INTRODUCTION

Bureaucracy is considered the backbone of public administration. Public administration is the formal institution of government, it includes so many institutions in a democracy which entirely depend for their functioning on bureaucracy. The nature, functions and role of bureaucracy in a democracy varies with the fundamental principles of the government. For example, in certain forms of government, the imperial one is a case in point, bureaucracy is subordinated absolutely to government because its aim is to fulfill the interests of the government. With the emergence of modern bureaucracy and welfare state, bureaucracy was developed as an independent institution coordinating between government and the people, as discussed in this thesis. For example, in ancient times and even in the era of colonialism, bureaucracy was a tool for the government to exploit the people. This is one of the reasons that it has acquired a lot of negative connotations. These reveal one important thing that bureaucracy was for the government not for the people. The readers of the colonial history of India perhaps know it very well that it was a mechanism to exploit the resources and suppress the people of the colonies. This is one of the reasons that in independent India there was a very strong reaction against colonial bureaucracy. This reaction is very clear in the words of the preamble of the constitution of India, as discussed in this work.

The thesis is an attempt to explore the nature and functions of bureaucracy and its role in the implementation of welfare schemes and developmental programmes in the state of Uttar Pradesh in India. Chapter first of this study deals with the origin and evolution of bureaucracy as an institution. Bureaucracy is in its modern form was founded by Max Weber in the context of industrial economy to help in maximising economic production and distribution. Weber thought that economic progress largely depends on the efficiency of bureaucracy. The nature and development of bureaucracy have in the modern times something to do with the nature of economic development, social organisation and political dispensation of a society. Indeed, it is almost impossible to have any notion of a modern political system of a society without bureaucracy. Bureaucracy, as it is understood in the modern sense of the term, has its origin in the industrial development and the establishment of capitalist economy and emergence of colonialism.
Introduction

The idea of society or of administration is indeed inconceivable without proper system of communication. From the beginning of society, rulers have developed certain forms of communication with the ruled. It is almost impossible to run and govern a state without it. Communication is not important simply for governance but even for its stability. Any society with poor means of communication is susceptible to insubordination and disintegration. Seeing from this angle, communication and bureaucracy seem to be synonymous. But one should draw certain line of distinction, that is, communication should be taken as a means while bureaucracy as a mode or institution. This institution can be regarded as a structure of governance through which communication is transmitted from the rulers to the ruled. It is, no doubt, very important to examine the role of the system of communication in the emergence of modern democracy and economic progress. The emergence of modern institution of bureaucracy is attributed to the industrial revolution and the establishment of liberal democracy in Europe. Since democracy is based on some positive humanistic principles which are aimed to establish a new relationship between the government and the governed in the sphere of administration and economic welfare. The role of bureaucracy, in this context, came to acquire central significance in the theory of political science. Modern bureaucracy, however, is a phenomenon of the post-industrial revolution and mostly of the nineteenth century. It was Max Weber who articulated the basic characteristics of bureaucracy in a form which has now become the standard theoretical basis for sociological and administrative research all over the world. The very nature of Weberian concept of bureaucracy implies hierarchy of authority from the top to the different strata of the organisation for the transmission of political, social and economic provisions to the people. It suggests that the idea of hierarchy and subordination is inseparable from the bureaucratic organisation. The nature of bureaucracy depends to a great extent on that of political dispensation of a society. Since bureaucracy is probably about the distribution of power, a society postulated upon autocratic principles is bound to render officers into mere instruments that invariably lead to a range of contradictions that are not very difficult to understand if one analyses different forms of autocratic and totalitarian governments. Though the nature of bureaucracy changes with democracy, and liberal democracy enunciates a system based on liberty and individuality, it is assumed that the executives or the officers are given genuine authority and individual responsibility when it comes to decision making, implementation of policies and registration of
public grievances. The law authorises the officers to initiate in different domains and it eventually lends legitimacy to their decisions and actions. This is what Weber seems to suggest in his concept of an ideal bureaucratic organisation.

Chapter first is an attempt to discuss the concept and pattern of organization given by Max Weber along with the aims and objectives of bureaucracy. It also discusses different features of bureaucracy. There has also been an attempt to see the emergence of modern bureaucracy in India as an institution. One can see in this chapter how it evolved in India as an institution and developed a system of selection, appointment and transparency through competitive exams. In this respect some light has been thrown on the reports of Macaulay in colonial India and also the reports of commissions to reform the institution of bureaucracy in post independence India. There has also been an attempt to find out the role of bureaucracy under federalism and its relationship with development in the context of welfare state. There is also a brief discussion on the theories of development and role of bureaucracy.

Chapter second deals with the development of bureaucracy in pre-independent India. There is also an attempt to see its nature and functions in ancient India. Similarly, bureaucracy has also been discussed in the context of Mughal era. It has been discovered that hierarchy and subordination have been the common features of bureaucracy. Before the emergence of modern democracy, bureaucracy was deeply integrated with government. Its main aim was to strengthen the control of government over the people. The structure of bureaucracy in the Mughal era has clearly been highlighted. Then follow a detailed discussion of the nature and function of bureaucracy in British India. In this reference different provisions about bureaucracy given in the regulating act from The Regulating Act of 1773, The Pitt’s India Act of 1784, The Act of 1858, The India Council Act of 1861, The India Council Act of 1892, The India Council Act of 1909, The Government of India Act 1919, The Government of India Act 1935, have been discussed. The discussion has revealed that bureaucracy in India was primarily meant to safeguard the interest of the colonial government rather than the welfare of the people of India.

There is a detailed discussion about the development of bureaucracy, its nature and functions, in post independence India. Bureaucracy in post independence India became an independent institution in which officers were appointed through open competitions. Apart from discussing the mechanism of selection and appointment an attempt is made to discuss in detail the functions of bureaucracy in India. Nehru,
while putting the country on the socialist course, tried to give a very different shape to bureaucracy in his vision of modern India. In this way he thought that bureaucracy can play an important role under a federal set up with planned economy. Nehru, the architect of modern India and the first Prime Minister of independent India inspired by socialist ideas, had a very different vision of development. The components of Nehru’s vision of development are: planning, dominant public sector, full utilization of all productive forces, full utilisation of science and technology as instruments of change and growth, radical land reforms, modernisation of agriculture and reduction of disparities. His dream of converting India into a secular democratic republic is of great significance. The dominant role of public sector made bureaucracy the central medium of undertaking India’s development. Thus, the responsibility fell on the shoulders of the administrators/civil servants who were to act as the principal agents of social change and economic development in the country. Bureaucracy suffered great subordination during the tenure of Indira Gandhi particularly during emergency. This had very far reaching and basically negative consequences for democracy and institutional autonomy and transparency. Once the idea got legitimacy, officers began currying favors from their politicians in power. Important posts were offered to those who did the bidding of their political bosses, while those who resisted and insisted on following an independent line based on professional training were ignored and punished. Punishment took the form of arbitrary transfers, postings to insignificant departments and in some cases, even suspension from service. A system of rewards and punishments got institutionalized in due course of time with civil servants being rewarded and punished on the basis of their loyalty and commitment to politicians or parties and not on the basis of their professional performance. As indicated above, over a period of time, the politician-bureaucrat nexus grew into a powerful force immensely benefitting both the parties, but spelling a blow to the concept of development and citizen friendly administration. During this period there was another unhealthy development in the form of bureaucrat-politician-businessman nexus in the time of the notorious license-permit-quota raj. It derailed the whole mission of effective bureaucracy and resulted into different forms of corruption, as has been discussed in this chapter. Independent India’s economy, with industrialization and globalisation, required a very effective bureaucracy for economic progress and also to extend the benefit of progress to the people. In this era industrialisation needed effective management of economy and policy making during the time of economic
reform and liberalisation of Indian economy in the last decade of 20th century bureaucracy came under severe pressure there was growing demand for diminishing the role of bureaucracy and also rolling back of the state. Nevertheless given the poverty and socialist vision, the welfare of the people was equally of great importance which could not be entirely neglected. All these features have been discussed in this chapter along with other technical and political aspects facing bureaucracy.

