agriculture and industry has gradually improved in the post independent India. Though Green Revolution has improved the condition of the big farmers particularly in western Uttar Pradesh which with its fertile land makes a large contribution to agricultural products, the condition of the small farmers has
deteriorated in almost every district of the state, despite all these contradictions the state economy has made great progress like other states of India which aspire to modernity, the state of Uttar Pradesh in the last two decades has initiated a large number of developmental programmes. Successive governments in the states run by different political parties particularly representing different caste denominations have focused in their policies in favour of large scale urbanization and industrialization. This also explains some of the causes behind the ruin of small peasants. Unlike urban areas in the rural Uttar Pradesh caste is the dominant factor which often decides the fate of political parties during elections. Since parties are based on caste equation, bureaucracy is not free from this prejudice. Political parties in power in Uttar Pradesh and the whole administration in control often frame their policies in some of the cases in favour of the regions dominated by particular caste of the electorates. It is not very difficult to find bureaucrats to be at the mercy of the political party in power for promotion and postings. Despite all mechanism of fairness and transparency parties often find ways to bypass them in order to appoint or promote an officer of its choice in matters of critical importance. Sometimes a party representing the interest of a particular caste or religious denomination tries its best to appoint officers on caste line. The idea is that discrimination in official appointment is a very common problem that drastically affects the behavior of the functionaries. That is discrimination in administration or favoritism is an extension of the social problem prevailing in the state. Therefore, it has minimised the scope of the officials to sincerely and efficiently use their knowledge and skills, while preparing agenda or framing policies and implementing developmental programmes. It is quite possible that a industrial development, which promises the percolation of the benefit to the common man though it has not happen on the ground as one sees the parallel growth of economic progress and poverty, requires a state to be rich in natural resources nevertheless better functioning of bureaucracy can make some meaningful difference particularly in a state going through rapid economic transformations. As India’s economy is transforming, and the state of the Uttar Pradesh is following almost the same pattern of development, it requires promotion of vocational and professional education. As economy of Uttar Pradesh is moving to industrialization and gradually setting itself on the course of knowledge based economy, it requires the state to promote technical knowledge and skills. It is in the context of economic transformation from agriculture to industry that Max Weber had postulated the structure of the modern bureaucracy.
He thought that in order to maximize economic production and its efficient distribution on which the health of a society depends, bureaucracy is of primary importance that is the role of bureaucracy in industrial economy is important from economic, social as well as political angles though scholars are equally critical of bureaucracy's increasing role as Richard P. Taub writes, “A mature and well-organized civil service is one of the items high on almost any list of the needs of developing countries. The new nations, it is commonly suggested, face almost insurmountable obstacles on the path toward economic development, and, at the very minimum, some national system of coordination is required to help them move along that path. In many of these nations, analysts continue, the entrepreneurial spirit is weak and, in addition, private capital is scarce; if these countries are to become modern industrial nations, the government, through its civil service, must play a large role indeed.

Yet, many of these same commentators are disappointed in those very civil services which have shown signs of maturity. Many critics report that bureaucracy in developing nations is synonymous with red tape, nepotism, and corruption. Foreign travelers and other observers recount harrowing, if slightly amusing, tales of infuriating encounters with bureaucrats who frequently either stick to the letter of the law, consequently violating the spirit, or are unable to make decisions.”

