CONCLUSION

This research is a critical study of the role of bureaucracy in the administration of welfare schemes and development programmes in the state of Uttar Pradesh in India. In all the forms of government, especially in a democracy, bureaucracy plays such an important role in the running of government that it is often assumed that it is indispensable to it. Bureaucracy has occupied such an important place in the organization of political systems that it has become synonymous with government. Irrespective of the forms and nature of government the institution of bureaucracy is unavoidable despite so many pejorative connotations associated with it. In a federal state like India, for example, its role is more important not simply for the effective coordination between the states and the centre but also for inter-state and intra-state coordination. Although, this is characteristically a purely political function but, due to its all-pervasive nature, it assumes administrative connotations. In a state at any level, bureaucracy has a big role to play, whether it is policy making, execution of law, implementation of public policies, supervision or monitoring of different types of programmes in the welfare of the people, bureaucracy’s presence cannot be ignored. From the institutional point of view, a federal country cannot be run without bureaucracy providing leadership. A country like India, divided into 29 states and 7 union territories, requires a very large and efficient bureaucracy to manage its political and economic spheres as has been amply observed throughout this thesis. Although bureaucracy as an institution was systematically studied only in the last couple of centuries but it has existed since times immemorial throughout the history of great empires. It assumed its modern form with the scientific treatment it received from some writers in France and Germany and later by Max Weber who is considered as one of its important architects. Weber had pleaded that in order to capitalise on industrial economy, to maximise its production and facilitate its distribution a state needs an effective bureaucracy. An effective bureaucracy from Weber’s point of view is possible with systematic education followed by intensive training imparted to them after assuming their offices. Even Macaulay gave emphasis on these aspects as has been discussed in this work. Apart from education and training, Weber suggested that the conduct or behavior of the government officials should be regulated by rational and objective rules so that they are not affected by unnecessary interference in the tasks assigned to them. The idea was clear that officials should be protected by legal
norms so that they can work with the required autonomy and independence. Weber also emphasized that every government enactment and decision must be properly documented. This was intended, probably because he thought that documentation is not simply important for efficiency of bureaucracy but it is also a way of making it accountable to the system and the people. These things and their importance are surely not unknown to the contemporary world and its democratic societies. Bureaucracy as an institution has its own hierarchical structure in which officers hold formal positions with their responsibilities divided in their respective spheres of work. According to Weber, officials should be appointed according to certain criteria. For example, the officer’s position is purely impersonal. Therefore, the official works are entirely separated from ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of the positions they occupy. They are personally free and subject to legal authority only with respect to their impersonal official responsibilities. There are these and some other criteria that constitute a career. There is a system of promotion according to seniority and achievement. Promotion is subjected to the judgement of superiors. They are organised in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices. Each office has clearly defined domains of competence in the legal sense of the term. As said earlier, candidates are selected and appointed on the basis of technical qualifications which makes the entire system run by experts in the field of administration. Weber completely rejected the idea of elections for civil servants as he wanted them to be appointed. The incumbents to the office work on the basis of a free contractual relationship. Therefore, in principle, there is a mechanism for free and fair selection process. The incumbents are also subjected to strict and systematic codes of discipline and control in the conduct of their official duties. The office is treated as the sole, or at least the primary, occupation of the officer. They are remunerated by fixed salaries in money, for the most part with a right to pensions. Only under certain cases does the employing authority, especially in private organisations, have a right to terminate the appointment, but the official is always free to resign. The salary scale is primarily determined according to rank in the hierarchy; but in addition to this criterion, the responsibility of the position and the requirements of the officer’s social status may be taken into consideration.