Chapter four is a detailed study of the development schemes and programmes launched by government of India and also by the state government in Uttar Pradesh. This chapter is an exclusive study of the role of bureaucracy in the administration of welfare schemes in the state. There has been a attempt to analyse the role of bureaucracy from different angles such as, policy making, administration, supervision, inspection and assessment. In this chapter the meaning of development has been discussed from a philosophical point of view with particular reference to John Rawls, Amartya Sen and Jean Dreze. Development in the light of these philosophers and theorists is propounded with human face. The very idea of economic development loses its social meaning in the face of increasing inequality and social injustice. It is in this context that important welfare and development schemes and programmes running in the state of Uttar Pradesh, particularly since the economic reform and liberalization of Indian economy, have been discussed in details. Schemes like Indira Awas Yojana, Mid Day Meals and NREGA have been discussed in the context of social justice and the impact of these schemes in changing the life of poor people. Moreover, it has been shown that in the conception and administration of these schemes the role of bureaucracy is of critical importance. But it has been found that bureaucracy is not able to play its role as independently as it requires. This is one of the important area which has been discussed in chapter fifth of this thesis chapter fifth is a critical study of the conditions in which the bureaucrat works and also the factors which have led to increasing corruption in the state of Uttar Pradesh. On the other hand, it has been discovered that corruption in different forms in bureaucracy has adversely affected the life of the common citizens of the state particularly the farmers, laborours and the underprivileged sections of society. It has been found out that the real causes of the miserable condition of the rural people in the state in fact lie in the bad condition of agriculture. Since agricultural occupation has now become extremely expensive, unlike the past, today farmers 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 broken down
the young generation has migrated to cities in search of better future. 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 the youth can easily get job in 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 permanent. If one seriously studies 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 ignore on technical
ground. The very foundation of the origin and the organization of the modern state
based on popular consent and social contract, if one examines 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 demand of
development and social justice.

Due to the misuse of government funds in which bureaucrats and politicians are
deeply involved many welfare schemes either do not reach the eligible people at all or
they reach the people with political connections. Corruption in Indira Awas Yojana
and NREGA has been found in this context. Moreover some of the factors like
discrimination, caste and corruption and criminalisation of politics in the state of Uttar
Pradesh have adversely affected government’s measures to improve the life of the
common man. In this chapter there is a discussion of urban and rural poverty. Since
the economy of Uttar Pradesh is largely dependent on agriculture, the decline of
agriculture particularly in the last two decades had badly destroyed the life of small farmers.

Methodology
The research has been conducted on the role of bureaucracy in the implementation and supervision of welfare schemes and development programmes in the state of Uttar Pradesh in India. While going through work I have not found to the source of my knowledge works on this aspect in Uttar Pradesh. Therefore, I have used as primary data, books on public administration, research work of similar nature and other states, articles published in scholarly journals in political science and public administration, reports of the government commissions and other official data. For empirical accounts I have relied on the field work done by social scientists and activists using questionnaires and conduction interviews and my own experience as a citizen of this state of the general condition of life in many districts of this state. In this thesis I have used historical as well as analytical methods to critically examine the role of bureaucracy. The thesis is an attempt to conduct research on the hypothesis and set of questions that follow.

Hypothesis
It is true that bureaucracy has an important role in the implementation of welfare schemes and developmental programmes, its actual function entirely depends on the competence, integrity and honesty of the representatives which people elect in a democracy under the social, political and historical constraints for the management of their life. Nevertheless, bureaucracy is considered as an important instrument of development and social transformation.

Research Questions
The thesis is guided by the following questions:

a) Whether bureaucracy has played any significant role in the general administration?

b) Has bureaucracy made any positive contribution to the social welfare and development?

c) Has bureaucracy been responsible to the welfare of the people in Uttar Pradesh?

d) What’s the general attitude of bureaucracy towards the poverty of the people?

e) What’s the nature of the relationship between government and bureaucracy?
Chapter- I
Concepts of Bureaucracy: Its Organisation and Development
CONCEPTS OF BUREAUCRACY, ITS ORGANISATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The terms bureaucrat, bureaucratic, and bureaucracy are clearly invectives. Nobody calls himself a bureaucrat or his own methods of management bureaucratic. These words are always applied with an opprobrious connotation. They always imply a disparaging criticism of persons, institutions, or procedures. Nobody doubts that bureaucracy is thoroughly bad and that it should not exist in a perfect world.¹

The term bureaucracy has its origin in the word ‘bureau’ which signifies desk or writing table. It not only simply symbolises some sorts of locations but a certain mode of communication. It gives a certain sense of a working environment, namely; it is a place for execution of the certain tasks. All the synonyms, which bureaucracy has given birth to, such as, office, administration, executive agencies and so on, have somehow their root in this term. It is not very strange to find the word bureaucracy being used with negative connotations particularly in the light of its contemporary behaviour. Today “Bureaucracy is a word more often used as a term of abuse than as a description. To many people it signifies delay, ‘red tape’, coldness, impersonal attitudes and inefficiency”.² Bureaucracy, seen from the technical perspective, is basically a system of communication for the interaction between the power and the people. This is perhaps one of the reasons that bureaucracy is defined as a backbone of governance. It means that no government can work successfully without bureaucratic infrastructure and communication. Though the term came into prominence in France as an administrative system, it was seen with a certain degree of reprehension. Max Weber, the great German economist and administrative thinker, developed it into a rational system of administration (as discussed later in this chapter). The nature and development of bureaucracy have in the modern times something to do with the nature of economic development, social organisation and political dispensation of a society. In fact, it is difficult to have any idea of a modern political organisation of a society without bureaucracy. Bureaucracy, as it is understood in the modern sense of the word, has its origin in the industrial development and the establishment of capitalist economy, and the colonialism in Europe. If the institution of bureaucracy has earned some pejorative connotations, as the above observation made by the great economist and philosopher Ludwig Von
Mises (1881-1973), seems to suggest, there are some reasons which would be discussed and explained in considerable details later on.