P. Taub doesn’t seem to be fully comfortable with the remarks of many scholars about bureaucrats in India as he notes, “other commentators have complained that the leaders are wedded to the obsolete traditions of the colonial rulers who trained them; still others object that leaders have broken too radically with the past, jettisoning many valuable traditions.” He thinks that such observations are superficial and seem to have been made without deep study of the ground reality. P. Taub further adds, “but strikingly enough, most of these evaluations do not rest on careful study of the civil servants themselves: their attitudes toward their lives and their work, the structure of their organizations, and the nature of their work. Rather, they are based on casual observation, informal chats with selected groups, analysis of rules and regulations, or random gossip. There have been, it is true, some provocative analyses of the relationship between bureaucrats and politicians. But of systematic study of bureaucrats in their work setting there has been strikingly little.”
As one examines the actual condition of government of Uttar Pradesh and its policies one realizes that there is a great impetus for industrialization and urbanization. In the context of changing economy of India the state of Uttar Pradesh is striving toward progress. Therefore, there is a considerable increase in the emphasis on scientific and technological education. As one studies the agenda and policies of the state in which bureaucrats play an important role one can understand their aspiration. They seem to have realised that, “no country can claim to be modern without being economically advanced or progressive. This is the very center of dynamism. To be advanced economically means to have an economy based on modern technology, to be industrialized and to have a high standard of living. No country can aspire to be modern and not purport to pay attention to its economic improvement. All this requires planning, employing economists and statisticians, conducting surveys, controlling the rates of saving and investment, controlling imports and foreign exchange, constructing new factories, building roads and harbors, developing of railways, irrigation schemes, fertilizer production, agricultural research, forestry research.”

It is true that development of a state largely depends upon the knowledge, skills, training and the cultivated attitude of bureaucracy. In the state of Uttar Pradesh where caste factor is very dominant it has often been observed that the ruling parties often representing overtly or covertly certain castes groups not only exercise biasness and favoritism in the promotion of the officials but also discriminate in the extension of a developmental programme in the regions dominated by particular castes groups. It should be noted that bureaucracy is not independent of government run by political parties; therefore, it doesn’t seem justifiable to imagine the role of bureaucracy independent of the institution of legislature. There is no doubt that an officer appointed under a certain department of the government is protected by the law of the land and in the mean time is given certain power and freedom to exercise but practically he is not as powerful as it seems to be. In this respect, the policies which the government formulates an officer can contribute in many ways and can implement them effectively but he cannot change or ignore those policies which a government designs more to protect itself and to stay in power than to promote the welfare of the people. Seeing from this angle the role of bureaucracy particularly in the estate of Uttar Pradesh has been reduce to a technical position. That is it is not as dynamic as it
should have been. There are many reasons; some of them indicated above, most importantly discrimination and manipulation in promotion and posting. It has often been observed that there is always some kind of controversy and conflict of interest regarding the appointment to an important official position. Of much controversy related to the appointment of the officers on critical positions, the most prominent one is the controversy regarding the appointment of Lokayukta in Uttar Pradesh in 2016. The post had remained vacant for many months since 2015. The ruling Samajwadi Party which is desperately dependent on the vote bank of Yadav community and Muslims to stay in power tried its best to bypass the given legal procedures to have a person of its own choice despite repeated pulls by the Supreme Court. It was with the intervention of the Supreme Court that the matter came to its conclusion and the appointment of Lokayukta was made in early 2016. Since the post of the Lokayukta is important to register and prevent anti-corruption cases and activities, the samajwadi party whose credentials are not very good, and the rest of the parties which have been in power for the last one decade, particularly Bahujan Samaj Party, have not set a very good precedent, does not like to have an officer who may exercise his independence. Similarly as one studies reports released by office of the Governor of the state and the state Lokayukta one finds a large number of complains and cases against the corrupt legislators and officers, unlike the actions hardly taken against corrupt legislators except when the Governor appointed by the central government run by ideologically opposite party or alliance of parties, actions like suspension and transfer are frequently taken against the officers. Particularly when the officer doesn’t follow the dictates of the government there are so many cases of corruption and disproportionate assets and graft against the ruling legislators in which officers are also involved which reveal the prevalent corruption in the state. It also shows in most of the case the helplessness of the state officials. Wherever an honest officer is able to make some difference to the life of the common man, it is simply through his courage, efforts, dedications, commitment, hard work and honesty. But the number of such officials is as less as the number of honest legislators.