In spite of such strict regulations, bureaucracy has also acquired some negative connotations in contemporary politics. Some of the theories of bureaucracy discussed
in this thesis have been critically analysed in relation to the functioning of the bureaucracy. For example, the liberal theorists are very sceptical of bureaucracy’s image of transparency and accountability. Similarly, Marxist theory considers bureaucracy as a tool in the hands of a state for the subordination and exploitation of the poor. They condemn it as a source of oppression of the common man. Similarly, the New Right has criticised bureaucracy on certain aspects of irresponsibility as a self serving institution and for being indifferent to the interests of the common man. These theoretical aspects of bureaucracy have been given a fair treatment in this study. Some of the prominent theories of bureaucracy have been discussed in detail. For example, rational administrative model which has incorporated fundamental principles with which Weber laid the foundation of modern bureaucracy has been dealt with in considerable proportions. Bureaucracy, as Weber had propounded, has grown and expanded with the decentralisation of political power in the contemporary democracies. India, with a very large federal system of government, where bureaucracy has evolved at different levels, is a good example. As one examine pre-democratic mode of political organisation where power and privileges were largely concentrated, the role of bureaucracy was very limited, yet, equally obscure was other forms of administrative systems. If bureaucracy, as Weber thought, is a rational organisation, its expansion is unavoidable for efficiency, transparency and accountability. He also thought that with the development of industrial society, apart from the ideologies of political organisation, socialism, communism or liberalism, the nature of bureaucracy will almost be similar. That is despite their ideological differences and administrative mechanisms. The industrial societies would be governed by a class of managers, supervisors, technocrats and officials who would be trained and skilled. Similarly, Marxists and socialists also developed ‘power-bloc’ model of bureaucracy, but, unlike Weber, Marx has not given any systematic theory of bureaucracy though he has made methodical observations about it. Marx perhaps did not consider bureaucracy as a natural requirement of industrial society. He views bureaucracy as a necessary institution along with capitalism to defend the interests of the capitalists, the Neo-Marxists, on the other hand, see it as a conservative mechanism indifferent to the interest of the poor people. Despite political neutrality and education, the government officials identify with the interests of the capitalists. The next important theory of bureaucracy has been discussed under ‘bureaucratic over supply’ model, which deals with the economic interests of the officials. This model
reflects some deeper understanding of the human nature in the sphere of economic choices. It stresses that officials look after their own interest and increase their own resources.

It would be appropriate in the context to reiterate that bureaucracy is considered to have a significant role to play in a democracy. Though it evolved in its modern form in Europe it was inherited in India through colonialism. The British system of bureaucracy came to India through the British rule. The British rule primarily was supposed to defend the interests of the British government; therefore, bureaucracy was purely a political tool to exploit the resources in India in their interests. It was considered to be, under these historical circumstances, a negative institution against the interests of the natives. This is why when India became independent its constitution tried to give a human face to bureaucracy. It all began with the fundamental change in the government as the preamble of the Constitution has emphasised. Nehru and the members of the congress set India on the course of socialist democracy in the best interest of the people under the prevailing circumstances. In such a situation, the role of bureaucracy became very important. This institution was not supposed to take care of the interests of the people. Therefore, officers were made accountable. Since it became a proper institution, the Constitution of India also laid principles of selection and appointment through competitive examinations as discussed in detail in the thesis.

In this study, a systematic attempt has been made to find relations between bureaucracy and development with reference to the state of Uttar Pradesh in India i.e., different patterns of development have been discussed and the role of bureaucracy has been highlighted in considerable details. As India became independent, the members of the Constituent Assembly of India accommodated certain principles for a welfare state. In a socialistic pattern of society and a welfare state, the success of the government largely depends on the measures and actions taken to improve the economic and social conditions of the people. That is why economic and social development is always regarded synonymous with initiatives taken for the welfare of the people. That is, in such conditions bureaucracy becomes the pivotal tool for the administration of development. An administrative accountability is not only to maintain law and order rather, its responsibility goes beyond the limited function of the care for the people in society. This trend developed as Indian democracy matured.
As one looks at this principle, it seems an attempt to change the colonial image of the bureaucracy and also to incorporate some human concerns in the general policies of the government. As it has been already noted, the role of bureaucracy in developmental programmes is a very modern phenomenon in its present magnitudes. Traditionally speaking, bureaucracy was identified with technical, clerical and mechanical practise. Today, every sphere of man’s social and economic life is highly bureaucratised. As social and economic changes are transforming man’s actual life, their management now largely depends on bureaucratic arrangement. Apart from administration, looking after law and order, assisting in making policies, execution of decisions, the concept of bureaucracy has expanded to include such spheres of life including economic production and education including those areas in the contemporary social and economic life which were hardly bureaucratised during the times of Weber, in the beginning of the industrial age.