The concept of society or of governance is in fact inconceivable without communication. From ancient ages, rulers have developed certain form of communication with the people. It is difficult to run and govern a society without it. Communication is not important simply for governance but even for its stability. Any society with poor means of communication is susceptible to insubordination and disintegration. Seeing from this angle, communication and bureaucracy seems to be synonymous. But one should draw certain line of distinction, that is, communication should be taken as a means while bureaucracy as a mode or institution. This institution can be regarded as a structure of governance through which communication is transmitted from the rulers to the ruled. It is, no doubt, very important to examine the role of the system of communication in the emergence of modern democracy and economic progress. The emergence of modern institution of bureaucracy is attributed to the industrial revolution and the establishment of liberal democracy in Europe. Since democracy is based on some positive humanistic principles which are aimed to establish a new relationship between the government and the governed in the sphere of administration and economic welfare. The role of bureaucracy, in this context, came to acquire central significance in the theory of political science. In this respect, particularly the promotion of citizen’s welfare parallel to economic development, Max Weber (1864-1920) the great German political philosopher, laid the foundation of the great modern institution. As said earlier, bureaucracy is the backbone of the administrative system of government. It plays a very important role in the developmental process of a nation. Modern bureaucracy, however, is a phenomenon of the post-industrial revolution and mostly of the nineteenth century. It was Max Weber who articulated the basic characteristics of bureaucracy in a form which has now become the standard theoretical basis for sociological and administrative research all over the world. The very nature of Weberian concept of bureaucracy implies hierarchy of authority from the top to the different strata of the organisation for the transmission of political, social and economic provisions to the people. It suggest that the idea of hierarchy and subordination is inseparable from the bureaucratic organisation. The nature of bureaucracy depends to a great extent on that of political dispensation of a society.
Since bureaucracy is probably about the distribution of power, a society postulated upon autocratic principles is bound to render officers into mere instruments that invariably lead to a range of contradictions that are not very difficult to understand if one analyses different forms of autocratic and totalitarian governments. Though the nature of bureaucracy changes with democracy, and liberal democracy enunciates a system based on liberty and individuality, it is assumed that the executives or the officers are given genuine authority and individual responsibility when it comes to decision making, implementation of policies and registration of public grievances. The law authorises the officers to initiate in different domains and it eventually lends legitimacy to their decisions and actions. This is what Weber seems to suggest in his concept of an ideal bureaucratic organisation. He thinks that the legitimacy and efficacy are contingent upon the acceptance of validity of some of the mutually interdependent ideas. For example, “any given legal norm may be established by agreement or by imposition, on grounds of expediency or rational values or both, with a claim to obedience at least on the part of the members of the corporate group. This is, however, usually extended to include all persons within the sphere of authority or of power in question—which in the case of territorial bodies is the territorial area—who stand in certain social relationships or carry out forms of social action which in the order governing the corporate group have been declared to be relevant.” Weber thinks that in the structure of bureaucracy, authorised individuals occupy an office which is subject to an impersonal order or command to which all his initiatives and actions are oriented. It means that the officers work not in private but public interest, these officers are obliged to obey the command given to them within the limits of rational authority. These officers constitute what Weber calls, administrative organs, with their own obligations and functions devided on rational lines.

Weber has given certain presuppositions and causes behind the origin of bureaucracy. He has tried to find out the origin of this institution in the ancient monarchy and medieval church administration. In this respect, clergymen held clerical posts in the churches. Weber has found strong bureaucratic institutions under Roman and Egyptian empires and catholic churches for economic and administrative management. Going down the history, Weber writes, “the historical model of all later bureaucracies—the new Empire of Egypt—is at the same time one of the most grandiose example of an organised subsistence economy. Yet this coincidence of bureaucracy
and subsistence economy is understandable in view of the quite unique conditions that existed in Egypt. And the reservations-and they are quite considerable-which one must take in classifying this Egyptian structure as a bureaucracy are conditioned by the subsistence economy. A certain measure of a developed money economy is the normal precondition for the unchanged and continued existence, if not for the establishment, of pure bureaucratic administrations.  

Organisation of Bureaucracy

Weber also outlines the fundamental structure of bureaucracy which he thinks, is by definition, hierarchical: “the organisation of offices follows the principles of hierarchy; that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one. There is a right of appeal and of statement of grievances from the lower to the higher. Hierarchies differ in respect to whether and in what cases complaints can lead to a ruling from an authority at various points higher in scale, and as to whether changes are imposed from higher up or the responsibility for such changes is left to the lower office, the conduct of which was the subject of complaint.” Weber further suggests that the conduct of these officers should be regulated by rational rules and norms, moreover, they should be given proper and required training to enhance their administrative competence, in order to protect them from extraneous motives or personal pursuit. Weber also emphasises that every administrative act, decision or initiative should be properly documented, which he suggests as a mandatory exercise. Modern citizens in contemporary democracy are perhaps no more unaware of the importance of documentation in public spheres which are run through written communication.

The hierarchical structure, formal positions of the officers, set codes of conduct, documented rules and decisions along with devided responsibilities of the individuals’ respective spheres of work are some of the fundamental features which one can find in the organisation of the corporates. According to Weber the administrative staff or the bureaucrats are appointed according to the following criteria:

1. They are personally free and subject to authority only with respect to their impersonal official obligations.
2. They are organised 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. Thus, in principle, there is free selection.

5. Candidates are selected on the basis of technical qualifications. In the most rational case, this is tested by examination or guaranteed by diplomas certifying technical training, or both. They are appointed, not elected.

6. They are remunerated by fixed salaries in money, for the most part with a right to pensions. Only under certain circumstances 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 graded according to rank in the hierarchy; but in addition to this criterion, the responsibility of the position and the requirements of the incumbent’s social status may be taken into account.

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

8. It constitutes a career. There is a system of “promotion” according to seniority or to achievement, or both. Promotion is dependent on the judgement of superiors.

9. The official works are entirely separated from ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of the position.

10. He is subject to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of the office.6

Weber thinks that apart from other qualifications, bureaucrats or officers must be technically sound which can be enhanced and increased through experience and training. In this respect, these officers are different from ordinary politicians in modern democracies. Moreover, they should also be given fixed salary as the financial security.