As already observed, the implementation of the developmental programmes and welfare schemes is badly affected by corrupt bureaucracy. Like other states Uttar Pradesh is badly infected, particularly in regions with low level of literacy, by corrupt bureaucracy. Corruption in bureaucracy exists in many forms which require very
extensive critical interpretations. It’s not simply a matter of embezzlement of the funds or accumulation of disproportionate assets or grabbing lands but discrimination, prejudice, negligence have more badly damaged the prospect of development and have made the life of common man very miserable. For instance, there have been a lot of complains recorded by volunteers, social activists, scholars and observers regarding the fair implementation of such developmental and welfare schemes like Indira Awas Yojana, employment under MGNREGA, provision of quality food under Mid Day Meal and distribution of ration under Public Distribution System. For example, villagers in many districts, such as Kushi Nagar, Bhadohi, Lalitpur and others, have complained that despite guaranteed employment they have not been given work and those who were employed have not got payment under the mandatory period of fifteen days. Therefore, such families have often been found in great distress. It has also been found out that in certain cases work is given to the ineligible people due to their association with the head of the village. On the other hand the homeless people in many villages have complained that their houses have not been built under Indira Awas Yojana despite official assurance. Similar complains have also been noted down regarding irrigation, provision of fertilizers and other resources of agriculture. That is one can noticed a lot of irregularities and negligence of duties. It is not surprising that officers often do not visit to the affected areas the way they should do. In Uttar Pradesh particularly in the backward districts the administration has often been found inactive and indifferent to the miserable condition of the poor people. In fact the colonial attitude in the civil servants still exists when they visit to the affected areas. In many cases if the area doesn’t hold much importance for the ruling party from the point of view of elections, district administration often neglects it. It shows that how deeply and strongly bureaucrats follow the line of state’s political establishment which eventually creates great obstacles in the way of free implementation of developmental programmes as Richard P. Taub writes, “the bureaucratic model is not helpful in understanding the problems administrators in developing nations face if these nations are committed to a democratic political order at the same time. Bureaucrats can function well in democratic societies if they have circumscribed and repetitive tasks to perform. In developing countries, by contrast where the tasks are complex and require both the high motivation of administrators and flexibility of administration for accomplishment, the democratic political order creates obstacles. This is especially true if officials are faced with the problem of
getting the public at large to comply with unpopular legislation. An administrator in a democratic society may simply be unable to administer laws that call for sacrifices on the part of the local populace. Specifically, politicians at the local level, who must balance long range development goals against shorter run satisfactions for their constituencies and payoffs for their supporters, often define the world in terms of the complex particularisms of village life. When these men work with administrators, whose major commitment is to abstract, universalistic rules and regulations, conflict is almost inevitable. Moreover, the democratic context supports the right of the politician, rather than that of the administrator, to choose goals and set policy. That is, in the democratic situation, power flows up in some measure from local politicians, rather than down from an autocratic ruler. What is startling is how many commentators on the Indian scene, and on problems of developing nations elsewhere, have failed to see this."9 On the other hand, another problem emerges out of the general attitude of the bureaucrats. Weber might have dreamed about bureaucracy as an instrument of development, but those who have work in this part of the world like India have realised that without cultivation of scientific mind and realization of common values of humanism no administration can work properly in the cause of particular society as Richard P. Taub comments in the light of his experience of the approach of the bureaucracy, “that the bureaucratic model put forward by Weber as the most efficient and rational possible means of administration is neither efficient nor, in that sense, particularly rational when applied in the development context. In other words, the Weberian model lives up to its billing only in certain limited circumstances, and is not universal, as Weber himself might have thought.”10 Taub has identified many areas of limitations of technical nature but some of them are matters of attitude and overall working conditions. For instance he further writes that, “Bureaucratic organization has been the device to consolidate holdings, maintain order, and collect taxes in the great colonial empires of the past one hundred years. So important has this been to Great Britain, for example, that her own internal civil service developed on the basis of lessons learned from the growth of the civil services in her overseas empire, particularly, the Indian Civil Service. Weber saw the bureaucracy as a coldly efficient machine in which all personal contingencies were eliminated. Few, if any, bureaucratic organizations realize this model. People find freedom, as Kenneth Boulding points out, in the interstices of inefficiency that seem to be characteristic of all bureaucracies. In addition, bureaucrats seem to develop
irrationalities of their own, such as adherence to rules even if that adherence stands in the way of achieving the larger goals of the organization. But the affinity between bureaucracy and authority exists nonetheless.”