It is believed that no government has ever worked without bureaucracy. Therefore, an attempt has been made in this thesis to trace the emergence of bureaucracy from ancient India up to its great evolution during the Mughal period. It has been discovered that expansion of bureaucracy has been parallel to the growth of government. A very complex system of bureaucracy was found during Mughal period in which India has become a very large empire. But the legacy of bureaucracy which the British rule had developed in India was more systematic and organised with the fundamental changes in the material condition of social and political life. For example, during the British rule bureaucracy was subservient to the interests of the colonial power. It was accountable directly to the government. The whole process of appointment and promotion was centralised, officers didn’t have any independence. These are the features of bureaucracy and of its functioning in the pre-independence India. Though, through a series of Acts from 1773 to 1935, as discussed in the thesis, periodic attempts were made to regulate the behaviour of bureaucracy but it still remained in absolute control of colonial power. Bureaucracy in India became an independent institution, though its independence has not always remained intact, with certain provisions given in the constitution regarding selection, appointment promotion etc. Nevertheless, it has been observed while examining the role of bureaucracy in the formulation of policies, implementation and supervision of welfare schemes and development programmes in Uttar Pradesh that officers are generally
promoted, transferred and subjected to different sorts of penalties at the whims and fancies of the politicians. Such whimsical and thoughtless manipulation of bureaucracy has greatly affected the overall development of the state. For example, in such a situation the honest officers find it difficult to work with independence and accountability. Since Uttar Pradesh is a very large state with a huge population where poverty and unemployment due to the decline of agriculture are so high and where most of the people are dependent on government’s aid and welfare schemes, the growing criminalisation of politics and politicisation of bureaucracy has badly affected the development of the state.

While exploring different schemes and development programmes launched either by the central government or state government for the people of Uttar Pradesh, in the last few decades particularly since the liberalisation of Indian economy, it has been observed that bureaucracy has not been able to play its role in line with the expectations of the people. For example, while critically examining the schemes like; Indira Awas Yojana, Mid Day Meal, NREGA and other development schemes from the construction of road network to the provision of irrigation facilities to the farmers, corruption has been found as the most common problem. Large sums of money have been wasted due to corruption, which if had been properly utilised they would have made positive difference to the life of the common man. For instance, if one examines from this angle, as has been often emphasised at different places in this thesis, the role of bureaucracy seems to be instrumental and is open to use and misuse, its efficacy and performance very much dependent on the overall political culture in the state. It would be a misunderstanding to think that by holding an official position, an officer or a group of officers can change the life of the people. This is a very common misunderstanding among those who have not studied the ground realities from close quarters. A case study of Uttar Pradesh in this thesis has shown that no society can develop without economic sources and the vision of the government represented by the elected members because even from institutional point of view bureaucracy’s functioning is considerably determined by the decisions of the legislatures. A state like Uttar Pradesh which has a very large number of tainted and poorly educated and corrupt members in the government, it is difficult to have any idea of effective bureaucracy under the command of such people in the government. Therefore, bureaucracy cannot play its role properly until there is a corruption free environment,
unless educated and competent people who have good understanding of ground realities are occupying political offices, until political leadership is sensitive to the problems of hunger and poverty, and other social and economic problems of the society, are elected by the people because, it has been observed, that an effective bureaucracy also depends for its strengths on an effective government which works for the people with commitment, dedication and honesty. It is not very surprising to discover that the general attitude of the officers changes in the light of the indication which they get from the government. If the government, legislators included, indulge in corrupt practices, bureaucracy cannot remain incorruptible. In certain situations, as it has been found in this study on Uttar Pradesh, an honest officer can even suffer if he doesn’t follow even unreasonable and illegal commands of the state government.