Bureaucracy is an important concept in contemporary politics where it has acquired different shades of negative associations, for example, the liberal theorists are very critical of bureaucracy for its lack of transparency and accountability. Marx’s theory, which is very apprehensive of the concentration on state power, condemns it as an instrument of the subordination and exploitation of the poor. They see it as a source of suppression of the common man. On the other hand, the New Right have criticised bureaucracy as a self serving, indifferent and inefficient institution. Though there are
divergent views on bureaucracy, they have been theorised under the following categories:

**Rational-administrative model** - It incorporates the principles with which Weber laid the foundation of modern bureaucracy. “The central feature of bureaucracy from the Weberian perspective is its rationality, because bureaucratization reflects the advance of a reliable, predictable and, above all, efficient means of social organization. For Weber, bureaucracy was nothing less than the characteristic form of organization found in modern society, and in his view, its expansion was irreversible. Not only was this a result of the technical superiority of bureaucracy over other forms of administration, but it was also a consequence of significant economic, political and cultural developments. The development of bureaucratization was closely linked to the emergence of capitalist economies-in particular, to the greater pressure for economic efficiency and the emergence of larger-scale business units. The development of the modern state, and the extension of its responsibilities into the social and economic spheres, also led to the growth of powerful government bureaucracies.” Bureaucracy, as Weber had conceived, has enormously grown and expanded with the decentralisation of political power in the contemporary democracies. India, with a federal system of government, where bureaucracy has established itself at different levels, is a case in point. One goes back to pre-democratic mode of political organisation where power and privileges were concentrated, the domain of bureaucracy was very narrow, yet, equally obscure. If bureaucracy, as Weber thought, is a rational organisation, its expansion is unavoidable for efficiency, transparency and accountability. Weber also thought that with the growth of industrial society, irrespective of the ideologies of political organisation, socialism, communism or liberalism, the nature of bureaucracy will almost be similar. This is what the theorist James Burnham(1905-87) developed as ‘convergence thesis’. That is despite their ideological differences and administrative setup. The industrial societies would be governed by a class of managers, supervisors, technocrats and officials who would be trained and skilled.

**Power-bloc model** - The concept of bureaucracy as a power-bloc is a product of the Socialist and the Marxist theorists. Unlike Weber, Marx has not given systematic theory of bureaucracy. He perhaps didn’t think that bureaucracy is the natural requirement of the industrial societies. He holds a very critical view of bureaucracy as
a particular requirement of the modern capitalism concomitant with a class phenomenon to defend the interests of the bourgeois. Marxists, particularly the neo-Marxist theorists, have pursued in it a conservative tendency which challenges and undermines the interests of the lower social groups. Ralph Miliband, for example, makes a very apt remark about the behaviour of the bureaucrats. He thinks that civil servants act, “as a conservative veto group that dilutes, even blocks, the radical initiatives of socialist ministers and socialist governments. As Miliband puts it, top civil servants are conservative in the sense that they are, within their allotted sphere, conscious or unconscious allies of existing economic and social elites. This happens for a number of reasons. Most obviously, despite the formal requirements of political neutrality, top civil servants share the same educational and social background as industrialists and business managers, and are, therefore, likely to share their ideas, prejudices and the general outlook. The possibility that rising civil servants may harbour radical or socialists sympathies, is also countered by recruitment and promotion procedures designed to insure their ideological ‘soundness’. Miliband thinks that, and in this respect he is far from wrong, that the association of the civil servants has unjustifiably strengthened with the corporate capitalism. This shift he pursues with the growing relationship of the state with capitalists and the business groups.

**Bureaucratic oversupply model** - This model of bureaucracy deals with the economic interests and the motivations of the officials. It is, in fact based on certain realistic assumptions about human nature in the matter of economic choice, that is, officials primarily serve their own interests and are motivated to increase their own resources. William Niskanen thinks that officials are motivated to work for their self interest. “This is because bureaucratic growth guarantees job security, patronage and prestige. Bureaucracies, thus, contain a powerful inner dynamic, leading to the growth of government itself and the expansion of public responsibilities. For the New Right, the ability of appointed officials to dictate policy priorities to elected politicians goes a long way towards explaining how state growth has accrued under governments of very different ideological complexions. Similarly, the image of bureaucrats as nature’s social democrats has important implications for New Right governments’ intent on rolling back the frontiers of the state. They believe that, quite simply, unless bureaucratic power can be checked or circumvented, any attempt to pursue free
This view has brought the bureaucratic functionaries closer to the agents of industries and management.

**Bureaucracy and Democracy**

Bureaucracy is a very old institution as L.V. Mises has pointed out and discussed in his book. Though its nature and structure or organisation have always remained the same, with certain modifications, consequent to the changes in the nature of communication, its functions have seen greater fluctuation and variation parallel to the changes in the mode of governance. For example, in the recent times, one can very clearly pursue the difference in the functioning of bureaucracy under dictatorship or totalitarianism, and liberal democracy. Unlike liberal democracy, in a totalitarian state, the behaviour of the officers is very ruthless and arbitrary in the absence of reasonable regulations. Sometimes under a dictatorship, the officers are subjected to dehumanising conformity to the denial of their individuality. For example, what is called bureaucratic collectivism, which came to prominence during the time of Stalin in Soviet Union, is a case in point. Such arrangement is aimed at perpetuating control over political power and economic resources. Moreover, since officers work under extreme secrecy and subordination they hardly find scope for dissent. It is not necessary to relate such bureaucratic subordination to Soviet socialism rather its elements can be found functioning in a state with capitalist economic arrangement. At times, bureaucracy takes this kind of functional appearance under certain socialistic arrangement.

In an ideal democratic condition, though the subordination of the functionaries is taken for granted, as Weber emphasises, “the members of the administrative staff may be bound to obedience to their superior (or superiors) by custom, by affectual ties, by a purely material complex of interests, or by ideal (wertrational) motives”, they are also supposed to exercise their mind, independence and autonomy, the most important human qualities.

**Bureaucracy in India**

One can trace the conceptual foundations of bureaucracy in India even before the colonial establishment. But the modern hierarchical bureaucratic organisation is a product of Weberian ideas which evolved in Europe after the industrial revolution and
capitalism. It came to India through the British rule. The British rule was probably guided by the Weberian concept of organizational sociology, a concept which has found an application in almost all modern organizations independent of whether they are social, economic or political. In other words, “Weber held that bureaucracy was an integral part of every planned and organized group activity called administration, and that it was not restricted to any particular system, colonial or capitalist, socialist or communist. It form as much a part of scientific, technological or even religious organization as so-called general administration. It would not in fact be possible to do away with bureaucracy in the transaction of human business in any organized field of activity. Starting from this general principle of organizational sociology, Weber analysed bureaucracy as an administrative organization and then proceeded to deal specifically with his pure or rational type of bureaucracy called the ‘ideal type’ (as has already been observed in this chapter). This consisted of an impersonal and legal body of salaried and professional administrators, appointed through selection by open competition, employed on a full-time basis and organized hierarchically in departments in accordance with rules governing the terms and conditions of service. The formal constitution of the bureaucracy that developed in India contains these basic ingredients of Weber’s rational or ideal type.”11 Weber defined bureaucracy as a rational system of administration (as already discussed). The Weberian concept has given birth to many modern theories of bureaucracy which Martin Albrow has discussed under the following categories: bureaucracy as rational organisation, bureaucracy as an organisational inefficiency, bureaucracy as a rule by officials, bureaucracy as public administration, bureaucracy as administration by officials, bureaucracy as the organisation and bureaucracy as modern society.12 As one conducts systematic study of Indian bureaucracy and its different aspects, one can find elements of almost all these theories. For instance, as one talks about inefficiency in bureaucracy, one can find it reflected in the lack of vision, interest and undue rigidity in maintaining the status quo and an inability to use appropriate thinking. One can see that bureaucracy has been a center of severe criticism from its very beginning that is well reflected when one considers bureaucracy as rule by officials. Since bureaucracy was thus originally conceived, which one can find in Weber’s theory, “de Gournay and Mill called this bureaumania ‘an illness in France which bids fair to play havoc with the people.’ He went on to complain: the offices, the clerks, secretaries, inspectors and indendants are not appointed to benefit the public interest, indeed the
public interest appears to have been established so that offices might exist.”¹³ Since bureaucracy is considered an administrative system in the service of the people, the idea of the rule of the officials with so much power and privileges has met with considerable criticism and reprehension from political theorists and administrative thinkers. For example, Harold Laski thinks that the idea of bureaucracy as a rule by officials is likely to endanger liberties of the ordinary citizens. When one considers bureaucracy as public administration it signifies a group of people engaged in meeting with social goals. In this context, bureaucracy is considered to be an institution in the hands of a group of people. On the other hand, bureaucracy as administration by officials is a concept which is associated with Max Weber (as discussed above). Bureaucracy as an organisation is regarded as an institution run by relatively large scale organisations with specialised functions. Bureaucracy as a modern institution is often understood as political executives who control the institutions they run. This is the pattern of bureaucracy which one finds in India.