Many scholars and commentators think that bureaucracy and popular democracy in the developing countries are so interlocked that the former is unable to work efficiently with the required autonomy that Weber had postulated in the cause of progress. Richard P. Taub thinks that there is an apprehension among scholars and writers in the developing societies like India that autonomy given to bureaucracy may undermine popular democracy. Taub thinks that their “commitment to democratic forms that many commentators do not want to improve the civil services in developing countries to much. These writers begin not with the question of the fitness of bureaucratic organization to accomplish development tasks, but rather with the question of ‘accountability’ of bureaucrats to politicians. This naturally recasts the whole question. Perceiving that the bureaucrats, trained under colonial rule, function in a far more modern framework then do the politicians, these scholars are concerned that administrators will not cede their former virtually complete control to the elected representatives of the people. There is a legitimate problem here. As we have seen, administrators do wish to resist pressures from political leaders. But one also senses a strong anti-elitist component in this line of argument.”

Increasing Gap Between the People and Administration

As already observed, today in the backward and underdeveloped regions most of the public servants are not in touch with the poor people, a fact which Taub observed in the 1970s in his empirical study of bureaucracy in the state of Orissa. He writes that officers, “do express values and attitudes that are markedly different from those of the populace whom they serve, and it is also true that they are somewhat out of touch with that populace. But that by itself is not necessarily detrimental. Distance from the people may, from a strictly technical point of view, be necessary if development is to take place at all. Development calls for modern styles of thinking, which almost by definition are not characteristic of most people in a developing country. The role of the political system in this context is first of all to serve as a bridge between the two kinds of outlook.”
The gap which an administration maintains on technical ground often leads to dehumanization of the people and different kinds of loss particularly in the rural areas. For instance, these days officers hardly go for inspections. In case of some emergency situations which involve crime and causalities or natural calamities, they hardly leave district headquarters. It is quite possible that an officer during his posting in a particular area and for a particular period may never had visited the rural areas to know the actual personally the actual condition on the ground and suggest certain measures accordingly. This attitude is in fact increasing day by day. The increasing plight of the farmers in different states including Uttar Pradesh and the measurable condition of the poor people can perhaps better be understood from this angle. Since, Uttar Pradesh is a pre dominantly based on agriculture and related activities, most of the officials who often frame policies and implement plans do not have real knowledge of the ground realities. This gap between knowledge and demand of the actual realities sometimes is counterproductive. It reveals an important fact that in order to run an administration effectively that makes human life better merely formal education is not the ultimate qualification and an administrator who has not lived actual life may fail to read this line of the real life. The increasing gap is a serious problem; it affects the efficiency of an administration at different levels. This gap is not simply between the officers and rural population; it has been noticed in different forms and at different levels even in urban areas. For example, it has been observed at the municipal level that there are tensions between elected leadership and bureaucracy leading to delay and a lot of hurdles and challenges in urban governance and development. As Asok Mukhopadhyay writes, “councillors come in close contact with municipal bureaucrats mainly at the committee and ward levels. It is the councillors’ anxiety to serve their constituencies which mostly brings them in conflict with the officials who belong to the state cadre and are eager to check the councillors’ enthusiasm, ostensibly to uphold the norms of municipal administration. The bureaucrats bring in their own norms and sense of propriety which do not tally with those of councillors. Sometimes the bureaucrats challenge the councillors at the overt or covert instance of higher-level bureaucracy or state level politicians. On the other hand, there are instances when municipal administrators have to rely on the councillors for local data and information and political intervention in administrative situations. Councillors informally supervise municipal activities at the ward level and act as useful liaison points between the municipal bureaucracy and the citizens. It is
the party political complexion of the state government and of the municipal council which determines the nature of tension or collaboration existing between politicians and administrators. Whenever the political leadership in municipal government is divided and weak, the municipal bureaucracy asserts its powers and also exercises influence by playing one group of councillors against another. In such situations the bureaucracy tries to function in an ‘autonomous’ manner, thereby either protecting citizens’ interests against corrupt councilors or jeopardizing democracy in urban governance. The worst thing happens when the elective and the bureaucratic elements manage to come to some sort of an understanding on the principle of ‘live and let live’ and share the loaves and fishes of office. An unholy alliance between politics and bureaucracy destroys both the efficiency and participative value of local government.”