Weber’s conception of bureaucracy is inseparable from democracy. Since bureaucracy is unthinkable in human organisation of any denomination for different purposes, Weber thought that a democracy can not work without bureaucracy, as has been pointed out above. He also thought that unlike kingship or feudal state in a democracy officials can, as citizens of a free state, somehow maintain their independence and neutrality. He thought that the officials are not servants in the traditional sense because invested with authority and bound by law they are not subjected to personal loyalty. They work in a system which works according to the constitution. Every political theory has certain imperfections, Weberian concept of bureaucracy is not an exception. As India’s constitution evolved through different historical stages, the colonial government incorporated and introduced most of the Weberian ideas to develop a bureaucratic structure in the context of socio-political situations to deal with administration in India (this aspect has been discussed in details in chapter two). The framers of the constitution of the independent India realised the validity and viability of the Weberian model. Therefore, the constitution of India has retained the inherited structure with required amendments over time. Such amendments have been necessitated due to historical as well as social reasons to regulate and conduct political and administrative institutions. India being a vast country has immense diversity of religions, castes and creeds, language and dialects,
this heterogeneity at different levels can not be managed effectively without a bureaucracy which keeps on updating itself to the demands of the time.

Indian bureaucracy is essentially a colonial legacy. The general impression has always been negative because of the behaviour of the officers, the conditions in which they work, the attitude which they hold towards the people and the mechanical way in which they execute their tasks. For example, “it is customary for a secretary or minister not to lift the receiver of the telephone. The Personal Assistant is left to ask irrelevant questions. This is the superstructure to present an appearance of superiority. The Babu-oriented administration wears the new mask of post-independence SAHEB. His total output in terms of social objective is anybody’s guess. But he, sometimes, works hard without delivering goods.

The image of an Indian bureaucrat does not rise above the ground line of familiar facts and is inflamed with unexalted thoughts. The picture is none too bright. The woodenness sometimes brings a blush to the cheeks of the sensitive people inside the service.

Demands on public servants are high, people are not resigned to lives of poverty, hunger, illness, idleness. With the expansion of government’s functions in all spheres, the promises made by the ruling parties on the eve of elections, the backlog of performance has been increasing. The imbalance between aspirations and performance, between needs and adequacy of the administrative machinery, these inscribe the character of a public servant.”

Bureaucracy in India is, in fact, one of the most important political institutions and it has perhaps received a lot of criticism from experts and ordinary people. Since India is a democracy with great number of people still in deep poverty who are largely dependent on the welfare measures which reach them through bureaucracy, it has often been observed that such social and economic schemes hardly reach the heterogenous people of the society, fairly and equally. This is what explains the causes reflected in the following observations. “The general impressions are that a public servant does not work according to the light of reason; nor according to rule; nor in accordance with the aspirations of the people, he whiles away his time; his output is ungloriously petty; it is also devoid of social purpose. In a large number of cases he lives beyond his emoluments. The traditional prestige structure makes him insolent
and isolated from the mainstream of life. Despite his wisdom and cleverness, more often, he lands the institutions over which he presides, in loss and mismanagement.”

Bureaucracy has met with scathing criticism in India for many reasons (some of them have been discussed in last chapter). One can understand the growing criticism concerning bureaucracy in India if one places the whole mechanism in its wider political, social and economic perspectives. For example, the structure of Indian administration is hierarchical. In such a situation, subordination of the officials is inevitable. They come directly under the control of the politician as well as their senior officials which affects their performance. Despite commissions and committee for the reformation of civil services, there has not been much progress in this regard. Around three decades after independence of India when there had already been initiatives to reform the Indian bureaucracy, it was realised that “there have been changes only partially to suit overpowering needs. The main lines of the civil service were laid down during the British rule. Even after Independence no fundamental reforms have taken place. In the institutional inertia of the British system, a basic cause of the disappointing performance, specially in the realisation of plan objectives, are noted by many people. Even the politicians have exhibited the customary attitude to administrative institutions as one of complacency.”

Indian bureaucracy is often considered in the light of colonial and post colonial history and a class system, replacing the original ICS, ‘which was considered the steel frame of the British administration’ by the IAS. Despite historical and political changes, the nature and the functions of bureaucracy are still almost the same, as revealed in the following observation made by the first Administrative Reforms Commission (ARC), appointed by the government of India, about the organizational deficiencies: (a) multiplicity of agencies, (b) overlapping and diffusion of functions, and (c) proliferation of personnel. It came to the conclusion that the methods and procedures were ill-suited for proper policy formulation as well as for efficient programme execution. Powers and responsibility did not match in several cases and there was over-centralization of authority in ministries and departments. The ministers were zealous of protecting their power and wanted to preserve them. The arrangements for coordination were not adequate. There was marked tendency towards too much cross references. The secretariat was burdened with unimportant work and had become an unwieldy and over-staffed organisation leading to
occasional blurring of responsibilities and choking of administrative machinery. ARC’s main recommendations for organizational reforms were: (a) a more rational distribution of work in the secretariat and among the executive agencies, (b) improvement of arrangements for coordination, (c) reduction in administrative agencies and staff, (d) strengthening of the top structure and adoption of board-type of management, (e) reduction in levels of consideration, (f) integration with the secretariat of the field agencies, and (g) delegation of powers.”17

Historical Background

It is important to outline the historical background of the institution of bureaucracy in India although their specific causes and functions have been discussed (in chapter two). Bureaucracy, or public service, in colonial India is generally traced to the growth of the Company’s civil service in 1834. It is important to highlight some of the features of the development of bureaucracy that preceded the Government of India Act, 1833. Before 1833, certain individuals were nominated to the Writerships by the Directors of the company on the condition that once appointed they would not accept any gift or reward. Under a rule established in 1806, the distribution of patronage was so designed as to give two nominations each to the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman of the Court, one to each of the other Directors and two to the Board of Control.18 Since the Court was a corporate body it had final control in selection including examining the desirability, suitability and competence of the persons for the Company’s civil service. In this respect the Committee of College at Haileybury played an important role. In 1826 the parliament passed an Act to increase the number of civil servants due to the territorial expansion of British empire in India. It necessitated structural changes in the pattern of selection and the organisation of the committee for such purposes. But at that time the servants had the background of liberal education as they were university products.

Prior to 1833, there was no competitive examination for selecting civil servants. The court of Directors had supreme authority in the matter of selection and appointment of civil servants and also in the supervision of the East India College. In all these matters the court alone was responsible. After 1833 Act, two fundamental changes were made. First, the Imperial control of the Company’s civil service came directly under the Board of Control, a parliamentary body. Secondly, the disciplinary control of the
Government of India over civil servants became stronger and more definite. For example, the Board of Control was authorised to revise the required number of vacancies for the civil establishments of the respective governments in India. It also had control over the procedures and mechanisms of selections. “According to its proposed four-fold system the Act in fact determined to introduced a principle of limited competition under which the candidates so nominated for admission were to be subjected to a preliminary examination in such branches of knowledge and by such examiners as the Board directed. The examiners were to prepare a list of such candidates in order of merit, and those who stood highest were to be admitted by the Court as students in the College. Subject to approval by the King in Council, the authority of the Board of Control extended likewise to the framing of rules governing the formation of the annual estimate by the Government of India, to the regulation of the affairs of the College, and to the control of the final examination of candidates after they had completed their residence. The old system of successful students being classed according to merit continued, their position in the list determined their seniority and gave them the right of choice in regard to the province to which they wished to be appointed.”19 But the four-fold system came under severe criticism and apposition of the Court of Directors who perceived it as a serious enfringement of their right to patronage.

The institution of civil service went through many changes from time to time. Changes were aimed at improving its structure and efficiency which involved method of selection, appointment and promotion. The enactment of 1850 Act was an important step in that direction. For example, under the previous Acts the preliminary investigation of any imputation against the public servant was made by the Sadar Courts or the Board of Revenue to which the officer was subordinate. In this context a complaint might have been examined even by the Judge-Magistrate or Collecter. In this process even a commission might have been appointed to make a regular or formal investigation. The Act of 1850 provided that a charge against the conduct of an officer should have a substantial proof. Thus, it tried to minimize the chances of malicious prosecution. “The Act of 1850, thus, imparted security to the civil service in two ways. First, it recused the discretion of the government of India by making formal and public enquiry, a condition precedent to any action being taken against a public servant; and secondly, it acted as a deterrent to the public against groundless
imputations being brought against him for fear of answering a counter charge."\textsuperscript{20} Such immunity which was conceived at that time as still survives with strong constitutional provisions. After 1850, one finds positive changes in civil service for example, as the Macaulay Committee, which gave India proper its first modern civil service in 1854, recommended the abolition of patronage system under the East India Company and converted it into a permanent institution based on merit through competitive examinations. Thus, “After 1855, recruitment to the ICS came to be based totally on merit. The report of the Civil Service Commission pointed out that, of those who entered the ICS between 1855 and 1878, more than two-thirds were university men, equipped with a liberal and finished education. Initially, the ICS sought its recruits from Oxford and Cambridge. It was, thus, an elite service. Subsequently, it opened its doors to Indians and from 1922 onwards the Indian Civil Service Examination began to be held in India.”\textsuperscript{21} Provision for open competition, which was introduced by the Charter Act of 1853, was in fact a positive development as it abolished the old powers and privileges of the Court of Directors to nominate candidates of their own choice. The Act provided that any person being a natural subject of the British empire who may be aspirant could be examined and appointed. Moreover, the Board of Control was authorised to make regulations for the determination of the qualifications for the admission and recruitment. It was on this occasion that the famous Macaulay Committee was appointed by the Board of Control to advise it. Macaulay Committee consisted of such prominent five members as T.B. Macaulay, Ashburton, Henry Melvill, Benjamin Jowett, John George Shaw Lefevre. Macaulay’s vision of civil service was in fact guided by the liberal education of that time. He thought that a civil servant should be properly educated, an idea which is perhaps missing today and its political and social consequences in the life of the general public is not very difficult to see. Macaulay thought that the duty of a public servant is to help the political executive in the formation and implementation of the policies. Since his job is complex which requires not simply mechanical talent but vision and experience, a public servant should be a properly educated person. It was in this manner that the Macaulay Commitee suggested the subsequent transformation regarding age, eligibility and qualifications for the appointments of the civil servants. One can understand the seriousness which Macaulay attached to education in order to make the institution efficient. “Macaulay’s whole emphasis was in fact on the cultivation of mind, on general education, on the enlarging and strengthening of understanding,
which must precede special education or training in skill, necessary for the despatch of professional business. His Committee, therefore, divided the whole of its proposed scheme into two parts, the first comprising the subjects of study for general education, and the second for the special education immediately relevant to the job of a civil servant. The subjects included in the first part were Greek, Latin, English language and literature, English history and the constitution, three modern European languages, such as German, French and Italian, pure and mixed mathematics, the natural sciences, such as; chemistry, geology, mineralogy, botany and zoology, elements of moral and political philosophy, sanskrit and arabic."

Given the elaborate and ostensibly comprehensive course of education which Macaulay conceived for the civil servants, one should not confused his pragmatism with pedantry. His aim was basically to create a clerical class for the industrialised society or to transact political and economic business for the East India Company in colonial India. It should be noted that the recommendations regarding the regulation of the pattern of examinations and recruitment which Macaulay suggested didn’t come into practice entirely without reservations. Considerable debates and discussions took place in the parliament to bring the desirable and viable suggestions into force.

Civil service in India, primarily known as Indian Civil Services (ICS), is in fact, as Macaulay envisaged, a legacy of the British India. Many social and administrative scientists with interest in Indian administration have given detailed account of bureaucratic administration in the pre and post independent India. It is believed, and given the nature of colonial administration it is meaningless to suspect it beyond certain limits, that bureaucracy identified itself with the colonial rule, a tendency which infuriated the nationalists in India. For example, in the 1930s when Britain was facing great trouble posed by the struggle of the nationalist the bureaucracy in India was often partial in its dealings with Indians. For instance, “When war came in 1939, the ICS, and the colonial bureaucracy more generally, were still basically loyal to the British Government. The main opposition to the raj and to the ICS as its agent came from the Indian National Congress. Nehru had repeatedly made his position clear as to what he thought of the ICS, and many in the Congress agreed with him. Certainly, there was no place in Gandhian ideology for a highly paid administrative elite. Yet only ten years later, Indian ICS men had leaped into the top administrative posts in hand, an ICS successor had been created, and nearly all, roughly three million
colonial officials who were working for the British at the time of independence, had been asked to stay at their posts. Why did the Congress change its position during the 1940s and opt for retaining an ICS framework and the tradition of administration it represented? There were, clearly, various factors involved. It gives one a very deep understanding about the behaviour of bureaucracy. In fact Weber and those who initially provided the theoretical foundation to this institution had some ideal view of it from which neutrality and independence can hardly be dissociated. If bureaucracy in colonial India was under the subordination of political structure and found it difficult to have an independent function, the situation, unfortunately, is not very difficult in the post independent India where bureaucracy is often partisan. That is why, the very idea of merit had always been suspect, “Throughout the history of the civil service, there have been different concepts of the merit principle. For many years after the passage of the first Civil Service Acts, the measure of merit was the degree to which political influence was kept out of the appointments and promotions, rather than the level of competence in the public service. Apart from receiving applications, giving examinations, and maintaining records, the first Civil Service Commission did little else.”