Unlike the rural areas where bureaucracy has often been found to be indifferent, in urban areas its involvement is very deep. But this growing intervention in urban areas in the matter of planning implementation has often created different problems between officers and elected public representatives. It is believed that elected members in urban government are not only instrument of political representation but they are supposed to ensure public accountability. In this respect their role is very important in the effective fulfillment of public goals in a democracy. Asok Mukhopadhyay has further noticed deep differences between bureaucrats and elected urban bodies in India, he thinks that “Essentially a prismatic society by nature, India is experiencing a serious lack of balance between the rate of political development and bureaucratic growth. Bureaucracy at the local level has been expanding in size and given more responsibilities at the cost of its efficiency and especially its ability to stand up to the pressure of self-seeking politicians. Municipal administration is exposed to the direct gaze of councillors at several points. It is useless to talk about deliberative-executive separation. Ali Ashraf’s inquiry into the patterns of dominance, interests and values of municipal leaders in Calcutta Corporation between 1924 and 1964 and the mechanisms of their control over the municipal bureaucracy reveals interesting information on politics and bureaucracy in urban governance. He has shown how the mechanism of control is determined by the social and political affiliations of municipal leaders. The councillors and standing committee members try to influence the bureaucracy in respect of the priorities of development expenditures,
award of contracts, assessment and valuation of property and promotion and disciplining of employees. The mechanisms of influence range from personal request to open threats of political revenge.”

Lack of involvement, as observed above in the urban areas, is not uncommon in the rural Uttar Pradesh. In most of the cases where farmers, common villagers and labourers who face problems at different levels of their life are never consulted about the nature of development and its relevance to their actual life. In this respect the development programmes implemented in urban area where educated citizens and public representatives who have more to say in the matter of planning and development look more relevant and sensible. On the other hand most of the rural planning looks disorganised which undermines the very idea of good governance.

The Idea of Good Governance

This critical study of bureaucracy and its role in urban and rural development and implementation of a variety of welfare schemes is due to the fact that bureaucracy in a federal society like India where a state like Uttar Pradesh is so vast plays important role at different levels. In fact it is difficult to assess the nature of development in a state without properly and thoroughly the role of bureaucracy. Asok Mukhopadhyay in his critical study of the functioning of bureaucracy remarks, “Bureaucrats, in practice, play multiple roles in administration. They pre-eminently function as adviser to their political executives. The politicians have many sources of advice and bureaucracy is an important source. Bureaucrats monitor the state of affairs within their departments and serve as an important antenna to feed the political executive. They are in contact with not only the persons and problems within the municipal government but generally keep a close watch on the reactions of the civil society generated outside it. They know the rules and regulations and also interpret them as and when necessary. Second, they function as diplomats in the local community. They have to face the pressures of the civil society, talk with the people who matter within and outside the municipal government, receive memoranda and petitions and negotiate over the demands in accordance with the broader policy frame determined by the political executive. Where the municipal commissioner is vested with full executive powers, he plays this role almost independently and indicates through his 'diplomatic’ moves how much of the demands upon the municipal government can be accepted and how much of the pressures can be accommodated. In small and medium
municipalities also, the bureaucracy is seen to be playing this role quite successfully within the parameters set by local politics. Third, a successful bureaucrat also has to play the role of a scholar and a barrister. He collects and collates data about the problems and policies which he handles and prepares the brief for the mayor or the member of the M-I-C or in a municipality, for the chairman and the council. If the issue is not politically sensitive, the political design-makers prefer to be guided by the notes and briefs prepared by the bureaucracy. The task of urban governance, especially in big cities, is so complex as to necessitate the participation of outside groups in such municipal activities as poverty alleviation programmes with socio-economic contents. By education and training, bureaucrats are in a better position than politicians to tackle the NGOs and CBOs working in urban governance, especially in regard to legal and financial problems. When the big cities are involved in the globalization policies of the government, the municipal bureaucracy has to function as a serious partner of the political executive in negotiating and implementing urban development programmes.”

If one critical studies the functioning of bureaucracy in rural areas one can realise that the education and training of the officers can play positive role in the eradication of many problems, such as poverty, deteriorating quality of education in the state, inadequate supply of medicine and other health care provisions in the primary health care institutions in the rural areas including problems faced by farmers. That is, if officers work with sincerity dedication and commitment their intervention can make great difference to the life of the rural people. In this way people can get one of the important benefits of the good governance. Here, the term good governance does not simply imply what it originally means: ‘minimum governance’ rather it is used in a very broad sense. What Bentham thought the greatest good of the greatest number in the context of India and welfare development one can call it, “welfare of all and happiness of all. Thus, good in the context of good governance means those decisions, policies and actions which aim at the welfare of all. Because of a generally implied orientation of the people in favour of a democracy, defined as a government of the people, by the people and for the people, the ‘good’, or ‘welfare’ or ‘interest’ of people is assumed to be the necessary and sufficient condition of governance (not to speak of good governance) and its legitimacy.” It underlines that the idea of good governance is based on participation that is public participation, official accountability, predictability and transparency. These elements of good governance constitute the fundamental meaning of the rule of law. C.P.
Barthwal writes that “the above four elements of good governance tend to be mutually supportive and reinforcing. Thus, accountability is often related to participation, and is also the ultimate safeguard of predictability and transparency. In the absence of accountability government may take decisions without taking the interest of the public in mind. Transparency cannot be assured without legal frameworks for accountability. Again, predictability in functioning of the legal framework would be helpful in ensuring the accountability of public institutions. At the same time, predictability also requires transparency, because without information about how similarly placed individuals have been treated, it may be difficult to ensure adherence to the rule of equality before law. Finally, a transparent system facilitates governmental accountability, participation, and predictability of outcomes.”

It should be noted that all the commissions or reformations of bureaucracy were conceived for the promotion of this concept, because “bureaucracy is considered as one of the most powerful instruments of governance. It is through bureaucracy that public policies are given shape as well as get implemented. Logically, therefore, it has a significant role in the governing process. The theme for discussion here is Bureaucracy and Good Governance. We, therefore, propose to take up the issue of bureaucracy, its nature, functions, etc. in the context of India first and then try to identify the parameters of good governance. Lastly, we would like to see the interlinkage of the two themes to assess as to how far the bureaucracy is helping the cause of good governance or hampering it.”

As one critically examines the role of bureaucracy in different spheres of life in rural and urban areas in Uttar Pradesh, it is not very uncommon to find it as a deadlock in many domains of development. This also reflects not simply interference but corruption. Asok Mukhopadhyay has rightly remarked that the increasing intervention and dominance of bureaucracy in the management of urban life has undermined the authority of the public representatives, in this way challenging the very scope of popular participation. Popular participation at the level of local and urban governance was one of the important visions of the framers of the constitution of India to distinguish it from colonial pattern of governance. “In India, the management of urban infrastructure has not remained under the exclusive jurisdiction of the municipal government. The policy of integrated urban development programme has produced, since the seventies, a large number of urban development authorities in big, medium
and growing towns, and metropolitan development authorities in metro cities. These development authorities have been set up with interdisciplinary expertise for planning, coordinating, implementing (where necessary), funding and supervising urban development programmes. An understanding of the urban development authorities would help illuminate the nature of an important part of urban governance in India and facilitate the answer to the question of ‘who gets what’, when and how’ in major Indian cities. These development authorities were justified as ideal administrative instruments to carry out urban extension schemes, leaving the core city in the charge of the municipal government. Urban development was sought to be kept separate from urban politics, mainly following the colonial tradition of improvement thrusts. These development bodies are nominated by the state government, bureaucratic in composition and unaccountable to the local people. But as planning and development process becomes complicated, and more and more citizen participation is demanded, these bodies prove to be politically counterproductive. These bodies play an important part in urban governance but they are far away from people's participation and response. In their working they are insulated from local politics but are heavily influenced by state-level politics. They often function in an authoritarian manner in making decisions on capital budgeting ris-a-ris the local civic bodies, and they release funds on condition of scheme-vetting and monitoring by them. Experience suggests that these bodies do not augment the management capacity necessary for urban governance. While giving constitutional recognition to the urban local government, the seventy-fourth Constitutional Amendment remains silent on the role of the development authorities vis-a-vis an elected municipal government. It is relevant to note here that, the Development Authority must receive inter-institutional legitimacy and acceptance in the governmental framework by which alone it can achieve the credibility of commanding and orchestrating the total urban programme. The existing development authorities, however, fail to pass through this acid test since bureaucracy dominates in this aspect of urban governance.²⁰