As already noted above, Indian Civil Service is a colonial legacy and is in fact indispensable for running a federal democracy. Its formal origin goes back to the provision under the Government of India Act 1919 to establish a public service commission for India. It came into being with the recommendations made in 1924 by the Royal Commission on Superior Civil Service also known as a Lee Commission. The first public service commission was setup in 1926 headed by Sir Ross Barker. Before 1926, the recruitment for most of the departments of the civil service in India was conducted in England. In 1922, simultaneous recruitment was made both in India and England. It was in fact in 1928 that India conducted the first competitive examination for the civil services. In this respect one can further note that the independent India conducted the first competitive examination for the civil services in September-October 1947 under the Government of India Act 1935. When India became a Republic the federal Public Service Commission was renamed as the Union Public Service Commission(UPSC). The Union Public Service Commission has been performing its tasks ever since January 26, 1950.
Indian Federalism and the Role of Bureaucracy

India, as envisaged by the framers of the Indian constitution, is a federal democracy with a strong unitary tendencies. Of all the elements which distinguish Indian federalism with a strong union, bureaucracy is regarded as an indispensable one. For example, in the United States the federal and state governments have their own officials to administer their respective laws and functions. On the other hand, there is no such absolute division in India. Majority of the public servants are employed by central and states on the condition of mutual transferability. For instance, the constitution of India under (Art. 312) provides for the establishment of the All India Services whose members are common to the center as well as the states. That is, members of Indian Administrative Service may be employed under some union departments and under state governments. But while serving under some state governments he may be dismissed or removed only by the union government, though state government is authorised to initiate any proceedings against the officer in this regard. As one places the complexity of Indian democracy, its vastness, the general condition of the elected representatives, the educated public servants play the role of paramount importance in the sphere of auxiliary legislation, general administration and implementation of public schemes, policies and decisions. This is why many parliamentary commentators considered the inclusion and provisions of public service in the constitution of India as a product of the wisdom of the members of the constituent assembly. “One of the matters which do not usually find place in a constitutional document but have been included in our Constitution is the public services. The wisdom of the makers of our Constitution in giving a constitutional basis to such matters as are left to ordinary legislation and administrative regulations under other constitutions may be appreciated if we properly assess the importance of public servants in a modern democratic government.” Although, in a federal parliamentary democracy like India legislation is laid down by the ministers responsible to the parliament, laws and policies are implemented and executed by a large body of officials at the center and state level who seems to have no objectionable political association. One can distinguish between permanent executive such as bureaucrats from the political executives like ministers in the government. There is no doubt that the political executives chosen by the electorates and assign different tasks in the respective departments of the government, they are consistently
assisted in the matter of legislation, policies and decisions by the officials. The officials not simply help them in formal ways but at times they offer advice in the initiation of important laws and schemes in the matter of administration and public welfare (as has been discussed in later chapters). The role public servants are playing at different levels in Indian democracy, though the power and privileges of such offices are not totally free from vices, abuses and misuses, the institution of civil service is indispensable in the context of federal parliamentary Indian democracy. One of the reasons is that legislation, in the fast changing socio-economic, scientific and technological changes, requires proper expertise, skills and trainings. Therefore, public servants who are supposed to be adequately equipped with knowledge are central to the matters of governance. One can say that, “Owing to its large size and importance, bureaucracy has now been regarded as an organised sub-system of the total societal system. It has a crucial role to play in the developing countries. The bureaucracy has developed its own structures, values, norms and patterns of behaviour. Everywhere, it has been granted a legal status, adequate powers and an aura of legitimacy. At various levels, the members of administrative organisations exercise considerable quantum of discretionary and other formal powers both in the execution of a law as well as its interpretation.” That is why Weber considered bureaucracy inalienable from every form of government.

**Bureaucracy and Development**

The concept of development is very complex and uncomprehensive. It encompasses all those aspects of material life which are essential to the overall social existence of man. In this respect Marx’s view of man’s social existence seems to be more convincing than the one held by idealistic philosophers and political thinkers. The Marxian idea that it is the changes in the means and modes of material condition which determine man’s actual life and all his idealistic values are subservient to it is irrefutable. It shows that the very idea of development is an economic concept, a definition which seems to be more relevant in the context of the changes which have taken place in the last few decades, particularly in the developing societies. “In strictly economic terms, ‘development’ for the past two decades has meant the capacity of a national economy whose initial economic condition has been more or less static for a long time, to generate and sustain an annual increase in its gross national product...”
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As India became independent, the framers of the constitution incorporated certain principles of a welfare state. In a socialistic welfare state the success of the government largely depends on the measures and actions taken to improve the economic and social condition of the people. That is why development is often considered synonymous with action. That is, in such a situation bureaucracy becomes the eventual administration of development. An administrative responsibility is not simply to maintain law and order rather his responsibility goes beyond the limited function to the care for the people in society. This trend consolidated 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 concern in the general policies of the government. “As one of Britain’s major interests in India, as in other parts of her colonies, was to use its resources to her best interests, little attention was given by the British to develop administration as an instrument of economic and social change. The administration was solely concerned with the maintenance of law and order and collection of revenues. After attaining independence, the functions of government have undergone a fundamental change. Instead of being the guardian of law and order alone it has now assumed the role of a custodian of welfare and the well-being of its citizens. This has led to a greater intervention of the state into economic and social fields. The penetration of the state into economic and social developmental activities has acquired new importance in the task of nation-building. The odium for bringing about desired economic, and political change in India has in greater part fallen on the bureaucracy, which has been built up over the years by the British to suit their objectives. The bureaucracy in India has now to undertake several complex socio-economic functions and bring about the necessary social and economic change for nation-building purpose in the society. With the adoption of these new goals and objectives, the style of the functioning of bureaucracy had also to undergo changes. Formerly the bureaucracy in India had to function in the background of a colonial rule and imperial order but it was now supposed to work in the framework of a democratic setup with active involvement of the people for whose welfare the state existed.”

The institution of bureaucracy, as discussed above, is very old. Its structure and functions and the role itself have gone through changes, the most obvious changes one can perceive colonial and post colonial governments. As one goes down the history of
the function of bureaucracy, particularly in India, its role has undoubtedly come into prominence with the emergence of a welfare state. The idea of welfare state is action oriented where a lot of economic responsibilities for on the official machinery. In fact, “With the growth of the welfare state, a phenomenon evident even in those countries which still lag behind in introducing state social services, the need for the diffusion of managerial responsibilities over a number of smaller units has rapidly extended during recent years, when so many central departments require to have local offices in close contact with the public which the department serves. Two important problems arise here, the first of leadership and the second of labour supply. On the one hand the leadership group needs to delegate as much responsibility as possible to the local manager, but this delegation must be compatible with the achievement of equal standards of administrative execution throughout the country: on the other hand, the expansion of the state administration into fields previously covered by smaller autonomous units places a strain upon the available managerial resources of the community. There are signs of shortage in abilities of this type. Unfortunately, the need for administrative uniformity restricts the scope of management in the public services while at the same time the mediocre nature of the managerial talents available supports this tendency, as though it were really the best solution but it may not be the best solution. The most difficult problem today is to discover, within the presuppositions of state enterprise, the way to distribute responsibilities as widely as possible. With this end in view, existing theories of politics need constant revision in order to give resiliency to public administration. It must also be the object of public administration not so much to restrict the scope of management to the managerial abilities available as to devise ways of widening the scope of those abilities. This problem arises in its most acute form in the centre-state department which has grown to huge proportions and least in local government which can still be tied intimately to a local sphere of operations, although the problem becomes of increasingly difficult with the tendency to diminish the scope of the smaller local authority. No doubt, the increasing importance of the public corporations in public administration has a special bearing upon this problem. Before the Second World War, this form of organization was favoured because it introduced the business type of management into public administration, but it is doubtful whether such reasons have recently been paramount.”
As it has been already noted, the role of bureaucracy in developmental programmes is a very modern phenomenon in its magnitude. Traditionally, bureaucracy was identified with clerical and mechanical exercises. Today, every sphere of man’s social and economic life is highly bureaucratised. As social and economic changes are affecting man’s actual life, their management now largely depends on bureaucratic distribution. 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 time of Weber in the beginning of the industrial age. One can see, for example, with the rapid social and economic transformation in India bureaucracy has entered almost every sphere of life. Thus, one can say that now bureaucrats in India, “are not only deeply connected with the implementation of public policies, but also assigned by other public policymakers, the responsibility for clarifying rules and regulations. Even more frequently, bureaucrats are expected to provide expertise in their particular policy areas for those elected to make public policy. With their power to interpret the management of policies, bureaucrats are often public policy brokers. As such, they often contribute to the placement of issues on the public agenda.” With the rapid industrialisation of Indian economy and increasing role of education, bureaucracy in India has developed beyond its traditional identity. Today’s bureaucrats are not simply performing traditional clerical tasks, they are state civil engineers, forest officers, policy planners, and so on.

Concepts and Patterns of Development

Development is a very complex concept, as has already been discussed, it has many aspects which can not be conceived and materialised without economic progress. Modern concept of development is predominantly economic driven by the periodic breakthroughs in science and technology. There are many approaches to development or modernisation which are being followed in underdeveloped and developing economies on the pattern of already industrialised societies in Europe and the United States, such as, communist model of development, diffusion approach, psychological approach, dependency theory, alternative development approaches, human centered development, market-friendly approaches to development, and in India, one often hears in political circles about emphasis been given to Gandhian approach to
development. These theories are somehow related with economics and fast increasing economic inequality in the age of immense economic growth. India, for example, passes today through the same stages of economic and social changes, the industrialised world experienced in the age of Marx. After the industrial revolution, as the communist model of development propounded by Marx, the main emphasis on development was to challenge the unreasonable inequality. This is one of the reasons behind Marx’s reaction against capitalism and its evils. Marx thought that, “in a capitalist society, the capitalists exploit the labour by employing it to produce goods and services for sale in return for a wage. This wage is expected to support workers in order that they can continue to work and maintain themselves. But this wage is less than the value of the production which their labour has produced. Profits are made by the capitalist taking or appropriating this newly produced value.”

One can trace the whole idea of socialistic pattern of development, which has given birth to the very idea of welfare state, has found practical expression in many capitalist democracies. There are countries with capitalist economy with many principles of socialism, India is one of them. But there are many countries, particularly in Latin America, where communist model of development is more dynamic.

Diffusion approach was propounded mainly by Everett M. Rougers and R. S. Edari. It is defined as a process of development based on the development of the information and communication technology. This concept has found expression in many underdeveloped and developing economies in the present age of globalisation and economic liberalisation. One can say that it is the homogenisation of economic model of development on the pattern and possibilities with the industrialised world has open for the rest of the world and its effect is very much clear in the economies of the third world, which have perhaps no alternative but to open their markets and to adopt the methods and values of the highly industrialised economies. The changes which India made in its economic policies in 1990s were the consequences of the economic changes and technological progress, resulting into many giant economic institutions, which the developed world had made many decades before. As one goes back to past, one finds that, “there were far-reaching changes in international economic relations between countries after the Second World War. The developed countries saw in them new opportunities for expanding their trade and investments reach all parts of the world. The developing countries saw these changes as an erosion of sovereign rights
in economic management and an attempt to open up the markets in their countries to goods and services from the developed countries. The origin of globalisation, as we see it today, can be traced to the Uruguay Round of talks, 1986-96, to expand the 1948 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The successive rounds of negotiations culminated in the WTO Agreement of 1995, signed by 130 countries in April 1994, which became effective in most of its parts from January, 1995.33

In the 1960s, Andre Gunder Frank gave the concept of dependency theory in the context of globalisation and the persistent poverty of the developing world. He thinks that the underdeveloped countries, due to the lack of resources, increasingly dependent on the technologically advanced countries. Gunder Frank, and Cardoso and Faletto “argue that the lack of industrial development in the Third World is due to its economic resources and ‘surplus’ being drained northwards to the ‘metropolitan’ centres: Western capitalism penetrates and simultaneously underdevelops the Third World ‘satellites’ which become ‘dependent’ countries, economically poor, and politically weak. Dependency theory dismisses the Brandt recommendations since the strategies they invoke ‘are not designed to be translated into basic products and services for the moneyless poor, but rather for the moneyed spenders of the South.’ The recommendations from dependency theory are:

I. The Third World should break its links with capitalist metropolises;
II. That it should do this by challenging international capitalism, mainly by the working class removing the domestic comprador elite;
III. They should develop a policy of international solidarity between Third World countries in order to help each other to build an effectively dependent industrial base in the South.”34

E.F. Schumacher drastically differs from other theorists of development, discussed above, and gave the concept of alternative development which has certain resemblance with the Gandhian view of development, also because he conducted his research, to a large extent, in India. His alternative development approach is different from other approaches in the sense that it claims to offer an alternative to industrial mode of development by propounding the idea of self reliance and small scale technological system. Schumacher visited India during the time of Nehru in 1961, when the independent India’s economy was struggling to find its place in the
economies of the world, and advised the government of India to set up small scale industrial units to create employment and ensure growth. Schumacher thought that it is not viable for a country like India to follow Western pattern of development. “Schumacher suggested that large-scale industrial corporations should allow fifty per cent of their equity capital to be held publicly by what he terms ‘Social Councils’, locally appointed groups made up of trade unionists, employers, and other community members, who would use the share dividend revenue to invest in the vital social needs of the community, something which private capital could never be relied on to do. Private management would still run the company but would have to allow members of the council to inspect their books and observe Board meetings.”35
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