It shows that in order to make good governance effective a healthy interaction between government officials and public representatives is very necessary. The increasing gap between government officials and rural people or the dominance of government officials and elected representatives in rural and urban development respectively is one of the emerging problems facing good governance, as Asok
Mukhopadhyay further observes “Good governance of urban areas is frustrated by a variety of factors, of which politics-bureaucracy interaction is a significant one. The roots of conflicts between politics and bureaucracy in India’s urban governance, if adequately researched, would illuminate the ramifications in it of politics and the role of local elites and the bureaucracy, their values and orientations, their interests and their mechanisms of control over urban governance. ‘Governance’ is basically the process of the state authority exercising coercive power and civil society, encompassing the private sector economy and groups and individuals, pursuing their economic goals. In the context of increasing liberalization and globalization the civil society in India is sure to assert itself, giving a new twist to urban governance. Democratic values are likely to gain in strength. More accountability and greater transparency in decision-making would require open government and people’s participation in governing India's urban areas. The seventy-fourth Amendment to the Constitution has made a small beginning by recognizing the role of municipal governments in the process of planning and development of urban areas. The interplay of politics and bureaucracy, conducted with diverse nuances in different contexts, are crucial in determining the nature and style of urban governance which, in its turn, largely depends on the nature and essence of the overall political culture of a society.”

Since public policy in India, as envisaged by the legislature, is an important process, it is believed that proper interaction and consultation between government and popular agencies is important for meaningful development. This is one of the reasons that it is emphasized that the public officers who helped in framing policies at different levels should not ignore the people who perhaps have better knowledge of the ground realities in the domain of their experience. That is why it is emphasized that in a federal democracy with a very heterogeneous demography over a vast area of land like India public policy is a very complex process “Public policy-making in India is as polyarchal as perhaps in any other country. It is more so because of the existence of a federal polity, the diversity of the country and the pluralistic nature of the society, a free press and the conflicting demands made by different groups through a vast network of communications system that has developed in the country during the past four decades of independence. The various institutions that are involved in public policy-making range from a number of agencies in all branches of government, the executive, the legislative and the judiciary to a host of non-
governmental institutions, associations, interest groups, political parties, academic bodies and individuals.²²

**Good Governance and the Idea of a Welfare Society: Some Challenges to Bureaucracy**

The idea of good governance and the concept of a welfare society seem to be compatible in the historical background of the Indian democracy. As S. Gupta writes in the context of Indian Bureaucracy “as one of the most powerful instruments of good governance in the present society and modern welfare state without which one cannot think of a responsible and organised governance. Whereas bureaucracy is an old concept, good governance is a recent one. Both are, however, closely interlinked so much so that one is incomplete without the other.”²³ The post independent India was confronted with two big problems of which prevailing poverty was the most threatening one in many states, Uttar Pradesh is one of them. On the other hand, the question of national integration was equally complex. Poverty and integration are contradictory in nature. A society in the face of unmanageable poverty is likely to collapse. Therefore, India in the very initial stages of its independence conceived the idea of planned economic development. Its primary aim was not simply to remove poverty and hunger from across the states but there was a deeper apprehension that the unity of a state largely depends on economic development and almost equal distribution of resources. It was in this context that the institution of bureaucracy found its logical meaning. This institution is open to manipulation and also has inherent tendency to create hurdles, nevertheless it is unavoidable in a state like Uttar Pradesh and a country like India for the implementation of welfare measures and other developmental programmes for the people. Therefore, the framers of the constitution so inspired by Gandhian vision of inclusive development, guided by colonial history, preferred the Weberian model of bureaucratic governance in a federal setup. In this reference, S.N. Singh’s remark seems to be of primary relevance “Any discussion about the modern bureaucracy has to take into account the Weber’s ideal model of bureaucracy which bases itself on the premises of neutrality, objectivity, rationality, rule-boundedness and hierarchy. Subsequent developments of the models of bureaucracy have been the criticism of Weberian model in one way or the other. The modern Indian system too opted for a Weberian model for its future administration and governance. Indian bureaucracy too was required to function on
the Weberian model, meaning thereby a preference for rules, political neutrality, etc. How far this model of bureaucracy has been suitable for the Indian system is a matter of debate. We have different accounts about performance of Indian bureaucracy. We can, therefore, identify some of the core issues listed below concerning Indian bureaucracy which directly affects the governing process:

1. In view of the needs and aspirations of Indian people, should the bureaucracy by value-neutral on value-loaded?
2. Have the extra-merit factors affected the performance level of the Indian bureaucracy?
3. Should the bureaucracy in India be more responsive as well as representative?
4. Is there a need for reforms in the structure as well as the functional areas of the Indian bureaucracy?

It reveals that the idea of development is almost impossible without the institution of efficient bureaucracy. In a state like Uttar Pradesh where a large number of people particularly in rural areas are so dependent on the aids of government, an efficient bureaucratic institution, that is, where officials work for the people with honesty, dedication, commitment, vision and human heart, is extremely important. The idea of good governance makes sense in the context of economic and social justice which reaches to the people in different forms through bureaucracy. On this occasion it seems necessary to recall important words of the first Prime Minister of independent India explaining his vision of inclusive development and social justice that provided the foundation of preamble of the constitution of India:

“Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, in his speech on 14-8-1947, on the eve of India’s independence said that ‘at this solemn moment we take the pledge of dedication to the service of India and her people and to the still larger cause of humanity-freedom and power bring responsibility-the service of India means the service of millions who suffer-It means the ending of poverty and ignorance and disease and inequality of opportunity. The ambition of the greatest man of our generation has been to wipe every tear from every eye-as long as there are tears and suffering our work will not be over.’
The Constitution of India-Preamble mentions that ‘We the people of India, solemnly resolve to constitute India into a sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic republic and to secure to all its citizens:

*Justice, social, economic and political,*

*Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship, Equality of status and of opportunity and to promote among them all,*

*Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity and the integrity of the nation.”*²⁵

It seems here important to substantiate the argument with the actual experience and observation made by B.P. Singh, “India’s democratic experience of the past six decades has clearly established that good governance must aim at expansion of social opportunities and removal of poverty. Good governance, according to the author, means securing justice, empowerment, employment and efficient delivery of services. The paper deals with these subjects in detail and also analyses administrative and political faultiness.”²⁶

Of some of the big challenges facing bureaucracy in Uttar Pradesh, criminalisation of politics and corruption in government are the most prominent one. As already noted, these two factors work in different forms in hampering the implementation of welfare and developmental schemes in the interest of the underprivileged people in the state. Unless effective steps are taken to undermine the influence of these factors bureaucracy may not find free ground to play its role. On the other hand, in order to make bureaucracy pro people there should be proper mechanism at district level for the officers to regularly hear public petitions and their grievances. Unless such steps are taken the idea of good governance may not become a reality. The independent India incorporated the idea of good governance and social justice in association with political responsibility, fair and objective policy making and effective bureaucracy along with an autonomous judiciary. As B.P. Singh writes, “The central challenge before good governance relates to social development. In his famous ‘tryst with destiny’ speech on 14 August 1947, Jawaharlal Nehru articulated this challenge as ‘the ending of poverty and ignorance and disease and inequality of opportunities’. Good governance must aim at expansion in social opportunities and removal of
poverty. In short, good governance, as I perceive it, means securing justice, empowerment, employment and efficient delivery of services.”27 It is necessary to decriminalize politics and strengthen state institutions particularly judiciary. At the same time it is also important to inspire the values which the framers of the constitution considered will go into the making of an independent India.
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